



Representations on the Brentwood Pre-Submission Local Plan

Contents

Section Name	Page
Chapter 1 Introduction	1 - 34
Chapter 2 Borough of Villages	35 - 45
Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives	46 - 67
Chapter 4 Managing Growth	68 - 172
Chapter 5 Resilient Built Environment	174 – 216
Chapter 6 Housing Provision	217 – 253
Chapter 7 Prosperous Community	254 – 277
Chapter 8 Natural Environment	278 – 366
Chapter 9 Site Allocations	367 – 975
Appendix 1 Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory	976 – 982
Appendix 2 Site Allocations	983 – 990
Appendix 6 Glossary	991

Brentwood Local Plan 2016 - 2033 (Pre-Submission, Regulation 19)

Report Date:

12/02/2020

CHAPTER: Chapter 1. Introduction

Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033

22234 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please refer to my representations below (ID 22202 and 22203) Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds: failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed; inadequate consultation with Epping Forest District Council and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore; failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development; adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22234 - 4376 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - ii, iv

22265 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: ECC supports preparation of BBC Local Plan.
Remain significant gaps in evidence base.
Support for Plan can only be provided following completed to ECC satisfaction:
a. appropriate transport evidence base to illustrate site specific, local and cumulative impact on local and strategic transport network, and to identify any infrastructure and/or mitigation measures required, together with costs and phasing;
b. up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) including infrastructure costs, phasing, delivery and viability (need to be agreed with ECC as primary infrastructure provider); and
c. clear references to evidence base within Plan to support spatial strategy, and Local Plan policies.

Change To Plan: BBC need to complete the following:

- An appropriate transport evidence base, to reflect ECC's role as Highway Authority, that clearly illustrates the site specific, local and cumulative impact on the local and strategic transport network, and to identify any infrastructure and/or mitigation measures which would be required, together with costs and phasing;
- An up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that includes infrastructure costs, phasing, delivery and viability; and
- Clear references to the evidence base within the Plan to support the spatial strategy, and the Local Plan policies.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22265 - 6776 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - i, ii, iii, iv

22303 Object

Respondent: Mr N McCarthy [6988]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We object on grounds of unsoundness and inconsistency in application of planning guidelines. Key information needed to assess the Plan has not been readily available leading to concerns over the legality of the undertaking.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of sites R25 and R26.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22303 - 6988 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - ii, iv

22337 Object

Respondent: Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan was not positively prepared because the council was aiming to "protect" its borough from development by putting housing away from where it was really needed. See attachment for details

Change To Plan: The strategic options need to be reassessed in the light of housing need throughout the borough rather than a desire to keep it away from villages and towns.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22337 - 4309 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - i

23096 Object**Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Despite the engagement between Brentwood Council and neighbouring authorities, it is considered that not all information and assurances sought from Brentwood Borough Council have been provided and this brings into question the soundness of the rationale and choices made in the Brentwood Borough Local Plan. Many of the comments previously raised remain unanswered or inadequately addressed. It is uncertain how the Plan has been informed by this previous input.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23096 - 369 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - i

24056 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]****Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]**

Summary: Representation summary. The landowner wishes to highlight the sustainability of the proposed site on land rear of Mill House Farm, Hay Green Lane, Hook End, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 0NX (as illustrated by the Site Location Plan included at Appendix 1) to deliver much-needed new rural housing for Hook End enhancing its vitality.

Change To Plan: Add site to plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24056 - 8359 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - None

24061 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]****Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]**

Summary: The plan needs more flexibility for smaller housing sites. The Site at land at rear of Mill House Farm is available and suitable. The location is a well contained urban extension. The green belt assessment shows it is suitable - is well contained, would not reduce significant gaps, has no specific countryside function and has no relationship with a historical town.

Change To Plan: Add land rear of Mill House Farm to plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24061 - 8359 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - i, ii, iii, iv

24077 Object**Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]****Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]**

Summary: Object to the omission of Honeypot Lane from the Brentwood Pre-Submission Local Plan. Honeypot Lane is a sustainable development location in close proximity and easy access and integration with new jobs, community facilities, services and greenspace as a principal tier 1 category settlement; it would contribute to the five year housing supply; it has already been tested by the Sustainability Appraisal. Removal is not justified.

Change To Plan: LLLP conclude that the Plan needs to be modified to identify and allocate Land at Honeypot Lane, Brentwood (ref: 022) for residential development of up to 250 new dwellings with associated transport, community and green infrastructure. The Brentwood Borough Local Plan: Pre-Submission, January 2019. Allocation of Honeypot Lane must include its removal from the Green Belt and the appropriate revision of the boundaries of that designated area. The Plan's proposed Housing Trajectory (Appendix 1), the Key Diagram and the list of proposed allocation sites should be updated to include Land at Honeypot Lane accordingly.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24077 - 8362 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - i, ii, iii

24749 Object**Respondent: Miss Harriet Davis [8440]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Any future development should be led by the local community rather than trying to hit target.

Change To Plan: To make the Plan sound Blackmore should be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24749 - 8440 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - None

25396 Object**Respondent: Mr & Mrs Michael & Valerie Lamont [8510]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not sound, not justified.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25396 - 8510 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - None

25626 Object**Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Submission on behalf of Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish council and on behalf of Blackmore Village Heritage Association by Holmes & Hills LLP. 18 March 2019.
 Representing 350 households in Blackmore (population 943) and a Parish Population of 2,561 with the BVHA membership of 150. strongly object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 within the local plan. They are contrary to both national and local policies as:
 BBC fail to demonstrate that housing need cannot be met on previously developed land sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on other proposed allocated sites.
 BBC fail to demonstrate that there are no or insufficient previously developed sites outside the existing urban areas.
 That there are preferable green field sites available and more sustainable.
 R25 and R26 are unsuitable due to inadequate access, flooding, a disproportionate increase in housing stock and the development would not be sustainable.
 Disagree that Blackmore is a category 3 settlement and is in fact a "larger village".
 Therefore concluding that the plan is unsound as it has not been positively prepared not effective, and is not justified nor consistent with the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25626 - 1921 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - i, ii, iii, iv

24055 Support**Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]****Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]**

Summary: General Support for the plan with specific comment on sections:
 Section 4: Managing Growth - specifically Policy SP02: Managing Growth
 Section 9: Site Allocations

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24055 - 8359 - Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 - None

22603 Object**Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to sites R25 and R26 within the LDP.

Not chosen for good planning protocols, but convenient due to developers lined up.

At last LDP iteration - inappropriate to develop in the villages due to a lack of infrastructure. Nothing changed.

The scale of 70 new houses in a village of 350 houses is totally out of proportion - will change character.

Poor access. Flooding risk to village increased. Lack of good transport links.

Blackmore School at capacity - would force pupils out of the area.

No 'very special circumstances' to warrant building on greenbelt.

Change To Plan: Taking out R25 and R26 as potential developments.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22603 - 4869 - 1.1 - i, ii, iv

24079 Object**Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]****Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]**

Summary: At Section 1 in paragraph 1.1 the BBLP establishes that the plan period is from 2016 to 2033 and indicates that the plan sets out how the Borough will develop over the next 17 years. Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (February 2019) states that: "Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure". [Our emphasis]. The BBLP will not have a minimum 15 year plan period at adoption which is anticipated to be 2020 at the earliest. As currently drafted the plan period would

Change To Plan: The plan period for the BBLP should be modified to ensure that there is a minimum 15 year period from the date of adoption.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24079 - 8362 - 1.1 - iv

23662 Object**Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: The proposed PSLP period runs until 2033. Assuming, optimistically, adoption in 2019, this means that the Local Plan will address development needs for a maximum of 14 years. The NPPF (paragraph 22) is clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption. This deficiency in the PSLP is of particular relevance given that the Borough is predominantly Green Belt, and failure to ensure that development needs are planned for over a sufficient period of time would likely result in an early review of the Green Belt being required.

Change To Plan: Paragraphs 1.1 - 1.5 of the PSLP and all references throughout the PSLP including supporting text and Policies should be amended to refer to a period of at least 15yrs from date of adoption. It is suggested that this be at least 2016 - 2035. Policies SP02; HP07; and PC02 should be amended to refer to a minimum of 15yrs from date of adoption with all housing and land requirements adjusted accordingly.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23662 - 8054 - Plan Period and Review - None

23690 Object**Respondent: Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Miss Emma Gladwin) [6745]**

Summary: The proposed PSLP period runs until 2033. Assuming, optimistically, adoption in 2019, this means that the Local Plan will address development needs for a maximum of 14 years. The NPPF (paragraph 22) is clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption. This deficiency in the PSLP is of particular relevance given that the Borough is predominantly Green Belt, and failure to ensure that development needs are planned for over a sufficient period of time would likely result in an early review of the Green Belt being required.

Change To Plan: Paragraphs 1.1 - 1.5 of the PSLP and all references throughout the PSLP including supporting text and Policies should be amended to refer to a period of at least 15yrs from date of adoption. It is suggested that this be at least 2016 - 2035. Policies SP02; HP07; and PC02 should be amended to refer to a minimum of 15yrs from date of adoption with all housing and land requirements adjusted accordingly.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23690 - 7463 - Plan Period and Review - None

23698 Object**Respondent: BPM Investments Ltd [8338]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: The proposed PSLP period runs until 2033. Assuming, optimistically, adoption in 2019, this means that the Local Plan will address development needs for a maximum of 14 years. The NPPF (paragraph 22) is clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption. This deficiency in the Plan is of particular relevance given that the Borough is predominantly Green Belt, and failure to ensure that development needs are planned for over a sufficient period of time would likely result in an early review of the Green Belt being required.

Change To Plan: All references throughout the Plan including supporting text and Policies should be amended to refer to a period of at least 15yrs from date of adoption. It is suggested that this be at least 2016 - 2035.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23698 - 8338 - Plan Period and Review - None

23829 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]**

Summary: The proposed plan period runs until 2033. Assuming - optimistically - adoption in 2019, this means that the Local Plan will address development needs for a maximum of 14 years. NPPF (Paragraph 22) is clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption. This deficiency in the PSLP. Failure to ensure that development needs are planned for over a sufficient period of time would result in an early review of the Green Belt - contrary to the NPPF (paragraph 136); undermining one of the two essential characteristics of the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Whilst we suggest 2035 should be the treated as the earliest end to the plan period, it should also be recognised that the authority is predominantly Green Belt. The NPPF requires this Local Plan to ensure the Green Belt will endure beyond the plan period. As such, we suggest the PSLP that even if the plan period is extended until 2035, policies should account for potential development needs beyond this.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23829 - 6713 - Plan Period and Review - ii, iii, iv

24064 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The NPPF makes clear that strategic policies within Local Plans should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years. It would be optimistic to assume that adoption of Brentwood Draft Plan will happen within 2019 and therefore the plan will only address development needs in the area for a maximum of 14 years. Failure to ensure that development needs are planned for over a sufficient period of time would likely result in an early review of Green Belt ahead of a new Local Plan, and would be contrary to the NPPF (para.136), and undermine the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24064 - 250 - Plan Period and Review - None

24107 Object

Respondent: Marden Homes Ltd [8363]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: Query the length of the Plan period: The NPPF states that strategic policies within Local Plans should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years. If the adoption of the Plan does not happen within 2019, the plan will only address development needs in the area for a maximum of 14 years. Failure to ensure that development needs are planned for over a sufficient period of time would likely result in an early review of Green Belt being required. This review ahead of a new Local Plan would be contrary to the NPPF and also undermines the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Plan's housing need should be amended to cover at 15 years from adoption. Realistically, we expect that an additional 2 years' worth of housing may be required to support a plan period up to 2035. Moreover, in respect of the fact that the authority is predominantly Green Belt, even if the plan period is extended until 2035, policies should account for potential development needs beyond this period. Allocating further sites for housing, like sites at Hanging Hill Lane, would provide for additional housing delivery.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24107 - 8363 - Plan Period and Review - i

24164 Object

Respondent: Turn2us [6753]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]

Summary: The proposed period runs until 2033. Assuming - optimistically - adoption in 2019 this means that the Local Plan will address development needs for a maximum of 14 years. The NPPF is clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption. Given that Brentwood is predominantly Green Belt, failure to ensure that development needs are planned for over a sufficient period of time would likely result in an early review of the Green Belt being required, contrary to the NPPF and undermining permanence of the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: We suggest a plan period to 2035 should be treated as a minimum, and an additional two years' worth of development needs to that which the PSLP currently seeks to address should be planned for.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24164 - 6753 - Plan Period and Review - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 1. Introduction

Plan-Making Process and Next Step

24769 Object

Respondent: Miss Abigail Dawson [8443]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local population should take part in a survey. Other lands which are more suitable should be investigated further. Flood risk survey.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24769 - 8443 - Plan-Making Process and Next Step - None

24889 Object

Respondent: Mr Marcus Forstner [8160]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local residents have not been asked or consulted properly. Local councils have not been consulted. Lack of information, lack of strategy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24889 - 8160 - Plan-Making Process and Next Step - None

22761 Object **Respondent: Mr Geoffrey Town [3982]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: This Comment form is an example of how not to 'comply with the Duty to Cooperate' i.e. not in plain English but more like Yes Minister script. No more houses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22761 - 3982 - Local Plan Regulation 19 Stage - None

22472 Object

Respondent: Hallam Land Management Limited [8258]

Agent: Marrons Planning (Dan Robinson-Wells) [7959]

Summary: The Plan has not taken into account any unmet needs from neighbouring areas in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for (paragraph 60 of the Framework).

No reference is made to co-operation over unmet housing need, and specifically no discussions are referenced in respect of whether Brentwood could accommodate some of the identified need in accordance with Paragraph 137 criteria c of the Framework.

Therefore, the BBDP is currently not sound as matters relating to unmet housing needs have not been dealt with and the Duty to Co-operate has not met the necessary legal tests.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan must be amended to explain how unmet housing needs within neighbouring areas will be addressed.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22472 - 8258 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

23124 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Whilst in all other respects the Brentwood Plan appears to meet legal requirements it is considered that the Duty to cooperate requirements have not been fully complied with in particular with regard to development of the evidence base and the lack of proper response and agreed outputs by Brentwood Council for evidence and a response on Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV).
Thurrock Council considers that there are key strategic issues and cross-boundary matters of importance in relation to the preparation of the Brentwood Local Plan that remain outstanding and should be addressed through further effective engagement and collaboration between Brentwood Council and Thurrock Council and with the other South Essex authorities under the Duty to cooperate. The key matters include:

- * Confirmation of the Brentwood Objectively Assessed need and whether the borough can accommodate its need;
- * The spatial strategy and alternative options within the A12 and A127 corridors to accommodate the growth;
- * The Thurrock Council concerns regarding the justification of Dunton Garden Village and the need to consider alternative options including at West Horndon;
- * Transport and other infrastructure Issues;
- * Further development of the Brentwood Local Plan evidence base;
- * The development of the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan and evidence.

In particular in recognition of the Thurrock concern about Dunton Hills Garden Village and due to its location close to and adjoining the boundaries between the two authorities Thurrock Council requests further engagement on this development and considerations of alternative options along the A127 Corridor and elsewhere.

Change To Plan: To ensure more effective collaboration and joint working it is suggested that Brentwood Council should progress key strategic matters through the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan process as well as with individual local authorities on cross-boundary matters.

Brentwood Council will need to consider how much additional evidence base for housing need and capacity can be prepared in partnership with adjoining authorities and the other South Essex authorities. In addition to the preparation of the SGLS study which includes a high level housing land and capacity assessment, the South Essex authorities are in the course of commissioning of additional elements of evidence base to support the preparation of the joint strategic planning including a review of the South Essex SHMA, a Strategic Green Belt review and further infrastructure studies.

The outcome of these studies and the preparation of the joint strategic planning will have implications for the nature and scale of housing provision across South Essex including Brentwood and the future approach to be taken in the Local Plan.

Section 3.6 of the Brentwood Local Plan should identify the key cross-boundary issues and challenges between Brentwood and adjoining authorities including Thurrock. It should set out how the plan seeks to address these including any future reviews of the plan and through joint working on the South Essex JSP.

Brentwood Council should prepare Statements of Common Ground on strategic cross- boundary matters in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Guidance.

Notwithstanding any additional text to the plan setting out key cross-boundary issues it is considered that the Duty to Cooperate has not been met as Brentwood Council has not undertaken effective and on-going engagement regarding the Dunton hills Garden village.

The Brentwood Pre-Submission Local Plan has also therefore not been prepared with a positive and justified strategy.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23124 - 2461 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii

23287 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Parish Council's representations dated 22nd March 2016 to the Draft Local Plan raised a number of issues. It is the opinion of the Parish Council that the points made have not been addressed; indeed very little has changed in the Reg 19 Plan in light of representations made by any parties. The Parish Council wishes therefore to make clear that the representations it made on the Draft Local Plan are still outstanding and still represent matters that require addressing for the Reg 19 Plan to be considered to be sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23287 - 381 - Duty to Cooperate - None

23651 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: We find the Local Plan to have failed Duty to Cooperate. However, the Joint Spatial Plan will be an important document that encompasses several local authorities that are struggling to meet their growth needs. It provides the opportunity to address the need for housing in the context of a probable shortfall across the South Essex Strategic Housing Market Area. Through the DtC procedure, Thurrock could contribute towards meeting any unmet housing needs from Brentwood within a proposed new settlement on land at Thurrock, centred on West Horndon, as proposed in Thurrock's emerging Local Plan. This is a feasible alternative.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23651 - 250 - Duty to Cooperate - None

23668 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: Welcomes South Essex Joint Strategic Plan but disappointed that this will not allocate specific sites but this will be left for the individual local plans to take forward. There is therefore an immediate need to address this situation; and for Local Plans to have to await the adoption of the JSP before sites are taken through the Local Plan process and finally released from the Green Belt, is simply going to result in inevitable further delay.

Change To Plan: A stronger reference to the Joint Strategic Plan is needed to improve Duty to Cooperate and improve housing delivery.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23668 - 2774 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

Summary: Chapter 1. Introduction

Duty to Cooperate (page 14)

Paragraphs 1.11 to 1.15 of the Local Plan briefly describe the Duty to Cooperate, its legal requirements in this regard and its commitment to cooperating with neighbouring authorities and key organisations on strategic planning issues. Paragraph 1.14 indicates the Council will publish a Duty to Cooperate Position Statement to describe the ongoing engagement and provide an update on the activities undertaken so far.

The Duty to Cooperate was introduced by the Localism Act 2011, and is set out in section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It places a legal duty on local planning authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis to maximise the effectiveness of local plan preparation in the context of strategic cross boundary matters. This is picked up in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which makes it clear that (paragraphs 25 - 27):

- (a) strategic policy-making authorities should collaborate to identify the strategic matters of relevance;
- (b) effective and ongoing joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant authorities is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy; and
- (c) in order to demonstrate this, statements of common ground should be produced (in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and made publicly available so as to ensure transparency.

The Position Statement makes it clear that engagement with a wide range of stakeholders has taken place over several years which is noted and supported, as it demonstrates a significant effort has been made. CEG can confirm such an effort has been made by the Council with them over the Dunton Hills Strategic Allocation. However, at present CEG is not convinced that the Position Statement demonstrates that the Council has complied with the duty. The Council itself describes the document as a 'snapshot' and an 'initial summary' suggesting more is being done.

The PPG places much more emphasis on statements of common ground as how strategic policy making authorities can demonstrate that a plan is based on effective cooperation and that they have sought to produce a strategy based on agreements with other authorities. The Council has not yet provided the level of detail set out in the PPG and this will need to be worked up in due course.

The PPG also indicates that as the duty relates to the preparation of the plan it cannot be rectified post-submission so if the Inspector finds that the duty has not been complied with the examination would not proceed further. It might well be the case that there is further evidence, to which the Council can point in demonstrating compliance with a duty but it does not appear to be publicly available.

CEG understands that discussions with various authorities and prescribed bodies are well advanced and that an updated Position Statement will be prepared prior to submission to fully document the level of cooperation and the extent of agreement reached.

It is noted that the Position Statement refers to Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) and consultation with Homes England but makes no reference to consultation with other relevant authorities or prescribed bodies which CEG knows has occurred. The updated Position Statement and relevant Statements of Common Ground should explain the full extent of the cooperation and agreement that has been reached in relation to this Strategic Allocation, as CEG is aware that it has been very extensive.

Change To Plan: Chapter 1. Introduction

Duty to Cooperate (page 14)

An updated Position Statement should be provided prior to submission of the Local Plan to explain the full extent of the cooperation undertaken and agreement reached with local authorities and prescribed bodies. This update should make clear the position reached in relation to DHGV, given the importance of this Strategic Allocation to the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23948 - 5050 - Duty to Cooperate - iv

Summary: Basildon's failure to allocate sufficient sites to meet housing needs will impact the other ASELA partners (e.g. increased unmet needs in the region). This should be addressed as a matter of urgency through Brentwood and Basildon's Duty to Cooperate Statements of Common Ground. A Duty to Cooperate position statement is welcome, although the MOU with the ASELA is insufficient to evidence the detailed Duty to Cooperate matters that need to be addressed with Basildon. At present the current policy position does not ensure an integrated approach to delivery of the Garden Village and adjacent sites to the West of Basildon.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23971 - 8351 - Duty to Cooperate - i

24442 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Duty to cooperate: there has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. There is a development of 30 new, large houses by Epping Forest DC 100m outside the parish boundary in Fingrith Hall Lane. These properties are 1/3 miles from Blackmore Village and 5 miles from any other town/village. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 new properties being considered for Blackmore in the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24442 - 8378 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

24455 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Duty to cooperate. Not enough consultation with neighbouring authorities with regard to sites R25 and R26 in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24455 - 8379 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

24511 Object**Respondent: Mrs Terri Reed [4303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Because we are on the Brentwood borders, no account has been taken of the development being undertaken by Epping & Chelmsford RIGHT ON OUR DOORSTEP, impacting on local facilities. Alternative sites have been ignored, even when more suitable

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26. Consider what Blackmore really needs not what ticks a few boxes, and what suits developers. The BVHA have worked hard to proposal alternative which are sustainable. They know the village better than the people behind the unsustainable proposal currently on the table.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24511 - 4303 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

25118 Object**Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC have not consulted with the other authorities in the area as to the effect their plans influence BBC's one.

Change To Plan: Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25118 - 4942 - Duty to Cooperate - None

25843 Object**Respondent: Mr John Hughes [4500]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. 100 metres outside the parish boundary in Fingrith Hall Lane is the entrance to a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities and more than 5 miles from any other town/ village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 (40 + 30) new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25843 - 4500 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

25855 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. 100 metres outside the parish boundary in Fingrith Hall Lane is the entrance to a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities and more than 5 miles from any other town/ village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 (40 + 30) new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25855 - 8637 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

25862 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. 100 metres outside the parish boundary in Fingrith Hall Lane is the entrance to a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities and more than 5 miles from any other town/ village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 (40 + 30) new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25862 - 8638 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

25869 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Hughes [8639]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. 100 metres outside the parish boundary in Fingrith Hall Lane is the entrance to a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities and more than 5 miles from any other town/ village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 (40 + 30) new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25869 - 8639 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

23094 Support

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A major step forward for effective cooperation has been the Memorandum of Understanding that was signed between Basildon, Brentwood, Castle Point, Essex County, Rochford, Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock Councils to form the ASELA. The Council has noted Brentwood Council's commitment in paragraph 1.13 to work as a member of ASELA on a process to develop a long-term growth ambition. The Council fundamentally supports this policy approach as meeting the soundness tests of being a) effective and b) in accordance with national policy.

Change To Plan: No specific amendment proposed

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23094 - 369 - Duty to Cooperate - iii, iv

23110 Support

Respondent: Castle Point Borough Council (Mr Ian Butt) [8304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: In January 2018 a Memorandum of understanding was signed by Brentwood, Castle Point, Essex County, Rochford, Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock to form the Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA). The Council has worked closely with BBC and other South Essex authorities to produce joint evidence base documents and through the emerging Joint Strategic Plan for South Essex (JSP). From CPBC's perspective, the production of the PSLP has included joint working which meets the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. There is no reason for the Council to question the legal compliance of the PSLP.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23110 - 8304 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

23173 Support

Respondent: Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC and CCC have engaged on strategic cross boundary matters. A Protocol for dealing with unmet housing needs requests has also been agreed between Essex Local Planning Authorities through the Essex Planning Officers' Association which has resulted in an effective joint mechanism being put in place. Furthermore, both Councils have also been involved in a joint the Gypsy, Traveller & Traveller Showpeople Accommodation Assessment with relevant other Essex Local Planning Authorities. CCC consider that the Duty to Co-operate has been fulfilled and will continue to work collaboratively where appropriate with BBC through the Duty to Co-operate.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23173 - 8305 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

23187 Support

Respondent: Southend on Sea Council (Mr Adrian Smith) [8307]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood and Southend Councils are both active partners in the Association of South Essex Authorities. This will set the overall planning context for South Essex and respective Local Plans will need to align with this or if they are prepared in advance, include appropriate review mechanisms. This is important for fulfilling the Duty to Co-operate. The A127 and the C2C rail routes are key strategic transport corridors linking Southend, Brentwood to London and beyond. Both already face capacity issues and it is important that the impacts of development are considered not in a "whole route" approach.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23187 - 8307 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

23275 Support

Respondent: c2c Rail (Chris Atkinson) [8280]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We strongly welcome the positive engagement we have had from the council's officers on this issue to date.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23275 - 8280 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

23280 Support

Respondent: c2c Rail (Chris Atkinson) [8280]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Given the projected housing numbers reported in the region, our contractualised route capacity will be exhausted by 2025. Trenitalia UK is currently developing an Outline Business Case for the Department for Transport for an investment in ETCS Level 2. As the ASELA are undertaking a joint approach to strategic planning and are considering an application to central government for a Growth Deal, we urge the Council to support the inclusion of our scheme in this strategy, and identify funding sources across the region that can be used to contribute to the capital and net operating costs of the proposal.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23280 - 8280 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

23308 Support

Respondent: Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We also welcome the Council's commitment to the preparation of a Joint Strategic Plan with the other South Essex authorities and associated strategic planning for growth in the area. We would be happy to support the preparation of the Plan and its technical evidence.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23308 - 6093 - Duty to Cooperate - i, ii, iii, iv

24008 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: It is evident that BBC has engaged with neighbouring authorities regarding cross-boundary matters as well as meeting housing need, as set out in the Duty to Co-operate Brentwood Position Statement (February 2019). The Council needs to continue to have regard to neighbouring authority plans and adequately co-operate with neighbouring authorities, rather than awaiting the future joint strategic plan, as well as Essex County Council plans, and strategies of other relevant bodies.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24008 - 2656 - Duty to Cooperate - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 1. Introduction

1.13

22371 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council acknowledges that Brentwood Borough Council is a fellow member of the Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA) and, as a result, is committed to the preparation of a South Essex Joint Strategic Plan (JSP).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22371 - 4178 - 1.13 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 1. Introduction

1.15

22538 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please include reference to the Thames Chase Plan. The overarching strategy for the Thames Chase Community Forest.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22538 - 7196 - 1.15 - None

22610 Object**Respondent: Miss Monica Eades [8288]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Evidence base flawed. Transport Assessment did not include traffic along Priests Lane. Done at a time which did not include greatest flow of school traffic. Impact of increase in traffic from the proposed development in Shenfield and impact of Crossrail have not been taken into account.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane (R19) should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22610 - 8288 - Evidence Base - None

23095 Object**Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Fundamental evidence has been 'in development', but not published during much of its preparation. This includes the entire Green Belt Review, Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study, Local Plan Viability Assessment and Transport Assessment which were not published until the month before Brentwood Council considered the Publication Local Plan in November 2018. This has created a lack of transparency during critical plan-making stages and contributed to the scale of representations from Basildon Council for its Regulation 19 response.

Change To Plan: No specific amendment proposed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23095 - 369 - Evidence Base - i

23143 Object**Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Thurrock Council has previously made representations on the Brentwood Local Plan at the draft 2016 Local Plan consultation and the 2018 Preferred Site Allocations regarding the lack of sufficient evidence base to support the policies and proposals in the emerging Local Plan.

It is recommended that specific additional evidence base required includes:

* An updated SHMA to take account of the Government policy requirements not to use the 2016-based household projections;

* Further evidence to have assessed the various spatial growth options;

* A more fully developed transport evidence base that includes cumulative and site specific impacts of development on the local and strategic highway network and to identify further infrastructure and /or mitigation measures required together with costing and phasing;

* An up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that includes infrastructure costs, phasing, delivery and viability.

Change To Plan: It is considered the Brentwood Draft Local Plan and supporting evidence base will require further revision and consultation with ongoing duty to cooperate with adjoining local authorities. In particular the preparation of the draft Brentwood Local Plan should be reviewed to take account of further technical evidence and potentially the outcome of other evidence including the testing of other spatial options being considered by the South Essex authorities as part of the preparation of a Joint Strategic Plan.

It is recommended that specific additional evidence base required includes:

* An updated SHMA to take account of the Government policy requirements not to use the 2016-based household projections;

* Further evidence to have assessed the various spatial growth options;

* A more fully developed transport evidence base that includes cumulative and site specific impacts of development on the local and strategic highway network and to identify further infrastructure and /or mitigation measures required together with costing and phasing;

* An up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that includes infrastructure costs, phasing, delivery and viability

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23143 - 2461 - Evidence Base - i, ii, iii, iv

23290 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Transport Assessment is not sufficiently robust, not in line with NPPF, capacity and highway safety considerations have not been adequately completed or aligned. It only focuses on specific junctions and requirements of growth in the Local Plan and neighbouring districts but fails to take into account the cumulative impacts of traffic from beyond the neighbouring authorities; whereas ECC's 2014 Economic Plan assesses the A127 from Southend to the M25 and shows that almost along its entirety, the A127 is close to or above capacity, note that the levels of growth being planned for has increased since 2014.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23290 - 381 - Evidence Base - None

23291 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Transport Assessment identifies a total of 8 junctions that require significant mitigation across the borough. The Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) schedule gives a 'headline estimate' of £4m to address local highway network improvements. West Horndon Parish Council considers it extremely unlikely that it will cost an average of just £0.5m per junction to put in place the necessary mitigation measures at these junctions. It is not only mitigation at junctions which is required but solutions to expand capacity on the A127 itself.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23291 - 381 - Evidence Base - None

23293 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The transit-oriented growth strategy that underpins the Reg 19 Plan relies heavily on rail, and to a lesser extent, bus cycling and walking infrastructure, to reduce levels of car use by effecting modal shift for as many journeys as possible. In many respects, the success of the strategy is predicated on this modal shift yet nowhere in the evidence base does it suggest what the required increases in rail and bus patronage, cycling and walking are.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23293 - 381 - Evidence Base - None

23294 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport Assessment and Sustainable transport strategy lacks credibility: in assessing sustainable modes of travel, the Transport Assessment makes reference to Department for Transport (DfT) evidence which based output on extremely dated evidence sources framed within a totally different historical policy context. Even if one does take the lessons learned from this historical evidence, the ability to affect significant modal shift in Brentwood borough is expected by the Transport Assessment to be very limited.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23294 - 381 - Evidence Base - None

23300 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Reg 19 Plan is not accompanied by a Level 2 SFRA. Without this, the Plan is not sound because it has not been justified and is not consistent with national policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23300 - 381 - Evidence Base - None

23302 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The SA has failed to properly consider alternative sites at a lower risk of flooding and the evidence supporting the Reg 19 Plan has failed to properly demonstrate that the level of growth proposed for DHGV can be accommodated on the site in areas with a low probability of flooding. The Reg 19 Plan is not sound because national planning guidance in respect of the approach to taking flood risk into account in the preparation of a local plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23302 - 381 - Evidence Base - None

23638 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Local Plan housing requirement can be met by the spatial strategy for growth proposed in the Draft Local Plan.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23638 - 250 - Evidence Base - None

23642 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: The document "Dunton Area Landscape Corridor Design options Local Plan Green Infrastructure" in 2017 commissioned jointly by Basildon District Council and Brentwood Borough Council was not included as part of the evidence base. A key finding of this assessment was that landscape mitigation works required would crucially not leave sufficient land for development to accommodate 2,500 new homes at that time proposed in the Draft Plan for Dunton Hills Garden Village, let alone the potentially higher figure of 4,000 beyond the plan period.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23642 - 250 - Evidence Base - None

23643 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: Incomplete transport evidence: Highway network considerations must be a foremost consideration when arriving at reasonable spatial strategy alternatives. Yet the appropriate highway modelling has not yet been undertaken to assess site specific and cumulative impacts of developments on the local and wider highway network resulting ECC withholding their support. Transport Assessment is incomplete with regards to A127/A128 studies/modelling. Meanwhile Highways England's work is not complete in terms of the transport study, ECC questions the use of the A127 corridor over the A12, Basildon Council raises concerns over infrastructure provision relative to DHGV, and Thurrock favours growth at West Horndon.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23643 - 250 - Evidence Base - None

23644 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: Inconsistent Green Belt/Landscape evidence: the 2016 Landscape Study had identified that Dunton was one of 7 sites that makes a 'high contribution' to the Green Belt, West Horndon contribution was 'moderate'. By 2018, Crestwood reached a different conclusion, DHGV importance in terms of contribution to the Green Belt went from 'high' status to 'moderate to high'. By 2019, the Green Belt Study Part III altered the status of part of the land at west Horndon (to the east) from a 'moderate' to 'moderate to high'. We find these results to be contrived to fit the Council's desire to promote DHGV.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23644 - 250 - Evidence Base - None

23658 Object**Respondent: EA Strategic Land LLP [279]****Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]**

Summary: The Council cannot demonstrate a Five-Year Housing Land Supply.

Change To Plan: Site West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon is fully in accordance with the spatial strategy focused on transit orientated growth and should be allocated. No significant constraints with developing an urban extension at West Horndon, in addition to Dunton Hills Garden Village was identified by the Sustainability Appraisal. If Brentwood is to attempt to meet the housing needs, this approach is required.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23658 - 279 - Evidence Base - None

23708 Object**Respondent: BPM Investments Ltd [8338]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: Strategic Green Belt Assessment (SGBA) assesses Green Belt parcels rather than a more fine-grained approach; therefore this assessment is less helpful when assessing smaller sites that are well associated with the urban area, such as Salmonds Grove. Part 3 Green Belt Appraisal considers specific sites, but in limited detail. The findings of the Green Belt Appraisal produced for Salmond Grove site (076a&b), which considered the site in far greater detail than the Council's Part 3 Green Belt Appraisal, have not been taken into account.

Change To Plan: A more fine-grained approach should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23708 - 8338 - Evidence Base - None

23717 Object**Respondent: BPM Investments Ltd [8338]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: The Council's Site Assessment Methodology (January 2018) is based on initial high-level assessments of the key criteria. Site 067 a&b was then discounted on the basis of 'Green Belt Impact' as it is located within Parcel 15 (458.4ha and is of high value to the purposes of the Green Belt given its extent). We are concerned that the assessment and the reasons for discounting an otherwise suitable, available and sustainable site, are not robust. A more fine-grain assessment of sites should be undertaken.

Change To Plan: A more fine-grain assessment of sites should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23717 - 8338 - Evidence Base - None

23718 Object**Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]**

Summary: No Policies Map has been published despite Appendix 4 setting out that maps detailing various changes, including Green Belt boundary amendments, will be provided for Regulation 19 consultation and there will be a combined policies map. The Policies Map is an important aspect of the Local Plan and should be published to provide clarity over the Green Belt boundaries to ensure these are clearly defined for all parties and that it can be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with Policy NE9 and the NPPF.

Change To Plan: The Policies Map should be published for affected parties to comment on if necessary, making the plan clear and effective.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23718 - 6122 - Evidence Base - i, iv

23743 Object**Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]**

Summary: Transport assessment: The trip generation forecast for Brentwood Enterprise Park (BEP) used in the Local Plan transport assessment is based on the site having an employment capacity of approximately 3,000 jobs, which is considered to be an over estimate. Based on industry standard employment densities for the likely mix of business uses on the BEP Site, the employment capacity is forecast to be approximately 2,000 jobs. Therefore, the Local Plan transport assessment overestimates the likely trip generation for BEP by as much as 50%.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23743 - 5124 - Evidence Base - i, iv

23850 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Summary: The Green Belt Assessment did not assess each individual site but rather undertaken based on parcels. Therefore the assessment of the four green belt assessments is not accurate. The key issues to consider include: * Whether all potential sites' impact on the Green Belt has been assessed; * Whether such assessment was undertaken at a sufficiently fine grain to properly consider individual sites' impact on the Green Belt. Not all potential development sites were subject to a sufficiently detailed analysis which could enable BBC to justifiably conclude it has identified a reasonable strategy to meet its housing needs. Land to the South of the B1002, Ingatestone, was not properly assessed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23850 - 6713 - Evidence Base - ii, iii, iv

23866 Object

Respondent: Brentwood School [2575]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Pryor) [2581]

Summary: The Green Belt evidence base has not been finalised with the Green Belt Study, Parts 1 and 2 still working drafts with particular consideration to the Area Appraisal for Site Assessment 55 East of Middleton Hall Lane. The evidence base does not conclude what is practically on the ground and the purposes of Green Belt which are considered to be assessed.

Change To Plan: The Local Authority should finalise its Green Belt Evidence Base.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23866 - 2575 - Evidence Base - i, ii

23879 Object

Respondent: Ms. Isobel McGeever [7286]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council's most recent Green Belt Study, assesses the site under Site Assessment 186. To note, only the car parks to the western extent of the site fall within the Green Belt, therefore the assessment only relates to 25% of the site. Overall, the site was assessed as having low-moderate contribution to the Green Belt. The site was considered as a 'partly developed site' due to the hardstanding car parks and was associated with the settlement boundary to the east.

Change To Plan: Should any part of the Brentwood Community Hospital site be declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirement of the NHS in the future, then the site should be considered suitable and available for alternative use, and considered deliverable within the period 5-10 years. These representations identify the sites potential for future development, in accordance with the realignment of the Green Belt so that this significant area of development land is no longer included. It is evident, that the site does not make a positive contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, redevelopment of the site could provide a key contribution to Brentwood's housing need, which the Council have failed to justify, given the reliance on key strategic sites, and the lack of acknowledgement for unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities (Basildon and Havering). These representations therefore promote and identify parts of the Brentwood Community Hospital site as a suitable site to contribute towards these requirements. This site presents an excellent opportunity for a high quality residential redevelopment on previously developed Green Belt land. This could be achieved without compromising the character of the area as the development can act as an infill site to the existing residential development surrounding it, and without the need for significant infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also available to accommodate further health related development should the CCG seek to expand their services in this location, including the possible expansion of the hospital to provide more comprehensive services for the community. However, the site's Green Belt designation would make it difficult for any planning application proposing additional built form to provide further healthcare services to be considered acceptable. The subject site is considered available, suitable and deliverable within the 5-10 year period of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23879 - 7286 - Evidence Base - None

23880 Object**Respondent: Ms. Isobel McGeever [7286]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Paragraph 10.6 of the IDP outlines that Brentwood has a slightly higher proportion of over 65s compared to Essex county, with a 17% increase expected between 2015 and 2025 equating to 2,600 more people. Therefore, there will be a greater need for housing which can accommodate people's changing needs. Paragraph 10.19 also states that hospitals will need to be redesigned to treat the patients of the future. The Brentwood Community Hospital could be suitable for housing for older people as its location is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Should any part of the Brentwood Community Hospital site be declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirement of the NHS in the future, then the site should be considered suitable and available for alternative use, and considered deliverable within the period 5-10 years. These representations identify the sites potential for future development, in accordance with the realignment of the Green Belt so that this significant area of development land is no longer included. It is evident, that the site does not make a positive contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, redevelopment of the site could provide a key contribution to Brentwood's housing need, which the Council have failed to justify, given the reliance on key strategic sites, and the lack of acknowledgement for unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities (Basildon and Havering). These representations therefore promote and identify parts of the Brentwood Community Hospital site as a suitable site to contribute towards these requirements. This site presents an excellent opportunity for a high quality residential redevelopment on previously developed Green Belt land. This could be achieved without compromising the character of the area as the development can act as an infill site to the existing residential development surrounding it, and without the need for significant infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also available to accommodate further health related development should the CCG seek to expand their services in this location, including the possible expansion of the hospital to provide more comprehensive services for the community. However, the site's Green Belt designation would make it difficult for any planning application proposing additional built form to provide further healthcare services to be considered acceptable. The subject site is considered available, suitable and deliverable within the 5-10 year period of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23880 - 7286 - Evidence Base - None

24060 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]****Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]**

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council will need to revisit its evidence base to determine a housing requirement which uses the 2014 population projections as a starting point. This will result in a larger housing requirement, with our estimate based on the indicative Standard Method being approximately 545 homes per year, or a total of 9,262 homes during the plan period 2016-2033.

Change To Plan: Add land at rear of Mill House Farm to plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24060 - 8359 - Evidence Base - ii, iv

24068 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: The Green Belt Study (November 2018) provided an assessment of Green Belt parcels against the five purposes of the Green Belt, assessed site 030A as having a moderate overall contribution to the Green Belt, despite the favourable assessment of the site. We have outlined that these elements of the assessment are incorrect and not reflective of the sites true characteristics. The weaknesses and inconsistencies recognised in the individual site assessments made demonstrate a potential flaw in the evidence base for the Local Plan and could result in the unjustified omission of Green Belt sites from consideration for allocation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24068 - 250 - Evidence Base - None

24112 Object**Respondent: Marden Homes Ltd [8363]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: The assessment of site in the Green Belt and their relative contribution to the Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt Study (November 2018): certain elements of the assessment are incorrect and are not a true reflection of Hanging Hill Lane site's characteristics (site 284). The weaknesses and inconsistencies recognised in the individual site assessments made, again demonstrate a flaw in the evidence base for the Local Plan and could again result in the unjustified omission of Green Belt sites from consideration for allocation as part of the new Local Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24112 - 8363 - Evidence Base - i

24140 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: Significant elements of the evidence base to the Plan, which were prepared under the 2012 NPPF, have not been updated. For example, the Site Assessment Methodology and Summary of Outcomes - Working Draft provides the basis on which sites have been assessed as suitable for development and whether they should be allocated in the Plan. This document has not been amended to reflect the publication of the revised NPPF, or the Standard Methodology. The paper still refers to making provision for 'slightly above 380 dwellings per annum'; in fact, this number will need to increase significantly.

Change To Plan: The Plan should be updated so that the housing need is calculated based on the Government's standard methodology for calculating housing need, as well as reflecting the findings of the Housing Delivery Test. This will significantly increase the housing numbers and the number of sites required. Further consultation should then take place on a revised draft Plan, before it is submitted for Examination.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24140 - 8368 - Evidence Base - iii, iv

24159 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: Site Assessment Methodology and Summary of Outcomes - Working Draft (2018): We do not consider that the capacity of brownfield sites has been fully explored. The Stage 2 assessment process discounts sites where they are considered to be in an unsustainable location, before considering the potential to use brownfield land. This has resulted in sites such as site 183, our client's site, being discounted prior to any assessment of the positive benefits of the re-use of this brownfield site and whether the location is sufficiently sustainable or can be made sustainable.

Change To Plan: In light of the higher housing numbers required, the Plan should be revised to re-assess all sites which do not meet the distance thresholds from existing settlements, and to take into account opportunities offered by smaller sites in the Green Belt, which could offer sustainable transport modes, and make a small but important contribution to meeting housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24159 - 8368 - Evidence Base - i, iii, iv

24253 Object

Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The councils lack of professionalism is certainly outstanding, as no-one can trust your facts without checking. For better information and accurate facts, rather than Brentwood Councils waffle visit WWW.DUNTONEXPLOITATION.CO.UK

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24253 - 5004 - Evidence Base - None

24397 Object

Respondent: Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance [2627]

Agent: Stutt & Parker (Mr Rory Baker) [8242]

Summary: Belt: A Part 3 Green Belt Appraisal (dated 31st January 2019) has been published by the Council. This considered specific sites, albeit in limited detail. Site 033 has been discounted, with the assessment explaining: 'based on the progressive findings of the HELAA and wider evidence base, a selective approach to the assessment of additional has been undertaken. Overall, Sites (located within the Green Belt) which have been discounted for other environmental or strategic reasons (i.e. too small to form a strategic allocation), were not considered for further assessment.' Whilst the assessment has justified Site 033 (and other sites) being omitted from the assessment, the study assesses the significance of each site's contribution to four of the five purposes of the Green Belt, with an understanding the fifth purpose is implemented as an integral part of the Brentwood Local Plan. As such, previous findings contained in the HEELA and environmental / strategic constraints, unless explicitly relating to the four purposes of the Green Belt, should not be used for justifying site omission. With regards to Site 033, this is especially pertinent when considering the ambiguity of weight given to various SA scores (i.e. distance to GP and interaction with the Conservation Area) and the inaccuracy of availability in the HEELA (2018). Even were it appropriate to use such criteria to discount sites from a Green Belt assessment, the criteria itself in the case of the above has proven inaccurate, overly simplistic and therefore unreliable.

Change To Plan: We recommend the land to the south of Lodge Close, Hutton is assessed within the Council's Part 3 Green Belt assessment as a suitable, deliverable and available site. As an overarching point, we are concerned with the simplistic approach that appears to have been taken in considering the contribution sites make to the purposes of the Green Belt. We would therefore recommend that the Council provide a far more detailed and robust review of sites' contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt as part of the plan-making process. As part of any residential allocation, we would look to undertake further technical evidence to support the site's release from the Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24397 - 2627 - Evidence Base - ii, iv

23742 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: The transport assessment methodology forecasts future demand based predominantly on historic trends, it does not fully account for the likely demand suppression that will occur due to worsening traffic congestion. Additionally, emerging internet based services and demand responsive public transport are likely to further change the way that people choose to travel. Consequently, the forecast cumulative traffic demand on the road network should not be interpreted as the likely outcome of the Local Plan site allocations. Instead it should be considered as an indicator of overall travel demand to inform future policy to avoid 'worst case scenario'.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23742 - 5124 - Evidence Base - i, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 1. Introduction

1.16

22335 Object

Respondent: Miss katherine Webster [6005]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council has used flawed data and has not taken proper account of evidence provided to them by residents or indicated that his has received widespread objections. The Council should have regard to all evidence, internally and externally generated, and should either include it or explain and justify why it has been excluded.

Change To Plan: The Plan should indicate the significant local opposition and either include the factual evidence supplied to them, or explain why it has been ignored.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22335 - 6005 - 1.16 - ii, iii, iv

22495 Object

Respondent: Mr Martin Skinner [8251]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council has not included or addressed contrary evidence provided by residents as part of the consultation process for site R19. Therefore the evidence base is incomplete and the process is not sound.

Change To Plan: The sustainability review should include all factual evidence provided. The Leader of the Council stated early in the process that this would be an evidenced based process yet has consistently refused to address concerns based upon the evidence provided by sources other than the Council.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22495 - 8251 - 1.16 - ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 1. Introduction

1.17

22336 Object

Respondent: Miss katherine Webster [6005]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The residents have provided evidence as requested by the Council which supported our view that the sites R19 are inappropriate. The Council has not engaged with the residents with regard to this evidence despite our requests.

Change To Plan: The sustainability review should include the resident's evidence that the access to R19 may not be viable due to safety risks, or explain why it has not been included.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22336 - 6005 - 1.17 - ii, iii, iv

22497 Object**Respondent: Hallam Land Management Limited [8258]****Agent: Marrons Planning (Dan Robinson-Wells) [7959]**

Summary: Whilst the SA has been updated to reflect decisions taken regarding the Local Plan at the Extraordinary Council meeting in November 2018, the decision was not made in light of the SA of January 2019

Other strategic options should be appraised which appraise higher levels of growth to reflect the higher level of LHN that now needs to be planned for.

The SA should therefore re-assess its appraisal of additional growth at Brentwood in light of the evidence presented by Hallam Land Management within its representations in respect of Calcott Hall Farm.

Change To Plan: The Sustainability Appraisal must be reviewed and updated in light of changes that need to be made to the Draft Local Plan, and in light of new evidence presented to the Council as to the positive effects of development of Calcott Hall Farm, Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22497 - 8258 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iii, iv

23121 Object**Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council questions whether the Spatial Strategy is therefore justified and consistent with national policy. The two transport corridors don't offer comparable choices in terms of the capacity of these transport connections. Four reasonable site alternatives in the Central Brentwood Corridor have been disregarded in the Sustainability Appraisal, despite having few constraints and being able to tap into the potential for movement capacity. This is considered to be in conflict with sustainable development when sites which have significant constraints to development or delivery have been included within the Plan, at the expense of sites which have fewer constraints.

Change To Plan: Using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the superior infrastructure available. This should help encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Chapter 3 should be modified as a result along with all land use allocations in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23121 - 369 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, iii

23122 Object**Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Challenge whether the SA has informed the choices made in the Spatial Strategy, given it states that there was an early intention by Brentwood Council to deliver at least one new large-scale strategic site, which could be judged as artificially limiting the exploration of other plausible and deliverable urban/ village extensions. The lack of a HELAA between 2011-2018 has negatively impacted upon previous Reg18 drafts, which could have evolved differently having been informed by such evidence, demonstrating that other suitable, available and deliverable site options were present. This is unjustified, inconsistent with SO1 and not in accordance with the NPPF.

Change To Plan: The Sustainability Appraisal should be reviewed to test an alternative strategy which does not include the artificial assumption that at least one new large scale strategic site should be incorporated into the Local Plan and then it should be amended accordingly. The Plan should then be reviewed informed by the outcome.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23122 - 369 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, iii

23639 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]**

Summary: The SA does not fully support the proposed spatial strategy and cannot be said to have informed the Plan. Throughout the preparation of the Plan, the Council has maintained its intention to deliver at least one large-scale, strategic site for a mixed scheme of housing and employment. The SA identifies two options: West Horndon and DHGV. DHGV was chosen as the preferred option mainly as a result of the Council despite this is contrary to the accompanying evidence base which appears to lend greater support to growth adjoining the existing settlement of West Horndon.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23639 - 250 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

23640 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: The SA seems to have relied on what was being proposed by developers/promoters of the key strategic sites, raising concerns about the fairness and consistency of the appraisal. Particularly it relies without question upon the word of CEG as the promoter of DHGV. In contrast, the SA acknowledges proposals for a new settlement in the north of Thurrock where it adjoins West Horndon but rejects these on the basis that "this proposal is at such an early stage of formulation that it cannot be considered to be a potential issue or constraint in delivering DHGV".

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23640 - 250 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

23641 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: Appraisal of the spatial strategy alternatives in versions of the SA over time, demonstrate differing results for which there is no justification. Under several topics the score for West Horndon has been downgraded in the most recent appraisal, without proper explanation (see appendix 1). The latest proposals by Thurrock on land to the south of West Horndon throw a different light on the SA conclusions.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23641 - 250 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

23669 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: The Council should ensure that the future results of the SA clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of this assessment why some policy options have progressed, and others have been rejected. This must be undertaken through a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and rejected alternatives. The Council's decision-making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.

Change To Plan: Further work on the SA is needed.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23669 - 2774 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iii, iv

23840 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Summary: Paragraph 5.5.31 of the SA confirms that Site 078 is listed as 1 of 5 omission sites in the HELAA as it is "deliverable or developable". The SA confirms that the two sites with the greatest potential for allocation are the adjacent "Parklands" Sites. The SA states that the accompanying Green Belt Review found that both sites contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt to a 'moderate' extent, however neither site is fully contained in the landscape. The SA concludes that the option of adding one or more omission sites was determined as "unreasonable", for the purposes of establishing reasonable spatial alternatives. The SA does not provide a justified reason for the rejection of the site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23840 - 6713 - Sustainability Appraisal - ii, iii, iv

23949 Object**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Sustainability Appraisal (Local Plan, page 15) & Interim Sustainability Appraisal (January 2019)
 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 makes clear that local planning authorities must carry out a process of sustainability appraisal alongside plan making. This approach is reinforced in the NPPF which states that local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant statutory tests. Sustainability appraisals are required to demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives and avoid significant adverse impacts, wherever possible.
 The Council has prepared Interim Sustainability Appraisals throughout the preparation of the Local Plan and this has informed the Spatial Strategy. The latest Interim Sustainability Appraisal explains the seven alternative development scenarios considered and the reasons for supporting some scenarios over others. There is an assessment of each scenario against economic, social and environmental topics based upon the relevant evidence base for each topic. This assessment explains why some scenarios rank higher than others. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal is sound and has been prepared in accordance with legislative requirements and the NPPF. CEG supports the conclusion regarding DHGV but considers that the Council should supplement the assessment of the options - this could be more empirical and provide a fuller explanation of the conclusions reached, with more cross reference to the outcomes of other evidence base. Furthermore, in considering landscape issues the assessment does not deal with the landscape capacity of sites or areas to accommodate new development.

Change To Plan: Sustainability Appraisal (page 15)

CEG considers a supplementary note or the like should be prepared by the Council to provide a fuller explanation of the conclusions reached in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal and how this has informed the Spatial Strategy which has been adopted.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23949 - 5050 - Sustainability Appraisal - iv

24069 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: The SA Report is simplistic in its approach to individual site assessment. It has used a predominantly spatial or 'GIS' approach to the assessment of each criteria, and no consideration for the positive contribution that the development of sites can make to the natural environment and local facilities. The assumption made within the Sustainability Appraisal that sites will only negatively impact the Green Belt and other landscape and natural environment designations has contributed to the unjustified omission of sites from allocation, such as site 030A.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24069 - 250 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

24078 Object**Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]****Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]**

Summary: Object to the omission of Honeypot Lane from the Brnetwood Pre-Submission Local Plan. Honeypot Lane is a sustainable development location in close proximity and easy access and integration with new jobs, community facilities, services and greenspace as a principal tier 1 category settlement; it would contribute to the five year housing supply; it has already been tested by the Sustainability Appraisal. Removal is not justified. Should further note the SA assessment: 8 criteria score as Green , 9 amber, 0 red. Have reviewed Amber scores and positively comment on the following: Air Quality management Areas; SSSIs; Local Wildlife Site; Woodland; Green Belt; Special Landscape Area; Agricultural Land, General Practice Surgery, Primary school and Secondary School.

Change To Plan: LLLP conclude that the Plan needs to be modified to identify and allocate Land at Honeypot Lane, Brentwood (ref: 022) for residential development of up to 250 new dwellings with associated transport, community and green infrastructure. The Brentwood Borough Local Plan: Pre-Submission, January 2019. Allocation of Honeypot Lane must include its removal from the Green Belt and the appropriate revision of the boundaries of that designated area. The Plan's proposed Housing Trajectory (Appendix 1), the Key Diagram and the list of proposed allocation sites should be updated to include Land at Honeypot Lane accordingly.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24078 - 8362 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iii

24113 Object

Respondent: Marden Homes Ltd [8363]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The SA Report is simplistic in its approach to individual site assessment. The SA has used a predominantly spatial or 'GIS' approach to the assessment of each criteria. It has had no consideration for the positive contribution that the development of sites can make to the natural environment and local facilities, such as in the case of Site 284. The assumption made within the SA that sites will only negatively impact the Green Belt and other landscape and natural environment designations leading to the unjustified omission of sites from allocation, has resulted in the Local Plan being unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24113 - 8363 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

24372 Object

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The SA forms only one part of the evidence base underlining the PSLP. The evidence base also includes documents such as the Brentwood Economic Futures 2013-2033 Report, Green Belt Study and Transport Assessment. In allocating additional land at Childerditch Industrial Estate, Brentwood Borough Council has taken a balanced judgement on the site constraints and the need to provide to create additional employment opportunities within the Borough. The SA is currently focused on a spatial approach to the assessment of each criterion, using the distance between the site and various factors to judge the extent to which it either achieves certain objectives or not. However, it is considered that the SA fails to fully consider the nature of each proposal or the likelihood in practice of effects in sustainability terms, where a 'broad brush' approach has instead been taken to sites regardless of their intended use. For example, in respect of distance to a GP Practice, the proposed employment allocations at Childerditch Industrial Estate have been scored in the same manner as a residential allocation. However, it is considered to be less important for an employment site to be located within close proximity to a GP practice than a residential site, given the nature of the uses. Therefore, Childerditch Industrial Estate should be considered against a different set of criteria more relevant to the proposed employment allocation.). On review of the appraisal of Childerditch Industrial Estate, the site has not scored particularly well in relation to the criteria that has data available. However, it is considered that the SA, or at least the sustainability criteria, could be too sensitive when it comes to assessing sites against the criteria. The fact that no site performed 'particularly well' against any of the criteria suggests that the scope of the assessment makes many sites appear unsustainable, with limited opportunity to score 'green' in many of the objectives. We do not consider that the sustainability of the site has been considered in sufficient detail by the SA given the particular circumstances of the site and existing uses.

Change To Plan: The Childerditch Industrial Estate sites have additionally been scored 'amber' with regard to effect on agricultural land, with the methodology stating that any site in land classified as Grade 3 will be 'amber' and Grade 2 will be 'red'. While the assessment notes that the dataset used is of poor resolution, the assessment has failed to adequately consider the existing nature of the sites (with particular regard to site 112D), as well as differentiate between Grades 3a and 3b. We would consider that the criteria should be amended to be more in line with the aims of Government policy, and that the sites be assessed on the basis of whether their use for employment purposes would lead to the loss of the best of the best and most versatile land.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24372 - 8371 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iii, iv

24396 Object

Respondent: Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance [2627]

Agent: Stutt & Parker (Mr Rory Baker) [8242]

Summary: The Environment Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004) requires SA/SEA to inter alia set out the reasons of preferred alternatives, and the rejection of others, be made set out. In addition, the Planning Practice Guidance⁴ makes clear that the strategic environmental assessment should outline the reasons the alternatives were selected, the reasons the rejected options were not taken forward and the reasons for selecting the preferred approach in light of the alternatives. Sustainability appraisal of the PSLP has been published: The Sustainability Appraisal of the Brentwood Local Plan January 2019 (the SA). Site 033 has been wholly discounted, failing to progress to 'shortlisted omission sites' nor the final shortlist. The SA explains that a number of sites were identified through the HELAA that were considered developable or deliverable, but are nevertheless not proposed to be allocated in the PSLP. The SA does not provide a justified reason for the rejection of the site. Paragraph: 038 Reference ID: 11-038-20150209.

Change To Plan: We seek modifications to refine the Site Appraisal Criteria contained in the SA of the Brentwood Local Plan, prepared by AECOM. The decision process for utilising the RAG scoring is unclear in regards to the weighting given to the overall scores, and how this results in a site being considered suitable for allocation or unsuitable. The criteria set out in Appendix B Table 3 must adopt a more refined approach to its scoring in order to be of use in the identification of which sites and more or less sustainable. Criteria 7, 8, 9 should take account of the capacity of existing facilities and the scale of a proposed site, as this will affect the ability to provide additional facilities, or to support existing facilities. Criteria 10, 12, 13, 15 each assume that closer proximity of a site will have a negative effect on the criteria, when this is not necessarily the case. Criteria 17 should not be included in the SA as the notes for this criteria (p.96) confirm the Agricultural Land Classification Maps are of a poor resolution. It is recommended that a more refined scoring system is required to improve the utility of the SA to the identification of sustainable sites. A more refined scoring system would more accurately reflect the sustainability of any potential allocation. Further, greater transparency is required in relation to how the individual RAG scores have been used to reach a decision to allocate or omit sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24396 - 2627 - Sustainability Appraisal - ii, iv

24398 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to inclusion of sites R25 and R26 in Blackmore as it is unsuitable location for development due to damage on historical village, there is no strategy for development in the villages in BBC, surface water flooding is an important issue with historical flood events, the infrastructure isn't sufficient: the roads, sewerage, flood protection, power supply, GP services, school places, parking, and this will be exacerbated when combined with Epping Forest DC proposed development.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council.
Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24398 - 1497 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iv

24629 Object**Respondent: Terence Dearlove [8404]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Sustainability Appraisal refers to improvement of services and facilities in rural areas but that is completely undermined by the impact that proposed developments R25 and R26 will have on residents of Blackmore and those in the surrounding areas reliant on Blackmore facilities. Blackmore Village is categorised as Cat. 3 (large village) however this is outdated as the village now consists of just one small village shop (inclusive of a Post Office counter) and one small primary school. The SA includes an objective to reduce flood risk. Blackmore already has significant challenges. Further development will almost certainly make a bad situation worse and hereby also conflict with the SA.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association 'Neighbourhood Plan', which clearly sets out the local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24629 - 8404 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iii, iv

25798 Object**Respondent: Mr Matthew Ionescu [8576]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Noticed Ingrave isn't marked as a location for improvement or partial urbanisation. In the SA, Figure 5.8 as an option would reduce parking. In the town centre, Sainsbury's parking is already full and costs money to park. Table 6.1 in the SA [Sustainability Appraisal] notes Brentwood ranks low with "significant effects". Urbanisation in these areas could further effect the biodiversity and quality if further traffic is added. This relates back to 024 Sawyers Hall Lane. The railway station in Brentwood being made into homes would mean people could park and would be able to counter productive to an increase in housing and local traffic. I feel a reduction in car parking would be a detriment to Brentwood community in come and ability for Brentwood to be a high street to visit since there is already limited parking. Even if 9.4.9 'other modes of transport' [Sustainability Appraisal] mean increasing local pots for the council as money making. I feel that older people cannot always rely on public transport. My experience is that it is slow and unreliable. I would prefer to pay for parking. This would enable me and my older family to retain independence around the neighbourhood rather than worrying about catching the bus. If your plan 9.4.10 [Sustainability Appraisal] states that there are no 'significant positive effects' doesn't this require re-evaluation to enable better effects?

Change To Plan: Has considered local opinions to an extent but requires further local consultation with residents.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25798 - 8576 - Sustainability Appraisal - iii

25804 Object

Respondent: Mr Timothy Webb [5612]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Strongly object to all non-brownfield proposed housing site allocations. The local plan fails to fulfil the prescribed criteria because it involves a deliberate wanton, massive, wholesale destruction, despoliation, violation and vandalism of the countryside and the green Belt in contravention of the Town and Country Planning Acts and the five main purposes of the Green Belt as stipulated by the National Planning Policy Framework. This is with regard to Dunton Hills Garden Village (R01), Shenfield (R03), Blackmore (R25 and R26), two schemes at Kelvedon Hatch (R23 and R24), Doddinghurst Road (R16 and R17). Additionally the plan fails to satisfy the objectives of the sustainability appraisal with regard to Soils, Heritage, Landscape, Biodiversity. The Duty to Cooperate has not been met in that the views of statutory bodies have not been met regarding Dunton Hills Garden Village. The concerns of Blackmore Parish Council on R25 and R26 have been treated with contempt.

Change To Plan: anning are building according only to absolute irrefutable necessity and not based on hypothetical projections of dubious accuracy way into the future. Rejecting all development in the countryside/Green Belt, thereby respecting and upholding relevant statutes. Concentrating unavoidable development on brownfield sites. eg West Horndon industrial estate R02, Warley (R04 and R05) and Wates Way industrial estate (R15), followed in order of priority by Ingatestone (former Garden Centre R21 and other R22) and town centre car parks (R10, R11, R14) in each case seeking greater yield by increasing density and constructing additional storeys. Complying with the prescribed objectives of the sustainability appraisal. Respecting council taxpayers, and the democratic process by rejecting any, all developments where there is significant local opposition. All policy - local, regional, national, international should be predicated primarily on the need to restrict and ultimately reverse unsustainable population growth, not pander to it.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25804 - 5612 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iii, iv

26090 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Failure in their obligation to preserve Green Belt as laid out in the Sustainability Appraisal - 507 Safeguard the Green Belt and protect and enhance valuable landscapes and the natural historic environment.

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26090 - 4275 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iii, iv

22369 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council has no specific observations to make on Brentwood Borough Council's Draft Sustainability Appraisal or Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Pre-Submission Draft (Regulation 19).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22369 - 4178 - Sustainability Appraisal - None

23761 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: With regards to scoring of Brentwood Enterprise Park, in the SA a number of the assessed criteria could be more accurately represented. Table B: in respect of its effect on Air Quality Management Areas, medium score would be more appropriate; in respect of proximity to County Wildlife Sites and Ancient Semi Natural Woodlands, a medium score would be more appropriate; in respect of its proximity to services the score should be 'NA'. As such, the current SA may suggest the proposed BEP is less sustainable than it actually is and this references should be updated.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23761 - 5124 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, iv

24009 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: We support the overall approach to the Sustainability Appraisal, insofar as:
* It follows a robust process in evaluating alternative options for growth as well as specific site options;
* The approach to individual site options is considered to be sound; and
* It is considered to be "sound" in that it arrives at the most reasonable option for growth

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24009 - 2656 - Sustainability Appraisal - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 1. Introduction

1.19

22563 Object

Respondent: Gerald Downey [4671]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Summary:
It's stated that the Sustainability Appraisal is a "systematic process". Note that the "Site Options Appraisal Findings Table C" from the original AECOM Interim SA (Ref: AECOM Interim SA Report, Feb 2016; <http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/pdf/12022016101306u.pdf>) contained "24 Appraisal Criteria". The updated AECOM Interim SA (January 2018/2019), now contains just "17 appraisal criteria". What has happened to 7 of the criteria in this systematic update; including removal of "Protected Urban Open Space" of which some sites performed poorly. I have concerns about the SA process with the criteria changing at key stages in the plan making process.

Change To Plan: Review the 7 criteria that were dropped from 2016 to 2018, including Protected Urban Open Space" so that "apples can be compared to apples" over time. Check if including these 7 criteria would have had a significant impact on decisions made during the plan making process.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22563 - 4671 - 1.19 - i, iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 1. Introduction

1.20

22582 Object

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Insufficient weight accorded to paramount importance of Green Belt, despite a strong mandate from local residents for the Green Belt to be preserved absolutely and entirely. Under the NPPF, the Green Belt is a perfectly acceptable reason to NOT meet Objectively Assessed Housing need, irrespective of neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Return to the 2013 version, in which the Green Belt was deemed paramount above ALL other considerations. This would be in line with the NPPF, even if it resulted in not meeting the Objectively Assessed Housing need. Given the strong housing market in Brentwood (contrary to the views expressed in Supporting Documents dating from early 2010 & 2011, during a national recession) and the excellent public transport connections, the density of developments could be radically increased (i.e.: blocks of flats, not houses).

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22582 - 4539 - 1.20 - ii

25410 Object**Respondent: Mr William A Smith [8512]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections HRA, R25 and R26 This plan is no dealing with a problem, it is making one, We do not have the infrastructure in this village or town. I need myself a good hospital, a GP appointment, these are both overstretched and difficult to obtain, they do thei best but we have far too many people per doctor. Our village now is not properly maintained. No street cleaning, no road repairs, no police, long waiting times nationally for ambulances. These things are important for young and old alike. There is nothing in this local plan that deals with this. Developers build, take the money and leave us with the mess these plans solve nothing to alleviate anything, I also have lived in this town 80 years.

Change To Plan: We need the investment to go with the plan not just houses we need massive improvement too infrastructure sewers, schools, Drs hospitals transport, better roads, we need a consultation to the whole of Brentwood, this is a devastating plan to our village and a disaster to Brentwood. We need government money to carry this out. I too question the site at South Weald. Be withdrawn. I lived there all my young life. It is within easy reach of the M25 amenities, easy access to the city, town within walking distance, the site is available. Give me one good reason why you turned it down.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25410 - 8512 - Habitats Regulation Assessment - i, ii, iv

25838 Object**Respondent: Mr Timothy Webb [5612]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Strongly object to all non-brownfield proposed housing site allocations. The local plan fails to fulfil the prescribed criteria because it involves a deliberate wanton, massive, wholesale destruction, despoliation, violation and vandalism of the countryside and the green Belt in contravention of the Town and Country Planning Acts and the five main purposes of the Green Belt as stipulated by the National Planning Policy Framework. This is with regard to Dunton Hills Garden Village (R01), Shenfield (R03), Blackmore (R25 and R26), two schemes at Kelvedon Hatch (R23 and R24), Doddinghurst Road (R16 and R17)

Additionally the plan fails to satisfy the objectives of the sustainability appraisal with regard to Soils, Heritage, Landscape, Biodiversity.

The Duty to Cooperate has not be met in that the views of statutory bodies have not been met regarding Dunton Hills Garden Village.

The concerns of Blackmore Parish Council on R25 and R26 have been treated with contempt.

Change To Plan: Planning are building according only to absolute irrefutable necessity and not based on hypothetical projections of dubious accuracy way into the future.

Rejecting all development in the countryside/Green Belt, thereby respecting and upholding relevant statutes.

Concentrating unavoidable development on brownfield sites. eg West Horndon industrial estate R02, Warley (R04 and R05) and Wates Way industrial estate (R15), followed in order of priority by Ingatestone (former Garden Centre R21 and other R22) and town centre car parks (R10, R11, R14) in each case seeking greater yield by increasing density and constructing additional storeys.

Complying with the prescribed objectives of the sustainability appraisal.

Respecting council taxpayers, and the democratic process by rejecting any, all developments where there is significant local opposition.

All policy - local, regional, national, international should be predicated primarily on the need to restrict and ultimately reverse unsustainable population growth, not pander to it.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25838 - 5612 - Habitats Regulation Assessment - i, ii, iii, iv

22266 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective

Request amendment to paragraph 1.21 to ensure factual representation of the most up to date Regulations.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 1.21 as follows -

replace '61' with '63'
replace '2010' with '2017'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22266 - 6776 - 1.21 - iii

22267 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective

4. Consistent with National Policy

The RAMS is not needed to assess the in-combination impacts - this is the role of HRA prepared by the LPA.

Mitigation is needed because these impacts cannot be ruled out and a strategic approach was advised by Natural England. This has now been produced (Jan 2019) and a SPD is in draft to secure per dwelling developer contributions.

Paragraph 1.22 should be amended to reflect this.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 1.22 as follows -

'...(RAMS) has been identified for the internationally important designated wildlife sites on the Coast. A RAMS has been prepared (January 2019) to deliver strategic mitigation to avoid impacts on these sites from residential development within the evidenced Zone of Influence, with a view to subsequent adoption of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) by the Council to secure per dwelling developer contributions. Residential development that is likely to adversely affect the integrity of Habitats (European) Sites, is required to either contribute towards mitigation measures identified in the RAMS or, in exceptional circumstances, identify and deliver bespoke mitigation measures (in perpetuity) to ensure compliance with the Habitat Regulations. Mitigation is needed because these impacts, in combination with other plans and projects, cannot be ruled out and a strategic approach was advised by Natural England.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22267 - 6776 - 1.22 - iii, iv

22539 Support**Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Should this also cover the Thames Chase Community Forest?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22539 - 7196 - 1.23 - None

24139 Object**Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]****Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]**

Summary: Since the Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation, which took place in early 2018, the revised NPPF has been published. Significant elements of the evidence base to the Plan, which were prepared under the 2012 NPPF, have not been updated. We question whether, in light of this fundamental change to the planning policy context, as well as changes to the introduction of the Standard Methodology for calculating housing need and the Housing Delivery Test, which will be discussed below, the Plan should progress to Examination.

Change To Plan: The Plan should be updated so that the housing need is calculated based on the Government's standard methodology for calculating housing need, as well as reflecting the findings of the Housing Delivery Test. This will significantly increase the housing numbers and the number of sites required. Further consultation should then take place on a revised draft Plan, before it is submitted for Examination.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24139 - 8368 - Planning Policy Context - iii, iv

22268 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective

Request amendments to paragraph 1.27 to ensure factual representation of the adopted Essex Minerals Local Plan 2014.

Change To Plan: Add the following wording to the end of paragraph 1.27 -

The aim of minerals safeguarding is to ensure that mineral resources are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development by ensuring their prior extraction, where this is viable, before the non-mineral development is implemented.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22268 - 6776 - 1.27 - iii

22269 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective

Request amendments to paragraph 1.32 to ensure factual representation of the adopted Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan 2017.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 1.32 to read:

'... the Waste Local Plan does identify a number of Areas of Search across the county where the Waste Planning Authority may support development outside of allocated waste sites. These Areas of Search are all existing industrial estates, and any waste use proposed on these estates will be required to be in keeping with existing development. The Waste Local Plan seeks to focus any new proposals for waste management facilities, which support local housing and economic growth, within these Areas of Search before other locations are considered. Two such Areas of Search have been designated in Brentwood ...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22269 - 6776 - 1.32 - iii

22270 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective

Request amendments to paragraph 1.34 to ensure factual representation of the adopted Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan 2017.

Change To Plan: Add the following wording to the end of first sentence of Paragraph 1.34 -

..., extending to 400m in the case of Water Recycling Centres.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22270 - 6776 - 1.34 - iii

23144 Object**Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Thurrock supports: commitment to ASELA, Brnetwoods commitment to review the plan to ensure any opportunities for additional growth and infrastructure identified in the JSP can be realised; that the review would be an effective mechanism to align the plans in the future.

However, it is considered that a number of the policies including SP02 should be amended to make reference to the circumstances and triggers in which the Brentwood Local Plan would need to be reviewed including failure to deliver the housing within the plan and /or a different spatial strategy or growth levels as a result of the policy approach following adoption of a South Essex Joint Strategic Plan.

Change To Plan: It is considered that a number of the policies including SP02 should be amended to make reference to the circumstances and triggers in which the Brentwood Local Plan would need to be reviewed including failure to deliver the housing within the plan and /or a different spatial strategy or growth levels as a result of the policy approach following adoption of a South Essex Joint Strategic Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23144 - 2461 - South Essex Joint Strategic Plan - None

23950 Object**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: South Essex Joint Strategic Plan (page 17 - 18)

The Council helpfully explains the progress that has been made on the Joint Strategic Plan (JSP) and the collaboration that has occurred on this. However, CEG considers that the relationship between the Local Plan and the JSP should be made clearer. It should be clearly explained that adoption of the JSP will only occur after the adoption of the Brentwood Local Plan and because of the timing the Brentwood Local Plan will contribute towards some of the growth requirements of the JSP. To address this, some modifications are suggested

Change To Plan: South Essex Joint Strategic Plan (page 17 - 18)

The below modifications are proposed paragraph 1.38 to ensure the Local Plan is positively prepared and the relationship between it and the JSP is clearer:

"Work on the Joint Strategic Plan is at an early stage with adoption in 2020 expected after the adoption of the Brentwood Local Plan. The Brentwood Local Plan will contribute towards some of the growth requirements of the Joint Strategic Plan. early in that Plan. However, Following the adoption of the Joint Strategic Plan it may be necessary to review the Brentwood Local Plan."

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23950 - 5050 - South Essex Joint Strategic Plan - iv

22235 Object **Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds: failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed; inadequate consultation with Epping Forest District Council and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore; failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development; adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22235 - 4376 - Introduction to Borough Profile - ii, iv

23951 Support **Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]** **Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Chapter 2. Borough of Villages

CEG supports the characterisation of Brentwood as a Borough of Villages and the Borough Profile (February 2019) evidence base which describes the unique nature of a market town and surrounding villages set amongst countryside as fundamental to the Borough's character. CEG considers that it is entirely appropriate that this characterisation forms a central part of the Vision set out in Chapter 3 of the Local Plan.

Fig. 2.2 (Brentwood Borough Hierarchy) in the Local Plan draws from the existing and proposed settlement hierarchy diagrams set out in the Borough Profile, and shows in plan form how well the Local Plan proposals reflect the Borough of Villages character. This includes the DHGV proposal, which presents a very positive response to meet the Borough's housing needs and will fit into the hierarchy of settlements in the future as set out in Fig. 2.3 (Settlement Hierarchy) in the Local Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23951 - 5050 - Introduction to Borough Profile - iv

22540 Support **Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Thames Chase Trust politely requests that in addition to mention of the "Essex Countryside" it also stated that the Borough falls within the Thames Chase Community Forest.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22540 - 7196 - 2.3 - None

23146 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is requested that Brentwood borough council clarify how the proposed settlement hierarchy is supported by the appropriate evidence base. Brentwood borough council should include appropriate reference to the evidence base on this matter in the supporting text

Change To Plan: It is requested that Brentwood borough council clarify how the proposed settlement hierarchy is supported by the appropriate evidence base. Brentwood borough council should include appropriate reference to the evidence base on this matter in the supporting text

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23146 - 2461 - Settlement Hierarchy - ii

24073 Object

Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]

Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]

Summary: LLLP support the overall settlement hierarchy and categorisation of individual existing towns and villages set out in Figure 2.2 of the BBLP but have concerns with respect to the categorisation of Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) as falling within Settlement Category 2. This representation must be read in conjunction with the other representations submitted by LLLP with related matters. Support that Brentwood Town is settlement Category 1, but figure 2.3 does not provide sufficient emphasis that this category provides the most sustainable location for future development and services. LLLP object to Dunton Hills Garden village being in Category 2 as it is untested and does not exist, therefore does not relate to text or figures regarding settlement category.

Change To Plan: DHGV should be deleted from Settlement Category 2 and separately identified in both Figures 2.2 and 2.3 of the Plan in order to make plain its current situation. Paragraph 2.14 should then be modified accordingly to clearly articulate that the Garden Village does not yet exist and remains an aspiration of the BBLP rather than a final development scheme.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24073 - 8362 - Settlement Hierarchy - ii, iii

24158 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: Whilst we support the classification of Ingrave as a "Category 3 - Large Village", we object to the inconsistent treatment of this settlement in comparison to others of the same classification. For example, Kelvedon Hatch, Blackmore and Hook End/Tipps Cross have been allocated development. However, neither Ingrave and Herongate (now linked), Wyatts Green nor Mountnessing, have been allocated any development. Mountnessing has already accommodated some development though existing permissions on previously developed sites, but the same is not true for Ingrave. The moratorium of growth in these villages is contrary to the NPPF with regards to rural communities.

Change To Plan: Additional land for housing should be allocated at Ingrave to meet local, settlement specific housing needs to address localised affordability issues but also retain the working age population in the village to ensure the viability and vitality of local shops and services. Paragraph 2.16 of the Plan notes that, in relation to Category 3 settlements; 'Brownfield redevelopment opportunities will be encouraged to meet local needs, and policies in this Plan will help to bring forward nearby redevelopment of brownfield sites in the Green Belt where appropriate.' This emphasis on bringing forward brownfield sites 'nearby' Category 3 settlements is supported. This approach would provide a more flexible approach and would enable sites such as our client's site to come forward.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24158 - 8368 - Settlement Hierarchy - i, iii, iv

24454 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: LPP Fig 2.3 settlement hierarchy. There are errors in the plan, population states 829 but does not include houses past Red Rose Lane or the residents in Chelmsford Road and Traveller site.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24454 - 8379 - Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

25650 Object**Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Parish Council and BVHA also take issue with the proposed allocation of Blackmore as a Category 3 settlement within the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (see pages 21-25 of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan). Therefore the Local Plan, with proposed allocations R25 and R26 and the allocation of Blackmore as a "larger village", is unsound in that it has not been positively prepared, is not justified, is not effective nor consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019 edition)('the NPPF').

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25650 - 1921 - Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

23900 Support**Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]****Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]**

Summary: Description of Category 1 sites appropriately aligns with the characteristics of Brentwood, in that it provides a wide range of services and employment opportunities, is highly accessible and well served by public transport. We consider Brentwood's placement at the top of the Settlement Hierarchy as appropriate. Agree that development opportunities in Category 1 settlements "should focus on making the best use of land, with a higher density" because it would ensure that the development potential of such suitable sites, including Land at Nags Head Lane, is maximised.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23900 - 2509 - Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

23907 Support**Respondent: Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust [8344]****Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]**

Summary: We consider that Brentwood Urban Area's placement at the top of the Settlement Hierarchy, including Warley, is appropriate and justified. Warley as part of the Brentwood Urban Area provides a wide range of services and employment opportunities, is highly accessible and well served by public transport - this is demonstrated by being only 800m from Brentwood mainline / Crossrail station.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23907 - 8344 - Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 2. Borough of Villages 2.8**22271 Object****Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.

BBC will need to be satisfied that the proposed Settlement Hierarchy is supported by the appropriate evidence base.

Change To Plan: BBC should include appropriate reference to the evidence base on this matter in the supporting text.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22271 - 6776 - 2.8 - ii

23313 Object

Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The population of Blackmore is listed as 829. However, the area that this covers (see diagram below) does not cover, amongst others, the residents in Nine Ashes Road past Red Rose Lane or the residents in the Chelmsford Road which includes a mobile home park and the illegal Traveller site. The populations stated in the plan separately for Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green add up to 2,402; however the total population for the Parish of Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green is actually 3,040. The Plan numbers are misleading and therefore invalidate assumptions made in the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23313 - 4905 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - None

23673 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: Plan sets out within the Settlement Hierarchy in Table 2.3 that the development of brownfield land will be prioritised. This requirement has no support in National Policy as Para 117 of the Revised Framework (2019) simply states that substantial weight should be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land. This requirement should therefore be changed to reflect Government guidance.
The prioritisation of brownfield land is also repeated in the Spatial Development Principles section under Paragraph 3.23 which similarly needs amending.

Change To Plan: Change requirement in Settlement Hierarchy in Table 2.3 that the development of brownfield land will be prioritised changed to reflect Government guidance.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23673 - 2774 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

24435 Object

Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]

Agent: N/A

Summary: IDP Fig 2.3 settlement hierarchy: there are errors in the plan eg the population of Blackmore is listed as 829 but this does not cover the residents in Nine Ashes Road past Red Rose Lanes and Chelmsford Road which includes a mobile home park and illegal travellers site.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24435 - 8378 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

24471 Object

Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is a small village which should never have been classed as category 3 it is category 4. Green field sites being proposed when there is alternative brownfield sites available. Amenities would not be able to cope, School is full, doctor appointments already up to 1 month & this will worsen with residents of old Norton Heath site descend on the village

Change To Plan: Refer to BHVA neighbourhood plan - remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24471 - 8380 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

25125 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Why is Blackmore, population 829, in Settlement Category 3 along with Doddinghurst, population 2,550, rather than Settlement Category 4? The definition of Category 4 is 'Remote and small rural villages and hamlets, with poor public transport, limited shops, jobs and community facilities; some of these settlements rely on nearby settlements for services' which is more pertinent to the village of Blackmore.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25125 - 4943 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - None

25744 Object**Respondent: Mr Douglas Piper [603]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore should be category 4.

Change To Plan: Blackmore should be category 4.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25744 - 603 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - None

25841 Object**Respondent: Mr John Hughes [4500]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are errors and omissions in the plan. The population of Blackmore is listed as 829; however, the area that this covers does not cover the residents in Nine Ashes Road past Red Rose Lane or the residents in the Chelmsford Road which includes a mobile home park and the illegal Traveller site. The populations stated in the plan separately for Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green add up to 2402, however the total population for the Parish of Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green is actually 3040. The Plan numbers are misleading and therefore invalidate assumptions made in the Plan based on population numbers.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25841 - 4500 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

25856 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are errors and omissions in the plan. The population of Blackmore is listed as 829; however, the area that this covers does not cover the residents in Nine Ashes Road past Red Rose Lane or the residents in the Chelmsford Road which includes a mobile home park and the illegal Traveller site. The populations stated in the plan separately for Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green add up to 2402, however the total population for the Parish of Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green is actually 3040. The Plan numbers are misleading and therefore invalidate assumptions made in the Plan based on population numbers.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25856 - 8637 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

25863 Object**Respondent: Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are errors and omissions in the plan. The population of Blackmore is listed as 829; however, the area that this covers does not cover the residents in Nine Ashes Road past Red Rose Lane or the residents in the Chelmsford Road which includes a mobile home park and the illegal Traveller site. The populations stated in the plan separately for Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green add up to 2402, however the total population for the Parish of Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green is actually 3040. The Plan numbers are misleading and therefore invalidate assumptions made in the Plan based on population numbers.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25863 - 8638 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

25870 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Hughes [8639]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are errors and omissions in the plan. The population of Blackmore is listed as 829; however, the area that this covers does not cover the residents in Nine Ashes Road past Red Rose Lane or the residents in the Chelmsford Road which includes a mobile home park and the illegal Traveller site. The populations stated in the plan separately for Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green add up to 2402, however the total population for the Parish of Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green is actually 3040. The Plan numbers are misleading and therefore invalidate assumptions made in the Plan based on population numbers.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25870 - 8639 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

26095 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The population of Blackmore is listed as 829, but this doesn't make provision for the residents of Nine Ashes road nor does it cover the Travellers living illegally within the village bounds which Brentwood Council still refuse to take action on - nor the residents living on the Chelmsford road, who all use local amenities. The total of the separate population figures do not add up to the total population figure either- by a margin of around 600 people. Assumptions have been made based on these figures, calling into question the validity of the proposals.

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore is not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26095 - 8677 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, iii, iv

23790 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: West Horndon as a large village within settlement Category 2.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23790 - 3738 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - i, ii, iii, iv

23791 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: West Horndon as a large village within settlement Category 2.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23791 - 3738 - Figure 2.3: Settlement Hierarchy - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 2. Borough of Villages 2.13

22272 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified

Clarification is sought on the infrastructure constraints of Ingatestone, given this paragraph states that Ingatestone has relatively good accessibility to public transport, has a rail station and a secondary school.

Change To Plan: BBC should make the appropriate reference to the evidence base covering this point.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22272 - 6776 - 2.13 - ii

23792 Support **Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]** **Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]**

Summary: for improvements to access to West Horndon station arising from and facilitated by Dunton Hill Garden Village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23792 - 3738 - 2.14 - None

23356 Object **Respondent: Steve Abrahall [666]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Can you please tell me if there are going to people any improvements to footways on Weald Road near Bardswell Close as I have lived in Brentwood 22 years and these pavements have never been done, also the pavements near Brentwood station are in a shocking state all loose and sunk!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23356 - 666 - Transport and Travel - None

23357 Object **Respondent: Steve Abrahall [666]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Also so much building near Brentwood station but no sign of the Council pushing for a faster service, the car park is always empty due to high fares and slow trains compared to Shenfield for speed and Harold Wood for cost. Also still no lift to platform 4 or no loos on the train despite nearly an hour to London!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23357 - 666 - Transport and Travel - None

23274 Support **Respondent: c2c Rail (Chris Atkinson) [8280]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: c2c strongly supports the importance of continued economic growth and the provision of more homes, both in Brentwood borough and the wider region. To deliver economic growth and the proposed housebuilding programme, maintaining and improving the transport infrastructure is absolutely essential and must be treated as such by the Council. Supporting the railway infrastructure in particular is vital, given the unique economic and environmental benefits it provides that cannot be delivered by investment in roads.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23274 - 8280 - Transport and Travel - i, ii, iii, iv

22541 Support **Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Please mention the Thames Chase Community Forest within this list of resources.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22541 - 7196 - 2.35 - None

22542 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please mention the borough's location within the Thames Chase Community Forest.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22542 - 7196 - 2.37 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 2. Borough of Villages Health and Well-being

22760 Object

Respondent: Mr Geoffrey Town [3982]

Agent: N/A

Summary: More houses result in more cars means more emissions whereas government policy is for clean air.

Change To Plan: No more houses.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22760 - 3982 - Health and Well-being - None

23239 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Within Brentwood administrative area, healthcare provision incorporates 9 GP Practices, 13 pharmacists, 9 dental surgeries, 10 Opticians, 2 community clinics and 2 community hospitals. Of the 9 GP Practices, 1 currently has limited capacity for growth and development. Existing health care services do not have capacity to accommodate significant growth and will require further investment and improvement in order to meet the needs of the planned growth shown in this LP document. The proposed developments would have an impact on healthcare provision in the area and its implications, if unmitigated, would be unsustainable.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23239 - 3791 - Health and Well-being - i, ii, iii, iv

23241 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Planning Authority should have reference to the most up-to-date strategy documents from NHS England which currently constitutes The Five Year Forward View and the NHS Long Term Plan. Reference should also be made to the emerging STP Estates Strategy and the Essex Health Places advice note for planners, developers and designers.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23241 - 3791 - Health and Well-being - ii, iii, iv

23242 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Removal of any reference to additional GPs is also requested as this does not reflect the current strategies referred to above. 'Workforce' should be used in place of GPs to reflect the changing models of care and workforce mix across health. As an example of this the statement 'NHS England has identified an additional need for GPs subject to the location of future development.' On page 29, section 2.47 should be amended to read 'NHS England has identified the need for additional workforce to increase capacity to accommodate future development'.

Change To Plan: Remove any reference to additional GPs. 'Workforce' should be used in place of GPs to reflect the changing models of care and workforce mix across health. As an example of this the statement 'NHS England has identified an additional need for GPs subject to the location of future development.' On page 29, section 2.47 should be amended to read 'NHS England has identified the need for additional workforce to increase capacity to accommodate future development'.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23242 - 3791 - 2.47 - ii, iii, iv

22273 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.

Request additional paragraphs to be inserted at the end of this section to ensure that the full range of education provision is considered.

Change To Plan: Insert the following two paragraphs after paragraph 2.51 -

Essex County Council has a statutory duty under the Childcare Act 2006 to ensure there are sufficient and accessible high quality early years and childcare provision. In September 2017, the Government also introduced the Extended Funding Entitlement, providing an additional 15 hours free childcare for 3-4 year olds who meet certain criteria.

In general Brentwood has a diverse range of Early Years and Childcare provision to a high quality, however data suggests a large majority of areas are reaching maximum capacity and with the introduction of the Extended Funding Entitlement, childcare choices are limited and new provision will be needed with the additional developments planned.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22273 - 6776 - Education and Schools - ii

22274 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.

Request additional paragraphs to be inserted at the end of this section to ensure that the full range of education provision is considered.

Change To Plan: Insert the following paragraph at the end of the Education and Schools section (paras 2.49-2.51) -

All of the secondary schools within Brentwood have 6th form provision, learner's wishing to study vocational subjects either travel to South Essex College (Thurrock/Basildon), Chelmsford College, with a further cohort travelling into Havering.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22274 - 6776 - Education and Schools - ii

22275 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified

Request additional paragraphs to be inserted at the end of this section to ensure that the full range of education provision is considered.

Change To Plan: Insert the following paragraph at the end of the Education and Schools section (paras 2.49-2.51), and before paragraph 7.103 -

In respect of Special Education Needs (SEN) children present with many different types of need and it is not possible to provide for every need within each District. Each special school is regarded as a regional centre of excellence for their type of need i.e. autism, severe learning difficulties etc and children attend from a wider geographical area. Some children in Brentwood with special needs travel to special schools in other areas of the County.

Endeavour School is a special school for children aged 5 years to 16 years with moderate learning difficulties and complex needs and is the only special school in Brentwood. ECC commissions places for local children with an Education Health and Care Plan at this school.

ECC has developed specially resourced provision for children with speech and language difficulties within West Horndon Primary School in Brentwood to meet the needs of a small number of children with specific speech and language difficulties who are able to access the national curriculum with specialist support.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22275 - 6776 - Education and Schools - ii

22543 Support **Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]** **Agent: N/A**
Summary: Please reference the Thames Chase Community Forest in this list.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22543 - 7196 - 2.54 - None

23758 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]**
Summary: The Borough has a limited amount of previously developed land within its authority to provide for short term delivery, as such Green Belt release is required in order to meet the Authorities housing need and deliver within the short, medium and long term, as stated at paragraph 2.54 of the PSLP. The approach to amend the Green Belt boundaries is therefore supported.
Change To Plan:
Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes
Full Reference: S - 23758 - 6751 - 2.54 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Vision
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22236 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds: failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed; inadequate consultation with Epping Forest District Council and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore; failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development; adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22236 - 4376 - Vision - ii, iv

22526 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.
Without prejudice to the above contention, if no previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites exist, that Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate there are no or insufficient previously developed sites available outside the existing urban areas.
In any event, there are greenfield sites available (for example adjoining existing urban areas) in preferable and more sustainable locations.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22526 - 8074 - Vision - i, ii, iii, iv

23580 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The strategy is unreasonable and disproportionate in that it concentrates growth excessively at one particular point in the Borough.

Change To Plan: Section 03, Rep 1: In order to make the Plan legally compliant Dunton Hills Garden Village, Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan, and provision for housing and employment growth should be distributed in a proportionate fashion across the Borough.
As mentioned in Section A, Representation 1, The Authority proposes to allocate 44% of the Allocation Total of homes and 78% of the Borough's new employment land to the small zone south of the A127. That zone amounts to just 5% of the land area of the Borough. Such a proposal is clumsy in the extreme and does not represent proper and thoughtful planning. An authority has a legal duty to act in a reasonable and proportionate manner. Such an unbalanced strategy is neither reasonable nor proportionate and so is unlawful.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23580 - 6185 - Vision - None

23581 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan concentrates the loss of Green Belt land at one point in the Borough. This decision was based on a preconception and not on evidence. Proportion of homes in the area is too high. Impact on Green Belt not fully considered. Para 3.21 a & b shows preconception drives sacrifice of Green Belt for Dunton HGV. Actually worst place in borough to do this.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy it should be withdrawn and rewritten from scratch. Potential development sites should be selected objectively on the basis of the evidence that exists now and not on the prejudgement that a large area at the south of the Borough will be developed.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23581 - 6185 - Vision - ii, iv

24075 Object

Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]

Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]

Summary: Vision is not effective. Unclear what landscape-led or design and build with nature means or how this is translated into the proposed Dunton hill Garden Village allocation. Also unclear from the Vision Statement and supporting text how a landscape led approach accords with the definition of sustainable development established in the NPPF at paragraph 8. Overemphasis on environmental, needs more on economic and social. Therefor plan is not consistent with national policy and is unsound.

Change To Plan: . LLLP conclude that amendment of the Vision Statement is required to ensure it properly reflects the three overarching national planning policy objectives for sustainable development and in particular makes an explicit reference to meeting in full the Borough's housing needs

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24075 - 8362 - Vision - iv

23218 Support

Respondent: Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093]

Agent: N/A

Summary: XX

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23218 - 6093 - Vision - None

23952 Support

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Vision and Strategic Objectives

The Spatial Strategy identifies two growth areas which align with transport corridors; the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor and the South Brentwood Growth Corridor, within which DHGV is proposed. Development outside of these corridors will be limited to retain the local character of the Borough (paragraph 3.21).

The NPPF recognises that the supply of a large number of homes can often best be achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns (paragraph 72). The approach of planning for DHGV is consistent with this and retaining the local character of the Borough.

CEG supports the Vision, the Driving Factors, the Overarching Aims, Strategic Objectives and the Strategic Allocation of DHGV as part of the South Brentwood Growth Corridor set out in Chapter 3. The Spatial Strategy and Development Principles will deliver the Vision. Given the importance attributed to Brentwood as a Borough of Villages and the need for Brentwood to meet its housing needs, the Spatial Strategy is sound; it is positively prepared, justified and consistent with national policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23952 - 5050 - Vision - iv

24266 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Vision for the Borough: The Vision for the Borough set out at Section 3 of the PSLP is supported. For the reasons set out in these representations, carefully planned development at Kelvedon Hatch as provided for at Policies R23 and R24 will make an important contribution to BBC's housing needs to meet the Local Plan objectives. Indeed, these representations and those relating to R24 make the case that a modest and justified increase in the sites' ability to accommodate more homes will assist meet those aims and provide for greater flexibility in meeting housing needs. Stonebond Properties have undertaken detailed site assessments. These confirm that there are no barriers to delivery of development. As a consequence, the expressed objectives of development in the Vision to be landscape-led responding to a "design and build with nature approach firmly embedding high quality green infrastructure through public realm to create a seamless transition to our surrounding countryside" can all be achieved and delivered in the allocation of sites R23 and R24. This is demonstrated in the accompanying Vision Documents to this representation for R24.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24266 - 2741 - Vision - i, ii, iii, iv

24309 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary:

Vision for the Borough: The Vision for the Borough set out at Section 3 of the PSLP is supported. For the reasons set out in these representations, carefully planned development at Kelvedon Hatch as provided for at Policies R23 and R24 will make an important contribution to BBC's housing needs to meet the Local Plan objectives. Indeed, these representations and those relating to R24 make the case that a modest and justified increase in the sites' ability to accommodate more homes will assist meet those aims and provide for greater flexibility in meeting housing needs. Stonebond Properties have undertaken detailed site assessments. These confirm that there are no barriers to delivery of development. As a consequence, the expressed objectives of development in the Vision to be landscape-led responding to a "design and build with nature approach firmly embedding high quality green infrastructure through public realm to create a seamless transition to our surrounding countryside" can all be achieved and delivered in the allocation of sites R23 and R24. This is demonstrated in the accompanying Vision Documents to this representation for R24.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

S - 24309 - 2741 - Vision - i, ii, iii, iv

24335 Support

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary:

The PSLP sets out the overarching aims of the Spatial Strategy, which includes an emphasis on 'Transit-orientated Growth'. This identifies two key transit corridors, including the 'Southern Brentwood Growth Corridor'. The PSLP focuses growth on land within the Borough's transport corridors, with strategic allocations along the A127 corridor for employment, which is justified given the aims and objectives of the Plan. The Council's strategy to direct development growth to the Borough's transport corridors is supported and has potential to provide for employment growth in locations where there is strong market demand, and to minimise environmental impacts on the wider Borough. The proposed allocation at Childerditch Industrial Estate will assist in meeting this objective, by bringing forward new business and employment opportunities along the A127 corridor. It will help support the planned residential growth within Borough. The Plan has been positively prepared in this respect. The Strategic Objectives identified within Section 3 of the PSLP are supported. Economic prosperity forms a key part of the objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

S - 24335 - 8371 - Vision - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Spatial Strategy Driving Factors
Vision and Strategic Objectives

23150 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Thurrock Council has previously objected to the spatial strategy through its various iterations in previous stages of Brentwood Local Plan consultation and those objections remain. It is unclear why the spatial strategy should advocate a free-standing greenfield settlement in the Green Belt and why this should be the preferred location for development compared to existing settlement expansion or green field urban extensions which are likely to be more sustainable, less constrained and are closer to existing transport and other existing infrastructure and services.

The development of the Brentwood Local Plan spatial strategy appears to have:

- * not considered a suitable range of reasonable alternative options that are easier to deliver and/or less constrained;
- * put forward a large free standing settlement at Dunton Hills at an early stage which has pre-determined the spatial approach without being supported by the evidence;
- * not assessed reasonable options for a free standing settlement or large scale settlement expansion elsewhere in the borough that should have been tested through local plan development evidence and SA process;
- * developed a spatial strategy without key elements of the evidence base including land availability transport assessment;
- * not taken account of the emerging spatial options being pursued by the adjoining authorities such as Thurrock and through the joint work of the South Essex authorities.

Change To Plan: It is considered the Brentwood Draft Local Plan and supporting evidence base will require further major revision and consultation with ongoing duty to cooperate with adjoining local authorities. In particular the preparation of the draft Brentwood Local Plan should be reviewed to take account of the outcome of testing of other spatial options being considered including the evidence by the South Essex authorities as part of the preparation of a Joint Strategic Plan.

Further work is required to develop the evidence base including the justification for the selection of the spatial options and dismissal of reasonable alternatives, housing capacity and supply further transport evidence and other infrastructure.

Due to the issues highlighted in this response and to the earlier documents it is considered that Brentwood Council needs to carefully consider how it proceeds with the preparation of the Local Plan and the timetable for its production. It is recommended that the Brentwood Plan with its current spatial strategy and site allocations should not be submitted for Examination.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23150 - 2461 - Spatial Strategy Driving Factors - i, ii, iii, iv

23451 Object

Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy' for the Villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the Borough.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23451 - 8117 - Spatial Strategy Driving Factors - None

24161 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: The Plan's spatial strategy is unsound because it excluded all sites which do not meet the distance thresholds from existing settlements, and has not fully taken into account opportunities offered by smaller sites in the Green Belt, which could offer sustainable transport modes, and make a small but important contribution to meeting housing need.

Change To Plan: In light of the higher housing numbers required, the Plan should be revised to re-assess all sites which do not meet the distance thresholds from existing settlements, and to take into account opportunities offered by smaller sites in the Green Belt, which could offer sustainable transport modes, and make a small but important contribution to meeting housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24161 - 8368 - Spatial Strategy Driving Factors - i, iii, iv

24170 Object**Respondent: Turn2us [6753]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]**

Summary: Hutton is identified as Category 1 - Main Town. It is clearly a sustainable location to which a proportion of the Borough's housing need should be directed. However, notwithstanding the above, the PSLP proposes to direct no housing growth to Hutton. This contrasts sharply with the proposed approach to the other settlements identified as Category 1.

Change To Plan: To ensure the Local Plan is sound, land should be allocated to ensure the sustainable growth of Hutton.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24170 - 6753 - Spatial Strategy Driving Factors - None

24717 Object**Respondent: Anna Dunk [8426]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. The large scale development plan being proposed will, without a doubt, negatively effect the quality of life of its residents. The plan is being proposed by a developer who holds no knowledge of the village itself, which has resulted in a proposal that is completely inappropriate. The facilities in Blackmore are limited and an influx of new residents would be detrimental. The following reasons clarify why: 1. The proposed plan would produce overcrowding, resulting in an unacceptable increase in traffic and noise, destroying the very nature of our village. 2. There is no clear 'strategy' for the village and there are many other more suitable and sustainable locations for development. 3. Parts of the village are liable to flood. Building on the proposed land would increase the flood risk everywhere in the village. 4. There is just one shop in our village, an overcrowded primary school, and a local doctor surgery where it is extremely difficult to get an appointment. Such an increase in residents is simply unmanageable.

Change To Plan: A sound local plan would require: 1. The assessment must take into account the modest and limited services in the village, including the shop, doctor surgery, primary school and parking. 2. The character and nature of the village must be carefully considered, and the current residents quality of life must be protected. 3. BBC needs to look at the many other suitable locations in the area which can sustain this type of development. 4. The problems with flooding need to be taken into account and current problems with flooding addressed.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24717 - 8426 - Spatial Strategy Driving Factors - i, ii, iii, iv

24742 Object**Respondent: Barry Robert Dean [8435]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In my opinion there is no clear 'strategy' for the village of Blackmore. There are more suitable sites and the green belt land does not have to be touched. Building the houses in Blackmore would put unwelcomed pressure on the already very busy doctors, schools, parking and bus services etc.

Change To Plan: I fully agree with the objectives of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24742 - 8435 - Spatial Strategy Driving Factors - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - 3.6
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22277 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Positively prepared
2. Justified
3. Effective
4. Consistent with National Policy

In accordance with paragraphs 21 and 27 of the NPPF, the plan should include information from its evidence base that identifies the cross-boundary issues, where they are located, and how the Plan seeks to address these. ECC would expect to see this in the section covering spatial challenges and opportunities in the Spatial Strategy chapter of the Local Plan.

Change To Plan: BBC should include within paragraph 3.6 information from its evidence base that identifies the cross-boundary issues, where they are located, and how the Plan seeks to address these.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22277 - 6776 - 3.6 - i, ii, iii, iv

23148 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 3.6 of the Brentwood Local Plan should identify the key cross-boundary issues and challenges between Brentwood and adjoining authorities including Thurrock. It should set out how the plan seeks to address these including any future reviews of the plan and through joint working on the South Essex JSP.

Brentwood Council should prepare Statements of Common Ground on strategic cross- boundary matters in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Guidance.

Change To Plan: Section 3.6 of the Brentwood Local Plan should identify the key cross-boundary issues and challenges between Brentwood and adjoining authorities including Thurrock. It should set out how the plan seeks to address these including any future reviews of the plan and through joint working on the South Essex JSP.

Brentwood Council should prepare Statements of Common Ground on strategic cross- boundary matters in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Guidance.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23148 - 2461 - 3.6 - i, iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Housing Need
Vision and Strategic Objectives

23670 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: The Plan sets out that one of the overarching driving factors behind the BLP is meeting the housing needs of the borough. However, the Council are using the 2016 Household Projections to calculate the housing needs of the borough, use of the 2014 Household Projections is likely to yield a higher housing requirement and therefore, the Council will need to address this issue before the Plan gets to Examination.

Change To Plan: Use 2014 Household projections to calculate housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23670 - 2774 - Housing Need - i, ii, iii, iv

24059 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]

Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]

Summary: The plan needs to be in line with para 59 of the 2018 NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing, including small sites. Para 68 confirms that small sites should be at least 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than 1ha. The Council has only 5%. With the strategic Garden Village as well, more smaller sites are needed.

Change To Plan: Add the Land at rear of Mill House Farm to plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24059 - 8359 - Housing Need - iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Spatial Strategy Overarching Aims
Vision and Strategic Objectives

23578 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The spatial strategy focuses growth on the Borough's two transport corridors but fails to recognise that the A127 has no spare capacity whereas a major increase in capacity is planned for the A12.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified DHGV, Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan, and provision for housing and employment growth should be made in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23578 - 6185 - Spatial Strategy Overarching Aims - ii

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Transit-orientated Growth
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22832 Object

Respondent: Lisa Atkinson [2991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development within the Plan is highly concentrated within the A127 Corridor. This scale and concentration proposed will irrevocably harm the landscape, environment and Green Belt within this area (at a disproportionate level than the wider Borough). Basildon, Thurrock, Castle Point, Rochford and Southend-on-Sea are also planning for growth and will also be relying on the A127 Corridor. Thurrock is considering a site for 10,000 + homes on land adjacent to West Horndon village. The Plan does not take account of this. It states that the area would remain surrounded by countryside but this would not be the case.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22832 - 2991 - Transit-orientated Growth - None

22833 Object

Respondent: Lisa Atkinson [2991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A sustainable level of development within the A127 Corridor should be limited to the development proposed at site RO2 (the West Horndon Industrial Estates). Even at this level however it would require a significant amount of infrastructure expenditure to ensure it is sustainable.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22833 - 2991 - Transit-orientated Growth - None

22834 Object

Respondent: Lisa Atkinson [2991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Throughout the development of the Plan, potentially viable alternative sites have been ignored. I believe the initial rejection of further growth in the A12 Corridor, or any material development in the North of the Borough, is not founded on sound analysis or hard evidence. No account seems to have been taken of the A12 upgrade or Crossrail.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22834 - 2991 - Transit-orientated Growth - None

22838 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Atkinson [2993]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development within the Plan is highly concentrated within the A127 Corridor. This scale and concentration proposed will irrevocably harm the landscape, environment and Green Belt within this area (at a disproportionate level than the wider Borough). Basildon, Thurrock, Castle Point, Rochford and Southend-on-Sea are also planning for growth and will also be relying on the A127 Corridor. Thurrock is considering a site for 10,000 + homes on land adjacent to West Horndon village. The Plan does not take account of this. It states that the area would remain surrounded by countryside but this would not be the case.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22838 - 2993 - Transit-orientated Growth - None

22839 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Atkinson [2993]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A sustainable level of development within the A127 Corridor should be limited to the development proposed at site RO2 (the West Horndon Industrial Estates). Even at this level however it would require a significant amount of infrastructure expenditure to ensure it is sustainable.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22839 - 2993 - Transit-orientated Growth - None

22840 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Atkinson [2993]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Throughout the development of the Plan, potentially viable alternative sites have been ignored. I believe the initial rejection of further growth in the A12 Corridor, or any material development in the North of the Borough, is not founded on sound analysis or hard evidence.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan. No account seems to have been taken of the A12 upgrade or Crossrail.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22840 - 2993 - Transit-orientated Growth - None

23118 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council questions whether the Spatial Strategy is therefore justified and consistent with national policy. The two transport corridors don't offer comparable choices in terms of the capacity of these transport connections. Four reasonable site alternatives in the Central Brentwood Corridor have been disregarded in the Sustainability Appraisal, despite having few constraints and being able to tap into the potential for movement capacity. This is considered to be in conflict with sustainable development when sites which have significant constraints to development or delivery have been included within the Plan, at the expense of sites which have fewer constraints.

Change To Plan: Using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the superior infrastructure available. This should help encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Chapter 3 should be modified as a result along with all land use allocations in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23118 - 369 - Transit-orientated Growth - i, iii

24111 Object

Respondent: Marden Homes Ltd [8363]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: Hutton is recognised as Category 1 - 'a main town', it has an established local centre, a range of services, facilities, access to public transport, and employment opportunities. It is a highly sustainable location to accommodate a proportion of Brentwood's housing need. However, the Plan proposes no growth for Hutton. We therefore have concerns that the PSLP is failing to support the sustainable growth of Hutton and this omission is unjustified and inconsistent with national policy.

Change To Plan: Land at Hanging Hill Lane should be allocated in Hutton to ensure the sustainable growth of the settlement, and to ensure the soundness of the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24111 - 8363 - Transit-orientated Growth - None

23179 Support

Respondent: Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Chelmsford Council supports BBC's proposed Spatial Strategy and approach to housing and employment allocations, which are unlikely to have any obvious adverse cross-boundary impacts on Chelmsford. However, it is crucial that the allocations are supported by the appropriate infrastructure, in particular highway and transportation schemes due to Brentwood's location on the A12/Greater Anglia road and rail corridor.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23179 - 8305 - Transit-orientated Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

23311 Support

Respondent: Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It should be noted that Brentwood is located within the new London Plan's Strategic Infrastructure Priorities 'Great Eastern Mainline (London - Ipswich - Norwich) and A12' and 'Essex Thameside, A217 and A13 corridor' (see Policy SD3 and Figure 2.15). The Lower Thames Crossing will also have implications for travel and land use in the Borough, which will need to be considered as the scheme progresses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23311 - 6093 - Transit-orientated Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

23902 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: Allocating development in these transit corridors ensures that new homes will be sustainably located, linked to existing service centres through proximity and accessibility to strategic transport infrastructure. We consider this an appropriate strategy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23902 - 2509 - Transit-orientated Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

23909 Support

Respondent: Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust [8344]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: Allocating development in the transit corridors ensures that new homes will be sustainably located, linked to existing service centres through proximity and accessibility to strategic transport infrastructure. We consider this an appropriate and justified strategy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23909 - 8344 - Transit-orientated Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - 3.11

Vision and Strategic Objectives

22278 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Narrative requires clearer references to evidence base to justify spatial strategy.

Spatial relies on two largest strategic sites (DHGV & BEP) along A127. Lack of clarity on transport impacts of development in locations and necessary supporting transport infrastructure requirements, particularly sustainable transport (necessary due to A127 location and capacity constraints).

Local Plan needs to be supported by transport modelling to demonstrate site specific, local and cumulative impact on local and strategic transport network, to demonstrate spatial strategy is most appropriate.

BBC and ECC have worked together to progress additional work, which is on-going and has not been completed or signed-off.

Change To Plan: BBC need to include within the Plan evidence, particularly in respect of transport, the site specific, local and cumulative impact on the local and strategic transport network, to demonstrate that the spatial strategy is the most appropriate.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22278 - 6776 - 3.11 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Strategic Objectives
Vision and Strategic Objectives

23666 Object	Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]	Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]
Summary:	Given the emphasis being placed by the Government on fixing the broken housing market, a further Strategic Objective is added to the Plan that specifically relates to the delivery of housing, providing housing to meet the needs of the local population and of addressing one of the key challenges facing Brentwood, that of tackling housing affordability.	
Change To Plan:	Add a new Strategic Objective that specifically relates to the delivery of housing	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 23666 - 2774 - Strategic Objectives - i, ii, iii, iv	
24088 Object	Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]	Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]
Summary:	LLLP object to the Strategic Objectives generally (and SO1 in particular) as there is no firm, clear commitment in any of the stated objectives to meet, in full, the Borough's housing requirement. The Strategic Objectives are not sound as they are not: Positively prepared - clearly establishing that the Plan will have the objective of meet the area's objectively assessed housing needs; Consistent with national planning policies - The Strategic Objectives are not consistent with national planning policies, including at paragraphs 8, 11(b), and 16(d).	
Change To Plan:	LLLP consider that the Strategic Objectives should be modified at an appropriate point in SO1 to clearly state that the Local Plan will meet the Borough's identified housing requirement.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 24088 - 8362 - Strategic Objectives - i, iv	
25924 Object	Respondent: Mr Kim Harding [8573]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Spatial Strategy - vision and strategic objectives. It is clearly stated that Brentwood has two key transit corridors. However the first names of these - the central Brentwood Growth Corridor with the A12, the Great Eastern mainline to London Liverpool Street station and the Elizabeth Line/Crossrail - has nit been appropriately or adequately explored from a strategic, resilience and sustainability viewpoint in providing areas for housing and industrial development. This has meant undue reliance has been placed on the southern Brentwood Growth Corridor with the vast majority of proposed housing and industrial development being placed in the southern most part of Brentwood - namely West Horndon Parish. A disjointed plan that does not meet strategic needs and will create transport chaos. To fully explore the opportunities provided by the central Brentwood growth corridor in accordance with National Planning Policy Guidelines and not rely on the statement that Brentwood is a borough of villages.	
Change To Plan:	To fully explore the opportunities provided by the central Brentwood growth corridor in accordance with National Planning Policy Guidelines and not rely on the statement that Brentwood is a borough of villages.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 25924 - 8573 - Strategic Objectives - i, iv	
26389 Object	Respondent: Dr Eleanor Beddoe [8732]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site R25 in appendix 2 appears to be in direct contravention of the strategic development objectives in section 3. It is outside the strategic growth areas, in a category C village which does not possess the infrastructure required to support this number of new houses.	
Change To Plan:	Revise site allocations to focus on urban extension to Brentwood or similar in identified growth areas. This would make the proposed development and associated plan more consistent and suitable when measured against its own objectives.	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 26389 - 8732 - Strategic Objectives - i, ii	

26395 Object

Respondent: Mr Gareth Beedoe [8733]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The strategic objectives of the local plan include delivering a healthy and resilient built environment as well as a clean and functional built environment. It then outlines how this strategy will be delivered in two key growth areas, the central Brentwood Growth Corridor and the South Brentwood Growth Corridor. The proposed development site R25, Land North of Woollard Way, Blackmore', is in direct contravention of this strategy. It is not in the two key growth areas, instead it is focused on a category 3 rural area which does not have the infrastructure to cope with this development.

Change To Plan: Removal of development site R25 would move the local plan consistent with the strategy outlined within the document. By focusing on brownfield sites in the key growth areas, the borough council would be demonstrating for greater sensitivity to the heritage of the area and preserve an idyllic rural village location

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26395 - 8733 - Strategic Objectives - i, ii

23719 Support

Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Support the wording of policies SO1 and SO3 in particular. It is critical that these objectives are carried forward into the detailed policies and allocations of the Local Plan. We welcome the recognition of the importance of the economic climate to the borough's communities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23719 - 6122 - Strategic Objectives - i, iv

23745 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Support the wording of policies SO1 and SO3 in particular. It is critical that these objectives are carried forward into the detailed policies and allocations of the Local Plan. We welcome the recognition of the importance of the economic climate to the borough's communities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23745 - 5124 - Strategic Objectives - i, iv

24816 Object **Respondent: Mrs Susan Webb [4919]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties. This is a single track road, and is already dangerous for walkers and horse riders. Adding the extra volume of traffic on this road is completely unsuitable. The village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on the Green were flooded. Additionally several of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems. The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties. There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. Whilst there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, it is as if Blackmore has been chosen with virtually no other options being considered and others - such as Honey Pot Lane and Red Rose Farm - completely ignored or withdrawn. There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LOP, and why other areas have not. The survey carried out by local reps has been entirely ignored. There are Brownfield sites available nearby (Red Rose Farm as one example) but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt. The infrastructure (bus services, roads, village facilities, doctors, school) simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people. Other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore which is not a sustainable development proposal. 12. The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures. The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularise an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road (at Oak Tree Farm-plots 1,2,3). This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of its services.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community. Also remove the Site GT 16 - a II 8 previously unapproved pitches. Leave Blackmore IN Green Belt and restore the classification of "Rural Village in a sparse setting (which it is for roads, Buses, etc. etc. it really is) I am very unhappy that you have chosen to issue such a difficult form to complete with wholly unnecessary/inappropriate personal elements in Section A. It has taken me an unacceptable amount of time to understand and complete. I am very tempted to believe this is a deliberate attempt to stifle meaningful comment. A lot of people who hold views exactly like mine HAVE been put off from objecting because of this.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24816 - 4919 - 3.16 - i, ii, iii, iv

24336 Support **Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: Strategic Objective SO1 seeks to direct development to the most sustainable locations and this links to the proposed allocation at Childerditch Industrial Estate. the indicative proposed masterplan prepared by CMP Architects. It provides a mixture of B1, B2 and B8 uses across the site. The Estate will offer opportunities for a range of businesses seeking new premises within a highly sustainable location, which the A127 corridor offers through the proposed allocations. The indicative proposed masterplan sets out how the proposed allocation would allow for the redevelopment of the Estate and how this could come forward through a series of phased developments. This will be able to offer a number of units of varying sizes that would be suitable to a range of businesses, responding to the economic climate. The work undertaken by CMP Architects demonstrates how the Estate can be more efficiently and effectively developed, by providing a modern range of units for B1, B2 and B8 uses and associated infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24336 - 8371 - 3.16 - i, ii, iii, iv

24817 Object **Respondent: Mrs Susan Webb [4919]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties. This is a single track road, and is already dangerous for walkers and horse riders. Adding the extra volume of traffic on this road is completely unsuitable. The village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on the Green were flooded. Additionally several of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems. The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties. There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. Whilst there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, it is as if Blackmore has been chosen with virtually no other options being considered and others - such as Honey Pot Lane and Red Rose Farm - completely ignored or withdrawn. There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LOP, and why other areas have not. The survey carried out by local reps has been entirely ignored. There are Brownfield sites available nearby (Red Rose Farm as one example) but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt. The infrastructure (bus services, roads, village facilities, doctors, school) simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people. Other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore which is not a sustainable development proposal. 12. The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures. The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularise an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road (at Oak Tree Farm-plots 1,2,3). This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of its services.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community. Also remove the Site GT 16 - a II 8 previously unapproved pitches. Leave Blackmore IN Green Belt and restore the classification of "Rural Village in a sparse setting (which it is for roads, Buses, etc. etc. it really is) I am very unhappy that you have chosen to issue such a difficult form to complete with wholly unnecessary/inappropriate personal elements in Section A. It has taken me an unacceptable amount of time to understand and complete. I am very tempted to believe this is a deliberate attempt to stifle meaningful comment. A lot of people who hold views exactly like mine HAVE been put off from objecting because of this.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24817 - 4919 - 3.17 - i, ii, iii, iv

22365 Support **Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support is offered for including a strategic objective (SO2) which seeks to promote design to encourage healthy active lifestyles. This would accord with Government policy in paragraph 91 of the NPPF and Sport England's 'Towards an Active Nation' strategy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22365 - 4294 - 3.17 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - 3.18
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22367 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support is also offered for the strategic objective (SO3) which seeks to sustain active communities through community and social infrastructure. This would accord with Government policy in paragraphs 91 and 92 of the NPPF and Sport England's 'Towards an Active Nation' strategy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22367 - 4294 - 3.18 - None

24023 Support

Respondent: Ms. Isobel McGeever [7286]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council aim to highlight opportunities which flexibly respond to the changing economic climate and employment sector trends making citizens feel economically empowered to enjoy and benefit from the necessary community/social infrastructure that sustains inclusive, informed, vibrant, active and cohesive communities. The potential for the Brentwood Community Hospital site to be developed for residential would help the Council to meet their identified and growing need for housing over the plan period. The sustainable location of the site in relation to the existing built form and settlement of Brentwood means that should the site ever become surplus to the requirements of the NHS, it would be a great location for residential development. The site is adjoined to the settlement, so therefore can help contribute towards creating a cohesive community.

Change To Plan: Should any part of the Brentwood Community Hospital site be declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS in the future, then the site should be considered suitable and available for alternative use, and considered deliverable within the period 5- 10 years. These representations identify the sites potential for future development, in accordance with the realignment of the Green Belt so that this significant area of developed land is no longer included. It is evident, that the site does not make a positive contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, redevelopment of this site could provide a key contribution to Brentwood's housing need, which the Council have failed to justify, given the reliance on key strategic sites, and the lack of acknowledgement for unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities (Basildon and Havering). These representations therefore promote and identify parts of the Brentwood Community Hospital site as a suitable site to contribute towards these requirements. This site presents an excellent opportunity for a high quality residential redevelopment on previously developed Green Belt land. This could be achieved without compromising the character of the area as the development can act as an infill site to the existing residential development surrounding it, and without the need for significant infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also available to accommodate further health related development should the CCG seek to expand their services in this location, including the possible expansion of the hospital to provide more comprehensive services for the community. However, the site's Green Belt designation would make it difficult for any planning application proposing additional built form to provide further healthcare services to be considered acceptable. The subject site is considered available, suitable and deliverable within the 5-10 year period of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24023 - 7286 - 3.18 - None

24104 Support

Respondent: Freeths LLP (Mr Paul Brailsford) [5642]

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Paul Brailsford) [5642]

Summary: Support the flexibility provided in paragraph 9.226 is consistent with the fact that the emerging Plan recognises the importance of providing a wide range of employment opportunities. Strategic Objective SO3 - Deliver sustainable communities with diverse economic and social cultural opportunities for all - identifies the need for "opportunities which flexibly respond to the changing economic climate and employment sector trends".

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 24104 - 5642 - 3.18 - iii, iv

24337 Support

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Strategic Objective SO3 supports opportunities that respond to the changing economic climate. Childerditch Industrial Estate is a traditional industrial estate that has developed over many years, as illustrated in the indicative proposed masterplan prepared by CMP Architects. It provides a mixture of B1, B2 and B8 uses across the site. The Estate will offer opportunities for a range of businesses seeking new premises within a highly sustainable location, which the A127 corridor offers through the proposed allocations. The indicative proposed masterplan sets out how the proposed allocation would allow for the redevelopment of the Estate and how this could come forward through a series of phased developments. This will be able to offer a number of units of varying sizes that would be suitable to a range of businesses, responding to the economic climate. The work undertaken by CMP Architects demonstrates how the Estate can be more efficiently and effectively developed, by providing a modern range of units for B1, B2 and B8 uses and associated infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24337 - 8371 - 3.18 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - 3.19
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22279 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy

To ensure that the Objective is in line with Paragraph 174 b) of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Amend S04 as follows:

SO4: Deliver Beautiful, Biodiverse, Clean and a Functional Natural Environment, Where resources are carefully managed to avoid adverse impact and provide net gains for biodiversity; and where our natural heritage is protected, and ecosystem services are restored, enhanced and integrated back into the built environment through multi-functional green and blue infrastructure and opportunities are pursued for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22279 - 6776 - 3.19 - iv

22307 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: SO4: the aspiration for green infrastructure is welcome, but we feel that the principle of access for all within any such green spaces should be embedded within this Plan from the top down; therefore, the Strategic Objectives of the Plan should contain this principle.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, we suggest that this objective is reworded thus: '...enhanced and integrated back into the built environment through accessible multi-functional green and blue infrastructure'.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22307 - 3855 - 3.19 - i, ii, iii, iv

22294 Support

Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We welcome the aspirations of this strategic objective with the caveat that the wording should be amended to include mention of biodiversity, as follows:

"...where our natural heritage and biodiversity are protected and enhanced..."

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22294 - 2414 - 3.19 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Growth Areas
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22484 Object

Respondent: Hallam Land Management Limited [8258]

Agent: Marrons Planning (Dan Robinson-Wells) [7959]

Summary: In identifying the A127 corridor as the other key axis, the Spatial Strategy is reliant upon the delivery of a significant level of growth away from where the vast majority of housing and employment needs of the Borough are derived.

The Local Plan proposes that more than half of the total allocations are located in the A127 corridor. There is an imbalance here. Therefore, if further growth is necessary as representations made in relation to housing need and requirement suggest, the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor should be considered first, ahead of any further growth within the A127 corridor.

Change To Plan: Further growth should be directed towards the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22484 - 8258 - Growth Areas - i, ii, iii, iv

22604 Object

Respondent: Cllr Philip Mynott [8283]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Central Brentwood Growth Corridor cannot sustain the proposed level of development, and the R16/R17 site conflicts with NPPF paragraph 134.

Change To Plan: Fundamental reassessment of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22604 - 8283 - Growth Areas - iii, iv

22698 Object

Respondent: D. Rawlings [1058]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the villages in the north of the borough, including Blackmore. Brentwood Borough Council has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities, e.g. the construction of circa 30 properties at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and its impact on the village. There are far more suitable and sustainable locations for development adjacent to the urban area of Brentwood and other brownfield sites should take priority over the development of greenfields / green belt land of off Red Rose Lane

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22698 - 1058 - Growth Areas - i, iii

23289 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concern that the spatial strategy presented fails to adequately justify or demonstrate what improvements are needed to the transport network and whether the costs can be addressed by investment which can reasonably be expected to come from development and other sources. In this regard, it is important to be clear that Brentwood borough is not the only local authority area along the A127 Corridor. Basildon, Thurrock, Castle Point, Rochford and Southend-on-Sea are also planning for growth and will also be relying on the A127 Corridor to support increased movement by all modes. The Plan fails to properly consider this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23289 - 381 - Growth Areas - None

23292 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Question the deliverability of the proposals in the Reg 19 Plan along the A127 Corridor. The current A127 does not qualify for RIS funding. Once the true cost of mitigation of the junctions along the A127 to address Local Plan growth has fully taken into account the cost of land acquisition and utilities, it will require funding from other sources. In the presentation of the A127 Economic Growth Corridor Task Force in November 2018, options for consideration include re-trunking of the road but no progress has been made in this regard therefore this cannot be part of the evidence base.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23292 - 381 - Growth Areas - None

23382 Object**Respondent: BJ Associates [8317]****Agent: Gerald Eve LLP (Mr. Peter Dines) [3762]**

Summary: The preferred strategy results in an unsustainable pattern of development. This is due to the fact that a number of the proposed strategic housing allocations are less sustainable and appropriate than unallocated alternatives.

Change To Plan: Allocation of the Roman Road Site for Housing and or Specialist accommodation for older people.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23382 - 8317 - Growth Areas - iii

23288 Support**Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Whilst it is questionable as to whether growth along a road corridor can ever constitute sustainable development given the detrimental effects of increased car use on climate change and air pollution, the stated principle is supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23288 - 381 - Growth Areas - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - 3.21

Vision and Strategic Objectives

23793 Support**Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]****Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]**

Summary: Support Para 3.21(b)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23793 - 3738 - 3.21 - None

23811 Support**Respondent: Mr Carl Croll [8053]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Miss Charlotte Williams) [6668]**

Summary: Paragraph 3.21 (b) of the PSLP states that brownfield opportunities will be taken to effectively meet local needs, such as the residential-led, mixed-use redevelopment of existing industrial land in West Horndon. We agree with this approach.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23811 - 8053 - 3.21 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Key Diagram

Vision and Strategic Objectives

22486 Object**Respondent: Hallam Land Management Limited [8258]****Agent: Marrons Planning (Dan Robinson-Wells) [7959]**

Summary: In respect of the Green Wedge arrow to the west of Brentwood, it doesn't separate any settlements given it is such a wide tract of land. Furthermore, this tract of land doesn't separate Brentwood from Pilgrim's Hatch because they are joined to the north and will be further joined by proposed site allocations R16 & R17.

Clearly, these Green Wedges have informed the Spatial Strategy but when considering the Key Diagram, they do not all serve the function as expressed in paragraph 8.93. Further analysis of the Green Belt, landscape and settlement coalescence is submitted with these representations.

Change To Plan: Remove the north west green wedge symbol from the Key Diagram.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22486 - 8258 - Key Diagram - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - 3.22
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22280 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified

Reference to Green Wedges on the Key Diagram is confusing in this context. There is no policy within the Local Plan providing such a designation, and it is unclear what their role and/or function are.

There does not appear to be any evidence to demonstrate that these areas require a separate designation, or why they have been specifically identified. Furthermore, these areas are within the open countryside and are covered by Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Delete reference to Green Wedge on the diagram and in its key.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22280 - 6776 - 3.22 - ii

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Figure 3.1: Key Diagram
Vision and Strategic Objectives

23746 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: The identification of an employment-led development in the south-west of the borough is supported. Such a location is well-connected to the strategic highway network, which as set out above, facilitates connections to other key employment centres. As such, the proposed approach in this regard is justified.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23746 - 5124 - Figure 3.1: Key Diagram - i, iv

24338 Support

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Figure 3.1 provides a visual aid in support of the Spatial Strategy. It identifies Junction 29 of the M25 as a key location for 'Employment-led development' (Brentwood Enterprise Park) and Childerditch Industrial Estate as a location for new 'Employment land', in addition to the strategic housing-led development at Dunton Hills and the redevelopment of West Horndon. A focus on employment growth along the A127 corridor will reduce the need for additional employment sites in less sustainable locations elsewhere in the Borough. This approach is fully supported and recognizes the importance of this location for new employment opportunities. This approach is justified and demonstrates that the Plan is consistent with national policy in this respect.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24338 - 8371 - Figure 3.1: Key Diagram - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Using Land Sequentially
Vision and Strategic Objectives

24730 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Downton [8432]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound. Unnecessary use of Green Belt land when Brownfield sites are available.

Change To Plan: Smaller and more dispersment (on preferably Brownfield sites) for any new builds in the surrounding area, rather than focusing such large development within an already stretched pretty village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24730 - 8432 - Using Land Sequentially - None

23674 Object **Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]** **Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]**

Summary: Plan sets out within the Settlement Hierarchy in Table 2.3 that the development of brownfield land will be prioritised. This requirement has no support in National Policy as Para 117 of the Revised Framework (2019) simply states that substantial weight should be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land. This requirement should therefore be changed to reflect Government guidance.
The prioritisation of brownfield land is also repeated in the Spatial Development Principles section under Paragraph 3.23 which similarly needs amending.

Change To Plan: Reflect government guidance - amend this paragraph to reflect that "states that substantial weight should be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23674 - 2774 - 3.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

24173 Object **Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]** **Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]**

Summary: The NPPF 2018 has two main stipulations relating to alterations of Green Belt boundaries: "136. (part) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries..." "137 (part) Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.." The second requirement should be conducted before the first. The Council's overall approach to site selection summarised in Figure 7 of that document and in para 3.23 of the Draft Plan. This sequential approach includes brownfield sites in the Green Belt but not greenfield sites in the Green Belt. Furthermore para 3.23 confuses a number of site selection criteria, for example proximity to transport facilities, as well as the key quality of the sites.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites will be are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place... 4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24173 - 7948 - 3.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

24269 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: A total of 7,752 dwellings be provided in the Borough between 2011-2033 with 310 homes per year to 2022/23 and then 584 per year from 2022/23 taking forward a "stepped delivery" approach to deal with a projected shortfall in the first 5 years of the PSLP. This is mainly because a greater proportion of homes to be delivered in the PSLP comprise sites located in the Green Belt, resulting in longer lead in times to delivery. Whilst we do not raise objections in principle to the stepped approach as far as our clients are concerned there is a prospect that some sites in the Green Belt have the prospect of coming forward earlier, particularly smaller and medium sized developments. This certainly includes this site R24, and R23 that is the subject of a separate representation. The stepped approach proposed, there are still issues with BBC's over-optimistic estimates and assumptions on the delivery of larger strategic sites proposed for allocation in the PSLP. Of the new allocations, 4,578 homes are made up of strategic allocations (of which 2,700 are at DHGV and are to be delivered in the Plan period) and 1,510 are other allocations. The strategic sites therefore represent 68% of the total number of new homes of which some 59% are allocated at DHGV. The ability of larger strategic sites to come forward quickly has been the subject of recent assessments in the Independent Review of Build Out, the Letwin Review (2018); and issues with their complexity, have been ably set out in the Lichfield's study From Start to Finish (2016). Both provide empirical evidence that the early delivery of such sites can be problematical due to a range of factors, including establishing required infrastructure requirements and the timing of housing delivery associated with those requirements, as well as the prolonged or protracted nature of the planning process. The Lichfield's report confirms that the planning process takes, on average, 2.5 years for the planning application determination period for up to 500 units; this can double for sites over 1,000 units. Two of the strategic sites within the PSLP's allocations also comprise developed sites currently in employment uses. The strategic sites are expected to deliver some 1555 homes within 5 years of an assumed adoption in 2020/21. Given the issues set out above it is considered that this is unrealistic and it would not be justified or the most appropriate strategy to rely on these sites for short term housing delivery. Therefore emphasises the need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Change To Plan: Need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24269 - 2741 - 3.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

24312 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: A total of 7,752 dwellings be provided in the Borough between 2011-2033 with 310 homes per year to 2022/23 and then 584 per year from 2022/23 taking forward a "stepped delivery" approach to deal with a projected shortfall in the first 5 years of the PSLP. This is mainly because a greater proportion of homes to be delivered in the PSLP comprise sites located in the Green Belt, resulting in longer lead in times to delivery. Whilst we do not raise objections in principle to the stepped approach as far as our clients are concerned there is a prospect that some sites in the Green Belt have the prospect of coming forward earlier, particularly smaller and medium sized developments. This certainly includes this site R24, and R23 that is the subject of a separate representation. The stepped approach proposed, there are still issues with BBC's over-optimistic estimates and assumptions on the delivery of larger strategic sites proposed for allocation in the PSLP. Of the new allocations, 4,578 homes are made up of strategic allocations (of which 2,700 are at DHGV and are to be delivered in the Plan period) and 1,510 are other allocations. The strategic sites therefore represent 68% of the total number of new homes of which some 59% are allocated at DHGV. The ability of larger strategic sites to come forward quickly has been the subject of recent assessments in the Independent Review of Build Out, the Letwin Review (2018); and issues with their complexity, have been ably set out in the Lichfield's study From Start to Finish (2016). Both provide empirical evidence that the early delivery of such sites can be problematical due to a range of factors, including establishing required infrastructure requirements and the timing of housing delivery associated with those requirements, as well as the prolonged or protracted nature of the planning process. The Lichfield's report confirms that the planning process takes, on average, 2.5 years for the planning application determination period for up to 500 units; this can double for sites over 1,000 units. Two of the strategic sites within the PSLP's allocations also comprise developed sites currently in employment uses. The strategic sites are expected to deliver some 1555 homes within 5 years of an assumed adoption in 2020/21. Given the issues set out above it is considered that this is unrealistic and it would not be justified or the most appropriate strategy to rely on these sites for short term housing delivery. Therefore emphasises the need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Change To Plan: Need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24312 - 2741 - 3.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

24125 Support

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford wishes to voice support for the spatial strategy set out within the PSD which seeks to prioritise brownfield sites wherever suitable, making efficient use of land in urban areas. In this regard, Ford wishes to highlight the suitability of the land at Eagle Way for residential development in supporting this endeavour - which is located within the established urban neighbourhood of Warley (recognised as being the priority settlement for housing growth). As such, the delivery of housing at the Ford site should be viewed as a vital, and priority opportunity for BBC in recognising that the Borough is heavily constrained by Green Belt, whereby this has made it challenging for BBC to fully meet its development needs. Our Client therefore contends that this approach is sound but should be consistently reflected in other aspects of the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24125 - 3769 - 3.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - 3.24
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22282 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Narrative requires clearer references to evidence base to justify spatial strategy. Relies on DHGV & BEP along A127. Lack of clarity on transport impacts and infrastructure, particularly sustainable transport. LP needs supporting by transport modelling. BBC and ECC working together to progress work. BEP unclear how access can be achieved directly from J29 M25 due to LTC. BBC need to demonstrate suitable access arrangements for all modes of travel and demonstrate what discussions with HE, ECC and site promoter to ensure access arrangements are deliverable and agreed. DHGV needs to reply upon sustainable transport measures, to mitigate impacts on highway network, to be informed by outputs of transport evidence.

Change To Plan: BBC need to include within the Plan evidence, particularly in respect of transport, the site specific, local and cumulative impact on the local and strategic transport network, to demonstrate that the spatial strategy is the most appropriate.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22282 - 6776 - 3.24 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 3. Spatial Strategy - Borough Gateways
Vision and Strategic Objectives

22421 Support

Respondent: MR Graham Clegg [5485]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Borough Gateways
I support the idea of investment in our Borough Gateways for the reasons mentioned in paras 3.25 - 3.26. In particular, I support the idea of using public art to contribute towards a sense of place and of helping to create a more distinctive "look and feel" about Brentwood. I think that street murals could be used to good effect, especially where there are blank facades to buildings. There are several candidate buildings located at our Borough Gateways where street murals could make a positive & creative contribution to the Town Centre.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22421 - 5485 - Borough Gateways - None

23903 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: Support the aspiration for key allocations to deliver gateways that contribute to enhancing a positive impression of the Borough through public art and/or public realm improvements.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23903 - 2509 - Borough Gateways - i, ii, iii, iv

22237 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds: failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed; inadequate consultation with Epping Forest District Council and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore; failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development; adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22237 - 4376 - Managing Sustainable Growth - ii, iv

22596 Object

Respondent: Cllr Philip Mynott [8283]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan as prepared, and the site options chosen are not sustainable. Character and settlement setting of borough of villages - not preserved or enhanced, plan stifles villages by not proposing development in them and uses villages as an excuse to pile unsustainable development on the boroughs main settlement areas, in contradiction of policies within the plan. The town centre already suffers adverse road conditions, with congestions, air pollution highway safety concerns.

Change To Plan: It is not clear that growth on the scale required by central government of Local Authorities under present conditions is capable of being sustainable. Brentwood's certainly isn't.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22596 - 8283 - Managing Sustainable Growth - iii, iv

22634 Object

Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to provide a development strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of Brentwood Borough. It lacks any provision for meeting the village's needs, which have not been objectively assessed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22634 - 8290 - Managing Sustainable Growth - None

22654 Object

Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to provide a development strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of Brentwood Borough. It lacks any provision for meeting the village's needs, which have not been objectively assessed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22654 - 8292 - Managing Sustainable Growth - None

22720 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to provide a development strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of Brentwood Borough. It lacks any provision for meeting the village's needs, which have not been objectively assessed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22720 - 7003 - Managing Sustainable Growth - None

23025 Object

Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to provide a development strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of Brentwood Borough. It lacks any provision for meeting the village's needs, which have not been objectively assessed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23025 - 4851 - Managing Sustainable Growth - None

23033 Object

Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to provide a development strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of Brentwood Borough. It lacks any provision for meeting the village's needs, which have not been objectively assessed.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23033 - 7227 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

23585 Object

Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concerned that the number and distribution of proposed new dwellings will place an impossible burden on the existing road system. With no reference in the Plan to innovative solutions such as park-and-ride, and only lip service paid to the encouragement of cycling and walking, the Association fails to see how the Plan is sustainably delivered.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23585 - 4922 - Managing Sustainable Growth - None

23590 Object

Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Congestion issue will only get worse as the number of vehicles follows the predicted increase and the addition of houses in Brentwood. Any additional or enhanced bus services into Brentwood will have to cope with increased congestion in the mornings on the A128 through Herongate and Ingrave - in fact it is difficult to see how much more traffic can be accommodated on this section of road even without additional developments. There will be consequences for parking, pollution, and viability of commercial bus services as their reliability and regularity is challenged.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23590 - 4922 - Managing Sustainable Growth - None

24387 Object

Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate. Yet again green belt is being developed on. Blackmore struggles to deal with the amount of traffic and parking and will not cope with the new development. Doctors surgeries, public amenities are already at breaking point, how will they cope. Increased risk of flooding

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties, Use parish council to communicate with the residents, Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24387 - 8373 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24492 Object

Respondent: Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The building of the proposed houses is totally unacceptable in Blackmore village. There doesn't seem to be any thought given to the local area with regard to local infrastructure, road safety, parking. Green Belt land should not be used for building houses.

Change To Plan: The use of brownfield sites to build a modest amount of houses would be much more acceptable to most people in the local areas.
DO NOT build on Green Belt or Green Field sites for the good of the environment and wildlife. [Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24492 - 8002 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24496 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Reed [4708]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound. Infrastructure already fails local needs: flood risk, school and doctors surgery at over capacity & struggle to cope, poor (virtually non-existent) bus service, roads not suitable, insufficient parking in village centre. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities (ie: Epping and Chelmsford). Sites mentioned not suitable, Alternative sites (that are better suited) have been ignored. There has been no "housing needs" survey.

Change To Plan: The only practical solution is to remove sites R25 and R26. Take heed of the BVHA neighbourhood plan which identifies the actual requirement of local residents and proposes better suited alternative sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24496 - 4708 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24500 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Robinson [4899]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As far as I am aware no "housing needs survey" has been performed to show why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Blackmore is an established village and it would appear that an increase in demand on the infrastructure is not viable. I understand that the village school is full and the Deal Tree medical centre is reported to have one of the highest patient to practitioner ratios in certainly Essex. The access onto and off Red Rose Lane will not be suitable for the anticipated increase in traffic. The sites R25 and R26 have over the years suffered from persistent flooding. I believe that around 30 houses are being or will be constructed at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 need to be removed from the plan.
I suggest the planners need to read the BVHA neighbourhood plan which includes the Blackmore local housing requirements for what is clearly an existing sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24500 - 4899 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24510 Object

Respondent: Mrs Terri Reed [4303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26 are unsuitable for building, they are liable to flood and the road is not suitable as it is too narrow & also it regularly floods, cars get trapped. I am unaware if a housing need survey is being carried out. The infrastructure is already at bursting point. Children turned away from the local school as full; Drs surgery over stretched already; no parking in village centre. Because we are on the Brentwood borders, no account has been taken of the development being undertaken by Epping & Chelmsford RIGHT ON OUR DOORSTEP, impacting on local facilities. Alternative sites have been ignored, even when more suitable, inadequate public transport - you can't live here without a car. Most families have 2 or more.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26. Consider what Blackmore really needs not what ticks a few boxes, and that suits developers. The BHVA have worked hard to proposal alternative which are sustainable. They know the village better than the people behind the unsustainable proposal currently on the table.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24510 - 4303 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24620 Object

Respondent: Mrs Tina Wilding [8405]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound because: Doctors, School, Green Belt Land, Local transport - buses. Infrastructure impacts in R25 and R26.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24620 - 8405 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24621 Object**Respondent: Terence Dearlove [8404]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village with limited services, infrastructure, and access to parking. EFDC is proposing 30 new development just on the boarder boundary with Blackmore. The combination of both EFDC's and BBC's proposed development will have a negative impact on the existing services and infrastructure making a bad situation worse. There is no clear strategy for the villages in the north of the Borough and no evidence to support there being a need for additional housing in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association 'Neighbourhood Plan', which clearly sets out the local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24621 - 8404 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24627 Object**Respondent: Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A residential development such as has been submitted for Blackmore will further stretch infrastructure (roads, parking, schooling, doctors, etc). There are more sustainable locations in the borough. There are "brown field" sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. This area of Blackmore is know to be a flood risk (23 June 2016).

Change To Plan: Do not believe Green Belt land in Blackmore should be released for this development as part of BBC local plan due to all aforementioned reasons (and probably many others!)

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24627 - 8406 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24636 Object**Respondent: Giovanni De Domonocos [8407]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the village BBC have not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities. Blackmore is an isolated village with limited services. No space in the village school for our children. No adequate bus routes / parking / doctors. There is other suitable locations other than Blackmore Village. The access off / from redrose lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic. The sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24636 - 8407 - Managing Sustainable Growth - ii, iii

24639 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Wilding [8409]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services being overwhelmed: schools; doctors; transportation hubs; more crime ie: not enough police; more demand on firefighters. More cars on road leading to very dangerous conditions for young children on footpaths.

Change To Plan: Cancel the project. Blackmore and its environs are already in danger of forever being changed. There are plenty of other brownfield sites in Brentwood to consider, we have already had our fair share of new builds in Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24639 - 8409 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24643 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alexandre De Dominicis [6951]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the village BBC have not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities. Blackmore is an isolated village with limited services. No space in the village school for our children. No adequate bus routes / parking / doctors. There is other suitable locations other than Blackmore Village. The access off / from redrose lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic. The sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24643 - 6951 - Managing Sustainable Growth - ii, iii

24693 Object

Respondent: Mr Desmond Temple [8420]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site allocations, disproportionate growth to Blackmore, flood risk, green belt. Blackmore infrastructure cannot cope now, without all the planned dwellings, We cant park in the village, our school is full, doctors waiting time is lengthy.

Change To Plan:

Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24693 - 8420 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24716 Object

Respondent: Anna Dunk [8426]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. The large scale development plan being proposed will, without a doubt, negatively effect the quality of life of its residents. The plan is being proposed by a developer who holds no knowledge of the village itself, which has resulted in a proposal that is completely inappropriate. The facilities in Blackmore are limited and an influx of new residents would be detrimental. The following reasons clarify why: 1. The proposed plan would produce overcrowding, resulting in an unacceptable increase in traffic and noise, destroying the very nature of our village. 2. There is no clear 'strategy' for the village and there are many other more suitable and sustainable locations for development. 3. Parts of the village are liable to flood. Building on the proposed land would increase the flood risk everywhere in the village. 4. There is just one shop in our village, an overcrowded primary school, and a local doctor surgery where it is extremely difficult to get an appointment. Such an increase in residents is simply unmanageable.

Change To Plan:

A sound local plan would require: 1. The assessment must take into account the modest and limited services in the village, including the shop, doctor surgery, primary school and parking. 2. The character and nature of the village must be carefully considered, and the current residents quality of life must be protected. 3. BBC needs to look at the many other suitable locations in the area which can sustain this type of development. 4. The problems with flooding need to be taken into account and current problems with flooding addressed.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24716 - 8426 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24804 Object

Respondent: Heather Eltham [8449]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The BBC has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities (Epping Council) who are in process of building c. 30 houses at top of Fingrith Hall Lane - the impact this has on the village where the infrastructure is not sound to incorporate extra traffic. There are other brownfield sites that are available and they must take priority over our precious greenbelt. The school is at full capacity and the doctors surgery would not be able to accommodate the extra numbers.

Change To Plan:

I believe sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out our Housing Needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24804 - 8449 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24822 Object

Respondent: Mr Adrian Quick [8451]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Refer to attached form. The infrastructure is already stretched, and these additional developments would have a significant negative impact to the local community including provision for medical services and schooling. Bus services to larger employment locations (Brentwood Chelmsford, Epping) are totally inadequate. The designated sites have flooding issues, a problems across wider Blackmore footprint and development will cause further problems, increasing the flood rate. There are other Brownfield sites within existing urban boundaries (and local infrastructure and transport grids) better suited to development, negating the need to destroy Green Belt environments. There has been no evidence that Blackmore has a housing need requiring such scale of development. Sites R25 and R26 should be removed form the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan:

Sites R25 and R26 should be removed form the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24822 - 8451 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24837 Object

Respondent: Donna Eaton [8455]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A residential development such as has been 1. submitted for Blackmore will further stretch the infrastructure (roads, parking, schools, doctors surgeries). 2. There are other more suitable locations in the borough. 3. There are brown field sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. 4. The area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23rd June 2016). 5. Access to and from the development site entirely unsuitable for increased traffic problems.

Change To Plan: We / I do not believe green belt land in Blackmore should be released for this development as part of BBC Local Plan due to all of the aforementioned reasons.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24837 - 8455 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24857 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beryl Fox [8457]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Overburden of all local services.

Change To Plan: Consideration for local needs and infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24857 - 8457 - Managing Sustainable Growth - None

24898 Object

Respondent: Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I consider the Local Plan to be unsound for the following reasons: 1. making infrastructure issues - other roads are flooded in this area and I suspect building on this scale will add is the problems - infrastructure parking is often a problem in Blackmore, difficult to see and no school places at present. 2. we have been told in the past that Blackmore village would not be required to access additional housing numbers. 3. We often have walkers and cyclist and horse riders in those narrow roads so more traffic could be dangerous.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA report - there are brownfield sites that should be considered first - there should be proper strategies for villages north of Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24898 - 8460 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

24907 Object

Respondent: Jacqueline Greagsby [8465]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Red Rose Lane is not suitable for urban development, Blackmore has modest services and infrastructure which are failing with the existing population. 2. Access to/from Red Rose Lane is unsustainable for the volume of traffic. 3. Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding and any construction on this site could push the problem onto current residents property.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out the local planning needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24907 - 8465 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25002 Object

Respondent: Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Making infrastructure issues - other roads are flooded in this area and I suspect building on this scale would add is the problems - furthermore parking is often a problem in Blackmore, difficult to see appointment with the local GP service and no school places at present. 2. We have been told in the past that Blackmore village would not be required to access additional houses numbers. 3. We often have walkers and cycle and horse riders in those narrow roads so more traffic could be a danger.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA report - there are brownfield sites that should be considered first - there should be proper strategy for villages north of Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25002 - 8460 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25014 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Sanders [8474]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan unsound because: needs a housing survey no consideration of infrastructure is given, school is full, 6-8 week wait for GP appointment, no local employment, limited public transport, local roads narrow and cant cope with more traffic, village becomes gridlocked due to parking.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey to be undertaken, build on Brownfield sites first, build types of houses needed in Blackmore. I support the BVH mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25014 - 8474 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25032 Object

Respondent: Ms Victoria Sanders [8482]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan unsound because: needs a housing survey no consideration or research of infrastructure is given, regarding lack of public transport, condition of roads, no parking in village, School oversubscribes and over 8 week wait for GP appointment. This will be made worse by increased population and not considered or tackled. Build on brownfield sites first and conduct a housing survey. Build the types of houses which are needed by the people of Blackmore. The reasons are self explanatory. I support the BHVA.

Change To Plan: Build on brownfield sites first and conduct a housing survey. Build the types of houses which are needed by the people of Blackmore. The reasons are self explanatory. I support the BHVA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25032 - 8482 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25036 Object

Respondent: Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Building on greenbelt; 2. Infrastructure of school, surgery, parking, drainage; 3. Lack of consultation re local needs; 4. Local wildlife habitat leading to more flooding because of habitat removal; 5. Impact from top of Fingrith Hall Lane!!! Epping Borough. 6. More traffic pollution, risk of road accidents increases could lead to injury and deaths; 7. Local shop couldn't cope with the extra load; 8. Village will end up being part of London sprawl; 9. The profound historical nature and heritage will be deeply impacts; 10. Blackmore be a 'through' way / short cut from Red Rose at top of Fingrith Hall Road.

Change To Plan: 1. I would like the proposed sites R25 and R26 removed from local development plan. 2. Consult the BVHA neighbourhood plan for sustainable development. 3. Why doesn't Brentwood Council lead the way to protect green belt and historical heritage sites - Blackmore at the top of the list. 4. Green alternative use to those sites eg allotments, solar panels on both to serve the village.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25036 - 5024 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25061 Object

Respondent: Mr Steven Jacobs [4408]

Agent: N/A

Summary: N/A

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25061 - 4408 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25067 Object

Respondent: Diane Jones [8488]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear strategy for Blackmore in north of BBC. Lack of consultation with nearby authorities (i.e. Epping FDC) - north part of Fingrith Hall Lane houses being built. Infrastructure - our modest services are already over stretched - school is full doctors appointments are hard to get. Traffic and parking - this will increase massively in the village will be dangerous. There are more suitable sites on and around Brentwood - i.e. old Toomey site on Ingrave Road has been empty for absolutely years as have many others in BBC Ongar Road former commercial park in town centre. No housing needs survey conducted to show why Blackmore is in the LDP. Access in/out Red Rose Lane unsuitable for volume of traffic the developments will produce accidents will happen. Proposed sites do flood - building on these will increase flood risk elsewhere in village

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 need to be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25067 - 8488 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25111 Object

Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan uses greenbelt land despite the fact that brownfield sites are available.

Change To Plan: Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25111 - 4942 - Managing Sustainable Growth - None

25160 Object

Respondent: Iris Jones [8495]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is narrow and winding, cars have to slow down to pass. There are ditches on either side and no footpaths. The exit onto Nine Ashes Road often floods and is a particularly junction, right by the school. An increase in traffic would be a great risk. Blackmore is a very small village and despite being very isolated has a minimal bus service. There is one shop a full school that is already over stretched and a doctor surgery that isn't cope now. The narrow roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and already car parking problems. Blackmore village cannot possibly cope with the strem of the proposed developments on its infrastructure. I therefore consider the plan to be unsound. Why choose Blackmore greenbelt when there are other locations within Brentwood Borough Council more sustainable.

Change To Plan: Greenbelt should not be built on. I agree with the Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25160 - 8495 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

25371 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Sanders [4923]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound, needs housing need survey, infrastructure not sufficient, school, GP appointment delay, no employment in village, non existent public transport, lanes narrow and unsuitable, grid locked village centre already, parking problems.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey should be completed, build on brownfield sites, build type of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25371 - 4923 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25399 Object

Respondent: Mrs Debbie Stevens [8509]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. No consultation with adjoining boroughs, Huge effect on Blackmore primary school almost full, health centre almost full. As a parent we are able to walk to primary school. In 13 years I am more worried of number of illegally parked vehicles outside the school, Woollard Way is near school, the increase in the number of speeding vehicles. More residents would make traffic worse. More traffic exiting Woollard Way 100 yards from already busy school. This is a risk that should not be taken, This whole project is a business deal with not consideration at all to the residents - the people!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25399 - 8509 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25401 Object

Respondent: Mr Craig Stevens [4958]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. No consultation with adjoining boroughs, new homes wil drain resources, impact on local school, already at capacity, as is GP. Will increase local traffic by at least 300 vehicles, Increase local traffic, road risks, road damage, and local roads not suitable for this r plant machinery. BBC failed to demonstrate that there aren't more suitable locations, already more suitable brownfield sites before green belt. Level 3 flood risk in village, new development will increase this risk downstream, roads and homes. No strategy on this impact on Blackmore. Blackmore is of historical heritage and importance new homes will heavily impact on this. These changes will be damaging and irrevocable and seemed to have been totally ignored by the planners to date.

Conduct a meaningful local housing survey with residents and listen to and respond to the concerns and needs of local residents before any planning decisions are made, It is my opinion that after meaningful consultation with local residents and a large and appropriate reduction in proposed development, small scale sympathetic development would be welcomed and supported.

Change To Plan: Conduct a meaningful local housing survey with residents and listen to and respond to the concerns and needs of local residents before any planning decisions are made, It is my opinion that after meaningful consultation with local residents and a large and appropriate reduction in proposed development, small scale sympathetic development would be welcomed and supported.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25401 - 4958 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25405 Object**Respondent: Mrs Malanie Sanders [8511]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. Unsound plan: no housing need survey, not sustainable as no infrastructure consideration, particularly as school full, 6-8 week wait for GP, no jobs available in village, no public transport, roads narrow and unsuitable, in area by shop it gets gridlocked due to parked cars. Housing needs survey should be undertaken, build on brownfield sites first, build the types of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey should be undertaken, build on brownfield sites first, build the types of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25405 - 8511 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25427 Object**Respondent: Mrs Anne Sands [8514]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 4, 8, 9 - R25 and R26. Unsound because: too much traffic in the village, Blackmore school is bursting plus morning traffic is increasing and dangerous, Flood risk, not enough parking in the village, doctors appointments already like gold dust, narrow lanes, risk for the cyclists and horse riders. Take R25 and R26 OUT of the LDP and please consider BVHA consultation plan.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 OUT of the LDP and please consider BVHA consultation plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25427 - 8514 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25449 Object**Respondent: Hazel Mills [8523]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Epping Forest District Council was not consulted about the 30 homes being built at the top of Fringrith Hall Lane, hence no consideration was given to the impact this will have on our village. No clear strategy has been outlined for Blackmore in the north of the borough. Our doctors surgery is oversubscribed - no more patients please!! The school is full, don't ruin it by overfilling the classrooms. Where would the excess water go? There's nowhere to park as it is! We love the wildlife here - please don't destroy their homes.

Change To Plan: Remove plans for sites R25 and R26. Suggest the Planners refer to the BVH Neighbourhood Plan which illustrates the villages housing needs relevant to maintaining a sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25449 - 8523 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25453 Object**Respondent: Edward Mills [8524]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village infrastructure is insufficient to deal with a significant increase in population in terms of oversubscribed school and doctor surgery. I totally disapprove of building on greenfield sites.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 need to be removed from the Local Development Plan. We need housing that fulfils a sustainable community as outlined in BVH Neighbouring Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25453 - 8524 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25457 Object**Respondent: Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities (Epping Forest and their development of 30 dwellings at the top of Fringrith Hall Lane and the effect on Blackmore facilities. There has been no consultation on actual requirements for Blackmore and what services will be required) to service additional housing. It is currently almost impossible to get a doctors appointment, transport to and from Brentwood is a barrier. The village is already congested without 70 more houses as the cars that will bring. The lone school is already full and no space to extend it.

Change To Plan: To sustain 70+ houses the road system with need to the upgrades and facilities (medical, schools and transport) will need to be in place before building commences.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25457 - 4709 - Managing Sustainable Growth - ii, iii, iv

25460 Object

Respondent: Doddinghurst Infant School (Ms. Ingrid Nicholson) [4339]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no consultation on the actual requirements for the village of Blackmore for example the services that will be required to meet the demand that the additional housing will bring. There has also been no consultation with neighbouring authorities, ie, Epping Forest and their allowed development of 30+ houses at the top of Fringirth Hall Lane and the effect these additional houses will have. The current social amenities, health education and transport one already over subscribed and therefore any additional housing will need these facilities upgraded prior to any building commence. This has not been identified in the proposed plan.

Change To Plan: In order to accommodate the 70 additional houses the current road system will need to be upgraded and in place. The current school provision is operating close to maximum and there is no room to expand the school. The local health centre is also under pressure and it can take up to 3 weeks to get a doctors appointment unless classed as an emergency.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25460 - 4339 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25463 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Sands [8525]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound. Protect Green Belt, my house id built on a building envelope and for this I paid a premium, flood risk, unsuitable roads, health risk form more traffic, parking issues, GP over run, village attracts and encourages cyclists, impact to existing village wildlife increase on local services - rubbish collection, recycling.

Change To Plan: Sections 4,8, 9_ policies R25 and R26. Blackmore is an historic village renowned for its village feel and qualities. The reason it has remained jewel in Essex is because of the protected Green Belt land. The government encourage "brownfield" site to be built on and there are many more suitable site, which would not impact on this traditional English village, Access in these medieval country lanes is not suitable for the increase volume of cars, The school & doctors would be unable to cope with this large growth in the population, and this would have an impact of the villagers wellbeing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25463 - 8525 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25505 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gladys Skinner [8540]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections R04, R08 (flood and Green Belt) and R09. Blackmore Village doesn't have the infrastructure for houses in Red Rose Lane, The volume of traffic at present has already reached its limit. Also I understand that flooding could be a real possibility.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be remove from the plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for ur already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25505 - 8540 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25538 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04, 08 09 - R25 R26

Limited consultation on this with neighbouring authorities, no housing needs survey, stretched infrastructure - school, GO, congestion, parking, bus services. Need evidence of other sites being considered, brownfield or urban extensions, which would regenerate the High Street,. Fields in village prone to flooding, new homes would increase this. Red Rose Lane is bounded by ancient hedgerows, providing a green boundary to Blackmore. This development would destroy that. Please refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25538 - 8107 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25545 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Ratcliffe [5040]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04,
08 - Green Belt and Flooding
09 - R25 R26
There is no clear strategy for villages (Inc. Blackmore) in north of borough.
Principle of development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. There are modest services and infrastructure in Blackmore (an isolated village). School is full, GP waiting times are over 4 weeks, parking in the centre of the village is already a nightmare.
BBC not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met on other (allocated) sites.
There has been no housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.
Access on/off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic. Equally access via Woollard Way 'hammer heads' would be problematical.
Flooding in the village - proposed sites are liable to flood and therefore building on this land will also increase flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: I fully support the plan put forward by Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25545 - 5040 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25550 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Romang [6974]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04 Managing Growth
08 - Green Belt and Flooding
09 - R25 R26two fields off Red Rose Lane

There is no clear strategy for rural communities in borough. Blackmore has been stripped of public services.
No consideration of development already occurring around Blackmore, recent planning decisions in Blackmore to reduce the housing stock whilst 30 new homes on Fingrith Hall Lane with their impact on village. Neighbouring Councils not consulted.
Development is ill considered as village has reduced public services, poor infrastructure, inadequate transport links, oversubscribed school and GP, parking problems, all cant cope with existing community. Parking controls not enforced, roads often unpassable
Development will push village envelop out into surrounding agricultural land and set an endless precedent for developers.
This development, not mentioned in previous LDP drafts, does not demonstrate an example of sustainable development and more suitable sites appear to the available in Shenfield and Brentwood.
Brownfields sites do not appear to have ben investigated fully and should take precedent over green belt. The ancient hedgerow boundary to Red Rose Lane also appears not to have been considered. It has been cut back hard for the first time in decades.
Document doesn't demonstrate required housing density? For Brentwood cannot be included as part of the provision identified in other allocated sites in the borough.
Housing needs survey not been done, so why was Blackmore selected for development and how would housing type be decided?
Existing road infrastructure inadequate - congestion, parking, road sizes.
Proposed sites and access roads are liable to flood and more homes increase this risk. Red Rose Lane floods regularly as does access to the village around the pond.

Change To Plan: These have been set out in the BVHA neighbourhood plan and I refer to this document.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25550 - 6974 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25557 Object

Respondent: Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04, 08, 09 - policy R25 and R26Blackmore village cannot cope with any further demand on its infrastructure. Presently school is at its capacity and medical centre is also struggling with patients having to wait unacceptable time to get an appointment.

Change To Plan: I agree with BVHA neighbourhood plan and planners need to heed th Blackmore local housing requirements.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25557 - 4897 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25597 Object

Respondent: Mr Matthew Romang [8565]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 04; 08 - green belt flooding; 09 - R25 and R26
The strategy for rural villages like Blackmore isn't clear in the document, . Red Rose lane is unsuitable for an increase in traffic flow, due to the access onto/off of the road; the proposed sites are areas known for flooding and development will also increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore; the principle of the red rose lane development is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with limited infrastructure and poor public transport, which would struggle more.

Change To Plan: Please refer to 'BVHA neighbourhood plan'.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25597 - 8565 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25694 Object

Respondent: MRS LESLEY LYNN [5591]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I am writing to you to object to the density of housing Brentwood Council is proposing on the office site in Western Road which equates to something like 229 dwellings per Hectare, which is far the biggest of any of the proposed sites and can only possibly be achieved with high rise blocks of flats, which is inappropriate in a residential street of houses with a maximum height of two and a half stories. This goes against the council strategy on good design which is sympathetic to the local character.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25694 - 5591 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

25711 Object

Respondent: Ms Norma Jennings [5444]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I am aware that it is a government diktat that Green Belt should be used to accommodate the unprecedented housing need but wonder why the enormous brownfield Clapgate scrapyard site, off Chivers Road in Stondon Massey, is not part of the equation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25711 - 5444 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

25818 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25818 - 4693 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

26093 Object

Respondent: Mr David Holland [8676]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local schools are struggling to cope already. More houses will increase demand. The local GP services are also struggling to cope and more homes will place even more pressure on them. The current road infrastructure will not be sufficient for more traffic. Flooding is a risk factor in the area and building more houses will aggravate this.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs as the Blackmore community is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26093 - 8676 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

26120 Object**Respondent: Mr. James Harris [8678]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There appears to be no clear strategy for the villages in this area and no discussion with Epping Council, as they border on the village

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26120 - 8678 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

26125 Object**Respondent: Mr Adam Harris [8679]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for Blackmore village

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26125 - 8679 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

26131 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beverley Holla [8680]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. No trains, bus one an hour everyone must drive. In my col de sack each household has 3, 4, 5 cars. 2. The roads are very narrow and dangerous every month at least one car (a Tesco delivery lorry last week) turned upside down in ditch. 3. Cannot get appointment with doctor surgery. 4. Roads too dangerous for children to cycle. 5. Plenty of space nearer to Brentwood

Change To Plan: Remove the proposed sites field 25 and 26 from local development plan. Consult local people they know how congested and dangerous the roads are winding and very narrow.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26131 - 8680 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

26135 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jane House [8681]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Extra traffic - roads already very busy. Extra population. Lack of supporting infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA Neighbourhood Plan for local development plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26135 - 8681 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

26138 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher House [8682]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of infrastructure - school / doctor places. Roads not fit for traffic.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA Neighbourhood Plan for local change.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26138 - 8682 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

26155 Object**Respondent: Laura Harris [8685]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There appears to be no clear strategy for the villages in this area and no discussions with Epping Council, as they border on the village.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26155 - 8685 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

26160 Object**Respondent: Susan Harris [8686]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the villages in this area. No consultations with Epping Council which border village.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26160 - 8686 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

26190 Object	Respondent: Mrs. Susan Miers [8695]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no clear strategy for the Villages .Including Blackmore.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26190 - 8695 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26221 Object	Respondent: Mr John Caton [4881]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no clear strategy for the villages within Brentwood. Too many houses planned for Blackmore. No consideration of the proposed development in neighbouring authorities - i.e. EFDC.	
Change To Plan:	BBC planners should refer to the Blackmore Village neighbourhood plan, which was properly composed and states what the village and villagers need. Far too many of what might have been thought of as affordable, have been extended, modified to the maximum and are no longer affordable. There are very few properties left in Blackmore of smaller, single storey bungalow type. The sites R25 and R26 should be taken out of the local development plan for the reasons given.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26221 - 4881 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26230 Object	Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The number of houses proposed is far too many for the small village.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26230 - 7016 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26241 Object	Respondent: Mrs Susan Capes [8702]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no proven need for more housing this far away from the town.	
Change To Plan:	I do not think that any modification will be able to make the plan sustainable for Blackmore.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26241 - 8702 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26250 Object	Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8704]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No evidence to support the need for housing within Blackmore. No other villages within Brentwood have proposed developments. Development by neighbouring authorities (e.g. Epping DC) have not been considered.	
Change To Plan:	Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. In accordance with 'local needs' some smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the choice to "downsize", redeeming their (?) home.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26250 - 8704 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26275 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Williams [8706]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Major concerns about flooding in village due to additional strain on the drainage / sewage systems. Overload on already strained infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors surgery, parking facilities. Additional traffic and parking problems on already overused country lanes which were not designed for heavy traffic. Building on green belt is not acceptable when brown fill sites are available.	
Change To Plan:	1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26275 - 8706 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	

26280 Object**Respondent: Mrs Julie Ann Williams [8707]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Major concerns about flooding in village due to additional strain on the drainage / sewage systems. Overload on already strained infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors surgery, parking facilities. Additional traffic and parking problems on already overused country lanes which were not designed for heavy traffic. Building on green belt is not acceptable when brown fill sites are available.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26280 - 8707 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

26287 Object**Respondent: Mr John Wollaston [8183]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been insufficient consultation with either the village or neighbouring councils to show clearly what impact these developments will have on the village and its environment. Blackmore is a small village and its resources are already overstretched and have little scope for expansion without severely impacting its village nature.

Change To Plan: There has been no adequate housing need survey. There has been no projected traffic survey to assess the impact of the proposed development. The needs to be greater consultation with those impacted by the development of the village and ensure that it does simply become a urban suburb of Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26287 - 8183 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

26290 Object**Respondent: Mr Neil Warner [8709]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I understand that there has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. There should be clear evidence that all brownfield sites in the Borough have been fully utilised in an development plan. There is insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the planned housing expansion.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26290 - 8709 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

26294 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Gillian Warner [8710]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I understand there has been no "housing needs survey" to demonstrate that Blackmore should be in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26294 - 8710 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

26351 Object**Respondent: Mr Arthur Birch [4769]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear coherent idea for the villages including Blackmore. No cohesion with neighbouring authorities. Other private developments, i.e. Fingrith Hall Lane and Red Rose Lane etc don't appear to have been taken into consideration.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26351 - 4769 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

26355 Object**Respondent: Mrs Maureen Butler [5017]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The infrastructure of the village is no capable of with standing the amount of housing being proposed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26355 - 5017 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii

26407 Object	Respondent: Mrs Ella Bradley [4875]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No consideration of the development taking place in Epping Council which borders with Blackmore.	
Change To Plan:	I really can't see what modifications could be considered in view of the infrastructure of the village. In view of my previous comments - the potential flooding - the narrow lanes - the parking - schools, doctors at full capacity.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 26407 - 4875 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26417 Object	Respondent: Ms Margaret Boreham [8033]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Green belt should not be built on. Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - school, doctors surgery, parking. Area prone to flooding. No housing needs survey done.	
Change To Plan:	scrap it	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 26417 - 8033 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii	
26420 Object	Respondent: Mr David Baines [8740]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - school, doctors surgery, parking. Area prone to flooding. No housing needs survey done. More suitable locations elsewhere. Lack of consideration of village needs.	
Change To Plan:	Consider the local needs as outlined by the BVHA plan.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 26420 - 8740 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26443 Object	Respondent: Mrs Wendy Dunbar [8743]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No housing need survey undertaken. No clear strategy for villages north of the borough such as Blackmore. BBC have not adequately consulted and considered development taking place in neighbouring authorities.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 to be removed from the LDP and Planners to refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which details the local housing needs, etc.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 26443 - 8743 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26456 Object	Respondent: Mr John Orbell [4805]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No Housing Need Survey completed. No consideration for the developments in neighbouring authorities.	
Change To Plan:	Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP Plan. You need to refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association for our Local Housing Needs for our sustainable community. We do not want unwanted and unjustified large scale development. There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Was is not the Brentwood Borough Council who said "we will continue to protect our key assets including the environment, heritage and character of the borough".	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 26456 - 4805 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	
26489 Object	Respondent: Mr Surinder Panesar [8749]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We believe that site allocations are inappropriate.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out the local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 26489 - 8749 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv	

26496 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annabelle Panesar [8750]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure is not strong enough and allocation to Blackmore is disproportionate.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 to be removed. BVHA neighbourhood Plan sets out the local housing needs, that are sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26496 - 8750 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

23946 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: Support Brentwood's approach to meet their identified housing needs in full plus a sufficient buffer in the early part of the plan period. Crucially the draft plan is not using the JSP as a reason for deferring difficult planning decisions. As such, the draft plan is not reliant upon the emerging JSP to meet Brentwood's needs up to 2033 which would be wholly unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23946 - 8351 - Managing Sustainable Growth - i, ii, iii, iv

23338 Object

Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23338 - 8313 - 4.2 - None

25834 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25834 - 8136 - 4.2 - i, ii, iii, iv

26003 Object

Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26003 - 8660 - 4.2 - i, ii, iii, iv

26023 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26023 - 8662 - 4.2 - i, ii, iii

26050 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26050 - 7304 - 4.2 - i, ii, iii, iv

26077 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council has Failed to fulfil its own SCI that relates to the involvement and engagement of the community and stakeholders in the exercising of its planning functions I do not believe that the local authority has fully demonstrated a willingness to engage with and take note of the opinions of the local community. No evidence of a local housing need in Blackmore supporting its inclusion in the Local Plan. The plan does not provide suitable infrastructure for the proposed new homes and does nothing to make housing affordable for people on average or low incomes. Failure to comply with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework in respect to the construction of new buildings being inappropriate on Green Belt

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26077 - 4275 - 4.2 - i, ii, iii, iv

26363 Object

Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]

Agent: N/A

Summary: there has been no survey with the community to explain Blackmore should be included in the LDP. BBC should be consulting with other local authorities to increase development on already allocated brownfield sites, where a far better infrastructure is already in place, including roads and public services

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to, which sets out local needs for housing.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26363 - 4618 - 4.2 - i, ii, iii, iv

26371 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Barber [8731]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26371 - 8731 - 4.2 - i, ii, iii, iv

26379 Object

Respondent: Mr. Colin Barber [919]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear strategy for villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26379 - 919 - 4.2 - i, ii, iii, iv

22295 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The policy does not fully satisfy the criteria for sustainable development.

Change To Plan: In order to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and to fully satisfy the criteria for sustainable development additional wording should be included as follows:

g. takes full account of opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in developments
 "ensuring delivery of no net loss and aiming to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity wherever possible"

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22295 - 2414 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - iii, iv

22333 Object**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Anglian Water is generally supportive of Policy SP01 as drafted although we would ask that established uses are also included in the policy wording.

Change To Plan: has no unacceptable effect on health, the environment or amenity due to the release of pollutants (such as light, noise pollution, vibration, odour, smoke, ash, dust and grit) to land, water or air and/or from any effects from established uses which should not be prejudiced by new development proposals;

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22333 - 6824 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - iii

22633 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane. The LDP is therefore unsound because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and is therefore contrary to national planning policy.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council are required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22633 - 8290 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

22653 Object**Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane. The LDP is therefore unsound because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and is therefore contrary to national planning policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22653 - 8292 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

22721 Object**Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane. The LDP is therefore unsound because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and is therefore contrary to national planning policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22721 - 7003 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

23026 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane. The LDP is therefore unsound because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and is therefore contrary to national planning policy.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council are required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23026 - 4851 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

23038 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane. The LDP is therefore unsound because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and is therefore contrary to national planning policy.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council are required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23038 - 7227 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

23142 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane. The LDP is therefore unsound because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and is therefore contrary to national planning policy.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council are required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23142 - 6923 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

23158 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane. The LDP is therefore unsound because it does not take into account reasonable alternatives and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and is therefore contrary to national planning policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23158 - 6965 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

23337 Object**Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to D(a) and D(f) (no reason provided).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23337 - 8313 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

23434 Object **Respondent: Mr Benjamin Rumary [8324]**

Summary: Object

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No

Full Reference: O - 23434 - 8324 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

Agent: N/A

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

23472 Object **Respondent: Mr Marc Cohen [4268]**

Summary: Object to Policy SP01 D (a) and D (f) (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No

Full Reference: O - 23472 - 4268 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

Agent: N/A

Tests: None

Examination: No

23539 Object **Respondent: Mr David Barfoot [7177]**

Summary: Object to Policy SP01 - D (a) and D (f). (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No

Full Reference: O - 23539 - 7177 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

Agent: N/A

Tests: None

Examination: No

23553 Object **Respondent: Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200]**

Summary: Object to Policy SP01 - D (a) and D (f)

What plans have been made for surrounding infrastructure?

Which other sites in Essex have been identified?

Asking residents door to door

Green Belt land is identified as green belt for a reason. There are other areas that can be built on which do not impact on small already strained village.

Change To Plan: SCHOOL! This is a local village one form entry school, which is already oversubscribed. More houses equal more children.
TRAFFIC! Blackmore is already congested with cars and for parking, We do not want more traffic spoiling this beautiful village.
GP. Already overcrowded and will be put under more strain.
There is not a need for more houses here in such a small village

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No

Full Reference: O - 23553 - 7200 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

Agent: N/A

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

23559 Object **Respondent: Ms Eleanora Barfoot [8328]**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No

Full Reference: O - 23559 - 8328 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

Agent: N/A

Tests: None

Examination: No

23568 Object **Respondent: Mrs Hayley Hammond [8329]**

Summary: Object (D (a) and D (f)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No

Full Reference: O - 23568 - 8329 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

Agent: N/A

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

23572 Object	Respondent: Sadie Barfoot [8330]	Agent: N/A
Summary: (no reason provided)		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23572 - 8330 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None	Tests: None	Examination: No
23630 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Evans [8332]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Object (no reason supplied)		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23630 - 8332 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
23778 Object	Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Brentwood Council has simply not demonstrated that they have taken into account other Brownfield sites that are available which surely must take priority over the development of Green Belt Lane between Red Rose Lane and Blackmore Village.		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23778 - 7193 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
23893 Object	Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]	Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]
Summary: SP01, criterion D, sub-criterion d: The wording of criterion D(d) does not reflect the wording of the NPPF at paragraph 109, which reads: "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe." It is therefore inconsistent with national policy. Criterion D(d) should be amended to read: d. ensures the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or give rise to a severe residual cumulative impact on the road network		
Change To Plan: Criterion D(d) should be amended to read: d. ensures the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or give rise to a severe residual cumulative impact on the road network		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23893 - 6669 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii	Tests: i, ii, iii	Examination: Yes
23953 Object	Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]	Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]
Summary: Policy SP01, Sustainable Development (page 46 - 47) Criterion B and C of Policy SP01 unnecessarily repeats the NPPF and could be removed. Criterion D(i) should be amended to reflect multiple heritage assets and conservation areas.		
Change To Plan: Policy SP01 Sustainable Development (page 46 - 47) Criterion B and C of Policy SP01 unnecessarily repeats the NPPF and could be removed. Criterion D(i) should be amended to reflect multiple heritage assets and conservation areas as follows: "i. preserves, and where appropriate, enhances heritage assets and conservation areas;"		
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:Yes
Full Reference: O - 23953 - 5050 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None	Tests: None	Examination: Yes

24085 Object

Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]

Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]

Summary: LLLP object to Policy SP01. The policy is not sound as it is not:

* Consistent with the NPPF - for the reasons identified in this representation, Policy SP01 is not consistent with the NPPF and is considered to be too prescriptive with respect to Criterion D(a) and Criterion D(d). The policy is not positively framed for these criteria and would be overly restrictive for the effective consideration of future development proposals. Criterion D is over prescriptive, particularly in terms of character and setting of settlements, regarding no adverse impact on highways and makes no reference to the ability of development schemes and proposals to mitigate any adverse effects that may be identified. The policy wording needs to reflect the potential for adverse highways conditions to be mitigated through appropriate interventions such as contributions to infrastructure improvement.

Change To Plan: LLLP consider that policy SP01 requires modification at D(a) and D(d) to ensure that it is positively framed and that the approach to securing sustainable development accords with the NPPF and is more flexible.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24085 - 8362 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - iv

24187 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane regularly floods with the water coming down Nine Ashes Road like a river and into the lane. The ditches and limited drainage near to the junction simply cannot cope and a large area is regularly left under water during the winter months. Flooding has increasingly become an issue in recent years and has now started to erode the lane at the front of our house. This will also further impact the flooding risk in the village which has been an increasing problem.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24187 - 7193 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24189 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local village school has very limited places and resources which was put under further pressure due to a large unapproved travelling community site with some 20-30 caravans and families is also impacting on the village resources available

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24189 - 7193 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24191 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* A Doctors surgery whereby I genuinely hope I do not need to request urgent care. If you want any form of response you have to continuously dial repeatedly to get assistance - comments on the website page highlights this

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24191 - 7193 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24193 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* One village shop/Post Office with very restricted parking

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24193 - 7193 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24197 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, its position is very isolated with narrow country roads. The bus service is very limited. Parking is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24197 - 7195 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24202 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The only shop is a small Co-op which already can't cope. Not long ago our post office moved to the Co-op giving a very unsatisfactory service. There just isn't enough room to support such a service.

Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24202 - 7195 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24209 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The one school is already full.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24209 - 7195 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24215 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The nearby doctors surgery is severely overstretched.

Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24215 - 7195 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24221 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flooding is already a problem, I fear this would only get worse.

Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24221 - 7195 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24227 Object**Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The accessibility including Red Rose Lane in particular is not sufficient and even farm vehicles struggle and have to bypass the village. It is already difficult to park/access the single village shop/Post Office along with the influx of the tea room which uses up all of the current parking resource available. Red Rose Lane is very narrow/winding road unsuitable for any increase in traffic. It is already dangerous with no pavements and is in constant use by dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24227 - 8370 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24233 Object**Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village school will not cope.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24233 - 8370 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24239 Object**Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery will not cope.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24239 - 8370 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24245 Object**Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane regularly floods as do other areas of the village and this will be made worse by any further developments.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24245 - 8370 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24430 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy SP01-D(a) D (f) Para 4.9,4.2 Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore. Blackmore has been disproportionately targeted with a 30% increase in the current population proposed. There must be more suitable brownfield sites within the borough that having to build on Green Belt in Blackmore. The Blackmore sites of R25 and R26 are entirely unsuitable for large scale development.

Change To Plan: The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the plans should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out the Blackmore local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24430 - 8375 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24436 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to SP01 and paras 4.6, 4.9 and 4.20. Object as sites chosen are not sustainable - R25 and R26 are prone to flooding, have poor infrastructure and there is no clear housing strategy for the villages in the north of the borough. Blackmore is not sustainable, other more suitable, brownfield sites should be used.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24436 - 8378 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24456 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development in Blackmore would be damaging to the area because: There are errors in the plan, population states 829 but does not include houses past Red Rose Lane or the residents in Chelmsford Road and Traveller site. Duty to cooperate. Red Rose Lane is single track and won't cope with more traffic; Flood Risk and Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R26. The local school is at capacity with no room for more children. The doctors is too at capacity, waiting times are bad already. Electricity and services won't be able to cope with 70 extra houses.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24456 - 8379 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24472 Object**Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green field sites being proposed when there is alternative brownfield sites available, Blackmore infrastructure and amenities would not be able to cope, school is full, doctor appointments already up to 1 month & this will get worse when the residents of old Norton Heath site descend on the village.

Change To Plan: Refer to BHVA Neighbourhood Plan - remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24472 - 8380 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24480 Object**Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan unsound. R25 and R26 are unsuitable and are in Green Belt. Developer led which is against national guidelines. Inadequate access, Red Rose Lane too narrow and floods frequently. Local amenities unable to cope with existing residents. Would result in large increase in traffic which is already increased dramatically in last 12 months

Change To Plan: See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24480 - 8381 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24503 Object**Respondent: Dr Belinda Dunbar [8382]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to sites R25 and R26.
Local GP services and schools are already struggling to cope. There is no consideration of increasing the GP services to cope with additional houses.
The access roads are not adequate to take the increased volume of traffic the extra homes will bring.
Flooding occurs in the area during heavy rainfall, building more homes will add to these problems.
Green Belt should be retained.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 & R26 from the Local Plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which sets out our local housing needs and that the Blackmore community is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24503 - 8382 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24543 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 4 Policy SP01, D (a) D (f) Para 4.4; Policy SP02

Local Plan, unsound, failure to consult with Epping Forest District Council. Re:- 30 houses being built on Fingrith Hall Lane which will already impact on the village. Village prone to flooding. No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites
Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan
Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24543 - 8392 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24545 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul De Rosa [8393]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24545 - 8393 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24572 Object**Respondent: Mrs Marion Woolaston [8397]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other councils or villagers to demonstrate what the impacts of developing R25 and R26 would be. A wider consultation is needed. The infrastructure is already overstretched and there is no housing needs survey for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: An adequate housing needs survey requires to be undertaken. This has not happened in Blackmore. To assess the impact on traffic flows through the village, a projected traffic survey requires to be undertaken.
To ensure that Blackmore does not become an urban suburb of Brentwood, a greater and wide consultation is required with those who are impacted by the development of the village

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24572 - 8397 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

24577 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 4
 Policy SP01 - D(a), D(f)
 Paragraphs 4.2 and 4.9
 Policy SP02

The plan is unsound. The plan is deficient in respect of Blackmore village and unsound on all 4 tests in particular:

There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough.

The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc).

There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development.

BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane.

BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.

There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24577 - 4874 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24609 Object**Respondent: Mr Pete Vince [8123]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.

Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.

Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24609 - 8123 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24615 Object**Respondent: Mr Lyall Vince [8403]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.

Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.

Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24615 - 8403 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24650 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There Is no clear strategy for Blackmore and other villages In the north of the borough. Brentwood Borough Council does not appear to have taken into consideration the proposals of neighbouring authorities e.g. Epping Forest District Council is proposing to construct 30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane - the residents of these houses will almost certainly use Blackmore as a local shopping place adding both to the traffic along Fingrith Hall Lane and the parking congestion In the centre of Blackmore village. There does not appear to have been any housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore requires such extensive development

Change To Plan: Sites R2S and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that Just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan In cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24650 - 8411 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24661 Object**Respondent: Mrs Edna Williams [4728]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound.
a) There has been no evidence produced to show that there is a need for this size of development in Blackmore
b) There has been no discussion or cooperation with any local bodies 30 houses have just been built just outside the village In EFDC area that will Impact on the village
c) There are many aspects that do not comply with the NPPF Guidance.
Protection of Green Belt
Development located to minimize travel
Local community not consulted
No proven local need

Change To Plan: All of the points should be reassessed with local involvement.
Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24661 - 4728 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24669 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Proposals for Blackmore are not justified. The plan proposal significantly changed from previous versions of the document, the discussion on the plan at the full council meeting was prevented, the regularisation of the travellers site was without warning, duty to cooperate with other boroughs and consideration of their development has not taken place, the consultation form is complex and unclear and unsuitable, other developments in the north of the borough are not considered, a 30% rise in housing here is unsustainable and does not have the infrastructure to support it, impacts on roads, wildlife, habitat is too great.

Change To Plan: * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
* Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Forest District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
* Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
* Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
.* Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
* Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
.* Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there Is already a severe flooding problem which h the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
* Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24669 - 1830 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24670 Object

Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Proposals for Blackmore are not justified. The plan proposal significantly changed from previous versions of the document, the discussion on the plan at the full council meeting was prevented, the regularisation of the travellers site was without warning, duty to cooperate with other boroughs and consideration of their development has not taken place, the consultation form is complex and unclear and unsuitable, other developments in the north of the borough are not considered, a 30% rise in housing here is unsustainable and does not have the infrastructure to support it, impacts on roads, wildlife, habitat is too great.

Change To Plan: * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
* Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Forest District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
* Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
* Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
* Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
* Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
* Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there is already a severe flooding problem which the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
* Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24670 - 1830 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24677 Object

Respondent: Ms Shirley Dearlove [8415]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 combined with developments in Epping Forest DC area will put extreme pressure on the infrastructure and facilities of Blackmore. There has been inadequate consultation between Brentwood BC and Epping Forest DC. Blackmore should be a category 4 (small village) not 3 (large village) due to its low population (829), it only has one shop and one small primary school. The existing doctors surgery is already struggling and will be made worse by these proposals. Existing recorded flooding issues will be exacerbated. No housing needs survey has been carried out. Contradicts previous 2016 iteration of the Local Plan which sought to limit growth in rural areas to retain local character. Development should be located in more sustainable locations such as Brentwood or Dunton Hills.

Change To Plan: The above sites should be removed from the LDP and the planners should refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan. This clearly sets out the village's local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24677 - 8415 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24683 Object

Respondent: Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound.
It will put pressure on rural infrastructure.
The character of the village will be impacted. It is currently enjoyed by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
It will put pressure on local lanes.
Bus services are infrequent.
Medical centre, shop and school also impacted adversely.
Other areas such as brownfield land should be developed first.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Heritage Village Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24683 - 8417 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24731 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Downton [8432]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A too significant increase in the number of houses which villages will not be able to cope with, resulting in higher degree of traffic. Increased levels of danger through more traffic, already lack of parking, increasing risk to cyclists and pedestrians, particularly dog walkers.

Change To Plan: Smaller and more dispersment (on preferably Brownfield sites) for any new builds in the surrounding area, rather than focusing such large development within an already stretched pretty village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24731 - 8432 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

24732 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Downton [8432]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A too significant increase in the number of houses which villages will not be able to cope with, resulting in on infrastructure e.g. schools.

Change To Plan: Smaller and more dispersment (on preferably Brownfield sites) for any new builds in the surrounding area, rather than focusing such large development within an already stretched pretty village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24732 - 8432 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

24733 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Downton [8432]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A too significant increase in the number of houses which villages will not be able to cope with, resulting in stretch on infrastructure e.g. doctors, surgery, etc.

Change To Plan: Smaller and more dispersment (on preferably Brownfield sites) for any new builds in the surrounding area, rather than focusing such large development within an already stretched pretty village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24733 - 8432 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

24765 Object

Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8442]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy ' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council. Over houses being constructed and/or planned close to Blackmore village. The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong, Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school and preschool is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed, inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc). There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP. The access off/from Redrose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites , not Green Belt, ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 form plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24765 - 8442 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24787 Object

Respondent: Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 4
Policy SP01 - D(a), D(f)
Paragraphs 4.2and 4.9
Policy SP02

Section 08
Policy NE06 8.5-8.64
Para 8.85 (iv)
Para 8.90
Para 8.101

Policy NE13

Section 09
Policy R25, 9.197-9.200
Policy R26, 9.201-204

No clear strategy for villages, why Blackmore and not others that have no special historic centre. Other locations must be more sustainable and suitable. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities, 30 homes on Fingrith Hall Lane. Blackmore Village is isolated, school is full, GP is 4 weeks for an appointment, parking in village in dangerous. Children and pensioners are at risk from this. Bus service is infrequent. More residents = more vehicles. More traffic will cause more air pollution bad for people and historic buildings. Sites are on Green Belt land, should use brownfield, not identified by BBC. Redrose Lane too narrow and floods severely, June 2016 floods across village. Sewers can't cope. Should increase densities on other proposed sites. Will increase village by 30%. Unauthorised travellers site will add to the impact on school, GP, local amenities. Has this been taken into account?

Change To Plan: I believe that R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the Blackmore village Heritage Association "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out our local housing needs to avoid further development locally.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24787 - 8175 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24827 Object

Respondent: Mr Ronald Quested [8452]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy SP01 - D(a), D(f) Paragraphs 4.2and 4.9
Policy SP02
Section 08
Policy NE06 8.5-8.64 Para 8.85 (iv) Para 8.90 Para 8.101
Policy NE13
Section 09
Policy R25, 9.197-9.200 Policy R26, 9.201-204

Blackmore is not suitable location for large number of new homes. This village walk to the shops, hall, school, etc. Already a problem with speeding and parking. More traffic will exacerbate this. 30 new homes on Fingrth Hall Lane not taken into account. Other locations more sustainable and suitable. Use brownfield sites not Green Belt. Consider surrounding villages. Village is historic, Impact on school and GP surgery will be huge. Major risk of flooding in parts of village. "016across the village, homes flooded and cars stuck. More housing will exacerbate this. Where is a Blackmore Housing Needs Survey>

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP> The 'Neighbourhood Plan' from the BVHA should be looked at by the planners. This clearly sets out the local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24827 - 8452 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25499 Object

Respondent: Mrs Melanie Simpson [8539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Section 04 - Policy SP01 ad SP02

Section 08. Policy Ne06 paras 8.85; 8.90; 8.101

BBC not considered lack of infrastructure in area, schools, doctors, buses, roads, bin collection, etc. Sites are Green Belt green field, us brownfield. There was no housing need survey. Village prone to flood, more houses will exacerbate this.

I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.

Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.

Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Change To Plan: I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.

Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.

Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25499 - 8539 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25530 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Simpson [4462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09 Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200; Policy R26, 9.201-9.205:

Section 4 Policy SP01-D(a) D (f) Para 4.9,4.2; Policy SP02

Section 8: Policy NE 06, 8.5-8.64 - para 8.85 (iv), 8.90, 8.101; Policy NE13

As a local teacher I worry about the impact on local infrastructure that is already struggling. Schools, doctors, buses, roads. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services that cannot cope with further pressure on the services. There needs to be a housing needs survey. Brownfield sites should be used. Access from/to red Rose lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic; the village is prone to flooding and when it does Red Rose land is the only way through the village - if there are homes built will this increase the flooding? There is no clear strategy for BBC on this proposal.

Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Change To Plan: Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25530 - 4462 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25584 Object

Respondent: Mr Simon Richardson [8562]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound.

- a) There is no proof that Blackmore needs this number of houses
- b) There has been no discussion with the villagers.
- c) No cooperation with any local neighbouring authorities. 30 houses have just been built outside the village in EFDC area that will impact on the village. 8 houses recently built at what was Nine Ashes Farm again in EFDC area.
- d) The LDP does not comply with NPPF Guidance:
 - No protection of Green Belt
 - Development is not located to minimize travel
 - Local community not consulted
 - There is no proven local need
 - There has been no Flood Risk Assessment
 - The location does not 'minimize travel' as required

Change To Plan: All of the above points should be reassessed with local involvement.
Local housing need to be assessed.
The size of the local school needs to be considered
The Doctors surgery is already oversubscribed and consideration needs to be given on to how address this.
Flooding is an issue and needs greater consideration. The Woollard Way field (R25) is often flooded.
Not an issue as a field but this surface water will need to go somewhere if the field is concreted over. (as a local villager my Father used this field and its ponds to water his horses).
Any development of this size needs to be located nearer to good transport links.
Small brownfield developments need to be considered.
Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25584 - 8562 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25589 Object

Respondent: Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policies: R25; R26; SP02; SP02; NE06; NE13

This will put intolerable pressure on GP services the local surgery fails to meet demand. Blackmore is a small community based around a small number of roads that are not designed to meet the inevitable increase in traffic due to a wholly inadequate public transport service. It is the level and scale of this development that is excessive and inappropriate.

Change To Plan: A significant reduction in the scale and number of houses to be built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25589 - 8563 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25602 Object

Respondent: Mr David Rolfs [8566]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC have pasted houses onto a Green Belt area around Blackmore to achieve that LDP targets and failed to consider the effects on the community and infrastructure. Additional housing around Blackmore not considered (32 new homes). Has BBC discussed local development with neighbouring councils?

The effect on local Highways by additional housing.

Blackmore village has a vibrant centre that has congestion due visitors to this with parking on pavements, parking on double yellow lines. Also no designated disabled parking spaces. No enforcement. This will be exacerbated by new homes. BBC say the developers have undertaken a flood survey for their land, what about adjacent land with the history of flooding. The school and GP are full, with long GP waiting list which will be exacerbated. Monies collected for infrastructure will be spent elsewhere. Parish Cllrs were not allowed to debate this in the full council meeting on 08 Nov 2018, this is undemocratic. Travellers site in Chelmsford Road was deemed illegal but now LDP making it legal but on what grounds? Previous development proposals there failed due to insufficient sewerage capacity, how will this be addressed. It is apparent that the Blackmore area is the "dumping ground" to make up the numbers and imposing a housing mix without carrying out a housing need survey.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25602 - 8566 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25608 Object

Respondent: Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Insufficient consultation with neighbouring boroughs; red Rose Lane is not suitable for access; Severe flooding in village will get worse and sewage pumping station cant cope; No housing need survey; Already problems with cars - congestion, parking, poor bus service,; destroy wildlife and habitat; green belt should be protected; primary school is full; no clear housing strategy to consider other sites than R25 and R26.

Change To Plan: As there seems to be considerable doubt that all aspects of the planning process have been adhered to R26 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Leave Blackmore in the Green Belt and restore its classification as a Rural Village in a setting with non f the amenities enjoyed by areas such as Mountnessing and Ingrave i.e. a through road., regular buses over an extended time frame, a doctors surgery that can be reached on foot. BBC should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out local housing need for our already sustainable community.
Please note that this was a very difficult form to fill in as many on us have limited knowledge of the planning process!

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25608 - 8567 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25618 Object

Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is deficient in respect of Blackmore Village. There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. There are more suitable and/or sustainable locations. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore Village is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26 Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely.
Please refer to the attached Blackmore Village Survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted.
Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan "available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25618 - 4874 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25628 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites. The inclusion of sites R25 and R26 is not sound and cannot be justified owing to the absence of proportionate evidence and a failure to assess all reasonable alternatives. The inclusion of these sites is contrary to national policy, particularly with regards to sustainable development and Green Belt land policies within the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Represent many residents in Blackmore and surrounding area against inclusion of R25 and R26 in the plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25628 - 1921 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25629 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore Parish Council and BVHA believe that the change in approach, i.e. in seeking to allocate R25 and R26 now, is a result of developer pressure rather than a true assessment of the planning merit (or lack of) of sites R25 and R26 for residential development.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Represent many residents in Blackmore and surrounding area against inclusion of R25 and R26 in the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25629 - 1921 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25630 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Object as not shown that no previously developed land sites or urban areas or increase in densities on other proposed sites exist, Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate there are no or insufficient previously developed sites available outside the existing urban areas.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified **Duty to Co-operate?:** Not Specified **Sound?:** No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** Yes

Full Reference: O - 25630 - 1921 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25667 Object

Respondent: Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: 70 homes could end up with 280 people (4 people per household) plus at least 200 cars (or more). Infrastructure will not be able to cope with this amount. Schools, hospitals, doctors, traffic and litter and at the end of the day we have lost our Green Belt. Blackmore will end up the same as Billericay, a sprawl of estates.

Change To Plan: Please refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:** No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25667 - 8597 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25670 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Newcombe [8598] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The history of Blackmore many years ago was known as the black swamp and was a very wet area. This is why it is not a large village due to flood risk. Most of the land is given over to Green Belt because of this reason. There are many brown sites which could be used without flood risk.

Change To Plan: Please refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:** No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25670 - 8598 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25675 Object

Respondent: Miss Charlotte Newton [8599] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: There has been no discussions with the village regarding proposed development. Should find out what needs improving before adding houses to the village. Plenty of places elsewhere that need new housing. Property in the village is not affordable but that's what makes it a lovely place to live. Adding more houses has a negative effect on local/government services (e.g. schools, doctors, hospitals, teachers etc). Would more building work be needed at the school to accommodate growth. The village has small narrow roads not equipped for builders/machinery. There is an issue with parking around the village especially during school term.

Change To Plan: Site that need removing from the LDP as follows: R26 and R25.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:** No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25675 - 8599 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25788 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Agree with points raised by BVHA - lack of school places, lack of parking, poor bus service, GP full, Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy vehicles and is narrow, dangerous for children to walk to school.

The form is complicated and full of legal jargon. Not clear even after visit to council offices. BVHA helping to portray view of myself and others. The borough set the building limits for Blackmore in the 1960s, considered infrastructure and Green Belt. Since then gas has been supplied and water pressure improved. We still have power cuts. The council set the village boundary and infrastructure right in the 1960s and has helped to preserve this wonderful village. There is no justification for the need to build on Green Belt land adjoining Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified **Duty to Co-operate?:** Not Specified **Sound?:** No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25788 - 8010 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25800 Object

Respondent: Mr Matthew Ionescu [8576]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concerned about congestion from development to the north of Brentwood and Pilgrims Hatch. Urbanisation in these areas could further effect the biodiversity and quality if further traffic is added

Change To Plan: Has considered local opinion to an extent but requires further local consultation with residents.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25800 - 8576 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - iii

25819 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25819 - 4693 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25827 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.)and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25827 - 8136 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25911 Object

Respondent: Mr Luke Holmes [8652]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25911 - 8652 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25919 Object

Respondent: Miss Ami Holmes [8653]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25919 - 8653 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25926 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25926 - 8574 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25932 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Foreman [4394]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools, Green Belt. Sites unsuitable.

In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25932 - 4394 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25942 Object

Respondent: Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to the inclusion of Blackmore sites as strategy for site choice is not justified, impacts not details and no account of other recent development in the area.

Change To Plan:

The Blackmore Sites should be removed from the Local Plan until there has been:

(1) A full housing need survey for Blackmore

(2) A proper consultation, including the BBC taking into account alternative sites

(3) A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25942 - 4547 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25950 Object

Respondent: Mr Ben Holmes [8654]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25950 - 8654 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25958 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Holmes [8655]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25958 - 8655 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25966 Object

Respondent: Mr John Caton [4881]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, there is no clear strategy for villages and has not considered brownfield sites which should be prioritised over Green Belt sites, this is developer led and not thought through by BBC, ignored adjacent authority development, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, the number of homes will overwhelm village - school and GP. Parking already a problem and shops, cafes, pubs already insufficient. Extend the urban development to Brentwood town instead.

Change To Plan: Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan, which was properly composed and states what the village and villagers need. Far too many of what might have been thought of as affordable, have been extended, modified to the maximum and are no longer affordable. There are very few properties left in Blackmore of a smaller, single storey bungalow type. The sites R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP for the reasons give.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25966 - 4881 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25970 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, there is no clear strategy for villages and has not considered brownfield sites which should be prioritised over Green Belt sites, this is developer led and not thought through by BBC, ignored adjacent authority development, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, the number of homes will overwhelm village - school and GP. Parking already a problem and shops, cafes, pubs already insufficient. Extend the urban development to Brentwood town instead.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. In accordance with local needs smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the chance to down size releasing their larger homes.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25970 - 8657 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25979 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore sites fail dismally (8 of the 11 requirements) when considering policy SP01: section D.

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25979 - 4759 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

25987 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore sites fail dismally (8 of the 11 requirements) when considering policy SP01: section D.

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25987 - 4700 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

26001 Object

Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26001 - 8660 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

26022 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26022 - 8662 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

26041 Object

Respondent: Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: The flooding of a few years ago has just been alleviated this would cause more problems in that area. Blackmore would be unable to cope with this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26041 - 8668 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

26049 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26049 - 7304 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

26076 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council has Failed to fulfil its own SCI that relates to the involvement and engagement of the community and stakeholders in the exercising of its planning functions I do not believe that the local authority has fully demonstrated a willingness to engage with and take note of the opinions of the local community. No evidence of a local housing need in Blackmore supporting its inclusion in the Local Plan. The plan does not provide suitable infrastructure for the proposed new homes and does nothing to make housing affordable for people on average or low incomes. Failure to comply with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework in respect to the construction of new buildings being inappropriate on Green Belt

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26076 - 4275 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

26083 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carole Cole [8675]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concerns over schools in the area, ie more traffic in and round Blackmore, Doddinghurst and nearby villages. Also Dr's surgery seems difficult to get appointments now, without new housing in the area.
Take R25 and R26 out of the plan and consider the alternatives.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 out of the plan and consider the alternatives.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26083 - 8675 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii

26096 Object**Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan makes no provisions for the development of local amenities and infrastructure - local school and doctor's surgery are already at capacity. The internet connection is appalling, the sewage system is at tipping point, there are frequent power-cuts in the area already, Public Transport is almost non-existent in the village and parking anywhere is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26096 - 8677 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, iii, iv

26149 Object**Respondent: Mrs Gillian Hall [8684]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I do not feel BBC has properly investigated other sites for development which would be suitable and not GREEN BELT. Access from Red Rose Lane is unsuitable as it is a narrow country lane. The proposed sites are liable to flooding and will exacerbate the flooding problem already exists. The existing infrastructure and services - roads, parking, schools, doctor surgery is at capacity.

Change To Plan: No development

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26149 - 8684 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

26152 Object**Respondent: Mr David Hall [4867]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are no brownfield sites that are available which should take priority over green belt land. There are other more suitable locations e.g. urban extension to Brentwood. The proposed sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk. The school will not be able to accommodate more children. The doctors surgery can barely cope with the existing population.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26152 - 4867 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

26174 Object**Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8691]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound because: 1. Access at Redrose Lane unsuitable for traffic. 2. Available brownfield sites should take priority over greenbelt. 3. Blackmore is not equipped to deal with more population on this scale. The school and doctors surgery are already stretched to capacity. 4. There are more suitable / sustainable locations than Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list f proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26174 - 8691 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii

26179 Object	Respondent: Mrs Janet Jacobs [8692]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Object to 09 [R25 and R26], 04, 08		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26179 - 8692 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified
26198 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Owen [4760]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Section 04 Section 08 Section 09 - policies R25 and R26. Local plan is unsound due to failure to consult with Epping Forest District Council RE: 30 houses being built at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and impact on village. There is not clear strategy for the village including Blackmore in the north of the borough. Red Rose Lane is a narrow dangerous lane not road with a band which is blind for pedestrians and traffic with no pavement facilities. School parking is congested in this area impeding traffic into the village, at entry to Redrose Lane in Nine Ashes Road. Doctors waiting lists for appointment is 4 weeks at times. The village is an unsafe area for pedestrians due to narrow uneven pavements and parking. Blackmore school is full to capacity. Buses for commuters without cars (teenagers etc) is unsatisfactory - no later than 7PL. Counted 8 Skylarks in fields adjacent to Nine Ashes Road last year, will they remain with heavier traffic on Rod? Blackmore Road floods (above waist high).		
Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community. Such plans will merge Blackmore into an urban sprawl, something counter to Brentwood's statement to preserve our environment, heritage and character.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26198 - 4760 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
26361 Object	Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]	Agent: N/A
Summary: There has been no survey with the community to explain Blackmore should be included in the LDP. BBC should be consulting with other local authorities to increase development on already allocated brownfield sites, where a far better infrastructure is already in place, including roads and public services. This would home a far lesser impact on the surrounding environment than building on greenbelt lane, which should be considered as the last resort for development.		
Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to, which sets out local needs for housing.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26361 - 4618 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified
26370 Object	Respondent: Mrs Kim Barber [8731]	Agent: N/A
Summary: No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.		
Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26370 - 8731 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified
26378 Object	Respondent: Mr. Colin Barber [919]	Agent: N/A
Summary: No clear strategy for villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.		
Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26378 - 919 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified

26423 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing need survey completed. No clear strategy for villages north of the borough including Blackmore. No consideration of developments taking place in neighbouring local authorities.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26423 - 8742 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

26439 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing need survey completed. No clear strategy for villages north of the borough including Blackmore. No consideration of developments taking place in neighbouring local authorities.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26439 - 8741 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

23208 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Suggested additional wording to refer to potential amenity impacts from existing uses as well as new development proposals. In effect we are seeking to avoid a situation where we are unable to operate our Water Recycling Centre (wastewater treatment works) on a continuous basis due to concerns raised about amenity impacts (principally odour) from development proposals in close proximity to these sites.

Change To Plan: Suggested additional wording to refer to potential amenity impacts from existing uses as well as new development proposals. We welcome the opportunity to enter into a Statement of Common Ground or similar in relation to the outstanding points set out above prior to the examination.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23208 - 6824 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iv

23211 Support**Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support the aim of Policy SP01(D). However, as worded the policy would only be effective in ensuring that development itself has no unacceptable impact on amenity. Consideration is also required to be given to whether the location of proposed development is appropriate taking into account existing sources of noise, odour and vibration to ensure that future occupiers will not be adversely affected by such issues. Where development would be affected by an existing source of pollution, development should only be allowed where it is demonstrated that suitable mitigation measures can be put in place and how these will be delivered.

Change To Plan: To address the above concern it is considered that Part D(e) of Policy SP01 could be revised to read as follows:
 "e. has no unacceptable effect on health, the environment or amenity due to the release of pollutants (such as light, noise pollution, vibration, odour, smoke, ash, dust and grit) to land, water or air, and where the amenity of future occupiers would not be adversely impacted by existing sources of such pollutants unless suitable mitigation measures are proposed and secured;"
 The additional wording would ensure that development is not located where the amenity of future residents would be affected by existing sources of pollutants unless suitable mitigation is provided. This would ensure that the policy is effective and consistent with the NPPF and therefore sound.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23211 - 1927 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii

23887 Support

Respondent: Ms. Isobel McGeever [7286]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The redevelopment of the Brentwood Community Hospital would aid the Council in delivering most of these objectives and policies. Although currently designated as Green Belt, the brownfield nature of the site and its location within the existing built up area of Brentwood means it can significantly aid in intensification. The site is easily accessible by existing public transport modes. The site is highly sustainable and helps contribute towards delivering the Strategic Objectives including having no unacceptable effect on visual amenity; having no unacceptable impact on health; and causes no unacceptable effects on adjoining sites.

Change To Plan: Should any part of the Brentwood Community Hospital site be declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirement of the NHS in the future, then the site should be considered suitable and available for alternative use, and considered deliverable within the period 5-10 years. These representations identify the sites potential for future development, in accordance with the realignment of the Green Belt so that this significant area of development land is no longer included. It is evident, that the site does not make a positive contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, redevelopment of the site could provide a key contribution to Brentwood's housing need, which the Council have failed to justify, given the reliance on key strategic sites, and the lack of acknowledgement for unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities (Basildon and Havering). These representations therefore promote and identify parts of the Brentwood Community Hospital site as a suitable site to contribute towards these requirements. This site presents an excellent opportunity for a high quality residential redevelopment on previously developed Green Belt land. This could be achieved without compromising the character of the area as the development can act as an infill site to the existing residential development surrounding it, and without the need for significant infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also available to accommodate further health related development should the CCG seek to expand their services in this location, including the possible expansion of the hospital to provide more comprehensive services for the community. However, the site's Green Belt designation would make it difficult for any planning application proposing additional built form to provide further healthcare services to be considered acceptable. The subject site is considered available, suitable and deliverable within the 5-10 year period of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23887 - 7286 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - None

23910 Support

Respondent: Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust [8344]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: This policy advocates a positive approach to considering developments that accord with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF. Clearly this is consistent with national policy and we support this approach. Paragraph C of the policy aligns with the NPPF requirement for development that accords with the emerging Local Plan to be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23910 - 8344 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24016 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy SP01: Sustainable Development takes a positive approach towards "Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development" and seeks to apply this in terms of planning applications, in accordance with the Development Plan. The NPPF (para 11) assumes a strong "Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development" in all planning related matters and places a responsibility on LPAs to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and to, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses. This policy is "consistent" with the NPPF and is therefore sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24016 - 2656 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24124 Support

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford wishes to voice support for the stated positive approach to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is in line with the NPPF (2018). In this regard, it is noted that the purpose of the planning system is to act positively to contribute to the achievement of this overarching objective. The Policy provides a commitment from BBC to always work 'proactively with applicants to find solutions which mean that proposals for sustainable development can be approved wherever appropriate, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.' Again, this is welcomed by our Client and is considered a sound approach to plan and decision making (in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 12) which we would strongly urge BBC to ensure is underpinned by all other aspects of the new Local Plan in order for it to be sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24124 - 3769 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

25897 Support

Respondent: Mr Peter Birch [8158]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There doesn't appear to be any coherent idea for the villages including Blackmore, no cohesion with neighbouring authorities. Should be considering other new development in other boroughs. The Blackmore community will be jeopardised by the proposed plan.

Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan. Please refer to the BHVA neighbourhood plan. Remove Blackmore from the proposed sites.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan. Please refer to the BHVA neighbourhood plan. Remove Blackmore from the proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 25897 - 8158 - POLICY SP01: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 4. Managing Growth 4.6

26097 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan makes no provisions for the development of local amenities and infrastructure - local school and doctor's surgery are already at capacity. The internet connection is appalling, the sewage system is at tipping point, there are frequent power-cuts in the area already, Public Transport is almost non-existent in the village and parking anywhere is a nightmare

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore is not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26097 - 8677 - 4.6 - i, iii, iv

23339 Object

Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23339 - 8313 - 4.9 - None

25835 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25835 - 8136 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii, iv

26004 Object

Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26004 - 8660 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii, iv

26024 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26024 - 8662 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii

26051 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26051 - 7304 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii, iv

26078 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council has Failed to fulfil its own SCI that relates to the involvement and engagement of the community and stakeholders in the exercising of its planning functions I do not believe that the local authority has fully demonstrated a willingness to engage with and take note of the opinions of the local community. No evidence of a local housing need in Blackmore supporting its inclusion in the Local Plan. The plan does not provide suitable infrastructure for the proposed new homes and does nothing to make housing affordable for people on average or low incomes. Failure to comply with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework in respect to the construction of new buildings being inappropriate on Green Belt.

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26078 - 4275 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii, iv

26098 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan makes no provisions for the development of local amenities and infrastructure - local school and doctor's surgery are already at capacity. The internet connection is appalling, the sewage system is at tipping point, there are frequent power-cuts in the area already, Public Transport is almost non-existent in the village and parking anywhere is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26098 - 8677 - 4.9 - i, iii, iv

26322 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No Housing Need Survey produced for the Blackmore area, therefore no justification as to why Blackmore has been selected for development.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26322 - 8720 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii, iv

26364 Object**Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: there has been no survey with the community to explain Blackmore should be included in the LDP. BBC should be consulting with other local authorities to increase development on already allocated brownfield sites, where a far better infrastructure is already in place, including roads and public services

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to which sets out local needs for housing.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26364 - 4618 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii, iv

26372 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kim Barber [8731]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26372 - 8731 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii, iv

26380 Object**Respondent: Mr. Colin Barber [919]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26380 - 919 - 4.9 - i, ii, iii, iv

23156 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to provide a development strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of Brentwood Borough. It lacks any provision for meeting the village's needs, which have not been objectively assessed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23156 - 6965 - Local Housing Need - i, ii, iii, iv

23157 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Pre-Submission Brentwood Local Plan (Regulation 19) fails to take into account the latest Government approach (as published in February 2019) to housing need assessment and use of the appropriate household and demographic data and is therefore considered unsound. The baseline housing target in the pre-submission plan of 350 dwellings per annum is now considered inappropriate and out of date. The upper end flexible target of 456 dwellings per annum is now just above the baseline requirement of 452pa as set out in the standard methodology approach.

Change To Plan: It is considered that the Brentwood Local Plan will need to be re-assessed in light of the implications of the Government requirement to use the standard methodology with CLG 2014-based household projections.

The plan will need to be revised make provision for a higher housing target and provision for additional housing sites to provide a contingency buffer.

In light of the revised housing baseline figures the SA will need to be reviewed to take account of this requirement.

Technical evidence and the IDP will need to be reviewed and where necessary amended to take account of revised housing target.

The South Essex Authorities are considering the commissioning of additional elements of evidence base to support the preparation of the joint strategic planning including a further review of the South Essex SHMA that would incorporate the outcome of changes to projections and methodology referred to above. It is considered that as a partner in the joint working that Brentwood Council should include any review of its OAHN in the South Essex review SHMA.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23157 - 2461 - Local Housing Need - i, ii, iii, iv

23409 Object

Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no Housing Needs Survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. [Sites R25 and R26].

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighborhood plan ". [Not supplied].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23409 - 4861 - Local Housing Need - i, ii, iii, iv

23645 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: The Plan failed to identify a five year housing land supply as required by government guidance. Consequently a greater proportion of required homes will be delivered beyond 2023

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23645 - 250 - Local Housing Need - None

23646 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]**

Summary: From an overall minimum requirement of 7,752 homes over the plan period, some 35% is proposed to be located within DHGV, which is not supported by evidence to demonstrate deliverability and viability. Part of the Extraordinary Council's 19 amendments moved to remove certain housing allocations such as land at Honeypot Lane, resolving simply to reallocate lost housing (some 200+ homes) to DHGV. Discussion between members simply referred to the promoters of DHGV stating that they have agreed to accommodate the extra number of homes. The proper justification for such a significant change is absent.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23646 - 250 - Local Housing Need - None

23647 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]**

Summary: Over-reliance on DHGV: the Plan places great emphasis on the fact that DHGV was one of 14 nationally selected Garden Villages and that the Council received funding to take this forward. In reality such an investment is made at the risk of the planning and legal processes which may conclude that the proposals go no further. For example, North Essex Garden Community proposals have not been shown to be viable and deliverable after inspector found that significant further work is required to justify the proposals. It could be argued that the proposals for DHGV will suffer the same problems.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23647 - 250 - Local Housing Need - None

23655 Object**Respondent: EA Strategic Land LLP [279]****Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]**

Summary: The assertion that Brentwood is a self-contained HMA is highly questionable. In any event this does not preclude Brentwood from accommodating unmet housing needs from either London or other adjoining authorities in Essex. These representations identify the extent of unmet need in adjoining boroughs including Basildon, Havering and from the London Plan, particularly in the short to medium term which the Brentwood Local Plan fails to address. On this matter the Plan fails the soundness test as it is neither justified nor effective in terms of cross boundary strategic matters.

Change To Plan: Site West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon is fully in accordance with the spatial strategy focused on transit orientated growth and should be allocated. No significant constraints with developing an urban extension at West Horndon, in addition to Dunton Hills Garden Village was identified by the Sustainability Appraisal. If Brentwood is to attempt to meet the housing needs, this approach is required.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23655 - 279 - Local Housing Need - None

23656 Object**Respondent: EA Strategic Land LLP [279]****Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]**

Summary: Brentwood has significantly under estimated its own housing need having failed to take account of the 'uncapped' housing requirement and the effects of Crossrail.

Change To Plan: Site West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon is fully in accordance with the spatial strategy focused on transit orientated growth and should be allocated. No significant constraints with developing an urban extension at West Horndon, in addition to Dunton Hills Garden Village was identified by the Sustainability Appraisal. If Brentwood is to attempt to meet the housing needs, this approach is required.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23656 - 279 - Local Housing Need - None

23667 Object**Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: Brentwood's most recent five-year housing land supply, reported in the Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2018, is 4.1 years; however, this is predicated on outdated requirement, therefore, the actual housing land supply is considerably less. The HLSS includes sites without detailed planning permission and without evidence they will be delivered within five years, these cannot be considered deliverable for the purposes of the five-year housing land supply. The acute housing land supply shortage underlines the importance of allocating sites that can deliver early in the plan period and avoiding over reliance on large strategic sites.

Change To Plan: Additional non-strategic sites are required. Having regard to the Standard Method and the need to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement, the total five-year requirement for the Borough is 2,712 dwellings. The housing trajectory provided as Appendix 1 to the PSLP projects that it will enable completion of 2,305 dwellings between 2019/20 and 2023/24 (or, to be precise, it projects 2,305.1 dwellings). Therefore, even before critical review of the supply, the PSLP will not provide a five-year supply of housing.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23667 - 8054 - Local Housing Need - None

23672 Object**Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: The Plan specifies that windfall sites will deliver 41 units/year in the last 10 years of the Plan period (totalling 410 units to be delivered by windfall sites). The reliance on windfall delivering seems unjustified and undeliverable. In addition, there is no robust reason why instead of allocating windfall sites to the last 10 years of the Plan, additional smaller sites could not be allocated in order to provide greater certainty of delivery and to improve the housing land supply, especially within the 5 years of the Plan being adopted, when the housing land position is at its weakest.

Change To Plan: Release additional, suitable Green Belt sites in order to assist with the delivery of homes over the Plan period, including to meet the need for specialist housing.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23672 - 8054 - Local Housing Need - None

23691 Object**Respondent: Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Miss Emma Gladwin) [6745]**

Summary: Housing requirement needs to be recalculated, factoring in:
 - PPG 's confirmation that 2014-based subnational household projections should be used;
 - unmet needs of neighbouring authorities;
 - increasing the plan period.

Change To Plan: Housing requirement number to be recalculated, relevant policies to be amended and additional sites allocated.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23691 - 7463 - Local Housing Need - None

23692 Object**Respondent: Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Miss Emma Gladwin) [6745]**

Summary: Brentwood's most recent five-year housing land supply is 4.1 years; however, this understates the need (not being calculated in accordance with the updated standard method) and overstates supply, therefore, the actual housing land supply is considerably less. In addition, the 2018 Housing Delivery Test result for Brentwood identifies that only 51% of the Borough's housing requirements were met over the last three years, being significantly below the 85% threshold. The acute housing land supply shortage underlines the importance of allocating sites that can deliver early in the plan period and avoiding over reliance on large strategic sites.

Change To Plan: Additional non-strategic sites are required.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23692 - 7463 - Local Housing Need - None

23699 Object

Respondent: BPM Investments Ltd [8338]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]

Summary: Brentwood's most recent five-year housing land supply, reported in the Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2018, is 4.1 years; however, this is predicated on outdated requirement, therefore, the actual housing land supply is considerably less. The HLSS includes sites without detailed planning permission and without evidence they will be delivered within five years, these cannot be considered deliverable for the purposes of the five-year housing land supply. The acute housing land supply shortage underlines the importance of allocating sites that can deliver early in the plan period and avoiding over reliance on large strategic sites.

Change To Plan: Additional non-strategic sites are required. Having regard to the Standard Method and the need to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement, the total five-year requirement for the Borough is 2,712 dwellings. The housing trajectory provided as Appendix 1 to the PSLP projects that it will enable completion of 2,305 dwellings between 2019/20 and 2023/24 (or, to be precise, it projects 2,305.1 dwellings). Therefore, even before critical review of the supply, the PSLP will not provide a five-year supply of housing.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23699 - 8338 - Local Housing Need - None

23788 Object

Respondent: RS2 Properties Ltd [8339]

Agent: Mr. Stuart Willsher [7331]

Summary: The Council's housing strategy only allocates 5% on sites no larger than one hectare. The NPPF confirms that smaller sites make an important contribution to meeting housing requirement, in part as they are able to be developed quickly and are able to therefore contribute towards housing supply whilst Strategic Sites are being brought forward in the background.

Change To Plan: the Local Authority reviews its housing supply, and particularly its approach to small sites, and allocate suitable smaller sites which can be brought forward early in the plan period.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23788 - 8339 - Local Housing Need - None

23914 Object

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Savills UK (Mr Ben Thomas) [2271]

Summary: Concerns about the significant reliance on the proposed development of Dunton Hills Garden Village to meet the Borough's housing need. The Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan states this site would provide 2,700 new homes, which equates to 35% of the borough's housing need. It is highly questionable whether such a large scale concept can be relied upon to address the borough's significant housing need.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23914 - 2509 - Local Housing Need - i, iv

23970 Object

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: The recent release of the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) in February 2019 confirmed that Brentwood and all the other ASELAs (with the exception of Thurrock) have to identify a 20% buffer to their five year housing land supply and prepare a HDT Action Plan by August 2019. At present, Brentwood is in danger of falling below the 45% threshold this November, 2019. This would leave the authority open to the presumption in favour of sustainable development (the 'tilted balance') and susceptible to speculative applications outside of the identified draft allocations.

Change To Plan: Brentwood will be subject to Housing Delivery Test (HDT) assessment on the basis of the minimum Local Housing Need figures until such time that their plans are adopted.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23970 - 8351 - Local Housing Need - i

24012 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: The Plan is unclear in terms of being able to demonstrate a 5-yr HLS of housing land. The most recent AMR (Nov 2018) demonstrates that BBC currently has a supply of 4.1 years - against requirement of 411.6dpa (2,058 units over 5-years) which encompasses a 20% buffer as required by the NPPF and Housing Delivery Test. BBC is not fully able to demonstrate a 5-yr HLS for Local Plan purposes. This position could be expedited by allowing allocated sites, such as "Officers Meadow" to come forward 1-2 years sooner, to help meet the required 5-yr HLS position.

Change To Plan: Allowing allocated sites, such as "Officers Meadow" to come forward 1-2 years sooner, to help meet the required 5-yr HLS position.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24012 - 2656 - Local Housing Need - i, ii, iv

24065 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The PPG now confirms that the 2014-based subnational household projection should be used to calculate housing requirements using the Standard Method, for Brentwood, the result is a requirement of 452 dwellings per annum. The NPPF requires for Local Plans to meet this need as a minimum, whilst also allowing sufficient flexibility to be able to respond to rapid change. A further factor is the need to consider unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. The proposed annual housing target of the Plan only fractionally exceeds the minimum housing requirement.

Change To Plan: The Plan's housing need should be amended to cover at 15 years from adoption. Realistically, we expect that an additional 2 years' worth of housing may be required to support a plan period up to 2035. Moreover, in respect of the fact that the authority is predominantly Green Belt, even if the plan period is extended until 2035, policies should account for potential development needs beyond this period. The allocation of sites for housing in Hutton, including that at Bayleys Mead, would provide for additional housing delivery.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24065 - 250 - Local Housing Need - None

24066 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The Plan failed to identify a five year housing land supply plus 20% buffer to make up for under delivery as required by the NPPF (Paragraph 73). The Borough's most recent reported five-year housing land supply is 4.1 years, this is predicated on a requirement; as such, the actual housing land supply is considerably less. In addition, the results of the 2018 Housing Delivery Test confirmed that Brentwood have delivered just 50% of the housing requirement over the last three years. The Plan should support 5YHS through the allocation of smaller scale sites that can be delivered over short timescales.

Change To Plan: The Plan should support 5YHS through the allocation of smaller scale sites that can be delivered over short timescales. Land at Bayleys Mead is a site that would cater to this need, with its deliverability discussed in greater detail later on in this representation.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24066 - 250 - Local Housing Need - None

24070 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The PPG now confirms that the 2014-based subnational household projection should be used to calculate housing requirements using the Standard Method, for Brentwood, the result is a requirement of 452 dwellings per annum. The NPPF requires for Local Plans to meet this need as a minimum, whilst also allowing sufficient flexibility to be able to respond to rapid change. A further factor is the need to consider unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. The proposed annual housing target of the Plan only fractionally exceeds the minimum housing requirement.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24070 - 250 - Local Housing Need - None

24083 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The PPG now confirms that the 2014-based subnational household projection should be used to calculate housing requirements using the Standard Method, for Brentwood, the result is a requirement of 452 dwellings per annum. The NPPF requires for Local Plans to meet this need as a minimum, whilst also allowing sufficient flexibility to be able to respond to rapid change. A further factor is the need to consider unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. The proposed annual housing target of the Plan only fractionally exceeds the minimum housing requirement.

Change To Plan: The Plan's housing need should be amended to cover at 15 years from adoption. Realistically, we expect that an additional 2 years' worth of housing may be required to support a plan period up to 2035. Moreover, in respect of the fact that the authority is predominantly Green Belt, even if the plan period is extended until 2035, policies should account for potential development needs beyond this period. The allocation of sites for housing in Hutton, including that at Bayleys Mead, would provide for additional housing delivery.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24083 - 250 - Local Housing Need - i, iv

24086 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: The Plan failed to identify a five year housing land supply plus 20% buffer to make up for under delivery as required by the NPPF. The Borough's most recent reported five-year housing land supply is 4.1 years, this is predicated on a requirement, and the HLSS includes sites without detailed planning permission and without evidence such sites will be delivered within five years; as such, the actual housing land supply is considerably less. In addition, the results of the 2018 Housing Delivery Test confirmed that Brentwood have delivered just 50% of the housing requirement over the last three years.

Change To Plan: In addition to amending the housing trajectory to reflect the realistic and earlier delivery of the site, as proposed by a developer with an option on the land, the inclusion of the site within the first five years on the plan period will assist BBC with their five-year housing land supply position.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24086 - 250 - Local Housing Need - i

24108 Object**Respondent: Marden Homes Ltd [8363]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: The PPG now confirms that the 2014-based subnational household projection should be used to calculate housing requirements using the Standard Method. On this basis, the housing requirement for Brentwood is 452 dwellings per annum. The Plan should also ensure to

- allow sufficient flexibility to respond to rapid change
- account for development needs beyond 2033 (or a revised later end so that the Plan period will cover at least 15 years);
- consider unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

The 456dpa target only fractionally exceeds the minimum housing requirement, and therefore does not provide any flexibility.

Change To Plan: The Plan's housing need should be amended to cover at 15 years from adoption. Realistically, we expect that an additional 2 years' worth of housing may be required to support a plan period up to 2035. Moreover, in respect of the fact that the authority is predominantly Green Belt, even if the plan period is extended until 2035, policies should account for potential development needs beyond this period. Allocating further sites for housing, like sites at Hanging Hill Lane, would provide for additional housing delivery.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24108 - 8363 - Local Housing Need - None

24109 Object**Respondent: Marden Homes Ltd [8363]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: The Plan failed to identify a five year housing land supply plus 20% buffer to make up for under delivery as required by the NPPF. The Borough's most recent reported five-year housing land supply is 4.1 years, this is predicated on a requirement, and the HLSS includes sites without detailed planning permission and without evidence such sites will be delivered within five years; as such, the actual housing land supply is considerably less. In addition, the results of the 2018 Housing Delivery Test confirmed that Brentwood have delivered just 50% of the housing requirement over the last three years.

Change To Plan: The suggested inability of the plan to ensure a consistent five-year supply is not consistent with national policy. Land at Hanging Hill Lane, could cater to this need.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24109 - 8363 - Local Housing Need - None

24157 Object**Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]****Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]**

Summary: In February 2019, the Government confirmed that the 2016 household projections should not be used. The Plan's annual housing requirement is still 380 homes per annum, based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) findings. It applies a 20% uplift, resulting in provision of 456 dwellings per annum, or 7,752 dwellings from 2016-2033, roughly in line with the Government's Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need. However, Brentwood was identified in the Government's Housing Delivery Test to have had delivered less than 85% of its housing requirement, therefore has to add a 20% buffer to its housing land supply figure.

Change To Plan: The Plan should be updated to make provision for the Borough's objectively assessed need, to take account of the figure in the Government's Standard Methodology for Calculating Housing Need, with an additional 20% buffer to reflect the Housing Delivery Test.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24157 - 8368 - Local Housing Need - iii, iv

24165 Object**Respondent: Turn2us [6753]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]**

Summary: The Government now confirms that the 2014-based subnational household projections should be used to calculate the housing requirement using the Standard Method, which result in a requirement of 452 dwellings per annum as a minimum. NPPF sets out that Local Plans should take into account:

- sufficient flexibility to be able to respond to rapid change
- ensure that the revised Green Belt can endure beyond the plan period
- unmet needs of neighbouring authorities.

Brentwood proposed annual housing target is only fractionally above the minimum housing requirement derived from the Standard Method, and does not consider any of the above.

Change To Plan: We suggest a plan period to 2035 should be treated as a minimum, and an additional two years' worth of development needs to that which the PSLP currently seeks to address should be planned for.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24165 - 6753 - Local Housing Need - None

24166 Object**Respondent: Turn2us [6753]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]**

Summary: The NPPF confirms a 20% buffer should be applied to the initial calculation in the event the results of the Housing Delivery Test show that delivery has fallen below 85% of the requirement. The 2018 Housing Delivery Test measurement for Brentwood Borough shows that only 51% of the Borough's housing requirements were met over the last three years. Using the 2014-based subnational household projections and the Standard Method, the Borough's housing requirement is 452 dwellings per annum. Applying the 20% buffer, this results in a five-year requirement of 2,712 dwellings.

Change To Plan: The acute housing land supply shortage underlines the importance of allocating sites through the Local Plan which can deliver early in the plan period, and the need to avoid over reliance on large strategic sites which inevitably take a considerable time to bring forward.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24166 - 6753 - Local Housing Need - None

24167 Object**Respondent: Turn2us [6753]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]**

Summary: Failed to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply ('HLSS'). The Borough's most recent reported 5YHLS (Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement, November 2018) is 4.1 years. This is predicated on a requirement which, when considered in relation to the latest guidance, understates need. It includes sites without detailed planning permission and without evidence such sites will be delivered within five years. The figure of 653 dwellings may overstate housing supply. Compared to a requirement of 2,712 it represents a 1.2-year housing land supply.

Change To Plan: The acute housing land supply shortage underlines the importance of allocating sites through the Local Plan which can deliver early in the plan period, and the need to avoid over reliance on large strategic sites which inevitably take a considerable time to bring forward.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24167 - 6753 - Local Housing Need - None

23188 Support**Respondent: Southend on Sea Council (Mr Adrian Smith) [8307]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support that you intend to accommodate your own projected need and are not seeking for neighbouring authorities to take any of your housing requirements. If this was not the case, Southend is unable to contribute to meeting other authorities need.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23188 - 8307 - Local Housing Need - i, ii, iii, iv

23901 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: The emerging Plan states it will allocate land to exceed the identified local housing need to provide flexibility in the supply and delivery of sites. We support the approach to significantly boost the supply of new housing because it demonstrates that the Plan is positively prepared. This should mean that at the site-specific level, allocations for development, including the Land at Nags Head Lane, should seek to deliver the maximum quantum of development possible, taking account of site constraints and masterplans where applicable.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23901 - 2509 - Local Housing Need - i, ii, iii, iv

23908 Support

Respondent: Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust [8344]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: The emerging Plan states it will allocate land to exceed the identified local housing need to provide flexibility in the supply and delivery of sites. We support the approach to significantly boost the supply of new housing because it demonstrates that the Plan is positively prepared. This should mean that at the site-specific level, allocations for development, including the Land at Nags Head Lane, should seek to deliver the maximum quantum of development possible, taking account of site constraints and masterplans where applicable.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23908 - 8344 - Local Housing Need - i, ii, iii, iv

23954 Support

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Local Housing Need (page 48 - 50)

Since the Regulation 19 Local Plan was published, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has confirmed its position on the standard method for calculating housing need (19 February 2019) which is of relevant to this Plan. In response, the Council will need to update explanatory text in Chapter 4 of the Local Plan to reflect the use of 2014 rather than 2016 household projections.

The Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that the standard method formula is used to identify the minimum number of new homes to be planned for and does not in itself establish a housing requirement figure. The Council's housing requirement figure is set out in the Plan at 456 dpa and this figure is in excess, albeit only slightly, of the standard method figure (452 dpa) using the 2014 projections and is sufficient. The requirements of national policy are met and the plan is sound.

The Council states that in including its 'annual housing supply buffer' on top of the 350 dpa (derived from use the standard method calculation using the 2016 projections) it serves to safeguard against any potential uplift to the standard method, this now having materialised. This was a sensible contingency. Considering this buffer has now effectively absorbed within the updated standard method figure the Council is requested to confirm if its purpose has now been served and it intends to submit the plan to examination with the housing requirement as currently stated.

CEG supports the Council's reliance on a stepped trajectory which, in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 34, Ref. ID: 3-034-20180913), is appropriate in circumstances where: there is to be a significant change in the level of housing requirement between the adopted and emerging Local Plans, as is the case here; and, recognising that many sites will not be available for development until the adoption of the plan, reflecting the high proportion of designated Green Belt in the Borough

CEG is committed to bringing forward the provision of new homes on Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) as early as possible in the Plan period and is working closely with the Council and Homes England to achieve this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23954 - 5050 - Local Housing Need - None

24010 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: We support the housing strategy for the Local Plan and welcome that BBC is seeking to meet its housing needs in full. This is particularly important having regard to the likely inability of adjacent authorities (referred to on page 5) to meet their own needs. We therefore consider the housing strategy in the Plan to be "sound" in accordance with the NPPF (Para 35).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24010 - 2656 - Local Housing Need - i, ii, iii, iv

23830 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Summary:

Paragraph 4.13 states the Borough's housing requirement plans for is 350 dpa. Paragraph 4.12 states that this figure has been calculated using the Standard Method, however doesn't appear to use the 2014-based subnational household projections as required by guidance; therefore when applied these figures result in a requirement of 452 dwellings per annum.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

O - 23830 - 6713 - 4.12 - ii, iii, iv

23756 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]**

Summary: Paragraph 4.13 states that the Borough's housing requirement is 350 dwellings per annum which was calculated using the 2016-based data and applying the standard methodology. PPG now confirms that the 2014-based subnational household projection should be used to calculate housing requirements - when applied results in a requirement of 452 dpa. PSLP only fractionally exceeds the minimum housing requirement derived from the Standard Method, and therefore does not provide any flexibility or Green Belt protection.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23756 - 6751 - 4.13 - i, ii, iii, iv

24385 Object**Respondent: Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance [2627]****Agent: Strutt & Parker (Mr Rory Baker) [8242]**

Summary: The proposed period runs until 2033. Assuming - optimistically - adoption in 2019 this means that the Local Plan will address development needs for a maximum of 14 years. The NPPF (paragraph 22) is clear that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum of 15 years. This deficiency in the PSLP is of particular relevance given that the Borough is predominantly Green Belt, and failure to ensure that development needs are planned for over a sufficient period of time would likely result in an early review of the Green Belt being required - contrary to the NPPF (paragraph 136); and undermining one of the two essential characteristics of the Green Belt: its permanence (NPPF, paragraph 133). Commentary on the Total Housing Requirement: At paragraph 4.13 of the PSLP, it states that the Borough's housing requirement it plans for is 350 dwellings per annum. At paragraph 4.12, it states that this figure has been calculated using the Standard Method (as per the NPPF and accompanying Planning Practice Guidance [PPG]). However, this does not appear to be the case having regard to updated guidance. The PPG now confirms that 2014-based subnational household projections should be used to calculate the housing requirement using the Standard Method. The relevant subnational population projections indicate an average annual increase of 293.2 households in the Borough between 2019 and 2029. The latest (2017) ratio of median house price to median gross annual workplace-based earnings for the Borough published by the ONS is 11.23. Once the Standard Method is applied using these figures this result in a requirement of 452 dwellings per annum. The Local Plan is required to meet this need as a minimum (NPPF paragraph 35); and with sufficient flexibility to be able to respond to rapid change (NPPF paragraph 11). In addition, the Local Plan is required to ensure that the revised Green Belt can endure beyond the plan period (NPPF paragraph 136), i.e. in amending the Green Belt boundary, the Local Plan should account for development needs beyond 2033 (or, more appropriately, a revised later end to the plan period, which will ensure strategic policies will cover at least 15 years). A further factor is the need to consider unmet needs of neighbouring authorities (NPPF paragraph 35). In this respect, we note in particular that Epping Forest District Council is at an advanced stage in the preparation of a Local Plan (at the time of writing it is currently being examined) which proposes to deliver 11,400 dwellings between 2011 and 2033 (518 dwellings per annum), against a requirement (based on the Standard Method) of 944 dwellings per annum. We are not aware of Brentwood Borough Council having objected to this approach, but neither is there any indication that the PSLP addresses any of this unmet need. The PSLP considers it appropriate to apply a 20% uplift to the identified housing target of 350 dwellings per annum, resulting in a proposed target of 456 dwellings per annum. The PSLP's rationale for this buffer is somewhat unclear: it states at Figure 4.1 that the buffer allows for an additional housing land supply to be maintained in the Borough throughout the plan period; but states at footnote 2 that the housing supply buffer serves to safeguard against any potential uplift to the standard methodology for calculating housing need, pending the outcome of the Government's 'Technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance'. In any case, the uplift means that the proposed annual housing target in the PSLP is only fractionally above the minimum housing requirement derived from the Standard Method, and does not provide any flexibility to ensure needs are met; does not ensure the Green Belt will endure beyond the plan period; and does not account for unmet need in neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: In respect of the plan period, and the PSLP's failure to ensure strategic policies are in place to cover at least 15 years from adoption, as an absolute minimum the PSLP must be amended to ensure an additional year's worth of housing need can be accommodated. Given likely timescales for adoption of the Local Plan, we suggest a plan period to 2035 should be treated as a minimum, and an additional two years' worth of development needs to that which the PSLP currently seeks to address should be planned for. Whilst we suggest 2035 should be treated as the earliest end to the plan period, it should also be recognised that the authority is predominantly Green Belt. The NPPF requires this Local Plan to ensure the Green Belt will endure beyond the plan period. As such, we suggest the PSLP that even if the plan period is extended until 2035, policies should account for potential development needs beyond this period

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24385 - 2627 - 4.13 - ii, iv

23103 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The housing target for Brentwood as approved in November 2018 is likely to be subject to a recalculation following Government's indication that it will make clear in national Planning Practice Guidance that the 2014-based CLG Household Projections should be used instead of the 2016-based ONS Household Projections; which identified an OAN for Brentwood is 452 homes per annum. This could cause the plan to be less effective and justified.

Change To Plan: 1) The Local Plan must be adjusted to incorporate previously discounted development sites, particularly in the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor to restore the flexibility in site supply across a broader range of spatial locations, thereby improving the Plan's effectiveness and deliverability. 2) The methodology to the Local Plan's Housing Trajectory needs to be published and open for comment and challenge of its assumptions.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23103 - 369 - 4.15 - i

23104 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The housing target for Brentwood as approved in November 2018 is likely to be subject to a recalculation following Government's indication that it will make clear in national Planning Practice Guidance that the 2014-based CLG Household Projections should be used instead of the 2016-based ONS Household Projections; which identified an OAN for Brentwood is 452 homes per annum. This could cause the plan to be less effective and justified.

Change To Plan: 1) The Local Plan must be adjusted to incorporate previously discounted development sites, particularly in the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor to restore the flexibility in site supply across a broader range of spatial locations, thereby improving the Plan's effectiveness and deliverability. 2) The methodology to the Local Plan's Housing Trajectory needs to be published and open for comment and challenge of its assumptions.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23104 - 369 - 4.16 - i

23831 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Summary: The PSLP's rationale for a 20% buffer is unclear. states at Figure 4.1 that the buffer allows for an additional housing land supply to be maintained in the Borough throughout the plan period; but states at footnote 2 that the housing supply buffer serves to safeguard against any potential uplift to the standard methodology for calculating housing need, pending the outcome of the Government's 'Technical consultation on updates to national planning policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23831 - 6713 - Figure 4.1: Annual housing requirement and supply buffer - ii, iii, iv

26099 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan makes no provisions for the development of local amenities and infrastructure - local school and doctor's surgery are already at capacity. The internet connection is appalling, the sewage system is at tipping point, there are frequent power-cuts in the area already, Public Transport is almost non-existent in the village and parking anywhere is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26099 - 8677 - 4.20 - i, iii, iv

26323 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No Housing Need Survey produced for the Blackmore area, therefore no justification as to why Blackmore has been selected for development.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26323 - 8720 - 4.20 - i, ii, iii, iv

22475 Object **Respondent: Hallam Land Management Limited [8258]** **Agent: Marrons Planning (Dan Robinson-Wells) [7959]**

Summary: The annual housing need in the BBDP should be adjusted to 452 dpa, using the standard method.

An allowance may be necessary for unmet housing needs arising from neighbouring areas.

Provide a housing supply buffer of 20% to allow for flexibility in meeting the requirement.

Provision should therefore be 9,214 dwellings (542 dpa) in the plan period 2016 to 2033.

A five-year supply on adoption cannot be demonstrated.

The stepped trajectory should be consistent with the start of expected completions from strategic allocations.

The plan period should be extended to a minimum of 15 years from adoption.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan must be amended to reflect the most up-to-date approach to assessing the local housing need, and take into account unmet housing needs from neighbouring areas when establishing its housing requirement.

The total housing supply must demonstrate that it provides a sufficient supply and mix to meet the requirement, including for the first five years of the Plan period.

The stepped trajectory must be consistent with the evidence as to when strategic Green Belt allocations will start delivering.

The Local Plan should plan for a minimum of 15 years from adoption.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22475 - 8258 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

22493 Object

Respondent: Hallam Land Management Limited [8258]

Agent: Marrons Planning (Dan Robinson-Wells) [7959]

Summary: There is not clear or sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the housing trajectory, in particular for the sites R01, R02, R03, R04, R05, & R07, in Appendix 1 is justified as required by the Framework to demonstrate a site is deliverable. This undermines the evidence within Figure 4.2 Demonstrating Housing Provision which therefore results in Policy SP02 being ineffective and not justified.

Change To Plan: Hallam Land Management have identified in these representations (and representations made in relation to Duty to Co-operate and Housing Need and Requirement), that the housing supply identified in the Plan will not meet the housing required to be provided for within the Plan. This is both in terms of the Plan period as a whole, and in terms of the first five years of the Plan period.

Additional Site Allocations are therefore necessary to make the Local Plan sound. Further, given the absence of non-Green Belt alternatives, the requirement to meet housing needs would be the exceptional circumstances for the further release of land and alterations to the Green Belt boundary as set out within the Local Plan.

Hallam Land Management are of the strong view that there is a suitable site adjoining the Brentwood Urban Area that would not undermine the purposes and importance of the Green Belt if it were to be released.

The site is referred to as Calcott Hall Farm, Brentwood, which is under the control of Hallam Land Management and could start delivery within five years of adoption of the Plan. The HEELA, October 2018 recognises the site as suitable, available and achievable (Site Ref 302c). Furthermore, the Sustainability Appraisal has already deemed the Site as a reasonable alternative (Table 5.2, SA of Brentwood Local Plan, January 2019).

Notwithstanding the Council's position that the site is suitable, available, and achievable, Hallam Land Management have submitted with these representations a suite of technical documents that demonstrate the site is both suitable and that its development would align with the Vision, Spatial Strategy and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. The key points to note are below:

Location

- * As illustrated on the attached plan, the site is immediately adjacent to the Brentwood Urban Area (Settlement Category 1) as defined in the Settlement Hierarchy (Figure 2.3);
- * The site lies to the immediate south of Pilgrims Hatch, and to the west of Brentwood and the A12;
- * The site does not perform a role in maintaining separation between the already connected settlements of Brentwood and Pilgrims Hatch as evident from the plan and when viewed on the ground;
- * The site falls within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor; and,
- * Its allocation would therefore be consistent with the Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Strategy for the Borough.

Green Belt

- * The site is already bounded on two sides by the Urban Area (to the north and east);
- * The site has clear, physical defensible boundaries to the Green Belt to the south and west, namely Weald Road and Weald Country Park (a Local Authority owned parkland which is also a Registered Park and Conservation Area);
- * These physical features are readily recognisable, and are permanent in accordance with paragraph 139 of the Framework, and an amended boundary for the Green Belt is appended to these representations;
- * Any development would therefore be contained and the site has limited intervisibility with the wider Green Belt due to the presence of the urban area, and woodland and tree cover within the site;
- * Paragraph 138 of the Framework requires first consideration to be given to releasing Green Belt land which has been previously developed or is well served by public transport. The site is well served by public transport as explained below under Accessibility and should therefore be a first consideration;
- * Paragraph 138 also requires removing land from the Green Belt to be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land. The environmental quality and accessibility of Weald Country Park can be improved through the release of this land as explained below under Transport and Connectivity; and,
- * The site's release from the Green Belt would therefore be consistent with National Green Belt Policy and would not undermine the integrity of the Green Belt within the Borough.

Accessibility

- * The site is within 2km or 10 minute cycle distance/20 minute walking distance of local services within Brentwood Town Centre, and closer still to day-to-day facilities within Pilgrims Hatch;
- * Brentwood Train Station is a 12 minute cycle distance/25 minute walking distance, with Shenfield Train Station around 15 minute cycle distance/30 minute walking

distance;

- * Safe, direct and convenient routes to the town centre and train stations from the site are achievable; and,

- * Existing bus routes already pass the northern entrance to the site, and a public transport strategy has been agreed with the Bus Operator to improve connections from the site with the train station and town centre.

Transport and Connectivity

- * The site has the ability to deliver a Community Link Road (CLR) connecting Ongar Road to the north, with Weald Road to the south. The Transport Feasibility Study prepared states that the CLR would provide an alternative route for traffic from Pilgrims Hatch heading south to the A12/M25 that avoids Brentwood Town Centre and the Air Quality Management Area;

- * The CLR would also improve the environmental quality of the Weald Country Park through enabling the downgrading of Sandpit Lane that runs along the site's western boundary by preventing through traffic; and,

- * The site also has the ability to provide safe, direct and convenient pedestrian and cycle routes from the Brentwood Urban Area to the Weald Country Park that do not currently exist, and thereby improving its accessibility to the local population.

Environment

- * There are no environmental features of interest that would prevent development of the site as evidenced within the suite of technical documents appended to these representations covering arboriculture, drainage, ecology, heritage, noise and air quality;

- * There is the ability to deliver environmental benefits on the site, including ecological benefits arising from the management of the High Wood Local Wildlife Site and provision of green infrastructure that would enhance habitat connectivity with the Weald Country Park;

- * Benefits to the setting of nearby designated heritage assets through the downgrading and reduction in vehicular traffic along Sandpit Lane;

- * The site has limited inter-visibility with the wider landscape, and its visual envelope is primarily limited to points along the boundaries of the site; and,

- * The retention of landscape features within the site, and locating development within the lease sensitive areas will ensure the landscape and visual impact is limited.

More specifically, with reference to the suite of technical documents, the site can be developed in accordance with relevant national and local planning policies as summarised below:

- * A Desk Based Heritage Assessment has been prepared which demonstrates how harm to the setting of nearby designated assets, including Weald Country Park and South Weald Camp Iron Age Hillfort, can be avoided through the incorporation of suitable buffers from built development which are incorporated into the Capacity Plan;

- * A Landscape and Visual Statement has been prepared which demonstrates how development of the site would not result in any sense of greater coalescence between Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood than exists today, and how the site has limited intervisibility with the countryside to the south and west such that its visual impacts would be limited. Key landscape features have also been incorporated into the Capacity Plan;

- * A Preliminary Acoustics Review has been prepared which demonstrates that potential sound sources, including from traffic on the A12, can be mitigated to acceptable levels through consideration being given to layout and the relationship of dwellings to the noise source, and incorporation of an acoustic bund which has been incorporated into the Capacity Plan;

- * A Preliminary Air Quality Review has been prepared which demonstrates the effects of sources of air pollution near to the site, including the A12, on development can be mitigated through incorporating sufficient buffers within the layout which have been incorporated into the Capacity Plan;

- * A Preliminary Arboricultural Assessment has been prepared which demonstrates how the woodland and trees of high quality within the site can be retained through the indicative layout incorporated into the Capacity Plan;

- * A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been prepared which demonstrates how valuable ecological habitats on site will be protected and enhanced through the indicative layout incorporated into the Capacity Plan; and

- * A Surface Water and Foul Water Feasibility Study has been prepared which demonstrates that surface and foul water can be appropriately managed in conjunction with onsite measures including attenuation ponds within the layout which have been incorporated into the Capacity Plan.

Infrastructure

- * The site has the ability to accommodate a primary school should this be necessary to serve the development; and

- * There are no constraints to development in terms of utilities infrastructure as illustrated on the appended Utilities Constraints Plan.

Delivery

- * Hallam Land Management control the site, and as outlined above there are no impediments to early delivery;
- * They have a strong track record of securing deliverable outline planning permissions that are attractive to the market. It is therefore considered that delivery could start within five years from plan adoption;
- * In addition, as there are two points of vehicular access (at either end of the site) with a central spine road (CLR) that in part could accommodate sales outlets on either side, two to three sales outlets are achievable. On this basis the following trajectory is assumed:

Year: Dpa: - 22/23: 25 23/24: 75 24/25: 100 25/26: 100 26/27: 100 27/28: 100 28/29: 100 29/30: 100 30/31: 100 - Total: 800

Review of the Draft Local Plan Evidence Base

Hallam Land Management have undertaken a review of the evidence base relevant to the above site.

As noted above, the HEELA, October 2018 recognises the site as suitable, available and achievable (Site Ref 302c). Furthermore, the Sustainability Appraisal deemed the Site as a reasonable alternative (Table 5.2, SA of Brentwood Local Plan, January 2019).

The site has also been assessed within the various Green Belt Studies that have been undertaken for the Council.

The Green Belt Studies Part 2 (January 2018) and Part 3 (November 2018) both assessed the site as making a moderate-high contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt.

However, this assessment changed when a new Green Belt Study Part 3 (January 2019) was published in February 2019 which assessed the site as making a high contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The reason for the changes to the evidence base after publication of the Draft Local Plan are unclear and should be explained.

Furthermore, there are a number of inaccuracies in the January 2019 assessment of the site as follows:

- * The study considers the site as having clear separation from the urban area based on the A12 and A128, and limited association with the urban area.

In response, Pilgrims Hatch extends to both sides of the A128 and therefore the A128 does not separate the site from the urban area. The site, and features such as High Wood, sports pitches, and Calcott Hall Farm, have close association with Pilgrims Hatch which forms part of the Brentwood Urban Area in accordance with the Council's Settlement Hierarchy.

- * The study assesses the site as 'not contained'.

In response, it is evident from the plan and on the ground that the site is contained on two sides by built development. The site abuts the built-up area, would be an urban extension, and should be regarded as 'partly contained'.

- * The study considers the site would lead to a physical narrowing of the gap and 'potential' visual coalescence between Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood. The study also refers to 'perceptual' coalescence.

In response, the A12 is the only gap between Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood and this would not change. The boundary of the site is pulled back from the Ongar Road adjacent to the A12 to reflect the existing sports pitches such that there would be no change to visual coalescence as perceived on the ground than that which already exists as a result of development on the opposite side of Ongar Road.

- * The study assesses the site as having 'significant separation reduction'.

In response, there is no reduction in the separation between Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood, and they both form part of the Brentwood Urban Area.

- * The study assesses the site as having a moderate relationship with a historic town.

In response, the site does adjoin Weald Country Park which is a Registered Park and Garden. However, Weald Country Park is not a historic town and therefore the assessment has unfairly considered the site.

These inaccuracies have led to the conclusion that the site has a high contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The weight to be given to this evidence in informing the Draft Local Plan is therefore diminished.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22493 - 8258 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23105 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The housing target for Brentwood as approved in November 2018 is likely to be subject to a recalculation following Government's indication that it will make clear in national Planning Practice Guidance that the 2014-based CLG Household Projections should be used instead of the 2016-based ONS Household Projections; which identified an OAN for Brentwood is 452 homes per annum. This could cause the plan to be less effective and justified.

Change To Plan: 1) The Local Plan must be adjusted to incorporate previously discounted development sites, particularly in the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor to restore the flexibility in site supply across a broader range of spatial locations, thereby improving the Plan's effectiveness and deliverability. 2) The methodology to the Local Plan's Housing Trajectory needs to be published and open for comment and challenge of its assumptions.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23105 - 369 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i

23141 Object

Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to provide a development strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of Brentwood Borough. It lacks any provision for meeting the village's needs, which have not been objectively assessed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23141 - 6923 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23159 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Thurrock Council seeks further clarification as to whether level of growth proposed for Brentwood could be accommodated in the plan in light of the concerns with regard to the assessment of housing need being required to be altered to meet Government policy at 452 dpa and due to the current concerns regarding the proposed strategic location at Dunton Hills Garden Village to accommodate this growth. Thurrock Council would wish to further engage with Brentwood Council to discuss other alternative options in the borough including at West Horndon.
It is considered that a number of the policies including SP02 should be amended to make reference to the circumstances and triggers in which the Brentwood Local Plan would need to be reviewed including failure to deliver the housing within the plan and /or a different spatial strategy or growth levels as a result of the policy approach following adoption of a South Essex Joint Strategic Plan.

Change To Plan: It is considered that the Brentwood Local Plan will need to be re-assessed in light of the implications of the Government requirement to use the standard methodology with CLG 2014-based household projections.
The plan will need to be revised make provision for a higher housing target and provision for additional housing sites to provide a contingency buffer.
It is considered that a number of the policies including SP02 should be amended to make reference to the circumstances and triggers in which the Brentwood Local Plan would need to be reviewed including failure to deliver the housing within the plan and /or a different spatial strategy or growth levels as a result of the policy approach following adoption of a South Essex Joint Strategic Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23159 - 2461 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, iii

23162 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unclear from the published methodology, as to why, having scored highly in relation to Purpose 1 and 3, DHGV is assessed as making a "moderate to high" contribution to Green Belt purposes, when there are other parcels which make high contributions towards two of the purposes have been assessed as making a "high" contribution towards Green Belt purposes. Basildon Council does not believe that the Plan has reached a justified position in respects of whether the Green Belt evidence has informed the policies. Unclear how the risk of coalescence can be adequately mitigated.

Change To Plan: The Plan should demonstrate in more detail, through a tool such as a Topic Paper, how its site selection choices have been informed by the Green Belt Study 2018 and should any inconsistencies occurs the Plan's land use allocations and justification should be changed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23162 - 369 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, iii, iv

23340 Object**Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Full Reference: O - 23340 - 8313 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23436 Object**Respondent: Mr Benjamin Rumary [8324]**

Summary: Object

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Full Reference: O - 23436 - 8324 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23473 Object**Respondent: Mr Marc Cohen [4268]**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Full Reference: O - 23473 - 4268 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23543 Object**Respondent: Mr David Barfoot [7177]**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Full Reference: O - 23543 - 7177 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23560 Object**Respondent: Ms Eleanora Barfoot [8328]**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Full Reference: O - 23560 - 8328 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23569 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hayley Hammond [8329]**

Summary: Object (no reason given)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Full Reference: O - 23569 - 8329 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23573 Object**Respondent: Sadie Barfoot [8330]**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Full Reference: O - 23573 - 8330 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

Agent: N/A

Tests: None

Examination: No

Agent: N/A

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Agent: N/A

Tests: None

Examination: No

Agent: N/A

Tests: None

Examination: No

Agent: N/A

Tests: None

Examination: No

Agent: N/A

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Agent: N/A

Tests: None

Examination: No

23631 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Evans [8332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object (no reason supplied)

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23631 - 8332 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23635 Object**Respondent: Tesco [5252]****Agent: GL Hearn (Mr Roland Brass) [4809]**

Summary: The Plan is not compliant with NPPF, objectively assessed development needs are not met, plan period is incorrect, no five year housing land supply is demonstrated, the growth strategy is questionable, over ambitious completion rates and over reliance on strategic site. It should: * Use 2014-based household projections as basis (454 dwellings per annum); * Set a housing requirement in Policy SP02 of 9,265 dwellings (which takes account of a 20% buffer); * Re-balance the stepped trajectory approach to bring forward more housing in the first five years. This will also help address the five year housing land supply issue.

Change To Plan: * Use 2014-based household projections as basis for the Local Plan. This means local housing needs baseline is 454 dwellings per annum.

* Set a housing requirement in Policy SP02 of 9,265 dwellings (which takes account of a 20% buffer).

* Re-balance the stepped trajectory approach to bring forward more housing in the first five years. This will also help address the five year housing land supply issue.

* Undertake additional work in respect of Duty to Co-operate, Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment. This is required to comply with the NPPF (2019) and legal tests.

* Undertake updated Green Belt assessment.

* Identify the Hopefield Site as a Housing Allocation in the new Local Plan as part of the revised and sound development strategy. This is required to address the above matters especially in relation to delivering the growth strategy and meeting five year housing land supply.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23635 - 5252 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23654 Object**Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]****Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]**

Summary: Overall Conclusion

Critical to the success of the South Essex area will be the timely production of the JSP which will define the major growth areas to meet the housing and employment needs across the area and will inform the preparation of the individual Local Plans.

Gladman have some fundamental concerns with the BLP, particularly with the identification of the level of housing need in the Plan and the implementation of a stepped approach to housing delivery, which would render the BLP unsound if they are not addressed. Gladman therefore request the right to participate in any forthcoming Local Plan Examination to discuss these concerns orally.

Change To Plan: Give JSP weight in plan to ensure local plans deliver JSP outcomes.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23654 - 2774 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - ii, iv

23663 Object**Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: Housing requirement needs to be recalculated, factoring in:

-PPG 's confirmation that 2014-based subnational household projections should be used;

- unmet needs of neighbouring authorities (potentially from Epping);

-potential development needs beyond Plan period by an additional two years' worth of development needs, that is to 2035, to ensure the Green Belt will endure beyond the plan period and allow sufficient flexibility.

Change To Plan: Housing requirement number to be recalculated.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23663 - 8054 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23676 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: The 2014 household projections should be used to identify minimum number of homes required, the housing requirement included within the Local Plan is not representative of the full housing needs of the area and that factors such as the high housing affordability ratio (11.23 in 2017), continuing economic growth and proximity to London should lead the Council to uplift the housing requirement figure above the minimum identified through the Standard Method. Brentwood still needs to include a 20% buffer above this figure, in order to provide the flexibility needed to ensure the housing requirement is met or surpassed.

Change To Plan: Amend using 2014 household projections

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23676 - 2774 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23677 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: Policy SP02 also sets out a stepped approach to housing delivery within Brentwood which would equate to 310 dwellings per annum 2016-2023 and 584 dwellings per annum from 2023 onwards. Given that Brentwood has struggled to deliver homes over recent years and has in fact, failed to meet the requirements of the recently published Housing Delivery Test, resulting in the need for a 20% buffer to be applied, coupled with the fact that housing affordability in the borough is severe, must lead the Council to the conclusion that it has to address the backlog of housing needs as quickly as possible. A stepped approach will slow delivery down. With a sufficient range and type of sites including small Green Belt release, delivery would improve.

Change To Plan: Remove stepped approach and release more small scale Green Belt locations.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23677 - 2774 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23700 Object

Respondent: BPM Investments Ltd [8338]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]

Summary: Housing requirement needs to be recalculated, factoring in:
-PPG 's confirmation that 2014-based subnational household projections should be used;
- unmet needs of neighbouring authorities (potentially from Epping);
-potential development needs beyond Plan period by an additional two years' worth of development needs, that is to 2035, to ensure the Green Belt will endure beyond the plan period and allow sufficient flexibility.

Change To Plan: Housing requirement number to be recalculated.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23700 - 8338 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23786 Object

Respondent: RS2 Properties Ltd [8339]

Agent: Mr. Stuart Willsher [7331]

Summary: The Council's Housing Requirement is not considered to have been calculated correctly. The 2014 based household projections should be used as the baseline for the 'standard method' instead of the 2016 population projections. An indicative assessment of housing need using the 2014 population projections (454 dwellings per annum) and 20% uplift would result in a housing requirement of 545 homes per year, or a total of 9,262 homes during the plan period 2016-2033.

Change To Plan: Housing Requirement should be recalculated. This will result in the requirement to identify additional site allocations.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23786 - 8339 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23894 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: The housing requirement set out in SP02 is based on an out-of-date method for calculating the LHN. The most recent advice is that the 2014 HHP should be used. The 2014 HHP with the 2017 affordability ratios applied reveal that the base need is 452, not 350. Although this is broadly similar to the 456 per annum figure in the policy, it does not allow for the buffer that the Council has considered necessary.

This raises potential consistency issues with national policy that may influence the ability of the plan to deliver the housing required to fulfil the identified need.

Change To Plan: For the reasons explained above, the justification for the housing requirement figure will need to be reviewed and updated accordingly. The Council will need to ensure that it can robustly defend the figure that it has put forward. The current wording of the supporting text and the evidence base referred to does not currently provide a robust defense.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23894 - 6669 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23955 Object**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Policy SP02, Managing Growth (page 50) & Figure 4.2 (page 51)

A modification to Policy SP02(A) and Figure 4.2 is proposed in our response to question no. 6 to acknowledge that housing provision should represent a 'minimum' for consistency with national policy and guidance, and Local Plan Policy R01.

Change To Plan: Policy SP02, Managing Growth (page 50) & Figure 4.2 (page 51)

A modification to Policy SP02(A) and Figure 4.2 is proposed to reflect that housing provision reflects a 'minimum'. This also ensures consistency with national policy and guidance, and Local Plan Policy R01.

To ensure that the plan is positively prepared and consistent with the NPPF criterion A should be updated to reflect that "provision should be made for a minimum of 7,752 new residential dwellings...".

CEG supports the inclusion of Figure 4.2 to explain how housing provision will occur. The column entitled 'Net homes' should either be retitled 'Minimum net homes' and/or a footnote should be included relating to DHGV to the effect that 2,700 is the minimum to be provided, consistent with the wording of Local Plan Policy R01.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23955 - 5050 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23969 Object**Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]****Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]**

Summary: We would advocate delaying submission of the plan until the 2018 affordability ratio data is released by the Office for National Statistics (the data used in the standard methodology for calculating housing need), due for publication in March/April 2019. This would allow time for factual updates to be made to Policy SP02 and housing target. Should submission come before the publication of the affordability ratio data, Brentwood should consider over allocating sites to increase the buffer of sites over for the plan period - sufficient to provide flexibility in respect of any increases brought about by the new affordability data.

Change To Plan: Delaying submission of the plan until the 2018 affordability ratio data is released or consider over allocating sites to increase the buffer of sites over for the plan period.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23969 - 8351 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i

24017 Object**Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]****Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]**

Summary: The stepped trajectory approach of Policy SP02 which seeks to deliver a greater proportion of the required homes beyond 2023, is not sound and could be reviewed to allow more housing to come forward from the period 2021 onwards. We consider that in order to address this, the Council should review its housing trajectory and at the same time, clarify the new dwelling number ahead of the Local Plan submission, to align with the February 2019 agreed position on the 'baseline' for the standard method calculation.

Change To Plan: The Council should, in addition, work with developers to bring applications forward in advance of the adoption of the Local Plan, to meet housing need.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24017 - 2656 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24057 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]****Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]**

Summary: Whilst calculation of the councils housing need figure has allowed for a 20% uplift, the figure was calculated in Oct 2018 and therefore must be updated using the Governments requirement to use the 2014 population projections. The Inspector should request this. More sites will therefore need to be identified, particularly small sites such as the Land rear of Mill House Farm, CM15 0NX, which is available.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24057 - 8359 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, iv

24074 Object

Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]

Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]

Summary: Identification of 454 housing need is an underestimation, an update using the Feb 2019 planning policy guidance is needed, this would use the standard methodology and 2014 projections. The SHMA should be updated accordingly. This would take the plan period requirements to a least 9214 (with Brentwood policy method). Plan Period should be extended to reflect adoption date.

Change To Plan: LLLP consider that the Plan requires modification to Policy SP02 to:
* increase the overall housing requirement in order to meet the current Local Housing Need with a suitable, additional 20% supply buffer;
* extend and increase the housing requirement set out to ensure that there is a minimum 15 year lifespan for the Plan at the point of adoption;
* remove or significantly modify through the allocation of additional sustainably located sites the proposed stepped housing delivery trajectory from the policy so that there is a significant increase in delivery in the early part of the Plan period; and
* redress the imbalance in housing distribution that over-emphasises the DHGV site and fails to align with the Plan's stated sequential land use test.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24074 - 8362 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - ii, iii

24126 Object

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: It is noted that the current PSD makes provision for 7,752 new residential dwellings (net) to be built in the Borough over the plan period 2016-2033 at an annual rate of 310 dwellings per year to 2022/23, followed by 584 dwellings per year from 2023/24-2033. This approach adopts a stepped trajectory; resulting in the backloading of housing delivery beyond 2023 which we understand is in part due to a high proportion of Draft designated GB edge of settlement sites not being available for development until later in the plan period. Whilst our Client supports BBC's ascertain to direct housing growth to allocated sites in highly accessible locations along the transit/growth corridor, our Client considers that the starting point for examination of the Plan should be that a straight, rather than stepped trajectory should be used - to avert a significant, historic under-delivery of housing to persist (acknowledging that BBC are continuing to under-supply against its housing requirement until at least 2022/3).

Change To Plan: Whilst we do not consider that the principle of a stepped trajectory is justified, if this is accepted, we consider that a higher annual rate of housing delivery over the five-year period to 2023 should be tested. Icen note that the current requirement for 310 dpa would fall below even the projected level of household growth. Indeed, the SHMA (2018) sets out that BBC has an uncapped need of 365 homes per year, reduced to 350 once a 40% cap is applied. The SHMA has pragmatically advised that BBC still needs to plan for at least 380 dpa as a minimum. Accordingly, we believe that BBC should take a rational position on this and plan for a higher annual housing target leading up to 2023 to ensure that a robust strategy is adopted (in line with the test of soundness). Notwithstanding, Ford encourages BBC to review the OAN figure as the Local Plan progresses towards examination to ensure that the housing target is adequately reflected.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24126 - 3769 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24151 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: Policy SP02 therefore sets out a stepped trajectory of delivery of 310 homes per annum to 2023, followed by a higher target of 584 per year to 2033. We do not believe that Policy SP02 is sound because it does not provide an appropriate strategy to comply with the requirements of the NPPF paragraph 23. The strategy does not result in the delivery of housing throughout the Plan period. Paragraph 73 of the NPPF requires strategic policies to include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the Plan period.

Change To Plan: The Plan should be amended to allocate a number of additional smaller and medium sized sites, as required by paragraph 68 of the NPPF, which will ensure provision of a five year housing supply, to enable continued delivery of homes throughout the Plan period.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24151 - 8368 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, iii, iv

24152 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary: Reliance and build rate of Dunton Hills Garden suburb is not realistic. This will squeeze delivery at Dunton Hills into an eight-year period with a resulting annual build rate requirement of nearly 340. The planning permission is likely to be slower than described, there are no documents of support from Basildon Council. The Emerging Basildon Local Plan shows no proposals relating to the Dunton Hills project on its side of the border. Instead it shows the whole area as Metropolitan Green Belt land. All the above indicates that there has been a lack of cross-border cooperation on the Dunton Hills proposed land allocation since 2016. The quantity and timing of new housing delivery from this site, set out in the Pre-Submission Document, are not soundly based. We believe the whole project is now mired in a controversy that involves two of the Borough's local authority neighbours. This must cast doubt on whether the Duty to Cooperate has been fully followed. Therefore at present the whole project is surely in jeopardy.

Change To Plan: The Pre-Submission Document relies very heavily on the Dunton Hills Strategic Allocation. If it were not accepted, or only partially accepted, a review of all the Plan's allocations would be needed and alternatives, like our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch, be reconsidered to make up the deficit.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24152 - 2788 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

24184 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary: The text at para 8.84 points to Policy SP02 Managing Growth as the policy that introduces the boundary changes. Policy SP02 sets out the number of dwellings for which land will be provided in the plan period and states that new development within the Borough will be directed towards (a) the site allocations in Chapter 9 and (b) highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. The policy makes no reference to Green Belt boundary changes. The text leading up to Policy SP02 explains how the Green Belt prevents the Council from identifying a five-year housing land supply, but not why land in the Green Belt is needed in order to deliver the required supply of additional housing.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place...4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24184 - 7948 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24198 Object

Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, its position is very isolated with narrow country roads. The bus service is very limited. Parking is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24198 - 7195 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24203 Object

Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The only shop is a small Co-op which already can't cope. Not long ago our post office moved to the Co-op giving a very unsatisfactory service. There just isn't enough room to support such a service.

Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24203 - 7195 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24210 Object	Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The one school is already full.		
Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24210 - 7195 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24216 Object	Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The nearby doctors surgery is severely overstretched.		
Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24216 - 7195 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24222 Object	Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Flooding is already a problem, I fear this would only get worse.		
Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24222 - 7195 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24228 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The accessibility including Red Rose Lane in particular is not sufficient and even farm vehicles struggle and have to bypass the village. It is already difficult to park/access the single village shop/Post Office along with the influx of the tea room which uses up all of the current parking resource available. Red Rose Lane is very narrow/winding road unsuitable for any increase in traffic. It is already dangerous with no pavements and is in constant use by dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders.		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24228 - 8370 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified
24234 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The village school will not cope.		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24234 - 8370 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified
24240 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The doctors surgery will not cope.		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24240 - 8370 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24246 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Red Rose Lane regularly floods as do other areas of the village and this will be made worse by any further developments.		
Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24246 - 8370 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No

24267 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: A total of 7,752 dwellings be provided in the Borough between 2011-2033 with 310 homes per year to 2022/23 and then 584 per year from 2022/23 taking forward a "stepped delivery" approach to deal with a projected shortfall in the first 5 years of the PSLP. This is mainly because a greater proportion of homes to be delivered in the PSLP comprise sites located in the Green Belt, resulting in longer lead in times to delivery. Whilst we do not raise objections in principle to the stepped approach as far as our clients are concerned there is a prospect that some sites in the Green Belt have the prospect of coming forward earlier, particularly smaller and medium sized developments. This certainly includes this site R24, and R23 that is the subject of a separate representation. The stepped approach proposed, there are still issues with BBC's over-optimistic estimates and assumptions on the delivery of larger strategic sites proposed for allocation in the PSLP. Of the new allocations, 4,578 homes are made up of strategic allocations (of which 2,700 are at DHGV and are to be delivered in the Plan period) and 1,510 are other allocations. The strategic sites therefore represent 68% of the total number of new homes of which some 59% are allocated at DHGV. The ability of larger strategic sites to come forward quickly has been the subject of recent assessments in the Independent Review of Build Out, the Letwin Review (2018); and issues with their complexity, have been ably set out in the Lichfield's study From Start to Finish (2016). Both provide empirical evidence that the early delivery of such sites can be problematical due to a range of factors, including establishing required infrastructure requirements and the timing of housing delivery associated with those requirements, as well as the prolonged or protracted nature of the planning process. The Lichfield's report confirms that the planning process takes, on average, 2.5 years for the planning application determination period for up to 500 units; this can double for sites over 1,000 units. Two of the strategic sites within the PSLP's allocations also comprise developed sites currently in employment uses. The strategic sites are expected to deliver some 1555 homes within 5 years of an assumed adoption in 2020/21. Given the issues set out above it is considered that this is unrealistic and it would not be justified or the most appropriate strategy to rely on these sites for short term housing delivery. Therefore emphasises the need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Change To Plan: Need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24267 - 2741 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24310 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: A total of 7,752 dwellings be provided in the Borough between 2011-2033 with 310 homes per year to 2022/23 and then 584 per year from 2022/23 taking forward a "stepped delivery" approach to deal with a projected shortfall in the first 5 years of the PSLP. This is mainly because a greater proportion of homes to be delivered in the PSLP comprise sites located in the Green Belt, resulting in longer lead in times to delivery. Whilst we do not raise objections in principle to the stepped approach as far as our clients are concerned there is a prospect that some sites in the Green Belt have the prospect of coming forward earlier, particularly smaller and medium sized developments. This certainly includes this site R24, and R23 that is the subject of a separate representation. The stepped approach proposed, there are still issues with BBC's over-optimistic estimates and assumptions on the delivery of larger strategic sites proposed for allocation in the PSLP. Of the new allocations, 4,578 homes are made up of strategic allocations (of which 2,700 are at DHGV and are to be delivered in the Plan period) and 1,510 are other allocations. The strategic sites therefore represent 68% of the total number of new homes of which some 59% are allocated at DHGV. The ability of larger strategic sites to come forward quickly has been the subject of recent assessments in the Independent Review of Build Out, the Letwin Review (2018); and issues with their complexity, have been ably set out in the Lichfield's study From Start to Finish (2016). Both provide empirical evidence that the early delivery of such sites can be problematical due to a range of factors, including establishing required infrastructure requirements and the timing of housing delivery associated with those requirements, as well as the prolonged or protracted nature of the planning process. The Lichfield's report confirms that the planning process takes, on average, 2.5 years for the planning application determination period for up to 500 units; this can double for sites over 1,000 units. Two of the strategic sites within the PSLP's allocations also comprise developed sites currently in employment uses. The strategic sites are expected to deliver some 1555 homes within 5 years of an assumed adoption in 2020/21. Given the issues set out above it is considered that this is unrealistic and it would not be justified or the most appropriate strategy to rely on these sites for short term housing delivery. Therefore emphasises the need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Change To Plan: Need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24310 - 2741 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24431 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore. Blackmore has been disproportionately targeted with a 30% increase in the current population proposed. There must be more suitable brownfield sites within the borough that having to build on Green Belt in Blackmore. The Blackmore sites of R25 and R26 are entirely unsuitable for large scale development.

Change To Plan: The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the plans should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out the Blackmore local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24431 - 8375 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24437 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to SP02 Object as sites chosen are not sustainable - R25 and R26. Policy SP02 states that new development will be directed towards highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. Blackmore is not highly accessible and not along a growth corridor.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24437 - 8378 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24457 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development in Blackmore would be damaging to the area because: There are errors in the plan, population states 829 but does not include houses past Red Rose Lane or the residents in Chelmsford Road and Traveller site. Duty to cooperate. Red Rose Lane is single track and won't cope with more traffic; Flood Risk and Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R26. The local school is at capacity with no room for more children. The doctors is too at capacity, waiting times are bad already. Electricity and services won't be able to cope with 70 extra houses.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24457 - 8379 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24552 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local Plan, unsound, failure to consult with Epping Forest District Council. Re:- 30 houses being built on Fingrith Hall Lane which will already impact on the village. Village prone to flooding. No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites
Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24552 - 8392 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24578 Object

Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]

Agent: N/A

Summary: SP01 & Sp02

Section 4

Policy SP01 - D(a), D(f)

Paragraphs 4.2 and 4.9

Policy SP02

The plan is unsound. The plan is deficient in respect of Blackmore village and unsound on all 4 tests in particular:

There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough.

The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong, Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc).

There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development.

BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane.

BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.

There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24578 - 4874 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24610 Object

Respondent: Mr Pete Vince [8123]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.

Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.

Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24610 - 8123 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24651 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear strategy for Blackmore and other villages in the north of the borough.

Brentwood Borough Council does not appear to have taken into consideration the proposals of neighbouring authorities e.g. Epping Forest District Council is proposing to construct 30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane - the residents of these houses will almost certainly use Blackmore as a local shopping place adding both to the traffic along Fingrith Hall Lane and the parking congestion in the centre of Blackmore village. There does not appear to have been any housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore requires such extensive development

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24651 - 8411 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24662 Object

Respondent: Mrs Edna Williams [4728]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound.

- a) There has been no evidence produced to show that there is a need for this size of development in Blackmore
 - b) There has been no discussion or cooperation with any local bodies 30 houses have just been built just outside the village In EFDC area that will Impact on the village
 - c) There are many aspects that do not comply with the NPPF Guidance.
- Protection of Green Belt
Development located to minimize travel
Local community not consulted
No proven local need

Change To Plan: All of the points should be reassessed with local involvement.

Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24662 - 4728 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24766 Object

Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8442]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy ' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council. Over houses being constructed and/or planned close to Blackmore village. The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong, Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school and preschool is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed, inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc). There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP. The access off/from Redrose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites , not Green Belt, ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 form plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24766 - 8442 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24788 Object

Respondent: Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 4
Policy SP01 - D(a), D(f)
Paragraphs 4.2and 4.9
Policy SP02

Section 08
Policy NE06 8.5-8.64
Para 8.85 (iv)
Para 8.90
Para 8.101

Policy NE13

Section 09
Policy R25, 9.197-9.200
Policy R26, 9.201-204

No clear strategy for villages, why Blackmore and not others that have no special historic centre. Other locations must be more sustainable and suitable. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities, 30 homes on Fingrith Hall Lane. Blackmore Village is isolated, school is full, GP is 4 weeks for an appointment, parking in village in dangerous. Children and pensioners are at risk from this. Bus service is infrequent. More residents = more vehicles. More traffic will cause more air pollution bad for people and historic buildings. Sites are on Green Belt land, should use brownfield, not identified by BBC. Redrose Lane too narrow and floods severely, June 2016 floods across village. Sewers can't cope. Should increase densities on other proposed sites. Will increase village by 30%. Unauthorised travellers site will add to the impact on school, GP, local amenities. Has this been taken into account?

Change To Plan: I believe that R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the Blackmore village Heritage Association "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out our local housing needs to avoid further development locally.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24788 - 8175 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24828 Object

Respondent: Mr Ronald Quested [8452]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is not suitable location for large number of new homes. This village walk to the shops, hall, school, etc. Already a problem with speeding and parking. More traffic will exacerbate this. 30 new homes on Fingrth Hall Lane not taken into account. Other locations more sustainable and suitable. Use brownfield sites not Green Belt. Consider surrounding villages. Village is historic, Impact on school and GP surgery will be huge. Major risk of flooding in parts of village. "016across the village, homes flooded and cars stuck. More housing will exacerbate this. Where is a Blackmore Housing Needs Survey

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP> The 'Neighbourhood Plan' from the BVHA should be looked at by the planners. This clearly sets out the local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24828 - 8452 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24858 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beryl Fox [8457]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Inappropriate use of Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Consideration for local needs and infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24858 - 8457 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

24930 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no strategy for villages, including Blackmore. Instead of seeking to deliver sustainable growth in accordance with national and regional policy, the Plan seeks to destroy small villages with unsustainable housing growth. Additional housing should be focussed on suitable and sustainable areas such as urban extension to Brentwood.

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24930 - 5892 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

24943 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no strategy for villages, including Blackmore. Instead of seeking to deliver sustainable growth in accordance with national and regional policy, the Plan seeks to destroy small villages with unsustainable housing growth. Additional housing should be focussed on suitable and sustainable areas such as urban extension to Brentwood.

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24943 - 8191 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

25012 Object

Respondent: Miss Claire Grant [8478]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Will increase existing flooding issues in and around village.
Proposals should be reduced to 30 dwellings to allow community to cope.
Facilities are already struggling.
Should focus building in Brentwood.
The recent development in Epping Forest DC is on the same road.
Traffic will be a nightmare as Blackmore is already used as a cut through.
No housing needs survey;
Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy traffic.

Change To Plan: Road network to be improved, including road widening from A414 to the village. Suitable drainage, speed restrictions etc.
Increased NHS facilities as it is impossible to get a doctors appointment at Deal Tree health centre.
Development of local school facility to cope with an increase of 100 families in the area.
The current local shop/post office is inadequate in size to cope and will need to increase.
Increases in public transport.
Flood improvements and preventative measures to be put in place.
Increase parking facilities (nightmare as it is already!)

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25012 - 8478 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25500 Object

Respondent: Mrs Melanie Simpson [8539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Section 04 - Policy SP01 ad SP02

Section 08. Policy Ne06 paras 8.85; 8.90; 8.101

BBC not considered lack of infrastructure in area, schools, doctors, buses, roads, bin collection, etc. Sites are Green Belt green field, us brownfield. There was no housing need survey. Village prone to flood, more houses will exacerbate this.

I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.

Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.

Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Change To Plan: I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.

Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.

Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25500 - 8539 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25531 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Simpson [4462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09 Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200; Policy R26, 9.201-9.205:

Section 4 Policy SP01-D(a) D (f) Para 4.9,4.2; Policy SP02

Section 8: Policy NE 06, 8.5-8.64 - para 8.85 (iv), 8.90, 8.101; Policy NE13

As a local teacher I worry about the impact on local infrastructure that is already struggling. Schools, doctors, buses, roads. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services that cannot cope with further pressure on the services. There needs to be a housing needs survey. Brownfield sites should be used. Access from/to red Rose lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic; the village is prone to flooding and when it does Red Rose land is the only way through the village - if there are homes built will this increase the flooding? There is no clear strategy for BBC on this proposal.

Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Change To Plan: Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25531 - 4462 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25585 Object

Respondent: Mr Simon Richardson [8562]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound.

- a) There is no proof that Blackmore needs this number of houses
- b) There has been no discussion with the villagers.
- c) No cooperation with any local neighbouring authorities. 30 houses have just been built outside the village in EFDC area that will impact on the village. 8 houses recently built at what was Nine Ashes Farm again in EFDC area.
- d) The LDP does not comply with NPPF Guidance:
 - No protection of Green Belt
 - Development is not located to minimize travel
 - Local community not consulted
 - There is no proven local need
 - There has been no Flood Risk Assessment
 - The location does not 'minimize travel' as required

Change To Plan: All of the above points should be reassessed with local involvement.
Local housing need to be assessed.
The size of the local school needs to be considered
The Doctors surgery is already oversubscribed and consideration needs to be given on to how address this.
Flooding is an issue and needs greater consideration. The Woollard Way field (R25) is often flooded.
Not an issue as a field but this surface water will need to go somewhere if the field is concreted over. (as a local villager my Father used this field and its ponds to water his horses).
Any development of this size needs to be located nearer to good transport links.
Small brownfield developments need to be considered.
Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25585 - 8562 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25590 Object

Respondent: Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policies: R25; R26; SP02; SP02; NE06; NE13

This will put intolerable pressure on GP services the local surgery fails to me demand. Blackmore is a small community based around a small number of roads that are not designed to meet the inevitable increase in traffic due to a wholly inadequate public transport service. It is the level and scale of this development that is excessive and inappropriate.

Change To Plan: A significant reduction in the scale and number of houses to be built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25590 - 8563 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25603 Object

Respondent: Mr David Rolfs [8566]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC have pasted houses onto a Green Belt area around Blackmore to achieve that LDP targets and failed to consider the effects on the community and infrastructure. Additional housing around Blackmore not considered (32 new homes). Has BBC discussed local development with neighbouring councils?
The effect on local Highways by additional housing.

Blackmore village has a vibrant centre that has congestion due visitors to this with parking on pavements, parking on double yellow lines. Also no designated disabled parking spaces. No enforcement. This will be exacerbated by new homes. BBC say the developers have undertaken a flood survey for their land, what about adjacent land with the history of flooding. The school and GP are full, with long GP waiting list which will be exacerbated. Monies collected for infrastructure will be spent elsewhere. Parish Cllrs were not allowed to debate this in the full council meeting on 08 Nov 2018, this is undemocratic. Travellers site in Chelmsford Road was deemed illegal but now LDP making it legal but on what grounds? Previous development proposals there failed due to insufficient sewerage capacity, how will this be addressed. It is apparent that the Blackmore area is the "dumping ground" to make up the numbers and imposing a housing mix without carrying out a housing need survey.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25603 - 8566 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25609 Object

Respondent: Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Insufficient consultation with neighbouring boroughs; red Rose Lane is not suitable for access; Severe flooding in village will get worse and sewage pumping station cant cope; No housing need survey; Already problems with cars - congestion, parking, poor bus service,; destroy wildlife and habitat; green belt should be protected; primary school is full; no clear housing strategy to consider other sites than R25 and R26.

Change To Plan: As there seems to be considerable doubt that all aspects of the planning process have been adhered to R26 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Leave Blackmore in the Green Belt and restore its classification as a Rural Village in a setting with non f the amenities enjoyed by areas such as Mountnessing and Ingrave i.e. a through road, regular buses over an extended time frame, a doctors surgery that can be reached on foot. BBC should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out local housing need for our already sustainable community.
Please note that this was a very difficult form to fill in as many on us have limited knowledge of the planning process!

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25609 - 8567 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25619 Object

Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is deficient in respect of Blackmore Village. There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. There are more suitable and/or sustainable locations. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore Village is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26 Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely.
Please refer to the attached Blackmore Village Survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted.
Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan "available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25619 - 4874 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25820 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25820 - 4693 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25828 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.)and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25828 - 8136 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25849 Object

Respondent: Mr John Hughes [4500]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The POLICY states that new development will be directed towards highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. Blackmore is not highly accessible and not along a transit I growth corridor.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25849 - 4500 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25850 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The POLICY states that new development will be directed towards highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. Blackmore is not highly accessible and not along a transit I growth corridor.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25850 - 8637 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25857 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The POLICY states that new development will be directed towards highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. Blackmore is not highly accessible and not along a transit I growth corridor.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25857 - 8638 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25864 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Hughes [8639]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The POLICY states that new development will be directed towards highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. Blackmore is not highly accessible and not along a transit I growth corridor.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25864 - 8639 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25912 Object

Respondent: Mr Luke Holmes [8652]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25912 - 8652 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25920 Object

Respondent: Miss Ami Holmes [8653]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25920 - 8653 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25927 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25927 - 8574 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25933 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Foreman [4394]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools, Green Belt. Sites unsuitable.

In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25933 - 4394 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25943 Object

Respondent: Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

Object to the inclusion of Blackmore sites as strategy for site choice is not justified, impacts not details and no account of other recent development in the area.

Change To Plan:

The Blackmore Sites should be removed from the Local Plan until there has been:

(1) A full housing need survey for Blackmore

(2) A proper consultation, including the BBC taking into account alternative sites

(3) A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25943 - 4547 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

25951 Object

Respondent: Mr Ben Holmes [8654]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25951 - 8654 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25959 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Holmes [8655]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25959 - 8655 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25980 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is a lack of the following infrastructure and services within Blackmore which does not make it a viable place to develop: lack of employment viability; transport links; infrastructure; medical facilities; education facilities; Severe flooding problems; roads to build the development and subsequently deal with the astronomical increase in traffic movement; loss of Green Belt and damage to natural habitats

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25980 - 4759 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

25988 Object**Respondent: Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is a lack of the following infrastructure and services within Blackmore which does not make it a viable place to develop: lack of employment viability; transport links; infrastructure; medical facilities; education facilities; Severe flooding problems; roads to build the development and subsequently deal with the astronomical increase in traffic movement; loss of Green Belt and damage to natural habitats

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25988 - 4700 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

26002 Object**Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26002 - 8660 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

26025 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26025 - 8662 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

26042 Object

Respondent: Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: The flooding of a few years ago has just been alleviated this would cause more problems in that area. Blackmore would be unable to cope with this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26042 - 8668 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

26052 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26052 - 7304 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

26079 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council has Failed to fulfil its own SCI that relates to the involvement and engagement of the community and stakeholders in the exercising of its planning functions I do not believe that the local authority has fully demonstrated a willingness to engage with and take note of the opinions of the local community. No evidence of a local housing need in Blackmore supporting its inclusion in the Local Plan. The plan does not provide suitable infrastructure for the proposed new homes and does nothing to make housing affordable for people on average or low incomes. Failure to comply with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework in respect to the construction of new buildings being inappropriate on Green Belt.

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26079 - 4275 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

26100 Object**Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy SP02 states that new development will be directed towards highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. Blackmore is neither of these things.

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26100 - 8677 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, iii, iv

26175 Object**Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8691]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound because: 1. Access at Redrose Lane unsuitable for traffic. 2. Available brownfield sites should take priority over greenbelt. 3. Blackmore is not equipped to deal with more population on this scale. The school and doctors surgery are already stretched to capacity. 4. There are more suitable / sustainable locations than Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26175 - 8691 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii

26321 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No Housing Need Survey produced for the Blackmore area, therefore no justification as to why Blackmore has been selected for development.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26321 - 8720 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

26373 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kim Barber [8731]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26373 - 8731 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

26381 Object**Respondent: Mr. Colin Barber [919]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26381 - 919 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

26388 Object**Respondent: Mr Martin Clark [2456]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no proven need that Blackmore need this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little local employment.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs.
 * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need If any is proven.
 * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood.
 * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26388 - 2456 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

26424 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing need survey completed. No clear strategy for villages north of the borough including Blackmore. No consideration of developments taking place in neighbouring local authorities.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26424 - 8742 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

26440 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing need survey completed. No clear strategy for villages north of the borough including Blackmore. No consideration of developments taking place in neighbouring local authorities.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26440 - 8741 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

22352 Support**Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council supports Brentwood Borough Council's commitment to planning to meet its identified housing needs in full, plus the incorporation of a 20% buffer in supply.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22352 - 4178 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23111 Support**Respondent: Castle Point Borough Council (Mr Ian Butt) [8304]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is acknowledged that BBC has undertaken extensive work to identify suitable sites, review the urban land capacity, seek additional land capacity through windfall, town centre and brownfield sites, review urban densities, seek to limit the loss of the Green Belt, and consider the practical realities of phasing development alongside infrastructure delivery. CPBC commends the approach taken by BBC in seeking to deliver high housing requirements in an area with significant environmental, Green Belt and infrastructure challenges. In relation to Policy SP02, CPBP has no reason to believe that the PSLP has not been prepared positively.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23111 - 8304 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23112 Support

Respondent: Castle Point Borough Council (Mr Ian Butt) [8304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The PSLP provides for an uplift in the amount of homes that will be delivered over the Plan period. It identifies that the majority of homes will be delivered after the first five years of the plan period. Where the majority of allocations within the Plan are on Green Belt sites, these sites will require longer lead in times before new dwellings can be delivered. The PSLP has set out a phased rate of housing delivery which they consider realistic and deliverable. CPBC has no reason to believe that this approach is not justified and effective.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23112 - 8304 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23113 Support

Respondent: Castle Point Borough Council (Mr Ian Butt) [8304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The PSLP will be assessed against the requirements of the 2018 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Based on an assessment of some of the key elements of the PSLP, CPBC has no reason to believe that the Plan is inconsistent with national planning policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23113 - 8304 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23174 Support

Respondent: Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Chelmsford Council welcomes Brentwood Borough Council's commitment to significantly boost the supply of housing to meet the needs of the area and the decision to adopt a higher figure of 456dpa in anticipation of MHCLG intention to adjust the standardised methodology to safeguard against any potential uplift.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23174 - 8305 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23175 Support

Respondent: Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC proposes to meet its own housing need within its administrative boundaries and has not approached neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-operate to request other authorities help accommodate any unmet needs. This is supported by CCC.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23175 - 8305 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23904 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: This policy seeks to direct development to the site allocations set out in the Local Plan and within the highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. Land at Nags Head Lane would accord with both of these principles, so we support this policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23904 - 2509 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

23911 Support

Respondent: Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust [8344]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: This policy seeks to direct development to the site allocations set out in the Local Plan and within the highly accessible locations along transit/growth corridors. Land off Warley Hill would accord with both of these principles, so we support this policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23911 - 8344 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - i, ii, iii, iv

24115 Support

Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]

Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood)
[8360]

Summary: Although on the whole it is generally considered that the Council's Pre-Submission Local Plan is sound there is some concern that the Council's Housing Requirement is not fully robust. The PPG on 'Housing and economic needs assessment', which was updated on the 20th February 2019, confirms that 2014 based household projections should be used as the baseline for the 'standard method'. The housing requirement has been calculated within the SHMA (2018) with this assessment confirming that the housing requirement has been calculated using the 2016 population projections as a starting point. The Standard Method using the 2014 population projections was published (2017) - this stated that Brentwood's housing need, based on the Standard Method, was 454 dwellings per annum. Applying the 20% uplift to this figure would result in a housing requirement of 545 homes per year, or a total of 9,262 homes during the plan period 2016-2033. Accordingly, we consider that the Inspector should, during the Examination, request that Brentwood update its evidence base, and its housing requirement, to reflect the 2014-based population projections.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council will need to revisit its evidence base to determine a housing requirement which uses the 2014 population projections as a starting point. This will result in a larger housing requirement, with our estimate based on the indicative Standard Method being approximately 545 homes per year, or a total of 9,262 homes during the plan period 2016-2033.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24115 - 8359 - POLICY SP02: MANAGING GROWTH - None

23636 Object

Respondent: Tesco [5252]

Agent: GL Hearn (Mr Roland Brass) [4809]

Summary: Object. Duty to cooperate doesn't consider unmet needs. Reasonable alternatives are not suitably assessed and the preferred strategy is not suitably justified.

Change To Plan: * Use 2014-based household projections as basis for the Local Plan. This means local housing needs baseline is 454 dwellings per annum.
 * Set a housing requirement in Policy SP02 of 9,265 dwellings (which takes account of a 20% buffer).
 * Re-balance the stepped trajectory approach to bring forward more housing in the first five years. This will also help address the five year housing land supply issue.
 * Undertake additional work in respect of Duty to Co-operate, Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment. This is required to comply with the NPPF (2019) and legal tests.
 * Undertake updated Green Belt assessment.
 * Identify the Hopefield Site as a Housing Allocation in the new Local Plan as part of the revised and sound development strategy. This is required to address the above matters especially in relation to delivering the growth strategy and meeting five year housing land supply.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23636 - 5252 - Sequential Land Use - None

23660 Object

Respondent: EA Strategic Land LLP [279]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]

Summary: The spatial strategy seeks to accommodate growth in locations which are sustainable and will maximise the value of railway connectivity. However, the sequential approach proposes that after urban and brownfield sites, growth should be focused on strategic sites (removed from existing services and infrastructure) followed by urban extensions (areas close to existing transport infrastructure). This approach conflicts with the spatial strategy and wider policies which all seek first and foremost to develop land next to existing infrastructure and services, provided there are no detrimental impacts on important environmental designations. In this respect the Local Plan policies conflict with one another.

Change To Plan: Site West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon is fully in accordance with the spatial strategy focused on transit orientated growth and should be allocated. No significant constraints with developing an urban extension at West Horndon, in addition to Dunton Hills Garden Village was identified by the Sustainability Appraisal. If Brentwood is to attempt to meet the housing needs, this approach is required.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23660 - 279 - Sequential Land Use - None

24174 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary: The NPPF 2018 has two main stipulations relating to alterations of Green Belt boundaries: "136. (part) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries..." "137 (part) Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development..." The second requirement (examined fully all other reasonable options) should be conducted before the first. The Council's overall approach to site selection is described and the approach is summarised in Figure 7 of that document and in para 3.23 of the Draft Plan. This sequential approach includes brownfield sites in the Green Belt but not greenfield sites in the Green Belt. Furthermore para 3.23 confuses a number of site selection criteria, for example proximity to transport facilities, as well as the key quality of the sites. At several points in the Draft Plan the Council has described how it went through this examination, most notably at paras 4.22-4.23 and the associated Figure 4.2, which shows that some 20% of the total new housing proposed will be located on Green Belt land. It would be helpful if this Figure could be explicitly labelled as illustrating the sequential examination.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place... 4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24174 - 7948 - Sequential Land Use - i, ii, iii, iv

24176 Object**Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]****Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]**

Summary: The NPPF 2018 has two main stipulations relating to alterations of Green Belt boundaries: "136. (part) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries..." "137 (part) Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.." At several points in the Draft Plan the Council has described how it went through this examination, most notably at paras 4.22-4.23 and the associated Figure 4.2, which shows that some 20% of the total new housing proposed will be located on Green Belt land. It would be helpful if this Figure could be explicitly labelled as illustrating the sequential examination.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place... 4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24176 - 7948 - 4.22 - i, ii, iii, iv

24271 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: PSLP suggested that a sequential approach is to be taken to the determination of planning applications, referring only to prioritising brownfield land in urban areas and brownfield land in the Green Belt. The reasons for this are unclear when the PSLP strategy includes releasing land from the Green Belt to meet development needs which includes the sites the subject of these representations. The growth requirements set out by Policy SP02, and the sequential approach to meeting those requirements are referred to at paragraph 3.23, provide for the justification for the chosen spatial strategy. As a consequence, it is not justified to suggest that a sequential test be taken for the determination of planning applications and paras 4.22 and 4.23 should be deleted from the PSLP.

Change To Plan: Paras 4.22 and 4.23 should be deleted from the PSLP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24271 - 2741 - 4.22 - i, ii, iii, iv

24314 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: PSLP suggested that a sequential approach is to be taken to the determination of planning applications, referring only to prioritising brownfield land in urban areas and brownfield land in the Green Belt. The reasons for this are unclear when the PSLP strategy includes releasing land from the Green Belt to meet development needs which includes the sites the subject of these representations. The growth requirements set out by Policy SP02, and the sequential approach to meeting those requirements are referred to at paragraph 3.23, provide for the justification for the chosen spatial strategy. As a consequence, it is not justified to suggest that a sequential test be taken for the determination of planning applications and paras 4.22 and 4.23 should be deleted from the PSLP.

Change To Plan: Paras 4.22 and 4.23 should be deleted from the PSLP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24314 - 2741 - 4.22 - i, ii, iii, iv

24175 Object**Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]****Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]**

Summary: The NPPF 2018 has two main stipulations relating to alterations of Green Belt boundaries: "136. (part) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries..." "137 (part) Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.." At several points in the Draft Plan the Council has described how it went through this examination, most notably at paras 4.22-4.23 and the associated Figure 4.2, which shows that some 20% of the total new housing proposed will be located on Green Belt land. It would be helpful if this Figure could be explicitly labelled as illustrating the sequential examination.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place... 4.- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24175 - 7948 - 4.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

24270 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: PSLP suggested that a sequential approach is to be taken to the determination of planning applications, referring only to prioritising brownfield land in urban areas and brownfield land in the Green Belt. The reasons for this are unclear when the PSLP strategy includes releasing land from the Green Belt to meet development needs which includes the sites the subject of these representations. The growth requirements set out by Policy SP02, and the sequential approach to meeting those requirements are referred to at paragraph 3.23, provide for the justification for the chosen spatial strategy. As a consequence, it is not justified to suggest that a sequential test be taken for the determination of planning applications and paras 4.22 and 4.23 should be deleted from the PSLP.

Change To Plan: Paras 4.22 and 4.23 should be deleted from the PSLP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24270 - 2741 - 4.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

24313 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: PSLP suggested that a sequential approach is to be taken to the determination of planning applications, referring only to prioritising brownfield land in urban areas and brownfield land in the Green Belt. The reasons for this are unclear when the PSLP strategy includes releasing land from the Green Belt to meet development needs which includes the sites the subject of these representations. The growth requirements set out by Policy SP02, and the sequential approach to meeting those requirements are referred to at paragraph 3.23, provide for the justification for the chosen spatial strategy. As a consequence, it is not justified to suggest that a sequential test be taken for the determination of planning applications and paras 4.22 and 4.23 should be deleted from the PSLP.

Change To Plan: Paras 4.22 and 4.23 should be deleted from the PSLP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24313 - 2741 - 4.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

23383 Object

Respondent: BJ Associates [8317]

Agent: Gerald Eve LLP (Mr. Peter Dines) [3762]

Summary: Too great an emphasis is placed on Dunton Hills Garden Village to provide for housing growth. An annual housing rate of 310 per year to 2023 reflects poor and unrealistic housing site choices. This strategy will have an adverse effect on affordability in the short term which will in turn increase land prices in the longer term.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23383 - 8317 - Figure 4.2: Demonstrating Housing Provision - None

23956 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Policy SP02, Managing Growth (page 50) & Figure 4.2 (page 51)

A modification to Policy SP02(A) and Figure 4.2 is proposed in our response to question no. 6 to acknowledge that housing provision should represent a 'minimum' for consistency with national policy and guidance, and Local Plan Policy R01.

Change To Plan: Policy SP02, Managing Growth (page 50) & Figure 4.2 (page 51)

A modification to Policy SP02(A) and Figure 4.2 is proposed to reflect that housing provision reflects a 'minimum'. This also ensures consistency with national policy and guidance, and Local Plan Policy R01.

To ensure that the plan is positively prepared and consistent with the NPPF criterion A should be updated to reflect that "provision should be made for a minimum of 7,752 new residential dwellings..."

CEG supports the inclusion of Figure 4.2 to explain how housing provision will occur. The column entitled 'Net homes' should either be retitled 'Minimum net homes' and/or a footnote should be included relating to DHGV to the effect that 2,700 is the minimum to be provided, consistent with the wording of Local Plan Policy R01.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23956 - 5050 - Figure 4.2: Demonstrating Housing Provision - None

24154 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary: Reliance and build rate of Dunton Hills Garden suburb is not realistic. This will squeeze delivery at Dunton Hills into an eight-year period with a resulting annual build rate requirement of nearly 340. The planning permission is likely to be slower than described, there are no documents of support from Basildon Council. The Emerging Basildon Local Plan shows no proposals relating to the Dunton Hills project on its side of the border. Instead it shows the whole area as Metropolitan Green Belt land. All the above indicates that there has been a lack of cross-border cooperation on the Dunton Hills proposed land allocation since 2016. The quantity and timing of new housing delivery from this site, set out in the Pre-Submission Document, are not soundly based. We believe the whole project is now mired in a controversy that involves two of the Borough's local authority neighbours. This must cast doubt on whether the Duty to Cooperate has been fully followed. Therefore at present the whole project is surely in jeopardy.

Change To Plan: The Pre-Submission Document relies very heavily on the Dunton Hills Strategic Allocation. If it were not accepted, or only partially accepted, a review of all the Plan's allocations would be needed and alternatives, like our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch, be reconsidered to make up the deficit.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24154 - 2788 - Figure 4.2: Demonstrating Housing Provision - i, ii, iii

24162 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: In the Regulation 18 document, three strategic sites were proposed; this has now increased to five. We object to the strategy relying on several large developments to deliver such a large proportion of growth for the Borough, particularly within the first five years from adoption. As set out in Appendix 1, this strategy results in the delivery of no new housing in the early years of the Plan.

Change To Plan: The Plan should be reviewed and sites identified to meet the higher housing number of 547 dwellings per annum, through the addition of smaller site allocations. Smaller sites are more deliverable over the early years of the Plan period since they typically require less investment in infrastructure, are within single ownership and have fewer complex issues to address at planning application stage. This is in contrast to larger strategic sites which are often reliant on significant infrastructure improvements, comprise multiple ownerships, require complex legal agreements and typically take much longer to deliver.

Allocating additional smaller sites will have multiple benefits; it will increase the flexibility of the Plan, it will contribute to the five year housing land supply, it will enable sites which do not require significant infrastructure provision to come forward quickly, and it will attract smaller house building companies who will not be present upon larger strategic sites.

Paragraph 3.21c of the Plan states that:

'Brownfield opportunities will be encouraged where appropriate schemes help meet local needs and ensure that our villages remain thriving communities, in line with policies in the Plan. Where appropriate, this includes the redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt.'

This source of sites should be reviewed to provide smaller sites which increase the deliverability and flexibility of the Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24162 - 8368 - Figure 4.2: Demonstrating Housing Provision - i, iii, iv

24177 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary: The NPPF 2018 has two main stipulations relating to alterations of Green Belt boundaries: "136. (part) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries..." "137 (part) Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development..." At several points in the Draft Plan the Council has described how it went through this examination, most notably at paras 4.22-4.23 and the associated Figure 4.2, which shows that some 20% of the total new housing proposed will be located on Green Belt land. It would be helpful if this Figure could be explicitly labelled as illustrating the sequential examination.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place... 4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24177 - 7948 - Figure 4.2: Demonstrating Housing Provision - i, ii, iii, iv

22602 Object

Respondent: Cllr Philip Mynott [8283]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of the chosen Local Plan sites fails to adhere to the Plan's SP03 (Health Impact Assessments).

Change To Plan: The chosen sites need to be changed for others.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22602 - 8283 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - iii, iv

23777 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Summary: We are in agreement with the HBF's response, dated 17th March 2019, in relation to the requirement for HIAs to be provided for 50 or more dwellings and consider the requirement to be unnecessary and an additional burden on applicants. Referring to the PPG we note that HIAs may be useful tools, however the PPG also expresses the importance of the local plan needing to consider the wider health issues in an area and ensuring the policies respond to these concerns.

Change To Plan: The requirement for a HIA should only be triggered where there is a departure from the plan, enabling the Council to assess any impacts on the health and wellbeing of the community as a result of said proposals.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23777 - 6751 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i, ii, iii, iv

23895 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: The policy presents an unnecessary burden on those developers bringing forward allocated sites where the infrastructure capacity on an area should have already been identified through the plan-making process. It is considered that HIA should be confined to strategic sites (500 units or more) to reflect the fact that they are required where significant impacts are anticipated. Other impacts referred to in the policy are a standard part of the development management process and do not warrant a further assessment to be included with the application.

Change To Plan: * Amend criterion C to raise the threshold to 500 * Remove the requirement for the developer to deliver the necessary health and social care facilities * Ensure that it is clear that the developer is only expected to contribute to improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of the development where such facilities are already in place.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23895 - 6669 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i

23896 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: Criterion C places the burden of delivery of health and social care facilities on the developer who is unlikely to be a health and social care provider and therefore cannot reasonably be expected to deliver such facilities or to address existing deficiencies. It may be that such facilities are entirely absent in any area where development is allocated despite an existing need. In such case, the wording of the policy means that a developer could be required to provide more than is necessary to mitigate the impacts arising from the development. This conflicts with national policy and could prejudice deliverability.

Change To Plan: * Amend criterion C to raise the threshold to 500 * Remove the requirement for the developer to deliver the necessary health and social care facilities * Ensure that it is clear that the developer is only expected to contribute to improvements necessary to mitigate the impact of the development where such facilities are already in place.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23896 - 6669 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - None

24018 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: This policy is considered to be unsound as it is not "justified". The requirement to undertake a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a superfluous burden on applicants. It should be down to the Local Plan to take into account wider health concerns in the local area and focus policies upon addressing these concerns. Health and well-being should be covered within the policies of the Local Plan and where a development aligns with these, an HIA should not be required.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24018 - 2656 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - None

24091 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: The HBF response to this policy is unsupportive and they consider the policy to be unsound as it is not consistent with national policy and is ineffective. The requirement for HIAs as set out in Policy SP03 is unnecessary and an additional burden on applicants. In order for the local plan to be consistent with national policy, the Local Plan should already consider the impact of development on the health and wellbeing of the communities and any identified infrastructure should be addressed. The requirement for a HIA should only be triggered where there is a departure from the plan.

Change To Plan: The requirement for a HIA should only be triggered where there is a departure from the plan, enabling the Council to assess any impacts on the health and wellbeing of the community as a result of said proposals.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24091 - 250 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i, iv

24671 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Proposals for Blackmore are not justified. The plan proposal significantly changed from previous versions of the document, the discussion on the plan at the full council meeting was prevented, the regularisation of the travellers site was without warning, duty to cooperate with other boroughs and consideration of their development has not taken place, the consultation form is complex and unclear and unsuitable, other developments in the north of the borough are not considered, a 30% rise in housing here is unsustainable and does not have the infrastructure to support it, impacts on roads, wildlife, habitat is too great.

Change To Plan: * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
 * Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Forests District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
 * Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
 * Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
 . * Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
 * Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
 . * Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there is already a severe flooding problem which the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
 * Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24671 - 1830 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i, ii, iii, iv

25981 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: If SP03 is actually imposed, the Blackmore developments will fail the requirements on over half and will in fact have a negative Health Impact on the existing residents. This means the Council would be obliged to refuse the planning permission or levy a huge CIL on the developer which would make it non-viable due to total loss of profitability.

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25981 - 4759 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i, ii, iii

25989 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]

Agent: N/A

Summary: If SP03 is actually imposed, the Blackmore developments will fail the requirements on over half and will in fact have a negative Health Impact on the existing residents. This means the Council would be obliged to refuse the planning permission or levy a huge CIL on the developer which would make it non-viable due to total loss of profitability.

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25989 - 4700 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i, ii, iii

26101 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan makes no provisions for the development of local amenities and infrastructure - local school and doctor's surgery are already at capacity. The internet connection is appalling, the sewage system is at tipping point, there are frequent power-cuts in the area already, Public Transport is almost non-existent in the village and parking anywhere is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26101 - 8677 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i, iii, iv

26362 Object

Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC should be consulting with other local authorities to increase development on already allocated brownfield sites, where a far better infrastructure is already in place, including roads and public services

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to, which sets out local needs for housing.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26362 - 4618 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i, ii, iii, iv

22296 Support

Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We welcome the policy recognition of the value of open and green space, with the caveat that this policy statement should be amended to include contact with nature, as follows:

e. open and green space, "including contact with nature and wildlife"

It is now widely recognised that contact with nature and wildlife significantly improves health and wellbeing, for example by helping to lower levels of heart disease, obesity, stress and depression

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22296 - 2414 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - None

22370 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This policy is supported as it requires major developments to promote healthy (and therefore active) environments through the preparation of Health Impact Assessments. The reference to the use of the EPOA advice to inform such assessments is particularly welcomed as the most recent review of the advice has fully incorporated consideration of how a development considers the opportunities for creating environments that encourage physically activity including consideration of Sport England's Active Design guidance.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22370 - 4294 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - None

23243 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We would suggest that the design of homes and housing can also have a positive impact on the physical, social, and mental health and well-being of communities and this should be reflected in Policy SP03.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23243 - 3791 - POLICY SP03: HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENTS (HIAs) - i, ii, iii, iv

22283 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Attention is drawn to ECC Full Council Motion in October 2014, reaffirmed in July 2017 - Essex County Council will not support Local Plans unless adequate resources are identified from developers, local councils and/or Government grants to ensure sufficient infrastructure is provided in timely manner and in way that balances needs to promote economic growth and provide housing for residents whilst protecting quality of life.

Policy should be amended to clarify and strengthen intent to effectively secure and deliver necessary infrastructure and contributions so ECC's role as infrastructure provider is not jeopardised. In line with NPPF paragraphs 20 & 34.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy SP04 B. b. as follows -

- b. on-site construction of new provision;
- c. off-site capacity improvement works;

Amend Policy SP04 F. as follows -

F. Exceptions to this Policy will only be considered whereby:

- a. it is proven that the benefits of the development proceeding without full mitigation outweigh the collective harm;
- b. a fully transparent open book Viability Assessment has proven that the full mitigation cannot be afforded, allowing only the minimum level of developer profit and land owner receipt necessary for the development to proceed. The viability assessment may be subject to an independent scrutiny by appointed experts;
- c. a full and thorough investigation has been undertaken to find innovative solutions to issues and all possible steps have been taken to minimise the residual level of unmitigated impacts; and ...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22283 - 6776 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

23167 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan fails to investigate the possible impacts on Basildon's road and rail infrastructure, as a neighbouring authority, arising from commuters or other road users choosing to access facilities within the Basildon Borough instead. The need for new connections into Basildon was not mentioned as being necessary to make it sustainable. Policy SP04 does not explicitly mention that it has accounted for the spatial context of DHGV. It does not state that it will support the possibility of developer contributions being used to mitigate this impact outside Brentwood in higher-order settlements which are closer to but outside Brentwood's own settlements.

Change To Plan: The Plan should be modified to recognise that some impacts are likely to be cross boundary and additional provisions should be incorporated into SP04 and RO1(I) that will support using S106/CIL arising from development in Brentwood Borough to be used for investment outside the Brentwood Borough, where it can be proven that there is reasonable likelihood of a direct or residual impacts otherwise being caused that need to be mitigated. This will make the Plan more effective, justified and in accordance with national policy.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23167 - 369 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i

23678 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: 5.2.1 Whilst Gladman has no specific comments on the content of Policy SP04, we would wish to voice concern over the myriad of policies contained in the Local Plan which may have implications for development viability. Many of the policies such as Policy SP05, BE01, BE02, BE03, BE09, BE10 etc have requirements within them that will impact on the viability of development schemes. It is unclear from the evidence provided whether the cumulative impact of all of these requirements has been considered through the Viability Study, which is a requirement set out at Paragraph 34 of the Framework to ensure that such policies do not undermine the deliverability of the Plan. This gap in evidence needs to be addressed by the Council to ensure that these policies are justified.

Change To Plan: Consider cumulative impact of Policy SP05, BE01, BE02, BE03, BE09, BE10 etc on Policy SP04: Developer Contributions

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23678 - 2774 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

23897 Object**Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]****Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]**

Summary: Criterion A expects developers to guarantee the sustained provision of infrastructure. The responsibility for sustained provision rests with the infrastructure provider and this should not be transferred to the developer. Criterion F requires a Financial Viability Assessment where there is conflict with planning policy requirements. It does not specify which policy conflicts would trigger this need, so as currently written would apply to any such conflict. This presents an unreasonable and unnecessary burden for a developer where the conflict arises of feasibility rather than viability issues. There may also be sound material considerations for departing from a particular policy.

Change To Plan: Remove the last sentence of criterion A and amend criterion F to confirm what policy conflicts trigger the need for a viability assessment.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23897 - 6669 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i

24019 Object**Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]****Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]**

Summary: Policy SPO4 should be more explicit on the exact nature of requirements that the developer may be required to meet to avoid overly onerous requirements or confusion over cumulative impact and phasing with other developments and therefore this policy is not "justified" and is unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24019 - 2656 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i

24277 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: There are no objections to the general approach expressed in Policy SP04 for developer contributions. However, section E is neither precise, necessary or justified and could be open to misinterpretation. It is therefore recommended that this be omitted.

Change To Plan: Section E is neither precise, necessary or justified and could be open to misinterpretation. It is therefore recommended that this be omitted.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24277 - 2741 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

24316 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: There are no objections to the general approach expressed in Policy SP04 for developer contributions. However, section E is neither precise, necessary or justified and could be open to misinterpretation. It is therefore recommended that this be omitted.

Change To Plan: Section E is neither precise, necessary or justified and could be open to misinterpretation. It is therefore recommended that this be omitted.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24316 - 2741 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

24438 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: SP04 A - this policy is not being applied to sites R25 and R26 to ensure infrastructure and therefore the policy is unsound.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24438 - 8378 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

22332 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Anglian Water supports the requirement for infrastructure capacity to be currently or made available to serve new development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22332 - 6824 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - None

22601 Support

Respondent: Essex Police and Fire Service [8278]

Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr. Michael Calder) [3814]

Summary: The additional population generated by development within Brentwood's Borough will place an increased demand on the level of policing and fire and rescue services for the area. This representation is therefore concerned with ensuring that policies in the Local Plan are sound in respect of infrastructure planning and mechanisms to secure new infrastructure or contributions towards both services. This submission is a holding response, which the PFCC office wishes to expand upon further during dialogue with Brentwood Borough Council in the remaining stages of its Local Plan preparation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22601 - 8278 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - None

23212 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support the policy in principle. However, it is not possible for any necessary upgrades to be secured through CIL or S106 contributions. In order to ensure that any necessary sewerage infrastructure reinforcement works required to support a development are delivered ahead of the occupation of development it may be necessary for planning conditions to be used to ensure that a development or phase of development is not occupied until the required upgrade has been delivered. To help ensure this Policy SP04 should make reference to the use of planning conditions as a mechanism alongside S106 and CIL.

Change To Plan: To address the above concern Part B of Policy SP04 could be amended to incorporate the following wording:
"c. off-site capacity improvement works (secured through appropriate planning conditions or agreements)"
The proposed change would ensure that planning conditions can be used to secure infrastructure improvements necessary to support development alongside S106 agreements and CIL thereby ensuring that the policy is effective and the Local Plan is sound.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23212 - 1927 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i, ii, iv

23240 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policies should be explicit in that contributions towards healthcare provision will be obtained and the Local Planning Authority will consider a development's sustainability with regard to effective healthcare provision. The exact nature and scale of the contribution and the subsequent expenditure by the STP will be calculated at an appropriate time as and if schemes come forward over the plan period to realise the objectives of the LP.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23240 - 3791 - POLICY SP04: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 4. Managing Growth 4.31

22522 Object

Respondent: Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The distribution of secondary schools is wrong, with too many in Brentwood Town. This causes too much unnecessary traffic.

Change To Plan: close Brentwood county and use site for housing development. use the money to build a school in West Basildon instead

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22522 - 4309 - 4.31 - iv

22287 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] Agent: N/A

Summary: ECC position = supporting Local Plans but ensuring do not place unnecessary burden on ECC and public purse. IDP in current form has significant infrastructure cost implications and unanswered questions for ECC (primary infrastructure provider). Places much greater risk on public purse (mitigation costs, delivery implications, viability unclear). IDP cannot be supported in current form.

Plan must be supported by completed IDP (costs, phasing, delivery and viability), needs to be agreed with ECC.

BBC needs to engage with ECC. Significant work still required. ECC will continue to be engaged to ensure appropriate IDP in place ahead of submission and examination.

Change To Plan: The Plan must be supported by a completed IDP that reflects the evidence base, discussions with ECC for those areas where we have responsibility, and include infrastructure costs, phasing, delivery and viability.

BBC needs to engage with ECC as a major infrastructure provider to prepare its final IDP to support its Plan. Significant work, particularly in respect of costings, phasing, deliverability and viability is still required. ECC will continue to be engaged in this process with BBC to ensure that an appropriate IDP is in place ahead of submission and examination.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22287 - 6776 - 4.33 - i, ii, iii, iv

23244 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791] Agent: N/A

Summary: In order to ensure that the Infrastructure Deliver Plan remains current we would suggest a review of health infrastructure requirements on an annual basis.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23244 - 3791 - 4.34 - i, ii, iii, iv

23779 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]**

Summary: The Policy expects all major development schemes/developers to sign up to the Considerate Constructors Scheme, or equivalent. The scheme is a non-profit making, independent organisation which monitors construction sites signed up to the scheme, with the aim of managing and mitigating impacts arising from construction. This requirement is considered unjustified and inconsistent with national policy. We are not aware of any other adopted or emerging Local Plan which requires applicants and developers of major sites to enter into a specified construction management scheme and therefore question the reasonableness of this policy.

Change To Plan: The imposition of Policy SP05 requires all major developments to be signed up to the Considerate Constructors Scheme regardless of the site or proposal details. It is recommended that this policy is removed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23779 - 6751 - POLICY SP05: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24092 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: The requirement that all major development schemes/developers to sign up to the Considerate Constructors Scheme, or equivalent is unjustified and inconsistent with national policy. We are not aware of any other adopted or emerging Local Plan which requires applicants and developers of major sites to enter into a specified construction management scheme and therefore question the reasonableness of this policy. This should be assessed on a case by case basis and should not be a matter for a strategic policy to prescribe.

Change To Plan: The imposition of Policy SP05 requires all major developments to be signed up to the Considerate Constructors Scheme regardless of the site or proposal details. It is recommended that this policy is removed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24092 - 250 - POLICY SP05: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT - i

23957 Support**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Policy SP05, Construction Management (page 58)
Policy SP05 requires developers to take a considered approach to construction management and seeks to manage construction activity to minimise local disturbance. CEG supports this policy and will bring forward the development at DHGV in this way. Criterion B might usefully clarify that this refers to other major 'committed' development.

Change To Plan: Policy SP05, Construction Management (page 58)
Criterion B might usefully clarify that this refers to "... other major 'committed' development..."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23957 - 5050 - POLICY SP05: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT - None

24020 Support**Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]****Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]**

Summary: It is considered that this policy accords with the NPPF and is therefore found to be sound, with particular reference to NPPF (para 72) which refers to larger scale development supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24020 - 2656 - POLICY SP05: CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

23898 Object**Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]****Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]**

Summary: The policy does not define what it considers to be a 'large complex allocation site' and as such could impose a blanket requirement for the submission of a masterplan and a design code as part of the submission for all allocated sites. This is considered to be an unreasonable and unnecessary burden that is not supported by the NPPF or the PPG and is not justified by the individual site allocations. It also has the potential to slow down the delivery of sites, which for a borough with a poor track record of delivery is not sensible.

Change To Plan: For the reasons explained above, clarify in the policy which of the allocated sites fall within the definition of a 'large complex allocation site'.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23898 - 6669 - POLICY SP06: EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT - None

23958 Object**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Policy SP06, Effective Delivery of Development (page 60)
Policy SP06 requires development proposals for large allocation sites to be developed in partnership with the Council, infrastructure providers and relevant organisations through a masterplanning approach. This may include an independent Design Review Panel process, which is an approach supported by the NPPF (paragraph 129). CEG supports this policy and is bringing forward the development of DHGV in this manner, with an independent Design Review Panel process and working in partnership with the Council and other relevant organisations as necessary.

A footnote might usefully clarify what constitutes large complex allocation sites as far as the Council is concerned.

Change To Plan: Policy SP06, Effective Delivery of Development (page 60)
A footnote might usefully clarify what constitutes large complex allocation sites, as referenced in criterion A, as far as the Council is concerned.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23958 - 5050 - POLICY SP06: EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT - None

24021 Object**Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]****Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]**

Summary: Policy SP06: Effective Delivery of Development states that proposals for large allocation sites will be expected to be developed in partnership with the Council, infrastructure providers and other relevant organisations, through a collaborative masterplanning approach. Development proposals should submit a supporting statement setting out the sustainable long-term governance and stewardship arrangements for community assets including land, services and facilities such as village halls, community centres, libraries, parks, green spaces, and buildings for sports, leisure, healthcare, education, social, arts and cultural activities. This policy is overly onerous and therefore "unjustified". This policy is therefore considered to be unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24021 - 2656 - POLICY SP06: EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT - None

24087 Object**Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]****Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]**

Summary: Points A and B of Policy SP06: indicates a raft of additional tasks and steps for larger sites including strategic and site-area masterplans, collaborative and partnership working to derive scheme proposals. While LLLP support the need for collaborative working with stakeholders, it is concerned that the requirements set out in SP06 are overly onerous and unjustified. It is not clear why the additional steps and documents are necessary and how they would lead to more efficient or timely development delivery. The NPPF includes opportunities for extensive stakeholder and consultee engagement as well as pre-application review and evolution of development proposals of all scales. This allows for a coherent and effective approach to site development to be undertaken already and therefore already provides the mechanisms to achieve this in the way that paragraph 4.45 of the Local Plan envisages.

Change To Plan: Policy SP06 should be modified by deletion of Point A entirely. Point B should be revised to include flexibility for the provision of supporting documentation on a site by-site basis in accordance with the relevant planning application validation list

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24087 - 8362 - POLICY SP06: EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT - ii, iii

24128 Object**Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]****Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]**

Summary: Our Client notes that Draft Policy SP06 is designed to ensure that a collaborative and participatory approach is taken when working up proposals. Ford are broadly supportive of this policy position, understanding the importance of comprehensive masterplanning to inform strategic site delivery. However, our Client wishes to note that such exercises should not inhibit the ability of individually owned sites to come forward for development. This is specifically referenced with regards to the Council Depot currently being included under the wider allocation for the Ford site, which we understand is not anticipated to be available for redevelopment until later in the plan period.

Change To Plan: Whilst Ford welcomes open and collaborative discussions regarding the wider allocation, and indeed the masterplan works to date have shown how future connections could be made to the Depot site; in tandem with how development could be proposed so as not to prejudice the development of either site, the early delivery of housing on the Ford owned land should not be prejudiced by delays in the decision-making process with regards to the Depot (see also comments under Draft Policy RO4 and RO5). It is considered that this would go against the premise of the overarching objective of the emerging Local Plan and the NPPF (2018) Paragraph 59 in terms of the delivery of sustainable development and ensuring the supply of homes without unnecessary delay.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24128 - 3769 - POLICY SP06: EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

22328 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We note that Policy SP06 include reference to the preparation of a masterplan for large complex allocation sites part of a collaborative process working with infrastructure providers including Anglian Water which is supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22328 - 6824 - POLICY SP06: EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT - None

23201 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We are supportive of the Local Plan policies relating to infrastructure delivery (SP06) Sustainable Design and construction.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23201 - 6824 - POLICY SP06: EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment 5.1

22238 Object**Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds: failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed; inadequate consultation with Epping Forest District Council and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore; failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development; adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22238 - 4376 - 5.1 - ii, iv

22308 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy BE01: we would prefer to see in point g reference to such infrastructure being publicly accessible whilst also being multi-functional.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, we suggest this policy point is reworded thus: 'accessible and multi-functional green and blue infrastructure...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22308 - 3855 - POLICY BE01: FUTURE PROOFING - i, ii, iii, iv

22619 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Palmer [8244]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan does not appear to positively embrace the practical implementation of the sentiments set out in BE01 and Chapter 5: reducing carbon emitting traffic, school clear zone and low emission zone.

Change To Plan: Firstly, all new houses and access roads where parking is allowed should be fitted with suitable charging points. Secondly, where in the plan are the areas that will be allocated for vehicle charging. A strategy needs to be developed that considers the physical area requirements for charging. Unless there are significant changes/developments in charging rates and battery energy storage density, then the days of the short refilling time and the concentrated energy of petrochemical fuels will be replaced with different journey planning and recharge stops.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22619 - 8244 - POLICY BE01: FUTURE PROOFING - ii, iv

24287 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Whilst the Council's objectives towards future proofing of development are broadly supported, it is questionable whether it is necessary to set out a detailed planning policy to this effect when a number of the criteria set out comprise a series of aspirations. It is of some concern that Part A of the Policy requires that all applications must take into account..... when the process of development management and determination of applications is far more prescriptive and binary in decision making. It is suggested that Policy BE01 should be set out as supporting text rather than a specific policy.

Change To Plan: It is suggested that Policy BE01 should be set out as supporting text rather than a specific policy.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24287 - 2741 - POLICY BE01: FUTURE PROOFING - i, ii, iii, iv

24317 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Whilst the Council's objectives towards future proofing of development are broadly supported, it is questionable whether it is necessary to set out a detailed planning policy to this effect when a number of the criteria set out comprise a series of aspirations. It is of some concern that Part A of the Policy requires that all applications must take into account..... when the process of development management and determination of applications is far more prescriptive and binary in decision making. It is suggested that Policy BE01 should be set out as supporting text rather than a specific policy.

Change To Plan: It is suggested that Policy BE01 should be set out as supporting text rather than a specific policy.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24317 - 2741 - POLICY BE01: FUTURE PROOFING - i, ii, iii, iv

22317 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anglian Water fully supports the reference made to multi functional green and blue infrastructure incorporating the principles of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) which will help to address sewer flooding and surface water flooding.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22317 - 6824 - POLICY BE01: FUTURE PROOFING - None

23202 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We are supportive of the Local Plan policies relating to future proofing (BE01 and BE02).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23202 - 6824 - POLICY BE01: FUTURE PROOFING - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment

Responding to Climate Change

23189 Support**Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan rightly identifies the potential impact of climate change and contains a number of policies to address these.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23189 - 8308 - Responding to Climate Change - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment

5.13

22288 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective

Request clarification footnote to footnote 5 to provide up to date information.

Change To Plan: Additional footnote should be added to 5 as follows -

United Kingdom Climate Projections 2018 (UKCP18) has started to consider revised risk associated with sea level change

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22288 - 6776 - 5.13 - iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment

5.16

22620 Object**Respondent: Mr Ian Palmer [8244]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan does not appear to positively embrace the practical implementation of reducing carbon emitting traffic, school clear zone and low emission zone.

Change To Plan: Firstly, all new houses and access roads where parking is allowed should be fitted with suitable charging points. Secondly, where in the plan are the areas that will be allocated for vehicle charging. Brentwood is adjacent to 4 main transport routes all of which will need significant improvements to support the traffic from the various local development plans. A strategy needs to be developed that considers the physical area requirements for charging.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22620 - 8244 - 5.16 - ii, iv

22544 Support**Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Thames Chase Plan addresses climate change mitigation and adaptation and could be an opportunity for partnership working between the Council and the Thames Chase Trust (Thames Chase Community Forest).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22544 - 7196 - 5.16 - None

23679 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: Part (f) of Policy BE02 as it is too onerous and goes beyond National Policy. Part (f) requires all proposals to include commercial and domestic scale renewable energy and decentralised energy as part of new development. This is an extremely onerous requirement, particularly for small schemes where it may not be technically feasible. It could also have a huge impact on development viability. Paragraph 153 of the Framework allows for planning policies to require development to include decentralised energy supply. However, it also provides a caveat that this is only where it is viable and feasible. Part (f) of Policy BE02 should therefore be amended to reflect this guidance.

Change To Plan: Paragraph 153 of the Framework allows for planning policies to require development to include decentralised energy supply. However, it also provides a caveat that this is only where it is viable and feasible. Part (f) of Policy BE02 should therefore be amended to reflect this guidance.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23679 - 2774 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i, ii, iii, iv

23780 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Summary: We consider the policy to be unsound as it is inconsistent with national policy. Part (f) of Policy BE02 requires the inclusion of renewable and decentralised energy as part of a new development, this is not consistent with national policy. Whilst Countryside recognise the importance of sustainable construction, a policy approach to such requirements does not allow for the appropriate flexibility in this regard, as recognised in the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that local plans can expect development to meet such provisions, however the NPPF also states that they are only required to comply with such policies where it is either feasible or viable. To ensure consistency with national policy part (f) of Policy BE02 should be amended to reflect this position.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23780 - 6751 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i, ii, iii, iv

23959 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Policy BE02, Sustainable Construction (page 67 - 68)
Paragraph 153(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to: (a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable;..."
Policy BE02(f) is currently inconsistent with the NPPF as it does not reflect that this should not apply in circumstance where it is not feasible or viable. It is also inconsistent with Policy BE03 which states that "Proposals for renewable, low carbon or decentralised energy schemes will be supported provided they can demonstrate that they will not result in adverse impacts..." i.e. this recognises that this approach may not be appropriate in all circumstances. This approach is sound and consistent with the NPPF.
It is important that Policy BE02 and BE04 are consistent with the NPPF and do not unintentionally result in a policy expectation that over burdens development and undermines viability. This is particularly important in relation to Dunton Hills Garden Village which is important to the delivery of housing in the Local Plan. Modifications are proposed to Policy BE02 in our response to question no. 6 to ensure consistency with the NPPF and between policies in the Plan.

Change To Plan: In relation to Policy BE02 criterion (f):
"f. where feasible and viable, include commercial and domestic scale renewable energy and decentralised energy as part of new development."

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23959 - 5050 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i

23960 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Paragraph 153(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to: (a) comply with any development plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable;..."
Policy BE02(f) is currently inconsistent with the NPPF as it does not reflect that this should not apply in circumstance where it is not feasible or viable. It is also inconsistent with Policy BE03 which states that "Proposals for renewable, low carbon or decentralised energy schemes will be supported provided they can demonstrate that they will not result in adverse impacts..." i.e. this recognises that this approach may not be appropriate in all circumstances. This approach is sound and consistent with the NPPF.
It is important that Policy BE02 and BE04 are consistent with the NPPF and do not unintentionally result in a policy expectation that over burdens development and undermines viability. This is particularly important in relation to Dunton Hills Garden Village which is important to the delivery of housing in the Local Plan.
Modifications are proposed to Policy BE02 in our response to question no. 6 to ensure consistency with the NPPF and between policies in the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23960 - 5050 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i

24022 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: BE02 requires all development proposals to maximise the principles of energy conservation and efficiency. Whilst the NPPF (para 153) has regard to the inclusion of renewable and decentralised energy as part of a new development, it states that such features are only required where it is either feasible or viable. This policy is therefore not "consistent" with National Policy. We therefore object to the policy in its present form. In order to ensure consistency with National policy, criteria (f) of Policy BE02 should be revised to mirror the NPPF position. Therefore, it is considered that proposed Policy BE02 is unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24022 - 2656 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i, ii, iii, iv

24093 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: Unsound as it is inconsistent with national policy. Part (f) of Policy BE02 requires the inclusion of renewable and decentralised energy as part of a new development, this is not consistent with national policy. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that local plans can expect development to meet such provisions, however the NPPF also states that they are only required to comply with such policies where it is either feasible or viable. To ensure consistency with national policy part (f) of Policy BE02 should be amended to reflect this position.

Change To Plan: Part (f) of Policy BE02 should be amended to reflect this position.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24093 - 250 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i, iv

24291 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Whilst the Council's objectives towards sustainable construction and resource efficiency are broadly supported, it is questionable whether it is necessary to set out a detailed planning policy to this effect when a number of the criteria set out comprise a series of aspirations. The requirement to submit details of measures that increase resilience to the threat of climate change at b. is also considered to be over prescriptive when such techniques may vary substantially. The general principles set out at para 5.19 are reflective of the fact that these matters ought more properly to be dealt with by supporting text rather than a specific policy. In addition, we are aware of comments made by the HBF on this policy and we support those comments.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24291 - 2741 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i, ii, iii, iv

24318 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Whilst the Council's objectives towards sustainable construction and resource efficiency are broadly supported, it is questionable whether it is necessary to set out a detailed planning policy to this effect when a number of the criteria set out comprise a series of aspirations. The requirement to submit details of measures that increase resilience to the threat of climate change at b. is also considered to be over prescriptive when such techniques may vary substantially. The general principles set out at para 5.19 are reflective of the fact that these matters ought more properly to be dealt with by supporting text rather than a specific policy. In addition, we are aware of comments made by the HBF on this policy and we support those comments.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24318 - 2741 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i, ii, iii, iv

22318 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anglian Water supports the requirement to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems as part of the design of new developments which will help to address sewer flooding and surface water flooding.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22318 - 6824 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - None

23203 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are supportive of the Local Plan policies relating to future proofing (BE01 and BE02).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23203 - 6824 - POLICY BE02: SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION AND RESOURCE EFFICIENCY - i, ii, iii, iv

23781 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Summary: It is Government policy to seek to deliver improvements to emissions from buildings through the building regulations regime. As such we do not consider it necessary to include the table at part (a) of this policy. Should a national zero carbon policy be introduced it will be achieved and applied through building regulations, as noted at paragraph 5.33. We therefore echo those comments of the HBF's consultation response and suggest that if the building regulations are updated then the Council should revisit the policy through a local plan review at that stage.

Change To Plan: Removal of the policy to prevent duplication of such matters through both planning and construction stages.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23781 - 6751 - POLICY BE03: CARBON REDUCTION, RENEWABLE ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY - i, ii, iii, iv

24028 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy BE03: Carbon Reduction, Renewable Energy and Water Efficiency states that proposals for renewable, low carbon or decentralised energy schemes will be supported, subject to adverse cumulative and visual impacts, which cannot be satisfactorily addressed. Criteria (b) of the proposed policy sets out the minimum standards of sustainable construction and carbon reduction. It is Government policy to seek to deliver improvements to emissions from buildings through the application of building regulations. It is therefore considered that the table provided in proposed Policy BE03 is not required, and therefore this policy is "unjustified" and unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24028 - 2656 - POLICY BE03: CARBON REDUCTION, RENEWABLE ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY - i

24080 Object

Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]

Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]

Summary: Policy regarding renewable energy and low carbon development, BE3, requires rise in CO2 emissions above building Control Part L rising to nearly zero carbon from 2020 onwards. This is unviable, it is not inline with Climate Change Act or EU Energy Performance of Buildings Directive (2012/13/EU). The national standards have been abandoned. Therefore there is a clear lack of local evidence to support this, out of step with Government current position, is likely to be outdated by adoption and is overly onerous, affecting viability.

Change To Plan: The deliverability and viability of Policy BE03 at Point (a) is uncertain. Additional testing and evidence is required in order to support and justify this policy measure and to show that the policy would be effective if implemented. This is particularly important if the Building Regulations baseline is increased in future (if the national near zero carbon policy is not finally adopted) as the final limb of Point B(a) states.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24080 - 8362 - POLICY BE03: CARBON REDUCTION, RENEWABLE ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY - ii, iii

24094 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: It is Government policy to seek to deliver improvements to emissions from buildings through the building regulations regime. As such we do not consider it necessary to include the table at part (a) of this policy. Should a national zero carbon policy be introduced it will be achieved and applied through building regulations, as noted at paragraph. Agree with HBF's comment dated 17/03/2019, if the building regulations are updated then the Council should revisit the policy through a local plan review, but in the mean time, such matters are to be dealt with through building regulations.

Change To Plan: Unnecessary to include the table at part (a) of this policy.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24094 - 250 - POLICY BE03: CARBON REDUCTION, RENEWABLE ENERGY AND WATER EFFICIENCY - None

23190 Support

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support the measures to address the issues of water resources and to reduce water consumption in new development. The need to consider waste water and sewage infrastructure still needs to be strengthened. Where sewerage capacity is identified as insufficient, development should only be permitted if it is demonstrated that improvements will be completed prior to occupation of development. The Brentwood Water Cycle Study (2018) identifies areas where there may be limitations to the waste water infrastructure and therefore where applicants need to carry out appropriate appraisals to assess whether the proposed development will lead to existing waste water infrastructure overloading.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23190 - 8308 - Water Efficiency - i, ii, iii, iv

23782 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Summary: We raise concerns in relation to the deliverability of part (b) of the policy in relation to sites within a cluster of 500 or more dwellings given that neighbouring sites will not necessary come forward by multiple landowners and developers at similar times. The coordinating and implementation of a heat network to serve smaller scale sites as separate applications but adjacent to other similar sized sites in the locality, is unreasonable and unjustified and could result in a delay in delivery of new homes, resulting in an ineffective local plan.

Change To Plan: It is recommended that the requirement for new development located where 'clusters' of neighbouring sites totals over 500 units should be removed from the policy in order to make the policy effective.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23782 - 6751 - POLICY BE04: ESTABLISHING LOW CARBON AND RENEWABLE ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK - i, ii, iii, iv

23877 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: Criterion B(c) of this policy requires the application of the heat hierarchy to all development proposals. This is an unreasonable and unnecessary burden to apply to all developments that is not supported by national policy or the evidence base. It could limit the deliverability of proposals. It is not reasonable to expect a developer to factor the cost of such an onerous requirement into the development economics for a site and then demonstrate the viability. Such a feature is only justifiable on the largest of the strategic sites and is not relevant to the majority of the site allocations.

Change To Plan: Amend criterion B(c) to clarify that such a requirement is only applicable to schemes of 500 residential units or more.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23877 - 6669 - POLICY BE04: ESTABLISHING LOW CARBON AND RENEWABLE ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK - None

23961 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Policy BE04 Establishing Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Infrastructure Network (page 77 - 79)
Policy BE04 is currently inconsistent with paragraph 153 of the NPPF, which states that local plans can expect to comply with such provision where it is feasible or viable, and with Policy BE03 of the Local Plan. Modifications are proposed in our response to question no. 6 to ensure consistency with the NPPF and between policies in the Plan.

Change To Plan: For consistency with paragraph 153 of the NPPF and with Policy BE03 of the Local Plan the following modification are proposed.

In relation to Policy BE04 criterion (B):

"B. New development of over 500 dwelling units, or brownfield and urban extensions at 500 units or more, or where the clustering of neighbouring sites totals over 500 units, will be expected, where feasible and viable, to incorporate decentralised energy infrastructure in line with the following hierarchy..."
and

"ii. Where there is no existing heat network, new development will be expected to deliver an onsite heat network, unless demonstrated that this would be unfeasible or would render the development unviable;"

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23961 - 5050 - POLICY BE04: ESTABLISHING LOW CARBON AND RENEWABLE ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK - i

24029 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: This policy is considered overly onerous and "unjustified" in relation to the NPPF and therefore unsound. In order to make the policy more effective, it could set out that the delivery of renewable energy infrastructure should be required based on evidence of need and viability and a "viability assessment" (at the time planning applications are submitted/determined) - as per Policy SP04.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24029 - 2656 - POLICY BE04: ESTABLISHING LOW CARBON AND RENEWABLE ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK - i

24095 Object

Summary: Part (b) BE04 which expects sites of over 500 dwellings, including where there are clusters of neighbouring sites that total over 500 units, shall incorporate decentralised energy infrastructure in line with a hierarchy however. The coordinating and implementation of a heat network to serve smaller scale sites as separate applications but adjacent to other similar sized sites in the locality, is unreasonable and unjustified and could result in a delay in delivery of new homes, resulting in an ineffective local plan. Suggest remove "where clusters of neighbouring sites totals over 500 units".

Change To Plan: Suggest remove "where clusters of neighbouring sites totals over 500 units".

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24095 - 250 - POLICY BE04: ESTABLISHING LOW CARBON AND RENEWABLE ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK - None

22289 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective
4. Consistent with National Policy

In line with paragraph 156 of the NPPF, request additional wording added to end of A. to ensure requirements of Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are met.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy BE08 A. as follows -

'... adverse impact on water quality. SuDS must be based on the criteria outlined in the Essex County Council SuDS Guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22289 - 6776 - POLICY BE08: SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE - iii, iv

24030 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: This aspect of the policy is therefore considered "consistent" with the NPPF (para 163) which refers to the need for local planning authorities to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Given the extensive nature of the development, opportunities exist to incorporate the above the SuDs management across the site both locally and site-wide. However, the requirement for prevention if run-off for all rainfall events up to 5mm is in excess of the SuDS manual and is therefore "unjustified". This renders the overall Policy BE08 to be unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24030 - 2656 - POLICY BE08: SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE - None

22297 Support

Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We welcome the policy commitment to include biodiversity enhancements as an integral feature of SuDS.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22297 - 2414 - POLICY BE08: SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE - None

22331 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anglian Water supports the requirement to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems as part of the design of new developments which will help to address sewer flooding and surface water flooding.

We fully support the reference made to applicants demonstrating that they have followed the surface water hierarchy with a connection to the public sewer being considered as a last resort.

In addition we welcome the requirement to demonstrate that there is capacity exists in the public sewerage network where a surface water connection is proposed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22331 - 6824 - POLICY BE08: SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE - None

23191 Support

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We support this policy and are pleased to see our previous comments have been incorporated into the supporting text.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23191 - 8308 - POLICY BE08: SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE - i, ii, iii, iv

23204 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are supportive of the Local Plan policies relating to Drainage and flood risk (NE06 and BE08).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23204 - 6824 - POLICY BE08: SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment
5.66

22545 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Thames Chase Trust is co-host of the Roding, Beam & Ingrebourne Catchment Partnership, of which Brentwood Borough Council is a member. Please reference the work of Catchment Partnerships in this section.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22545 - 7196 - 5.66 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment
5.68

22290 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective

The Water Framework Directive (WFD) is a driver for the need for water quality improvements. However, the inclusion of this paragraph within the section relating to SuDS is confusing because ECC as LLFA do not use the criteria associated with water body status to assess pollution control delivered by SuDS.

Change To Plan: Delete paragraph 5.68.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22290 - 6776 - 5.68 - iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment
POLICY BE09: COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE

23245 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are pleased to note that the policies within the LP support our health and wellbeing objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23245 - 3791 - POLICY BE09: COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

23785 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Summary: We would draw the Council's attention to the Written Ministerial Statement 25-03-2015 which announced the local planning authorities preparing Local Plans "should not set any additional standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwelling". We are also unaware of National Policy requiring benches and bins to be connected to mobile digital infrastructure. The Council should not seek higher standards than Building Regulations. Policy BE10 is considered unsound because it is unjustified and contrary to national policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23785 - 6751 - POLICY BE10: CONNECTING NEW DEVELOPMENTS TO DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

23881 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: Criterion C of this policy requires the developer to make alternative arrangements for broadband provision where a provider has identified that superfast broadband is not practical. This shifts the burden of responsibility from the provider to the developer who is unlikely to be a broadband provider. This is an unreasonable requirement and not supported by national policy. The viability work in the evidence base does not provide a sufficiently robust assessment of the likely costs of providing this and therefore the impact on the viability of the proposed allocation has not been adequately assessed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23881 - 6669 - POLICY BE10: CONNECTING NEW DEVELOPMENTS TO DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE - i

24031 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy BE10: Connecting new developments to digital infrastructure seeks to support Brentwood's economic growth and productivity by improving the offer of digital infrastructure available within the Borough. Whilst planning strives to achieve the highest possible standards of construction and performance for new dwellings, Council's should not seek higher standards than Building Regulations on any other technical standards. Proposed Policy BE10 is therefore "unjustified" in light of National policy and therefore unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24031 - 2656 - POLICY BE10: CONNECTING NEW DEVELOPMENTS TO DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE - i

24096 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The LPAs are only allowed to adopt the three optional technical standards, in relation to construction, internal layout and performance, subject to evidenced need and viability. The Council should not seek higher standards than Building Regulations. Therefore, Policy BE10 is considered unsound because it is unjustified and contrary to national policy. We are also unaware of National Policy requiring benches and bins to be connected to mobile digital infrastructure. We have concerns that by introducing a wealth of additional planning policies in these areas, there will be unnecessary duplication to building regulations, and potentially delays to planning applications.

Change To Plan: Whilst we consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant and compliant with the Duty to Co-Operate, we consider the Local Plan to be unsound. We therefore wish to participate orally at the examination in order to argue the case for recommending the modifications as set out in this form and the accompanying representation.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24096 - 250 - POLICY BE10: CONNECTING NEW DEVELOPMENTS TO DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE - i

23246 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are pleased to note that the policies within the LP support our health and wellbeing objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23246 - 3791 - POLICY BE10: CONNECTING NEW DEVELOPMENTS TO DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

22346 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan needs to be supported by transport modelling(site specific, local and cumulative impacts, infrastructure, and/or mitigation measures, costings and phasing).

ECC as Highway Authority and BBC need confidence, and assurance that identify transport mitigation measures (in site allocation policies and viability and IDP work).

BBC have own highway consultants, ECC to check outputs, confirm satisfaction, and ensure mitigation measures identified and accounted for.

BBC and ECC meetings with BBC's transport consultants (PBA) to progress outstanding work, set out in PBA note - 30-01-2019.

ECC as Highway Authority cannot, at this stage, endorse transport evidence (incomplete and not inform IDP.

Change To Plan: BBC need to complete the transport modelling, in order to clearly illustrate the site specific, local and cumulative impacts of the Local Plan growth, and identify any infrastructure and/or mitigation measures which would be required, together with costings and phasing.

BBC (together with ECC) need the confidence, and assurance that it can identify up-front the required developer funded transport mitigation measures, and that such mitigation measures are covered within the Local Plan site allocation policies and accounted for in both viability and IDP work.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22346 - 6776 - Transport and Connectivity - i, ii, iii, iv

23160 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Whilst Thurrock Council supports in principle the overall aims of the sustainable transport Policies in the Brentwood Pre-Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) it is concerned about the realism and practical deliverability of this approach. Generally, there seems to be insufficient information to support the change in travel behaviour that is needed to support the ambition and policies of the local plan. More information is needed in relation to sustainable travel initiatives, cost of implementation/operation (where relevant) and, importantly, how residents and commuters will be encouraged and empowered to use and embrace the suggested sustainable travel initiatives. It is unlikely that simply delivering more cycle routes, cycle parking provision, EV charging etc will result in the required increase in sustainable modes of travel, without some form of behavioural change provision. It is unclear how the suggested improvements to walking, cycling, public transport and EVs will deliver meaningful benefit if they are not supported by a package of behaviour change components which set out and support the need to use sustainable travel options. Despite the need for further clarification on the transport network impacts, there is an opportunity to work collaboratively on the plan to deliver sustainable transport measures that will benefit Thurrock. The Southern Growth Corridor includes measures as the West Horndon New Transport Interchange, a new multi-modal interchange at West Horndon Station that could also serve Northern Thurrock developments. Cycle routes on this part of the plan can also be connected with Thurrock's network.

Change To Plan: It is recommended that specific additional evidence base required includes:

* A more fully developed transport evidence base that includes cumulative and site specific impacts of development on the local and strategic highway network and to identify further infrastructure and /or mitigation measures required together with costing and phasing;

* An up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that includes infrastructure costs, phasing, delivery and viability.

Despite the need for further clarification on the transport network impacts, there is an opportunity to work collaboratively on the plan to deliver sustainable transport measures that will benefit Thurrock. The Southern Growth Corridor includes measures as the West Horndon New Transport Interchange, a new multi-modal interchange at West Horndon Station that could also serve Northern Thurrock developments. Cycle routes on this part of the plan can also be connected with Thurrock's network.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23160 - 2461 - Transport and Connectivity - i, ii, iii, iv

23295 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport Assessment states that "This (Sustainable Measures) seems a proportionate and pragmatic approach [...]", but assumed numbers of car driver trips once 'sustainable measures' have been applied are minimal: In the morning peak, there would be a reduction of 239 car driver trips out of a total of 22,499 trips (1.06%), in the evening peak there would be a reduction of 194 car driver trips out of a total of 22,484 trips (0.86%) (tables 7.5 and 7.6). This is not considered a sustainable movement strategy therefore the Reg 19 Plan is not justified.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23295 - 381 - Transport and Connectivity - None

23297 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is unclear what the strategy is to increase modal share by bicycle. Not only does the Reg 19 Plan not identify specific routes but it does not make clear how cyclists would navigate across key junctions safely. The Reg 19 Plan provides no suggestion that such a route has been properly considered or that it has been secured. The costs identified in the IDP schedule therefore cannot be verified because the evidence does not demonstrate how they have been derived.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23297 - 381 - Transport and Connectivity - None

23579 Object

Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no references to traffic congestion, to which the Plan will clearly contribute. There are three references to bus services, one in the strategic objective and two in relation to one preferred site for an employment site which "has the potential" for development of bus services i.e. there are none at the moment. It is difficult to see how a plan can be called strategic without proper consideration of public transport within the borough.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23579 - 4922 - Transport and Connectivity - None

23582 Object

Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no mention of how congestion, which already inhibits travel within the borough and is predicted to increase even without the additional housing and business development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23582 - 4922 - Transport and Connectivity - None

23583 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The strategy fails to exploit the Elizabeth Line's capacity to accommodate growth in the north of the Borough.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified it should be withdrawn and rewritten from scratch, concentrating growth on the A12 corridor.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23583 - 6185 - Transport and Connectivity - ii

23586 Object

Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Ingatestone: The Ingatestone developments are just about walkable from the station and the limited number of shops in Ingatestone High Street. The train service from Ingatestone is less frequent than from Shenfield so people are likely to drive there rather than use their local station. Concerned that the number and distribution of proposed new dwellings will place an impossible burden on the existing road system. With no reference in the Plan to innovative solutions such as park-and-ride, and only lip service paid to the encouragement of cycling and walking, the Association fails to see how the Plan is sustainably delivered.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23586 - 4922 - Transport and Connectivity - None

23587 Object

Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922] Agent: N/A

Summary: Outer Area: The sites in the outer area (beyond reasonable walking distance) present some difficulty: for convenience, residents may choose to drive rather than wait for the regular bus services. Concerned that the number and distribution of proposed new dwellings will place an impossible burden on the existing road system. With no reference in the Plan to innovative solutions such as park-and-ride, and only lip service paid to the encouragement of cycling and walking, the Association fails to see how the Plan is sustainably delivered.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23587 - 4922 - Transport and Connectivity - None

23588 Object

Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922] Agent: N/A

Summary: Northern Villages: Existing bus services are not sufficiently attractive to residents to switch from driving. The addition of 169 additional units is unlikely to change the economics for bus companies to increase services. The consequence is higher volumes of traffic on feeder roads into Brentwood. Concerned that the number and distribution of proposed new dwellings will place an impossible burden on the existing road system. With no reference in the Plan to innovative solutions and only lip service paid to the encouragement of cycling and walking, the Association fails to see how the Plan is sustainably delivered.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23588 - 4922 - Transport and Connectivity - None

23589 Object

Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922] Agent: N/A

Summary: DHGV: It is likely that DHGV residents will look towards Basildon and Lakeside for shopping and leisure activities, resulting in minimal consumer spending in the core of Brentwood, with increased capacity and potential new routes spread along the A127/A13 corridor than northwards. Concerned that the number and distribution of proposed new dwellings will place an impossible burden on the existing road system. With no reference in the Plan to innovative solutions such as park-and-ride, and only lip service paid to the encouragement of cycling and walking, the Association fails to see how the Plan is sustainably delivered.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23589 - 4922 - Transport and Connectivity - None

23591 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185] Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposal to site a "garden community" adjacent to the London-Southend line and not the Elizabeth Line is inconsistent with the strategy set out in the Statement of Common Ground to which the Authority is a signatory. In the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan: Statement of Common Ground, June 2018, local authorities including the Authority recognise the potential for new garden communities; they note that the opportunities that they offer for the sub-region are dependent on significant investment in road and rail infrastructure; and they conclude that the opening of the Elizabeth Line offers major advantages in terms of connectivity to the new garden communities. Irrational to propose in its Plan a garden community linked not to the Elizabeth Line but to the London-Southend line, which is at capacity.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified Dunton Hills Garden Village should be removed from the Plan, and housing growth redirected to other areas of the Borough. If a garden community is the most appropriate solution, then it should be linked to the Elizabeth Line.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23591 - 6185 - Transport and Connectivity - ii

23997 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351] Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: The general approach taken to transport within policies BE11 to BE17 is supported and it can be seen that these policies are feeding through into the site specific policies.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23997 - 8351 - Transport and Connectivity - None

22186 Support **Respondent: Trailnet CIC (Mr Geoff Fletcher) [8194]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Cycle Brentwood group has surveyed residents regarding their attitudes to cycling and the overwhelming reason that they don't cycle more is their perception of cycling as a dangerous activity.

With the amount of open land in the borough, developing off-road cycle routes should be a priority. This will encourage more people, especially families, to cycle for leisure and maybe transport.

Where off-road routes are not appropriate, more provision must be made for segregated cycle paths alongside busy roads, or marked lanes in combination with traffic calming measures on quieter roads.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22186 - 8194 - 5.88 - None

22546 Support **Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Thames Chase Plan actively promotes sustainable transport and encourages walking, cycling and horse riding. The Thames Chase Community Forest should be referenced in this section.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22546 - 7196 - 5.88 - None

22347 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criteria B. b. needs to make it clear who BBC will work with in relation to the matter. This would be consistent with the wording for criteria B. a.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy BE11 B. b. as follows -

'The Council will work with all relevant statutory bodies, stakeholders and passenger transport providers to consider '

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22347 - 6776 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - iii

23123 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no specific highway mitigation measures provided in the Plan, just a general statement. Highway modelling should have been tested to determine impact in development locations. It is questionable whether it can be adequately demonstrated by the Plan that the allocations chosen represent the most sustainable option without specific highway mitigation measures that will be necessary to make them deliverable and sustainable. Without this work, the capacity to deliver new communities and homes becomes hindered by a lack of infrastructure capacity and outline solutions to overcome them. It is not considered that Policy BE11 is effective.

Change To Plan: BE11 and the land allocations should have been informed by highway modelling that tests highway mitigation solutions to mitigate impact caused by development. This work should be repeated and the Plan amended in light of its findings.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23123 - 369 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - None

23195 Object

Respondent: Highways England (Heather Archer) [8309]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan developments are expected to have an impact on the strategic road network. Policies BE11 and BE16 state, "any significant impacts from the development on the highway network on highway safety must be effectively mitigated...". These policies should be amended to reflect that there is a need to mitigate the impacts of the full Local Plan rather than the developments within it individually. Accordingly we are looking for evidence on the cumulative impacts of the Local Plan.

Change To Plan: For clarity, we suggest that the wording is amended to reflect that there is a need to mitigate the impacts of the full Local Plan rather than the developments within it individually. Any single development may have no discernible impact whereas cumulatively the Local Plan impacts may require mitigation. Accordingly we are looking for evidence on the cumulative impacts of the Local Plan. Similarly, you may wish to amend the wording of policies relating to individual allocations.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23195 - 8309 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - None

22353 Object

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council does not wish to raise any issues of soundness or legal compliance with respect to Brentwood Borough Council's proposed approach to strategic transport infrastructure but wishes to make the following general comments. Agree of need to maximise capacity of strategic transport infrastructure, modal change and improvement to connectivity across south Essex.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22353 - 4178 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - None

23229 Support

Respondent: Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BE11 A: TfL supports the intention to maximise the value of railway connectivity and specifically the improvements brought by the Elizabeth Line by ensuring that new development is well connected to rail stations by foot, cycle and public transport and introducing parking controls where necessary. Prioritising access to stations by sustainable modes of transport and seeking improvements to links, access, public realm and station capacity through developer contributions, alongside parking controls, is consistent with the approach being taken in London.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23229 - 7185 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

23230 Support

Respondent: Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BE11C: As highway authority for the A12 and A127 roads within London TfL welcomes the intention to seek highway improvements and particularly to seek suitable non highway measures and/or improvements to walking and cycling that may help to mitigate traffic impacts as a result of development. When assessing impacts and providing mitigation, the cross boundary impacts of new development on the Transport for Road Network within London should be taken into account

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23230 - 7185 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

23276 Support

Respondent: c2c Rail (Chris Atkinson) [8280]

Agent: N/A

Summary: C2C strongly welcome the Plan's recognition that the projected growth in passengers at West Horndon will require significant improvements to the existing station.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23276 - 8280 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

23277 Support

Respondent: c2c Rail (Chris Atkinson) [8280]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The London-bound platform at West Horndon station is not currently accessible, and this will require a bridge and lifts to ensure it is suitable for all proposed new residents. West Horndon station building itself is also of limited capacity, with only a short gateline. This will require significant investment to ensure it can handle the future anticipated number of passengers. Finally, the car park is also limited in capacity and will require expansion.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23277 - 8280 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

23747 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Support part C of Policy BE11: Strategic Transport Infrastructure, which sets out how the Council will continue to liaise with Highways Authorities and other key stakeholders to ensure the necessary improvements to ensure highway infrastructure capacity is maintained. We welcome BBC's proactive approach in this respect.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23747 - 5124 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - i, iv

23794 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: SUPPORT Strategic Transport Infrastructure designed to improve access to West Horndon station; arising from and facilitated by Dunton Hill Garden Village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23794 - 3738 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - None

23962 Support**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: BE11 Strategic Transport Infrastructure (page 92 - 94)
 CEG supports the objectives of Policy BE11, particularly improving multi modal integration and/or capacity at train stations, which is consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 110(a)). In relation to criterion B(ii) a modification is proposed to ensure consistency with Policy R01.

Change To Plan: BE11 Strategic Transport Infrastructure (page 92 - 94)

For consistency with Policy R01, the following modification is proposed:

"B. ii) improving the public realm, circulation arrangement and capacity of West Horndon station as well as creating associated multimodal interchange through phases to support new residents and employees at West Horndon and Dunton Hills Garden Village"

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23962 - 5050 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - i

24032 Support**Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]****Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]**

Summary: Policy BE11 is in line with ECC's Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions. This aligns with the NPPF (section 9) on "Promoting Sustainable Transport". These considerations therefore appear to be "justified", in accordance with national planning policy and therefore the policy is sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24032 - 2656 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

24339 Support**Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: Strategic Transport Infrastructure: We support part C of Policy BE11, which states that the Council will continue to work with the Highway Authority, statutory bodies and key stakeholders to deliver improvements to the ensure highway infrastructure capacity is maintained. Any future planning applications to be submitted in respect of new development at Childerditch Industrial Estate will be accompanied by the relevant transport studies.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24339 - 8371 - POLICY BE11: STRATEGIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment 5.92

22348 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Request amendment to paragraph 5.92 to reflect current situation. Both stations have existing forecourts, the policy should be seeking to improve these.

Change To Plan: Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.92 as follows -

'... with improved forecourt and pedestrian crossing facilities.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22348 - 6776 - 5.92 - iii

23296 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Despite the Transport Assessment stating that "an increased capacity on the existing train service will be central to the new cycling, walking and bus movements of the new residents and employees accessing the four sites.", there are no identified plans for investment in increased passenger rail capacity on C2C line, and no suggestion in the Reg 19 Plan or the evidence base as to the scale of improvements required. No evidence supporting the Reg 19 Plan provides assessment of accessibility of the train station.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23296 - 381 - Improvements to the train stations - None

23348 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Minter [2999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council are living in Never Never Land if they think people will use alternative forms of transport to the car people will use cars! West Horndon station is a 2 platform station which barely copes (in the rush hour) with the sudden impact of hundreds of people descending on such a tiny space. There is very little parking space and nowhere to allocate further spaces. Nowhere for extra infrastructure to accommodate bus interchange or bicycle storage.

Change To Plan: I believe the plan to be unsound and not thought out thoroughly with common sense in mind. It is full of "ideas" that have not been sensibly thought through. Development at West Horndon and Dunton is unrealistic and unworkable.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23348 - 2999 - Improvements to the train stations - None

23281 Support

Respondent: c2c Rail (Chris Atkinson) [8280]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Installing ETCS Level 2 system on the core section of current c2c route would unlock the possibility for a new higher-frequency timetable that can be operated while maintaining current punctuality levels, and would provide sufficient additional capacity across the route. A funding strategy is currently being developed to gain support from the Department for Transport. If the Outline Business Case demonstrates a positive BCR for this scheme, it is essential that Brentwood Council supports its development to mitigate the existing risk to the proposed allocations. The capital costs would require contributions from developers and others who benefit through appropriate mechanisms.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23281 - 8280 - Improvements to the train stations - i, ii, iii, iv

22183 Object

Respondent: Mr DAVID FISHER [8184]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1: Unambiguous statement for improving station capacity should be stated. Shenfield station struggles with peak-time pedestrian flow, this is unlikely to improve while having single access points to platforms.

2: The taxi parking around the station remains a consistent problem, causing risk to pedestrians and road users.

Change To Plan: AMEND: As mentioned above, enhancement to Shenfield station would centre around improving station capacity, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, taxi rank provisions and bus services and where necessary, parking controls

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22183 - 8184 - 5.96 - None

22349 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Additional wording requested to the end of paragraph 5.96 b. to ensure the proposed improvements can be appropriately funded.

Change To Plan: Insert additional sentence at end of paragraph 5.96 b. as follows -

Where appropriate contributions will therefore be sought from nearby developments.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22349 - 6776 - 5.96 - iii

23231 Support

Respondent: Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: TfL notes the reference to TfL rail services and the Elizabeth Line in 5.96. As stated above the revised timescale for the start of Elizabeth Line services is to be announced shortly.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23231 - 7185 - 5.96 - i, ii, iii, iv

23795 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: Support

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23795 - 3738 - 5.96 - None

22350 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Clarification is sought with regards to the status and progress with South Brentwood Growth Corridor Masterplan referenced in criterion i in paragraph 5.102. BBC should consider providing further narrative in the paragraph to explain this.

Change To Plan: BBC should seek to clarify the status and progress of the South Brentwood Growth Corridor Masterplan referenced in criterion i in paragraph 5.102. BBC should consider providing further narrative in the paragraph to explain this.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22350 - 6776 - 5.102 - iii

22351 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Recommended that reference made to A127 Task Force. Has representation from all South Essex authorities including BBC. Task Force will oversee public affairs interaction between Councils and Government to ensure route seen as strategic and potential candidate for re-trunking to bring about long-term improvement required for area of South Essex with over 600,000 residents. Planning and design work for any improvement of this scale require a short-term, medium and long term phasing. Whilst A127 is main focus ECC would be looking to work collaboratively with BBC and other councils in area on impact on A128 and M25 Junction 28 scheme.

Change To Plan: Insert additional point to paragraph 5.102 as follows -

iv. The A127 Task Force has representation from all South Essex authorities including BBC. This Task Force will oversee much of the public affairs interaction between the Councils and Government to ensure that the route is seen as strategic and as a potential candidate for re-trunking in order to bring about the long-term improvement required for an area of South Essex with over 600,000 residents. The planning and design work for any improvement of this scale will of necessity require a short-term, medium and long term phasing. Whilst the A127 is the main focus ECC would be looking to work collaboratively with BBC and other councils in the area on the impact on the A128 and the M25 Junction 28 scheme.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22351 - 6776 - 5.102 - iii

24340 Object

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Paragraph 5.105 states that, within the South Brentwood Growth Corridor, there is a recognition that provision of sustainable transport in this area is poor. Since the Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation, the Council has published an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for the Borough. This includes, at Figure 3.14 of Chapter 3, a sustainable transport plan for the Southern Growth Corridor, which includes indicative locations for new cycle ways and a new bus route to connect Childerditch Industrial Estate, Brentwood Enterprise Park, Dunton Hills Garden Village and West Horndon Industrial Estate (to be redeveloped). We support the principle of improving walking and cycling links within the land owned by our client, which extends to Little Warley Hall Lane. However, we would question the extent to which these new cycle ways could be delivered along the A127 corridor, as this would require every land owner to be committed to this initiative and an identification of funding. It is also not clear within the IDP who would be responsible for delivering this infrastructure improvement i.e. would this be the responsibility of Essex County Council, Brentwood Borough Council or landowners. This point needs to be clarified. In respect of the new bus route loop that is shown within the IDP at Childerditch Industrial Estate, whilst our client broadly supports the principle of a bus service at the Estate, they consider that the circulatory route shown within the IDP is too prescriptive and misleading, and at this stage, a broad arrow would be sufficient within the IDP. Details of how the Estate could be served can be dealt with as part of the iterative masterplan process. If a bus service from the A127 were to drop off/pick up were to be brought forward, our client could support this if the bus were to stop outside the Estate, turn and move back down Childerditch Hall Drive

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24340 - 8371 - 5.105 - i, ii, iii, iv

23720 Support

Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: We support the intent of Paragraph 5.105 in seeking to improve sustainable transport measures in the South Brentwood Growth Corridor. We would caution that transport improvements should be undertaken and required on a site specific basis, recognising the scale of new growth at each location. In the case of site E10 at Codham Hall, the employment uses on site are existing and therefore the allocation will provide for modest further growth, which should be recognised in considering any transport improvements required.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23720 - 6122 - 5.105 - i, iv

23748 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Support the wording in Paragraph 5.105 relating to the South Brentwood Growth Corridor, particularly the intent for BBC to work proactively with developers and stakeholders along the A127. We recognise the need to work collaboratively to address any transport impacts the BEP development may have on the highway network.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23748 - 5124 - 5.105 - i, iv

23796 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: Support

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23796 - 3738 - 5.105 - None

23126 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: P5.106-107 acknowledge the Lower Thames Crossing preferred route and that it is not expected to have a direct impact on Brentwood Borough in terms of land safeguarding. However, following the engagement of authorities in Essex, Highways England has accepted that its impact modelling was deficient in determining how driver behaviour in South Essex and further afield could alter when the scheme opens. Highways England are now taking steps to incorporate growth proposals set out in Local Plans in the vicinity to address this and identify any measures needed to the scheme or nearby routes to mitigate any adverse impacts.

Change To Plan: Paragraph 5.106 should be amended to include reference that local authorities have secured additional testing within the Lower Thames Crossing modelling being undertaken by Highways England to determine the extent of local impacts on the road network arising from Local Plan growth.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23126 - 369 - 5.106 - None

23232 Support

Respondent: Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We agree with the outlined approach of working with relevant bodies regarding the impact of the Lower Thames Crossing and any mitigations that are needed on the A127, A12 and local road network, and would be happy to work with you and other bodies to ensure the appropriate mitigation is delivered.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23232 - 7185 - 5.106 - i, ii, iii, iv

23233 Support

Respondent: Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We agree with the outlined approach of working with relevant bodies regarding the impact of the Lower Thames Crossing and any mitigations that are needed on the A127, A12 and local road network, and would be happy to work with you and other bodies to ensure the appropriate mitigation is delivered

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23233 - 7185 - 5.107 - i, ii, iii, iv

23749 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Concur with paragraph 5.107, which raises doubt on the scale and timelines associated with the impacts of the proposed Lower Thames Crossing. Having liaised extensively with the LTC teams, we are aware of the proposals and their relationship with the Brentwood Enterprise Park. We can confirm that the LTC teams and ourselves are committed to the realisation of both projects in a mutually acceptable manner and discussions are on-going in this regard.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23749 - 5124 - 5.107 - i, iv

22374 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Principle of car limited development (CLD) policy is supported.

Policy references CLD being considered at Brentwood Town Centre, District Shopping Centres, railway stations, strategic employment sites. Unclear why locations separated or is intention to refer to locations individually?

Considered reasonable that CLD considered at 'District Shopping Centres'.

Unclear how CLD considered at Strategic Employment Allocations (inc. Brentwood Enterprise Park). Unclear how employees expected to travel via safe and direct walking and cycling routes given location (M25, J29) without significant improvements to sustainable transport network, including provision of new passenger transport services.

Criteria b and c repeats Policy BE13.

Unclear how methods identified in criteria d. would be implemented.

Change To Plan: It is recommended that the policy wording is amended to address the points raised in order to remove ambiguity and provide clarity for the decision maker in relevant planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22374 - 6776 - POLICY BE12: CAR-LIMITED DEVELOPMENT - iii, iv

23234 Support

Respondent: Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: TfL welcomes the inclusion of a policy on car limited development which reflects the approach being taken in London.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23234 - 7185 - POLICY BE12: CAR-LIMITED DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

22621 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Palmer [8244]

Agent: N/A

Summary: If you take the very laudable sentiments for supporting school clear zones, low emission zones and the need to significantly reduce carbon emitting traffic, the plan does not appear to positively embrace the practical implementation of these sentiments.

Change To Plan: Firstly, all new houses and access roads where parking is allowed should be fitted with suitable charging points. Secondly, where in the plan are the areas that will be allocated for vehicle charging. A strategy needs to be developed that considers the physical area requirements for charging. Unless there are significant changes/developments in charging rates and battery energy storage density, then the days of the short refilling time and the concentrated energy of petrochemical fuels will be replaced with different journey planning and recharge stops. But where might they be situated given the pressure on housing and the wish for them to be adjacent to road junctions?

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22621 - 8244 - 5.109 - None

22561 Support

Respondent: Gerald Downey [4671]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Walking or cycling along where I live (Priests Lane) is very dangerous given the volume and speed of vehicles coupled with the very narrow road. I would support further improvements to making Brentwood Pedestrian and Cycle friendly.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22561 - 4671 - 5.109 - None

22309 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Whilst the aspiration of the Plan is to encourage sustainable transport and reduce peoples' dependence on the private car, if safe off-road routes are being provided then they should be open to all users - including equestrians.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan fully inclusive and to not discriminate against any user group, and therefore sound, we suggest that the term 'multi-user route' is used rather than singling out pedestrians and cyclists. After all, a route that is accessible on horseback is also accessible to all other users - especially the disabled in wheelchairs/mobility scooters and parents with double buggies.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22309 - 3855 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - i, ii, iii

22376 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Amendment required to seek distinction between new and existing development and terminology to correctly refer to 'passenger transport'.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy BE13 B. b. as follows -

'... good accessibility for passenger transport within sites and between sites and adjacent areas, and where appropriate improve areas where passenger transport, ...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22376 - 6776 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - iii

23721 Object

Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Policy BE13 refers to sustainable means of travel, setting out criteria for new development. Sites allocated for development have site specific policies within the Local Plan, which include criteria on transport and it is not currently clear whether Policy BE13 imposes additional requirements. In order to be effective in accordance with the tests of soundness, Policy BE13 should therefore be clearer that it does not impose additional requirements.

Change To Plan: Policy BE13 should be clearer that it does not impose any additional requirements over the site specific policies in order to be effective.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23721 - 6122 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - i, iv

23750 Object

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Policy BE13 should be amended so that it is made clear that it does not have the effect of imposing any requirements on the allocated sites that are in addition to those set out in the individual site allocation policies. Policy BE13 should acknowledge that site specific policies provide details of how sustainable travel opportunities will be achieved in respect of each site.

Change To Plan: Policy BE13 should be clearer that it does not impose any additional requirements over the site specific policies.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23750 - 5124 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - i, iv

22354 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council is broadly supportive of Policy BE13 and acknowledges the importance of ensuring new developments are well supported by sustainable transport options.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22354 - 4178 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - None

23235 Support

Respondent: Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: TfL welcomes the priority given to walking, cycling and public transport and the aim of facilitating sustainable modes of transport through new development. Again this is broadly consistent with the approach being taken in London. However, we would be grateful if mention could be made of the Healthy Streets Approach that is being implemented in London through the Mayor's Transport Strategy and Policy T2 of the draft London Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23235 - 7185 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - i, ii, iii, iv

23247 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are pleased to note that the policies within the LP support our health and wellbeing objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23247 - 3791 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - i, ii, iii, iv

23312 Support

Respondent: Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As set out in the consultation response by Transport for London, we welcome the Council's support for sustainable modes of transport. As Brentwood borders London, we would be grateful, if consideration could also be given to the Healthy Streets Approach that is set out in the Mayor's Transport Strategy and Policy T2 of the draft London Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23312 - 6093 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - i, ii, iii, iv

24033 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: BE13 seek to secure developments that are, inter-alia, designed to make necessary contributions to the improvement of existing infrastructure and provision of new infrastructure; be consistent and contribute to the implementation of the Essex County Council's Development Management Policies and include Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. This aligns with the NPPF (section 9) "Promoting Sustainable Transport" and is therefore considered "justified" and sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24033 - 2656 - POLICY BE13: SUSTAINABLE MEANS OF TRAVEL AND WALKABLE STREETS - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment
5.111

22562 Support

Respondent: Gerald Downey [4671]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Strongly support this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22562 - 4671 - 5.111 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment 5.112

22547 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Thames Chase Plan has a focus on Access and Sustainable Transport, actively encouraging walking, cycling and horse riding. The Thames Chase Community Forest should be referenced in this section.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22547 - 7196 - 5.112 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment POLICY BE14: SUSTAINABLE PASSENGER TRANSPORT

22378 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

ECC's Development Management Policies February 2011 provide guidance on the development requirements for the provision of passenger transport. Reference should be made to the requirement to have consideration to these.

Change To Plan: Insert additional criteria to Policy BE14 after A. as follows -

Sustainable passenger transport provision should have consideration to the Essex County Council Development Management Policies, or successor.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22378 - 6776 - POLICY BE14: SUSTAINABLE PASSENGER TRANSPORT - iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment 5.121

23797 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: Support

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23797 - 3738 - 5.121 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment POLICY BE15: ELECTRIC AND LOW EMISSION VEHICLES

22380 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

As currently worded the policy only requires consideration of such infrastructure at major new developments. Points may be located at other locations. This is not consistent with the policy's supporting text or paragraph 110 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace Criteria A. of Policy BE15 with the following wording -

New dwellings and non-residential buildings shall provide convenient access to Electric Vehicle (EV) charging point infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22380 - 6776 - POLICY BE15: ELECTRIC AND LOW EMISSION VEHICLES - iv

22386 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

The wording in Criteria A needs to be amended to ensure that the policy is positively prepared, and is consistent with paragraph 108 of the NPPF, particularly criterion c.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy BE16 A. as follows -

A. Developments should seek to ensure that any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22386 - 6776 - POLICY BE16: MITIGATING THE TRANSPORT IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT - iv

22597 Object

Respondent: Cllr Philip Mynott [8283]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan fails to support its own staed objectives. It is fundamentally contradictory. [With regard to proposed development site impacts on the highways in terms of junction capacity and associated congestion.]

Change To Plan: A ground up rethink of the plan, starting from a realistic assessment of what development might have a transport and traffic impact that was acceptable and practicably capable of being resolved.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22597 - 8283 - POLICY BE16: MITIGATING THE TRANSPORT IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT - iii, iv

23197 Object

Respondent: Highways England (Heather Archer) [8309]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan developments are expected to have an impact on the strategic road network. Policies BE11 and BE16 state, "any significant impacts from the development on the highway network on highway safety must be effectively mitigated...". These policies should be amended to amended to reflect that there is a need to mitigate the impacts of the full Local Plan rather than the developments within it individually. Accordingly we are looking for evidence on the cumulative impacts of the Local Plan.

Change To Plan: For clarity, we suggest that the wording is amended to reflect that there is a need to mitigate the impacts of the full Local Plan rather than the developments within it individually. Any single development may have no discernible impact whereas cumulatively the Local Plan impacts may require mitigation. Accordingly we are looking for evidence on the cumulative impacts of the Local Plan. Similarly, you may wish to amend the wording of policies relating to individual allocations.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23197 - 8309 - POLICY BE16: MITIGATING THE TRANSPORT IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT - None

23882 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: The wording of criterion A does not reflect the wording of the NPPF at paragraph 109, which reads: "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe." It is therefore inconsistent with national policy.

Change To Plan: For the reasons explained above, criterion A should be amended to read: "Developments should not give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the residual cumulative impacts on the road networks should not be severe".

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23882 - 6669 - POLICY BE16: MITIGATING THE TRANSPORT IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT - None

22355 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council is broadly supportive of Policy BE16 and acknowledges the importance of ensuring that new developments are sustainably supported by transport infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22355 - 4178 - POLICY BE16: MITIGATING THE TRANSPORT IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT - None

22326 Support

Respondent: Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: TfL welcomes the requirement to submit Transport Assessments/Statements and the requirement for mitigation where necessary.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23236 - 7185 - POLICY BE16: MITIGATING THE TRANSPORT IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment Managing Parking

22420 Support

Respondent: MR Graham Clegg [5485]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Parking provision needs to be carefully handled if the Council intends to re-develop some of its own car parks.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22420 - 5485 - Managing Parking - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment POLICY BE17: PARKING STANDARDS

22387 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Amendment is requested to criteria A of the policy in order to reflect the current position in respect of parking policy.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy BE17 A. as follows -

'... Essex Parking Standards - Design and Good Practice (2009), or as amended....'

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22387 - 6776 - POLICY BE17: PARKING STANDARDS - iii

24034 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: The imposed parking standards are subject to the site's ability to minimise pressure on land and encourage the use of alternative modes of transport, therefore Policy BE17 is inconsistent with the NPPF (para 105). Policy BE12 also deals with "parking matters", but is not aligned with Policy BE17. This adds further inconsistency, in addition to Policy BE17 itself being "inconsistent" with the NPPF. It is therefore presently unsound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24034 - 2656 - POLICY BE17: PARKING STANDARDS - i

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment 5.143

22548 Support **Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Thames Chase Community Forest should be referenced as key GBI in this section.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22548 - 7196 - 5.143 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment 5.145

22549 Support **Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Working with environmental charities should also be referenced e.g. the Thames Chase Trust is the body with overall responsibility for overseeing the continued development of the Thames Chase Community Forest in Brentwood.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22549 - 7196 - 5.145 - None

22310 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy BE18: point b sets out the requirements for any new development in relation to green and blue infrastructure and we suggest that it is also important for opportunities for access to such infrastructure to be incorporated into the Plan.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, we suggest that point b is reworded thus: '...maximise opportunities for the provision, restoration, enhancement, accessibility and connection...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22310 - 3855 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

22321 Object

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anglian Water is generally supportive of Policy BE18 as drafted.

Policy BE18 should be amended to make it clear that sewage companies fund any required improvements to wastewater treatment works to accommodate development rather than developers.

Change To Plan: f. seek to improve the water environment and that demonstrate that adequate wastewater infrastructure capacity is available or can be provided in time to serve the development;

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22321 - 6824 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - iii

22389 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Additional wording requested to ensure the policy considers connectivity for wildlife and people in line with paragraph 91 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Add the following wording at the end of B. b. -

'...and systems to improve connectivity for wildlife and people;'

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22389 - 6776 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - iv

23883 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: Criterion B(a) requires development proposals to dictate the decision-making process. It is assumed that this is an error in drafting. Such a requirement is best-placed in the supporting text with clarification that it will be the way in which the Council will handle decision-making.

Change To Plan: Criterion B(a) is best-placed in the supporting text with clarification that it will be the way in which the Council will handle decision-making.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23883 - 6669 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - i

23884 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: Criterion B(f) requires improvements to be made to the water environment. Such a requirement is not justified by national policy as it is not for development proposals to resolve existing issues - development proposals can only mitigate the impact of the development proposed. Criterion B(g) requires development proposals to eliminate misconnections between foul and surface water networks. This can only be achieved where the whole site is being redeveloped and it cannot remove misconnections that are outside of the developers control. The concerns raised must be addressed as criterion C seeks financial contributions where the measures required are not possible.

Change To Plan: Remove the reference to improving the water environment in criterion B(f) as a requirement for all development proposals.
Amend criterion B(g) to make it clear that the requirement relates the connections within the development site where the development proposals relate.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23884 - 6669 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - None

24035 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Points A-I of Policy BE18 identify the measures by which development proposals can maximise opportunities to protect and enhance green and blue infrastructure, aligning with the NPPF (section 15) "Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment". However, it is presently unclear how any net gains/losses and any associated requirements would be measured/calculated, or the mechanism by which the Council or developer would deliver this. In addition, the requirement for a developer to ensure there is sufficient foul capacity within the local network before a development commences is unsound, it is ultimately the Water Authority's responsibility to ensure sufficient capacity.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24035 - 2656 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - i

22298 Support

Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We welcome the commitment to protect and enhance green and blue infrastructure, with the caveat that the wording should be amended to include mention of biodiversity, as follows:

borough's network of green and blue infrastructure (GBI) and should be protected, planned, enhanced and managed "to maximise biodiversity"

i. deliver "measurable" environmental net gains; if there is a net loss from the development, provide provisions through offsetting. This should be quantified using a recognised biodiversity metric such as the Defra metric.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22298 - 2414 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - None

22364 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council is generally supportive of policies BE18 and BE23 and consider them to broadly align with national policy and local and national objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22364 - 4178 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - None

22372 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The policy is supported on the basis it seeks an integrated approach to the provision of Green and Blue Infrastructure which would include outdoor sport and recreation facilities plus seeking new development to make appropriate provision either directly or through financial contributions. This general approach is supported by the Council's evidence base such as the Playing Pitch Strategy and would be consistent with the NPPF.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22372 - 4294 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - None

23192 Support

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support this policy and pleased to see the prominent position given to the water environment. We feel that the supporting text could be enhanced by acknowledging the role of natural flood management: reducing flooding by working with natural process, reconnecting watercourses with floodplains to enhance flood storage in times of need, and taking opportunities to restore watercourses to a naturalised state. This should be considered and incorporated into developments wherever opportunities arise. As well as contributing to reducing flood risk, such schemes can enhance the blue infrastructure and contribute to enhancing biodiversity.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23192 - 8308 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

23209 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Suggest clarification of wording to make it clear that wastewater treatment capacity is made available by the sewage companies and not developers who have a role in funding improvements to the network itself.

Change To Plan: Clarification of wording as suggested above. We welcome the opportunity to enter into a Statement of Common Ground or similar in relation to the outstanding points set out above prior to the examination.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23209 - 6824 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iv

23306 Support

Respondent: Natural England (Ms Louise Oliver) [8299]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy is in accordance with national planning guidance and the Habitats Regulations through seeking to protect, conserve and enhance the natural environment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23306 - 8299 - POLICY BE18: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment
5.151

22550 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please reference the Thames Chase Community Forest in this section. The Thames Chase Trust is host of the South Essex Catchment Partnership and co-host of the Roding, Beam & Ingrebourne Catchment Partnership.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22550 - 7196 - 5.151 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment
5.152

23193 Support

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We feel the wording in 5.152 could be modified, as it seems to relate to the effect of development on watercourses with either a poor or moderate status, the duty to prevent deterioration of water body status should apply to all water bodies irrespective of their current status.

Change To Plan: Wording in 5.152 could be modified so that the duty to prevent deterioration of water body status should apply to all water bodies irrespective of their current status.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23193 - 8308 - 5.152 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment
5.155

23798 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: Support

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23798 - 3738 - 5.155 - None

22551 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please change 'Thames Chase Forest' to 'Thames Chase Community Forest'.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22551 - 7196 - 5.156 - None

22299 Support

Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We recommend that wording should be amended to include mention of biodiversity, as follows:
b. these measures should be protected, planned, designed and managed as integrated features of green and blue infrastructure "to maximise biodiversity"

Nature friendly development design should include integral features such as swift bricks, sparrow terraces, bat roosts, bee hotels etc. It should also have features and green corridors to help invertebrates, reptiles, hedgehogs and other mammals; wildlife-permeable boundaries between gardens and open spaces; wildflower verges and hedgerows integrated with the development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22299 - 2414 - POLICY BE19: ACCESS TO NATURE - None

24036 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy BE19 seeks that major developers provide direct access to nature and that this provision is protected, planned, designed and managed as an integrated feature of the landscape. Developments in areas that are more than 1km walking distance from an accessible green open space should also seek opportunities to improve resident's experience and interaction with nature by means of design. The NPPF (section 8) "Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities" states that planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, this policy is therefore deemed to be "consistent" with the NPPF and sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24036 - 2656 - POLICY BE19: ACCESS TO NATURE - i

23885 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: Neither the policy nor the supporting text identifies the scale of development where this policy would be applicable. Such a requirement will not be feasible on some allocated sites with site constraints or where the scale of development does not support such provision. It is an unreasonable and unnecessary requirement for any scale of residential development and should be restricted to the larger allocation sites of 500 units or more. This blanket requirement will reduce the development yield resulting in allocations not delivering the number of units identified and contributing to the failure of the plan to meet housing requirement.

Change To Plan: For the reasons explained above, amend the policy to identify that the requirement relates to schemes of 500 units or more.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23885 - 6669 - POLICY BE20: ALLOTMENTS AND COMMUNITY FOOD GROWING SPACE - None

24292 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: : Whilst the Council's aspirations for providing allotments are acknowledged, the policy as set out provides for no clear thresholds as to when such space should be provided which is not justified in the terms set out. On this basis, it is recommended that the policy should either be omitted and dealt with by the text to the PSLP or justified against thresholds or site specific requirements. In this respect, it may be that large strategic sites may need to include a requirement but it is certainly not necessary for smaller or medium sized sites, such as those the subject of these representations.

Change To Plan: It is recommended that the policy should either be omitted and dealt with by the text to the PSLP or justified against thresholds or site specific requirements

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24292 - 2741 - POLICY BE20: ALLOTMENTS AND COMMUNITY FOOD GROWING SPACE - i, ii, iii, iv

24319 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Whilst the Council's aspirations for providing allotments are acknowledged, the policy as set out provides for no clear thresholds as to when such space should be provided which is not justified in the terms set out. On this basis, it is recommended that the policy should either be omitted and dealt with by the text to the PSLP or justified against thresholds or site specific requirements. In this respect, it may be that large strategic sites may need to include a requirement but it is certainly not necessary for smaller or medium sized sites, such as those the subject of these representations.

Change To Plan: It is recommended that the policy should either be omitted and dealt with by the text to the PSLP or justified against thresholds or site specific requirements

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24319 - 2741 - POLICY BE20: ALLOTMENTS AND COMMUNITY FOOD GROWING SPACE - i, ii, iii, iv

23248 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are pleased to note that the policies within the LP support our health and wellbeing objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23248 - 3791 - POLICY BE20: ALLOTMENTS AND COMMUNITY FOOD GROWING SPACE - i, ii, iii, iv

23817 Object

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is understood that Policy BE21 will only apply to garden land not forming part of an allocated site for development. If it is considered by the Examiner that as drafted BE21 is not clear, then it is requested that there is a clarification by way of an explanatory paragraph to exclude the application of Policy BE21 to parts of sites in garden land use, such as identified in Policy R07. Likewise para. 5.174 refers to the NPPF 2018 and the exclusion of gardens from the definition of previously developed land. However Annex 2 Glossary to the NPPF 2018 states with regard to previously developed land, land that is excluded includes: "land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks .. ". As land in site R07 includes residential garden land to the Bungalow and dwelling at Sow N Grow Nursery, and also to the adjoining 346 Ongar Road, which is currently outside the development/settlement boundary and in the countryside/green belt, it will be previously developed land. When it is brought into the settlement boundary and out of the green belt upon adoption there may be a need to clarify the application of this explanatory paragraph which forms part of the emerging Local Plan; as referred to above.

Change To Plan: Clarify policy BE21 with regard to site R07

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23817 - 303 - POLICY BE21: PROTECTING LAND FOR GARDENS - None

23844 Object

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is understood that Policy BE21 will only apply to garden land not forming part of an allocated site for development. If it is considered by the Examiner that as drafted BE21 is not clear, then it is requested that there is a clarification by way of an explanatory paragraph to exclude the application of Policy BE21 to parts of sites in garden land use, such as identified in Policy R07. Likewise para. 5.174 refers to the NPPF 2018 and the exclusion of gardens from the definition of previously developed land. However Annex 2 Glossary to the NPPF 2018 states with regard to previously developed land, land that is excluded includes: "land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks .. ". As land in site R07 includes residential garden land to the Bungalow and dwelling at Sow N Grow Nursery, and also to the adjoining 346 Ongar Road, which is currently outside the development/settlement boundary and in the countryside/green belt, it will be previously developed land. When it is brought into the settlement boundary and out of the green belt upon adoption there may be a need to clarify the application of this explanatory paragraph which forms part of the emerging Local Plan; as referred to above.

Change To Plan: Clarify policy BE21 with regard to site R07

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23844 - 4657 - POLICY BE21: PROTECTING LAND FOR GARDENS - None

23861 Object

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is understood that Policy BE21 will only apply to garden land not forming part of an allocated site for development. If it is considered by the Examiner that as drafted BE21 is not clear, then it is requested that there is a clarification by way of an explanatory paragraph to exclude the application of Policy BE21 to parts of sites in garden land use, such as identified in Policy R07. Likewise para. 5.174 refers to the NPPF 2018 and the exclusion of gardens from the definition of previously developed land. However Annex 2 Glossary to the NPPF 2018 states with regard to previously developed land, land that is excluded includes: "land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks .. ". As land in site R07 includes residential garden land to the Bungalow and dwelling at Sow N Grow Nursery, and also to the adjoining 346 Ongar Road, which is currently outside the development/settlement boundary and in the countryside/green belt, it will be previously developed land. When it is brought into the settlement boundary and out of the green belt upon adoption there may be a need to clarify the application of this explanatory paragraph which forms part of the emerging Local Plan; as referred to above.

Change To Plan: Clarify policy BE21 with regard to site R07

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23861 - 4656 - POLICY BE21: PROTECTING LAND FOR GARDENS - None

23705 Object

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: As land in site R07 includes residential garden land to the Bungalow and dwelling at Sow N Grow Nursery, and also to 346 Ongar Road, which is currently outside the development/settlement boundary and in the countryside/green belt, it will be previously developed land. When it is brought into the settlement boundary and out of the green belt upon adoption there may be a need to clarify the application of this explanatory paragraph which forms part of the emerging Local Plan; as referred to above. There should be a further clarification to para. 5.174 to exclude gardens outside built up areas to accord with the definition in the NPPF 2018, and to provide certainty where part of allocated development sites which become part of built up areas.

Change To Plan: Amend para 5.174

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23705 - 8337 - 5.174 - None

23818 Object

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As land in site R07 includes residential garden land to the Bungalow and dwelling at Sow N Grow Nursery, and also to 346 Ongar Road, which is currently outside the development/settlement boundary and in the countryside/green belt, it will be previously developed land. When it is brought into the settlement boundary and out of the green belt upon adoption there may be a need to clarify the application of this explanatory paragraph which forms part of the emerging Local Plan; as referred to above. There should be a further clarification to para. 5.174 to exclude gardens outside built up areas to accord with the definition in the NPPF 2018, and to provide certainty where part of allocated development sites which become part of built up areas.

Change To Plan: Amend para 5.174 to exclude gardens outside the built up area

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23818 - 303 - 5.174 - None

23843 Object

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As land in site R07 includes residential garden land to the Bungalow and dwelling at Sow N Grow Nursery, and also to 346 Ongar Road, which is currently outside the development/settlement boundary and in the countryside/green belt, it will be previously developed land. When it is brought into the settlement boundary and out of the green belt upon adoption there may be a need to clarify the application of this explanatory paragraph which forms part of the emerging Local Plan; as referred to above. There should be a further clarification to para. 5.174 to exclude gardens outside built up areas to accord with the definition in the NPPF 2018, and to provide certainty where part of allocated development sites which become part of built up areas.

Change To Plan: Amend para 5.174 to exclude gardens outside the built up area

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23843 - 4657 - 5.174 - None

23860 Object

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As land in site R07 includes residential garden land to the Bungalow and dwelling at Sow N Grow Nursery, and also to 346 Ongar Road, which is currently outside the development/settlement boundary and in the countryside/green belt, it will be previously developed land. When it is brought into the settlement boundary and out of the green belt upon adoption there may be a need to clarify the application of this explanatory paragraph which forms part of the emerging Local Plan; as referred to above. There should be a further clarification to para. 5.174 to exclude gardens outside built up areas to accord with the definition in the NPPF 2018, and to provide certainty where part of allocated development sites which become part of built up areas.

Change To Plan: Amend para 5.174 to exclude gardens outside the built up area

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23860 - 4656 - 5.174 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment Open Space

22422 Support

Respondent: MR Graham Clegg [5485]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The green open space lying between the Baytree Centre and Coptfold Road is worth special attention.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22422 - 5485 - Open Space - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 5. Resilient Built Environment 5.179

22311 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Para 5.179 and Policy BE22: we note the requirement for access to open space, but we would prefer to see the aspiration to include more user groups within this open space both within the Policy and its reasoned justification.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound we suggest that a requirement to enhance existing open space and create new where possible and to ensure that as far as practicable this becomes accessible to all user groups.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22311 - 3855 - 5.179 - i, ii, iii, iv

23886 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: Although it is noted that the sentence includes the phrase 'where appropriate' it is considered that the policy should make clear that the contributions will go towards facilities that are directly related to the development proposal to mitigate the impacts rising. It would not, for example, be appropriate or consistent with national policy if the contributions were for the improvement of play facilities that the residents of a proposed residential scheme would be unlikely - through proximity - to utilise or have an impact upon.

Change To Plan: Amend criterion A to make it clear that the financial contributions will relate to facilities that are directly related to the development proposals and the impacts arising.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23886 - 6669 - POLICY BE22: OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - i

23963 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: The NPPF states at paragraph 56 that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:
a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
b) directly related to the development; and
c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
Policy BE22 is not positively prepared or consistent with paragraph 56 of the NPPF because it is not reasonable to request financial contributions in circumstances where a developer is providing functional open space on-site. To ensure the policy is positively prepared consistent with the NPPF modifications are proposed in our response to question no. 6.

Change To Plan: Policy BE22, Open Space in New Development (page 119)

Policy BE22 is not positively prepared or consistent with paragraph 56 of the NPPF because it is not reasonable to request financial contributions in circumstances where a developer is providing functional open space on-site. To ensure the policy is positively prepared consistent with the NPPF modifications are proposed as follows:

"A. New development proposals are expected to provide functional on-site open space and/or recreational amenities or, where it is demonstrated that this is not possible, and may, where appropriate be required to also provide a financial contribution in lieu towards new or improved facilities within the borough."

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23963 - 5050 - POLICY BE22: OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - i

24114 Object

Respondent: Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall Charitable Trust [4558]

Agent: Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall Charitable Trust (Mrs Catherine North) [4559]

Summary: Allocation of Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall Charitable Trust's Property as a Protected Urban Open Space (PUOS): Unclear what criteria, policy or process determines the allocation of properties as a PUOS and what considerations are given for such allocations. The property is a Village Hall, not a playing field nor does it serve as a football pitch, mini football pitch and playground as described in the 'Sport, Leisure and Open Space Assessment' 2016. If planning allocations are retrospectively placed on the community's property, without the community's consent, the Trustees are under an obligation to challenge that.

Change To Plan: - The allocation of the Trust's property (Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall) as a PUOS is not needed and should be removed. BBC had enough capacity to deliver its policies and responsibilities without the use of the Charitable Trust's property. Before any loss of control of the property, including sale or lease, the Community must hold a referendum, if the outcome is an agreement to loose control of all or part of the property this must be ratified by the Charity Commission.
- Allocate Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall as PC14, as this better describes the property.
- If this is not possible to remove the PUOS and replace it with PC14 please could all the reasons be fully itemised, i.e. how the community benefits from loss of their legal rights to determine how best to provide and maintain their village hall.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24114 - 4558 - POLICY BE22: OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - None

24293 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The policy is broadly supported. As can be seen from the Vision document that accompanies these representations, our proposed scheme for R24 makes provision for such space. It is nevertheless questionable whether it is necessary for all open space to be fully equipped (D.). The need for equipped space should also be related to the amount of development proposed and/or availability of local equipped areas. As a consequence, it is recommended that criteria D is amended to be refined to provide clarity on when equipped open space is required eg. on sites over 50 homes.

Change To Plan: It is recommended that criteria D is amended to be refined to provide clarity on when equipped open space is required eg. on sites over 50 homes.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24293 - 2741 - POLICY BE22: OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

24320 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The policy is broadly supported. As can be seen from the Vision document that accompanies these representations, our proposed scheme for R24 makes provision for such space. It is nevertheless questionable whether it is necessary for all open space to be fully equipped (D.). The need for equipped space should also be related to the amount of development proposed and/or availability of local equipped areas. As a consequence, it is recommended that criteria D is amended to be refined to provide clarity on when equipped open space is required eg. on sites over 50 homes.

Change To Plan: It is recommended that criteria D is amended to be refined to provide clarity on when equipped open space is required eg. on sites over 50 homes.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24320 - 2741 - POLICY BE22: OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

22373 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The policy is supported in principle as it is proposed that new development will make open space (including outdoor sports) provision on-site or through developer contributions to meet the additional needs generated and allows sufficient flexibility to allow commuted sums to be paid in circumstances where on-site provision will not be possible or appropriate.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22373 - 4294 - POLICY BE22: OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - None

24037 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: The Council's Open Space Standards seek proposals which meet the Fields in Trust (Guidance for Outdoor Play Space: Beyond the Six Acre Standard) minimum standards. The FiT standards relate to provision on the basis of hectares per 1,000 population generated. The Council's Open Space Standards are considered to be effective as they are based on FiT standards and are therefore "justified" and the policy is sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24037 - 2656 - POLICY BE22: OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

22375 Object

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: While the policy is welcomed in principle, there are the following concerns:

* Criterion B requires development to accord with the Council's open space standards which would include a standard for outdoor sport despite the Council's evidence base recommending an alternative approach;

* Criterion D only partly accords with Government policy as it does not make provision for alternative facilities to be at least equivalent or better in quantity. Furthermore, it does not allow the principle of loss of facilities where the proposal is for new open space/sports/recreation facilities where the benefits outweigh the impact.

Change To Plan: To address these objections, it is requested that policy BE23 be amended as follows:

* Criterion B is amended to require new development to make provision for outdoor sport in accordance with the approach proposed in the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy and the reasoned justification to the policy provides more detail of this approach including how more detailed guidance will be provided of how it will operate in practice i.e. through the IDP, Planning Obligations SPD etc. There will be a consequent requirement to remove the outdoor sport standard from Figure 5.4.

* Criterion D is amended to replace reference to "equal or better quality and convenience" with "equal or better, quantity, quality and convenience". An addition is made to the criterion to allow for the principle of the loss of facilities where the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use. The criterion may need to be restructured to facilitate this.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22375 - 4294 - POLICY BE23: OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES - ii, iv

23732 Object

Respondent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587]

Summary: Policy BE23 states that permission will not be granted for development of land allocated on the Brentwood Policies Map as Protected Urban Open Space (PUOS) or Local Green Space... Site ID:19b scores low on the three criteria which Protected Urban Open Space is assessed against. Previous representations have been made identifying why this site should be removed from PUOS. This designation should be lifted from this site and consideration given for it to be developed.

Change To Plan: Publication of the Policies Proposals Map to enable it to be consulted upon and to provide context to the references to it within the draft Submission Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23732 - 2587 - POLICY BE23: OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES - ii, iv

24038 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy BE23: Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities states that permissions will not be granted for the development of designated Protected Urban Open Space or Local Green Space unless it can be demonstrated that alternative and improved provision can be created, existing open space enhanced or no additional displacement within the Green Belt caused. As with Policy BE22, where appropriate all proposals will be required to comply with the Council's Open Space Standards which aim to meet those set out by FiT. It is therefore considered that policy BE22 is "justified" in line with national guidance and therefore sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24038 - 2656 - POLICY BE23: OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES - i, ii, iii, iv

22312 Object **Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Para 5.184 mentions the need for connectivity between open areas of informal recreation via the rights of way network and this is of course welcomed; however, much of the good multi-user provision is fragmented and not connected, and Policy BE23 should contain an aspiration to enhance the links for all user groups to Brentwood's considerable amount of public open space.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, we suggest that this Policy contains an aspiration to link its open spaces by enhancing the public rights of way network and upgrading them to enable their use by more user groups eg cyclists and equestrians.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22312 - 3855 - 5.184 - i, ii, iii, iv

22239 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please refer to my representations below (ID 22202 and 22203).

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22239 - 4376 - Housing - ii, iv

22527 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.

Without prejudice to the above contention, if no previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites exist, that Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate there are no or insufficient previously developed sites available outside the existing urban areas.

In any event, there are greenfield sites available (for example adjoining existing urban areas) in preferable and more sustainable locations.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22527 - 8074 - Housing - i, ii, iii, iv

23119 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council questions whether the Spatial Strategy is therefore justified and consistent with national policy. The two transport corridors dont offer comparable choices in terms of the capacity of these transport connections. Four reasonable site alternatives in the Central Brentwood Corridor have been disregarded in the Sustainability Apprial, despite having few constraints and being able to tap into the potential for movement capacity. This is considered to be in conflict with sustainable development when sites which have significant constraints to development or delivery have been included within the Plan, at the expense of sites which have fewer constraints.

Change To Plan: Using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the superior infrastructure available. This should help encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Chapter 3 should be modified as a result along with all land use allocations in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23119 - 369 - Housing - i, iii

23664 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: A local planning authority must identify its housing needs, these needs should be met in full, unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so. Local planning authorities should seek to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, resulting in net gains across all three. Adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided, where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered. To be considered sound at Examination the emerging Local Plan will need to meet all four of the soundness tests set out in paragraph 35 of the Revised Framework (2019).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23664 - 2774 - Housing - i, ii, iii, iv

23873 Object

Respondent: Ms. Isobel McGeever [7286]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The PSLDP aims to deliver 7,752 over the Plan period, averaging 456 dpa. The minimum housing requirement for BBC is 452 dpa. Taking into consideration some of the neighbouring authorities unmet housing need - Basildon 3,508 and Havering 5,650 - the Council should consider contributing to their housing needs through outlining and planning for a higher housing target. The Council should also consider the arrival of Crossrail, which is set to unlock further demand for housing in the area. The Councils approach to a stepped trajectory is also not justified, and should look to deliver housing in the short term.

Change To Plan: Should any part of the Brentwood Community Hospital site be declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirement of the NHS in the future, then the site should be considered suitable and available for alternative use, and considered deliverable within the period 5-10 years. These representations identify the sites potential for future development, in accordance with the realignment of the Green Belt so that this significant area of development land is no longer included. It is evident, that the site does not make a positive contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, redevelopment of the site could provide a key contribution to Brentwood's housing need, which the Council have failed to justify, given the reliance on key strategic sites, and the lack of acknowledgement for unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities (Basildon and Havering). These representations therefore promote and identify parts of the Brentwood Community Hospital site as a suitable site to contribute towards these requirements. This site presents an excellent opportunity for a high quality residential redevelopment on previously developed Green Belt land. This could be achieved without compromising the character of the area as the development can act as an infill site to the existing residential development surrounding it, and without the need for significant infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also available to accommodate further health related development should the CCG seek to expand their services in this location, including the possible expansion of the hospital to provide more comprehensive services for the community. However, the site's Green Belt designation would make it difficult for any planning application proposing additional built form to provide further healthcare services to be considered acceptable. The subject site is considered available, suitable and deliverable within the 5-10 year period of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23873 - 7286 - Housing - None

23307 Support

Respondent: Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We welcome the Council's strategic longer-term approach to housing supply. Your target accommodates a 'buffer' on top of the housing need based on the Government's standardised methodology. It should be noted that our latest demographic modelling provides alternative population and household projections that could also be taken into account when applying the standardised approach. Our projections include consistent outputs for all local authorities in England and form the basis for housing need in the draft new London Plan. They are available on the London Datastore: <https://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/projections>.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23307 - 6093 - Housing - i, ii, iii, iv

22558 Object

Respondent: Gerald Downey [4671]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As referenced by Brandon Lewis MP in communication to Rt Hon Sir Eric Pickles MP (attached), the number of self-build plots allocated per site should be proportional to the local demand for self-build within Brentwood as noted on the local self-build register.

A minimum of 5% self-build on development sites of 500 (N=3 sites in LDP) does not meet the demand for self-build in the local area.

Note that the original Local Plan had 5% self-build on sites with more than 100 dwellings. Despite previous representations, the focus on self-build has been diluted in the latest LDP.

Change To Plan: To make the Local Plan sound and legally compliant, the necessary changes are to :

1) Require that a minimum of 5% self-build homes which can include custom housebuilding on "developments of 60 or more (net) dwellings".

Given the expected demand for self-build (as referenced in point #67 of the 2011 Housing Strategy for England), I would propose that the minimum 5% self-build should also apply to developments of 60 or more dwellings.

2) "The inclusion of self-build and custom build homes and Specialist Residential Accommodation on smaller sites will also be encouraged".

For this last sentence, provide stronger wording other than "encouraged".

For example, including wording received in personal communication from the housing minister (attached), as presented below:

"encouraged, with the number of self-build plots allocated per site proportional to the local demand for self-build within Brentwood as noted on the local self-build register"

Suggest to also reference "The Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015".

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22558 - 4671 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - ii, iv

23133 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The DHGV is within close proximity with Basildon & Thurrock Boroughs and it is considered that there may be implications for the future geographical extent of both the Brentwood and South Essex Housing Market Areas as the housing markets evolve. The attached table has been prepared using Figure 6.1 from the Plan and the South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment that has informed the Basildon Borough Local Plan 2014-2034 and it is considered both these SHMA's should instead be used to inform the housing mix policy for DHGV.

Change To Plan: It is considered the stark contrast between the house size requirements for Basildon and Brentwood in DHGV, which is on a boundary location, means it needs to have taken into account the South Essex SHMA in determining the housing mix for DHGV so that it can better sit within the landscape of the strategic context of South Essex, which is not reflective of the wider Brentwood Borough HMA. Policy HP01 and R01 should be amended in light of this.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23133 - 369 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i, iii, iv

23681 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: HP01 contains a number of development requirements which would be applied to all new development including housing mix, accessible and adaptable dwellings and self and custom build homes. This should be done in line with Revised Framework 46 and must be justified and evidenced. Disagree with requirement to Part M Category 1, 2 or 3 standards and inclusion of self/custom build on large scale plots given issues around working hours, site access, health and safety etc. that are associated with large scale development sites.

Change To Plan: Remove the Building Regulation Part M Category and self/custom build requirements from the plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23681 - 2774 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i, ii, iii, iv

23686 Object

Respondent: Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]

Summary: Policy HP01 requires each dwelling to be constructed to meet M4(2) accessible and adaptable standards, with 5% of dwellings to be M4(3) on schemes of 60 or more. Where other Councils have sought to require all dwellings to meet M4(2) there have been multiple objections due to viability implications, with the requirement generally being significantly reduced. We are therefore concerned that the actual amount of housing meeting accessible and adaptable, and wheelchair user standards will be significantly below this level.

Change To Plan: Allocate deliverable sites to meet the diverse needs of older people. Such sites should include those that can come forward in the early part of the plan period to meet immediate needs, and should be distributed across the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23686 - 2930 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - None

23707 Object

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: HP01B states: "Where a development site has been divided into parts, or is being delivered in phases, the area to be used for determining whether this policy applies will be the whole original site".Where an allocated site is in two or more separate ownerships and separated by a physical barrier or legal ownership, this criterion may be difficult to apply and could delay or halt development.it would be preferable that there should be a further clarification or explanatory paragraph to Policy HP01B to allow for smaller sites in separate ownerships, say under 1 hectare) to be excluded from the Policy. This would facilitate quicker delivery of such sites. It would also better accord with the NPPF 2018. (See para. 68 of the NPPF 2018, noting the Sow N Grow part of the site is less than 1 hectare (about 0.93 hectares) - in particular also para. 68a and the requirement for 10% delivery of sites of less than 1 hectare, with the further smaller separate parcel at 346 Ongar Road).

Change To Plan: Amend and clarify policy HP01B

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23707 - 8337 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - None

23819 Object

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: HP01B states: "Where a development site has been divided into parts, or is being delivered in phases, the area to be used for determining whether this policy applies will be the whole original site".Where an allocated site is in two or more separate ownerships and separated by a physical barrier or legal ownership, this criterion may be difficult to apply and could delay or halt development.it would be preferable that there should be a further clarification or explanatory paragraph to Policy HP01B to allow for smaller sites in separate ownerships, say under 1 hectare) to be excluded from the Policy. This would facilitate quicker delivery of such sites. It would also better accord with the NPPF 2018. (See para. 68 of the NPPF 2018, noting the Sow N Grow part of the site is less than 1 hectare (about 0.93 hectares) - in particular also para. 68a and the requirement for 10% delivery of sites of less than 1 hectare, with the further smaller separate parcel at 346 Ongar Road).

Change To Plan: Amend and clarify policy HP01B

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23819 - 303 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - None

23842 Object

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: HP01B states: "Where a development site has been divided into parts, or is being delivered in phases, the area to be used for determining whether this policy applies will be the whole original site".Where an allocated site is in two or more separate ownerships and separated by a physical barrier or legal ownership, this criterion may be difficult to apply and could delay or halt development.it would be preferable that there should be a further clarification or explanatory paragraph to Policy HP01B to allow for smaller sites in separate ownerships, say under 1 hectare) to be excluded from the Policy. This would facilitate quicker delivery of such sites. It would also better accord with the NPPF 2018. (See para. 68 of the NPPF 2018, noting the Sow N Grow part of the site is less than 1 hectare (about 0.93 hectares) - in particular also para. 68a and the requirement for 10% delivery of sites of less than 1 hectare, with the further smaller separate parcel at 346 Ongar Road).

Change To Plan: Amend and clarify policy HP01B

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23842 - 4657 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - None

23859 Object

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: HP01B states: "Where a development site has been divided into parts, or is being delivered in phases, the area to be used for determining whether this policy applies will be the whole original site".Where an allocated site is in two or more separate ownerships and separated by a physical barrier or legal ownership, this criterion may be difficult to apply and could delay or halt development.it would be preferable that there should be a further clarification or explanatory paragraph to Policy HP01B to allow for smaller sites in separate ownerships, say under 1 hectare) to be excluded from the Policy. This would facilitate quicker delivery of such sites. It would also better accord with the NPPF 2018. (See para. 68 of the NPPF 2018, noting the Sow N Grow part of the site is less than 1 hectare (about 0.93 hectares) - in particular also para. 68a and the requirement for 10% delivery of sites of less than 1 hectare, with the further smaller separate parcel at 346 Ongar Road).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23859 - 4656 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - None

23964 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Self-build and/or custom build housing is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its contribution can help to diversify a housing offer, thus supporting housing delivery overall (Letwin, October 2018). CEG is committed to the delivery of self and custom build housing at Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV). Planning for a variety of housing types, including self and custom build assists in the delivery of housing on large sites. However, the minimum target of 5% set out in criterion A. c. (i) is not justified by an appropriate evidence base.

CEG is aware that the current level of interest on the Council's Self and Custom Build Register is relatively limited and the need for such housing does not, therefore, justify a minimum level of 5% being required. Indeed, if such a level isn't needed setting such a high minimum requirement could effectively prevent land being released for other types of housing which are needed.

In the 12 month period ending in October 2018 it is understood that 47 individuals and no associations were registered with the Council. Of the total number, 9 indicated a preference for village locations across the Borough, which in the future might include DHGV.

It is acknowledged that the Register is relatively new and the need for this type of housing might change over time. Considering this, a lower minimum requirement should be sought, probably at 1%, to support this type of housing at a level proportionate to the likely need. DHGV will provide for 2,700 new homes over the plan period, and 1% of this would amount to 27 self-build homes in total.

Overall CEG considers the 5% is too high and a lower figure should be adopted.

Change To Plan: To ensure the policy is positively prepared and justified the following modification is proposed:

"c. i. a minimum of 5 1% self-build homes which can include some custom housebuilding;..."

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23964 - 5050 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i, ii, iv

24001 Object

Respondent: CALA Homes [5237]

Agent: JB Planning Associates Ltd. (Mr. John Boyd) [469]

Summary: The Council has failed to demonstrate that the requirement in paragraph A (a)(ii) of the policy for every dwelling built on all residential developments of 10 or more dwellings to be constructed to meet requirement M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings, unless they are built in line with M4(3) wheelchair adaptable dwelling standard, is actually justified in terms of either need or viability. The policy fails to adequately reflect dispensations from these housing requirements in respect of specific types of residential development. The Council should be fully committed to ensuring that the housing mix policy will be implemented in a flexible manner, and not seek to apply a 'one size fits all' approach to all sites across the Borough.

Change To Plan: Policy HP01 should be provide greater flexibility and reflect the fact that the policy requirements should not be so rigid. The following amendments are proposed to the text of Policy HP01:

A. All new development should deliver an inclusive, accessible environment throughout.

a. On residential development proposals of 10 or more (net) additional dwellings the Council will seek:

i. an appropriate mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures to take account of meet the identified housing needs in the borough as set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment or any similar evidence for market and affordable units (such as the Council's Housing Strategy, AMR and localised market information), to provide choice, and contribute towards the creation of sustainable, balanced and inclusive communities; and

b. On developments of 60 or more (net) dwellings the Council will seek the above, and:

i. a minimum of 5% of new affordable dwellings should be built to meet requirement M4(3) wheelchair accessible dwellings of the Building Regulations 2015, or subsequent government standard.

c. On development sites of 500 or more dwellings the Council will seek all of the above, and:

i. a minimum of 5% self-build homes which can include custom housebuilding; and

ii. provision for Specialist Accommodation taking account of local housing need in accordance with the criteria set out in Policy HP04 Specialist Accommodation.

B. Where a development site has been divided into parts, or is being delivered in phases, the area to be used for determining whether this policy applies will be the whole original site.

C. The inclusion of self-build and custom build homes and Specialist Residential Accommodation on smaller sites will also be encouraged.

The following amendments are proposed to the supporting text of Policy HP01:

6.4 The Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Part 2 (2016) provides a detailed assessment of the housing required to meet existing and future needs across the borough. Proposals should respond to other up-to-date and relevant local evidence where available, such as the Council's Housing Strategy, AMR and more localised market information.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24001 - 5237 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i

24039 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: The objective of securing accessible and adaptable homes is supported, however, it is unclear as to how the "each dwelling to be constructed to meet requirement M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings, unless it is built in line with M4(3) wheelchair adaptable dwellings" is a fair and reasonable request. The supporting text refers to DCLG research which shows that, nearly 30% of households have at least one person with a long-term illness and over 3% have one or more wheelchair user. This need for "all developments" to meet this target is not set out in the evidence or in the NPPG.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24039 - 2656 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i, ii, iii, iv

24129 Object**Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]****Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]**

Summary: Ford supports the intentions of Draft Policy HP01 in seeking to ensure that residential development proposals deliver housing in a way that contributes to the rebalancing of the housing stock; ensuring it reflects the recognised needs of existing and future communities. This includes providing a mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures, relevant to the context of each site. Our Client notes that the threshold for requiring a minimum of 5% selfbuild homes (which can include custom housebuilding and provision for specialist accommodation) is set at 500 or more dwellings. However, this threshold does not appear to have been applied to Draft allocations RO4 and RO5, which includes a requirement for both custom build housing and specialist accommodation across the wider allocation, despite having a total housing yield of 473 units across the Draft allocation - i.e. under the 500-unit threshold. Accordingly, our Client urges BBC to review this and requests that Draft allocation RO4 and RO5 is revised to remove this requirement based on the threshold set under Draft Policy HP01. At present, it is considered that there is a lack of evidence to justify this policy position, rendering the PSD unsound on this basis.

Change To Plan: review the self-build requirements and requests that Draft allocation RO4 and RO5 is revised to remove this requirement based on the threshold set under Draft Policy HP01. At present, it is considered that there is a lack of evidence to justify this policy position, rendering the PSD unsound on this basis.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24129 - 3769 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i, ii, iii, iv

22356 Support**Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council is broadly supportive of the provisions of policy HP01 and does not have any specific concerns around its soundness or legal compliance.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22356 - 4178 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - None

23249 Support**Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We are pleased to note that the policies within the LP support our health and wellbeing objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23249 - 3791 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i, ii, iii, iv

24294 Support**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The Council's approach to providing for an appropriate mix of dwelling types is generally supported. However, the Policy as set out refers to the Borough wide requirements in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and does not necessarily take into account a local area or sub area within the Borough. It is important to note that the SHMA requirements, at Figure 6.1, confirms that it is an indicative mix guide for market housing. It is also noted that para 6.5 confirms that the final mix will be subject to negotiation. This is welcomed on the basis that some flexibility will be necessary in certain circumstances as part of the planning application process. We are aware of the representations submitted by HBF regarding accessible homes and justification. We support those views. It is questionable whether it is necessary for the PSLP to set out in planning policy the requirements of Building Regulations.

Change To Plan: It is suggested that para 6.5 should provide greater clarity and a minor change confirming that the final mix will be subject to negotiation "as part of a planning application" rather than "with the applicant".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24294 - 2741 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i, ii, iii, iv

24321 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The Council's approach to providing for an appropriate mix of dwelling types is generally supported. However, the Policy as set out refers to the Borough wide requirements in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and does not necessarily take into account a local area or sub area within the Borough. It is important to note that the SHMA requirements, at Figure 6.1, confirms that it is an indicative mix guide for market housing. It is also noted that para 6.5 confirms that the final mix will be subject to negotiation. This is welcomed on the basis that some flexibility will be necessary in certain circumstances as part of the planning application process. We are aware of the representations submitted by HBF regarding accessible homes and justification. We support those views. It is questionable whether it is necessary for the PSLP to set out in planning policy the requirements of Building Regulations.

Change To Plan: It is suggested that para 6.5 should provide greater clarity and a minor change confirming that the final mix will be subject to negotiation "as part of a planning application" rather than "with the applicant".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24321 - 2741 - POLICY HP01: HOUSING MIX - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 6. Housing Provision 6.5

24295 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The Council's approach to providing for an appropriate mix of dwelling types is generally supported. However, the Policy as set out refers to the Borough wide requirements in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and does not necessarily take into account a local area or sub area within the Borough. It is important to note that the SHMA requirements, at Figure 6.1, confirms that it is an indicative mix guide for market housing. It is also noted that para 6.5 confirms that the final mix will be subject to negotiation. This is welcomed on the basis that some flexibility will be necessary in certain circumstances as part of the planning application process. We are aware of the representations submitted by HBF regarding accessible homes and justification. We support those views. It is questionable whether it is necessary for the PSLP to set out in planning policy the requirements of Building Regulations.

Change To Plan: it is suggested that para 6.5 should provide greater clarity and a minor change confirming that the final mix will be subject to negotiation "as part of a planning application" rather than "with the applicant".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24295 - 2741 - 6.5 - i, ii, iii, iv

24322 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The Council's approach to providing for an appropriate mix of dwelling types is generally supported. However, the Policy as set out refers to the Borough wide requirements in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and does not necessarily take into account a local area or sub area within the Borough. It is important to note that the SHMA requirements, at Figure 6.1, confirms that it is an indicative mix guide for market housing. It is also noted that para 6.5 confirms that the final mix will be subject to negotiation. This is welcomed on the basis that some flexibility will be necessary in certain circumstances as part of the planning application process. We are aware of the representations submitted by HBF regarding accessible homes and justification. We support those views. It is questionable whether it is necessary for the PSLP to set out in planning policy the requirements of Building Regulations.

Change To Plan: It is suggested that para 6.5 should provide greater clarity and a minor change confirming that the final mix will be subject to negotiation "as part of a planning application" rather than "with the applicant".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24322 - 2741 - 6.5 - i, ii, iii, iv

24296 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The Council's approach to providing for an appropriate mix of dwelling types is generally supported. However, the Policy as set out refers to the Borough wide requirements in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and does not necessarily take into account a local area or sub area within the Borough. It is important to note that the SHMA requirements, at Figure 6.1, confirms that it is an indicative mix guide for market housing. It is also noted that para 6.5 confirms that the final mix will be subject to negotiation. This is welcomed on the basis that some flexibility will be necessary in certain circumstances as part of the planning application process. We are aware of the representations submitted by HBF regarding accessible homes and justification. We support those views. It is questionable whether it is necessary for the PSLP to set out in planning policy the requirements of Building Regulations.

Change To Plan: It is suggested that para 6.5 should provide greater clarity and a minor change confirming that the final mix will be subject to negotiation "as part of a planning application" rather than "with the applicant".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24296 - 2741 - Figure 6.1: Indicative Size Guide for Market Housing - i, ii, iii, iv

24323 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The Council's approach to providing for an appropriate mix of dwelling types is generally supported. However, the Policy as set out refers to the Borough wide requirements in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and does not necessarily take into account a local area or sub area within the Borough. It is important to note that the SHMA requirements, at Figure 6.1, confirms that it is an indicative mix guide for market housing. It is also noted that para 6.5 confirms that the final mix will be subject to negotiation. This is welcomed on the basis that some flexibility will be necessary in certain circumstances as part of the planning application process. We are aware of the representations submitted by HBF regarding accessible homes and justification. We support those views. It is questionable whether it is necessary for the PSLP to set out in planning policy the requirements of Building Regulations.

Change To Plan: It is suggested that para 6.5 should provide greater clarity and a minor change confirming that the final mix will be subject to negotiation "as part of a planning application" rather than "with the applicant".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24323 - 2741 - Figure 6.1: Indicative Size Guide for Market Housing - i, ii, iii, iv

23965 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Policy HP03, Residential Density (page 128)

The policy is positively prepared. Taking a design led approach to density should enable development to achieve a net density of at least 35 dph or higher. This approach is consistent with Chapter 11 of the NPPF which seeks to make efficient use of land and optimise the density of development. A modification is proposed to reflect that density across a site should be an average.

Change To Plan: Policy HP03, Residential Density (page 128)

A modification is proposed to reflect that the density should be an average across a site, recognising that on large strategic sites a range of densities might be appropriate. This would ensure the policy is positively prepared.

"B. Residential development proposals will generally be expected to achieve an average net density of at least 35 dwellings per hectare or higher..."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23965 - 5050 - POLICY HP03: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY - i, ii, iv

23905 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: This policy seeks to define appropriate residential development densities with the caveat that individual schemes should employ a design-led approach to determine an appropriate, site-specific density. Generally, a density of 35 dwellings per hectare or higher will be sought on sites outside of town centres, district shopping centres and local centres. We consider that adopting standards such as this is appropriate, because it would ensure that land is used as efficiently as possible, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 123.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23905 - 2509 - POLICY HP03: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY - i, ii, iii, iv

24040 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy HP03: Residential Density sets out that residential development proposals will generally be expected to achieve a net density of at least 35 dwellings per hectare net or higher. Proposals for new residential development should take a design-led approach to density which ensures schemes are sympathetic to local character and make efficient use of land. Proposals for housing developments should "Make an Effective Use of Land" in line with NPPF (Section 11). This policy is therefore "consistent" with the NPPF and sound, but must provide for a degree of flexibility to allow for local circumstances.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24040 - 2656 - POLICY HP03: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY - i, ii, iii, iv

24130 Support

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford welcomes Draft Policy HP03, which aims to ensure efficient use of the boroughs land whilst promoting a design-led approach to density which ensures schemes are sympathetic to local character and context. The supporting text states efficient land use is essential in a borough like Brentwood where land is scarce and enables new homes to be provided without encroaching on the countryside. This stresses the importance of delivering new housing on previously developed sites.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24130 - 3769 - POLICY HP03: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY - i, ii, iii, iv

24297 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: We support the PSLP's approach to residential density as set out in Policy HP03. This is considered to be justified based on the evidence and consistent with the national policy. As far as our client's land interests are concerned at R23 and R24, both sites are capable of providing an increased density to that expressed for the relevant policies R23 and R24. However, part B of the policy quite properly acknowledges that a chosen density should take into account the character of the surrounding area and other site constraints. This is supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24297 - 2741 - POLICY HP03: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY - i, ii, iii, iv

24324 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: We support the PSLP's approach to residential density as set out in Policy HP03. This is considered to be justified based on the evidence and consistent with the national policy. As far as our client's land interests are concerned at R23 and R24, both sites are capable of providing an increased density to that expressed for the relevant policies R23 and R24. However, part B of the policy quite properly acknowledges that a chosen density should take into account the character of the surrounding area and other site constraints. This is supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24324 - 2741 - POLICY HP03: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY - i, ii, iii, iv

25695 Support

Respondent: MRS LESLEY LYNN [5591]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I am writing to you to object to the density of housing Brentwood Council is proposing on the office site in Western Road which equates to something like 229 dwellings per Hectare, which is far the biggest of any of the proposed sites and can only possibly be achieved with high rise blocks of flats, which is inappropriate in a residential street of houses with a maximum height of two and a half stories. Development of this site contradicts policy HP03 in regards to population density.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 25695 - 5591 - POLICY HP03: RESIDENTIAL DENSITY - i, ii, iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 6. Housing Provision 6.21

22184 Object

Respondent: Mr DAVID FISHER [8184]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I do not agree that one specific area of Hutton & Shenfield should be singled out to preserve density, one could argue the same rule could be applied to other leafy streets, not listed here. Any new or in-filling should be judged on it's merits of surrounding area, not by postcode.

Change To Plan: Remove exception

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22184 - 8184 - 6.21 - ii

22221 Object

Respondent: Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The housing strategy aims to reduce density in Hutton Mount rather than increase it as required by national policy

Change To Plan: remove paragraph 6.21

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22221 - 4309 - 6.21 - iv

23680 Object

Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]

Summary: There is an acute need for specialist accommodation to meet the needs of an ageing population, which the Plan proposes to provide for through care homes on strategic allocations and Policy HP04. The proposed care homes on strategic allocations will provide in total 180 beds of C2 accommodation, falling significantly short of the identified requirement for 494 additional units; whereas policy HP04 is not clear as to how much specialist accommodation, where, or how it is delivered. A more wholistic and supportive approach towards elder population's housing needs will be required.

Change To Plan: Suggest specific housing sites are delivered to meet the needs of an ageing population and the modifications sought, recommended policy wording will follow in a subsequent email to BBC.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23680 - 8054 - Specialist Accommodation - None

23687 Object

Respondent: Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]

Summary: There is a particular need for private sector retirement housing but the current approach within the Plan does not meet the range of housing needs: Policy HP01 seeks specialist accommodation provision on strategic residential schemes to provide for 180 beds of C2 accommodation, further specialist accommodation is also to be provided on DHGV but no indication of the size or type is given so it's unclear whether this will be another care home or a different form of accommodation. There is a long process before development on larger sites can begin, resulting in likely delay to care homes being delivered.

Change To Plan: Allocate deliverable sites to meet the diverse needs of older people. Such sites should include those that can come forward in the early part of the plan period to meet immediate needs, and should be distributed across the Borough to meet local needs and allow people to remain within their existing communities if they wish.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23687 - 2930 - Specialist Accommodation - None

24169 Object

Respondent: Turn2us [6753]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]

Summary: Lack of evidence of how the accommodation needs for older people have been assessed. The Plan proposes care homes through residential development within strategic housing allocations at Land at West Horndon Industrial Estate (Policy R02); Land north of Shenfield (Policy R03); Ford Headquarters and Council Depot (Policies R04 and R05). These would provide, in total, 180 beds of Use Class C2 accommodation. In the absence of an assessment of need, it is unclear if this will meet need in quantitative terms. In addition, all of these are strategic allocations, and will inevitably be relatively long lead-in times to delivery.

Change To Plan: The Council should identify the need for specialist accommodation, and allocation deliverable site to meet this.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24169 - 6753 - Specialist Accommodation - None

23385 Object

Respondent: BJ Associates [8317]

Agent: Gerald Eve LLP (Mr. Peter Dines) [3762]

Summary: The Draft Plan acknowledges the aging population but fails to plan for any increase in accommodation. In effect policy HP04 creates un-justified negative criteria against which to consider proposals. This approach is contrary to NPPF and NPPG guidance.

Change To Plan: Allocation of the Roman Road Site for Housing and or Specialist accommodation for older people.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23385 - 8317 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - None

23652 Object

Respondent: Drs M. & Z. Sahirad [2118]

Agent: Spectrum Planning (Planning Consultancy) [2040]

Summary: Proposal for site for new elderly persons residential home at Little Warley Hall Farm. Site not within 2019 Reg 19 local plan. Arguing need for facility and the special circumstances case (need, demographic, lack of alternative sites, delivery economics, highway improvement, additional community benefits, landscape and biodiversity enhancements).

Change To Plan: Add site to plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23652 - 2118 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - i, ii, iii, iv

23675 Object

Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]

Summary: The Plan's broad definition of Specialist Accommodation, which include Gypsies and Travellers who no longer exercise a nomadic lifestyle, is potentially too broad to meet the needs for older people. The Plan does not, therefore, give an accurate representation of the type of accommodation the Plan is seeking to deliver and for what specific group(s).

Change To Plan: Release additional, suitable Green Belt sites in order to assist with the delivery of homes over the Plan period, including to meet the need for specialist housing.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23675 - 8054 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - None

23683 Object

Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]

Summary: The policy is not clear as to how much, where, or how specialist accommodation and independent living are expected to be delivered. It is difficult to see where a new site within the existing built up area will come forward for specialist accommodation, casting further doubts on the effectiveness of Policy HP04. The approach is neither positively prepared, consistent with national policy, nor effective.

Change To Plan: Allocate deliverable sites to meet ageing population's need and reflect the objectives set out in the Plan in relation to accommodation for older people as the Plan has already (presumably) exhausted the available sites outside of the Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23683 - 8054 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - None

23688 Object

Respondent: Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]

Summary: Policy HP04 is not clear how much specialist accommodation, where, or how, this will be delivered. Furthermore, as part of the Plan, the review of site capacity identified that development needs in general cannot be met within the existing developed, it is difficult to see where a new site within the existing built up area will come forward for specialist accommodation, casting further doubts on the effectiveness of Policy HP04.

Change To Plan: Allocate deliverable sites to meet the diverse needs of older people. Such sites should include those that can come forward in the early part of the plan period to meet immediate needs, and should be distributed across the Borough to meet local needs and allow people to remain within their existing communities if they wish.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23688 - 2930 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - None

24136 Object

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford acknowledges that BBC are encouraging proposals to contribute to the delivery of Specialist Accommodation and are broadly supporting in terms of providing such facilities where there is a 'demonstrable established local community need'. Ford recognises that the SHMA Part 2 (2016) identifies that there is likely to be an additional need for 494 specialist units over the next 20 years, including 466 units as sheltered housing and 28 extracare units. Whilst Ford is supportive of BBC seeking to accommodate such facilities across the Borough, we note that there is currently a lack of evidence (including a detailed assessment of local community need) to fully justify accommodating such a use under Draft allocation RO4 and RO5, alongside residential. Indeed, we understand that that this requirement has only been included in response to a likely strategic-need for age friendly housing, but with no local analysis and/or basis to support this.

Change To Plan: Ford's commercial advisors CBRE have undertaken a recent analysis of local demand and supply within the surrounding Site area (Pulse Report) whereby this has identified that there is an oversupply of bed spaces across a variety of care spectrums (including a c.200 bed space oversupply within a 5-mile radius and c.1,000 within a 3 mile radius) - signifying a lack of need within the local area; whereby the Draft allocation would likely result in an un-viable future use (contrary to the parameters of sustainable development set out within the NPPF). As such, we would strongly urge BBC to revise the Draft allocation for the Site accordingly - recognising that it is most suitable for residential use only.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24136 - 3769 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - i, ii, iii, iv

22357 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council acknowledges that demographic shifts and changing preferences are likely to increase the demand for specialist accommodation into the future, particularly forms of accommodation for older people.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22357 - 4178 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - None

23427 Support

Respondent: Dr Maria Faraone [8320]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A robust and balanced vision for the future to ensure all of the community's needs are accounted for. The regular updating of a 'Specialist Accommodation Report' will help ensure this continues to be fair. Grouping elderly, disabled and the Gypsy and Traveller as specialist accommodation does well to ensure there is a considered and targeted approach without being exclusionary. The consideration for accommodation for those no longer travelling means that Brentwood is a leader in recognizing the true needs of all members of its community. Overall the Local Plan incorporates all the critical issues of environment, demographic changes, social and economic forecasting. This is an excellent Local Plan and represents what is hopefully a new trend for planning for local authorities in England.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23427 - 8320 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - None

24041 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: The Council's SHMA indicates that, if occupation patterns of Specialist Residential Accommodation for older people remain at current levels, there will be a requirement for 494 additional specialist units to 2033, aligning with the requirement in the Land North of Shenfield site allocation for provision of a residential care home (a 60-bed scheme as part of the overall allocation). This policy is also "consistent" with the NPPF section 5 (para 64 b) and is therefore considered to be sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24041 - 2656 - POLICY HP04: SPECIALIST ACCOMMODATION - i, ii, iii, iv

22391 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: ECC currently have 39 individuals in South of Essex who are waiting for Supported Living Scheme placements. In terms of housing, new potential builds for Supported Living could be beneficial to supply demand for this type of accommodation, and any specialist accommodation provision for people with disabilities and/or autism could meet the need of local population or individuals who would move to area. ECC are currently carrying out review of demand for adults with disabilities under Independent Living programme.

Request additional paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 6.25 to ensure that full range of specialist accommodation is considered in line with NPPF paragraph 61.

Change To Plan: Insert the following paragraph after paragraph 6.25 -

In terms of housing, new potential builds for Supported Living could be beneficial to supply demand for this type of accommodation, and any specialist accommodation provision for people with disabilities and /or autism could meet the need of the local population or individuals who would move to this area. The demand for adults with disabilities is considered under the Independent Living programme.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22391 - 6776 - 6.25 - iii, iv

23665 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: Use of the NPPF standard methodology (Sept 2018) and Planning Policy Guidance para 005 (2a-005-20180913.) is needed to raise the level of homes in the plan. If it becomes clear that affordable housing need will not be delivered in full, then an increase to the total housing figures included in the plan should be considered where it could help to deliver the required number of the affordable homes

Change To Plan: Amend to follow Para 2a-005-20180913 PPG

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23665 - 2774 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i, ii, iii, iv

24002 Object

Respondent: CALA Homes [5237]

Agent: JB Planning Associates Ltd. (Mr. John Boyd) [469]

Summary: Support the policy's aim of seeking to deliver as much affordable housing as possible but wording set out in paragraphs A and B is too inflexible and fails to take adequate account of both viability and the fact that affordable housing requirements will inevitably change over the course of the Plan. It is inappropriate that the Council will require the provision of 35% of the total number of residential units to be affordable housing within major development.

Change To Plan: The amendments should include the deletion of references to 'require' and their replacement with 'see k' in order to provide greater flexibility and reflect the fact that the policy requirements should not be so rigid that they fail to take adequate.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24002 - 5237 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i

24003 Object

Respondent: CALA Homes [5237]

Agent: JB Planning Associates Ltd. (Mr. John Boyd) [469]

Summary: It is inappropriate in para B.(a) to require that the tenure split be made up of 86% Affordable/Social Rent and 14% as other forms of affordable housing (including starter homes, intermediate homes, shared ownership and all other forms of affordable housing).

Change To Plan: The following amendments are proposed to the text of Policy HP05: A. The Council will seek require the provision of 35% of the total number of residential units to be provided and maintained as affordable housing within all new residential development sites on proposals of 11 or more (net) units or sites of 10 or less units which have a combined gross internal floorspace in excess of 1,000 square meters. B. In considering the suitability of affordable housing, the Council will seek that: the tenure split be made up of 86% Affordable/Social Rent and 14% as other forms of affordable housing (this includes starter homes, intermediate homes and shared ownership and all other forms of affordable housing as described by national guidance or legislation) or regard to the most up to date SHMA, AMR and localised market information; b. the affordable housing be designed in such a way as to be seamlessly integrated to that of market housing elements of a scheme (in terms of appearance, build quality and materials) and distributed throughout the development so as to avoid the over concentration in one area; and c. the type, mix, size and cost of affordable homes will reflect meet the identified housing need as reported by the Council's most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment, AMR, localised market information and Housing Strategy. C. In seeking affordable housing provision, the Council will have regard to scheme viability; only where robust viability evidence demonstrates that the full amount of affordable housing cannot be delivered, the Council will negotiate a level of on-site affordable housing that can be delivered taking into account the mix of unit size, type and tenure and any grant subsidy received. D. The Council will only accept a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that on-site provision is neither feasible nor viable. E. Where a site has been sub-divided or is not being developed to its full potential so as to fall under the affordable housing threshold, the Council will seek a level of affordable housing to reflect the provision that would have been achieved on the site as a whole had it come forward as a single scheme for the allocated or identified site. F. Planning obligations will be used to ensure that the affordable housing will remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled to alternative affordable housing provision. G. In accordance with national policy, the requirement to provide affordable housing will apply to all qualifying residential development.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24003 - 5237 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i

24004 Object**Respondent: CALA Homes [5237]****Agent: JB Planning Associates Ltd. (Mr. John Boyd) [469]**

Summary: Paragraph G. states that the requirement to provide affordable housing will apply to all C3 residential development with the exception of G&T Pitches or Travelling Showman Plots. This is contrary to Paragraph 63 of the NPPF states that provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount.

Change To Plan: The following amendments are proposed to the text of Policy HP05: A. The Council will seek require the provision of 35% of the total number of residential units to be provided and maintained as affordable housing within all new residential development sites on proposals of 11 or more (net) units or sites of 10 or less units which have a combined gross internal floorspace in excess of 1,000 square meters. B. In considering the suitability of affordable housing, the Council will seek that: the tenure split be made up of 86% Affordable/Social Rent and 14% as other forms of affordable housing (this includes starter homes, intermediate homes and shared ownership and all other forms of affordable housing as described by national guidance or legislation) or regard to the most up to date SHMA, AMR and localised market information; b. the affordable housing be designed in such a way as to be seamlessly integrated to that of market housing elements of a scheme (in terms of appearance, build quality and materials) and distributed throughout the development so as to avoid the over concentration in one area; and c. the type, mix, size and cost of affordable homes will reflect meet the identified housing need as reported by the Council's most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment, AMR, localised market information and Housing Strategy. C. In seeking affordable housing provision, the Council will have regard to scheme viability; only where robust viability evidence demonstrates that the full amount of affordable housing cannot be delivered, the Council will negotiate a level of on-site affordable housing that can be delivered taking into account the mix of unit size, type and tenure and any grant subsidy received. D. The Council will only accept a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that on-site provision is neither feasible nor viable. E. Where a site has been sub-divided or is not being developed to its full potential so as to fall under the affordable housing threshold, the Council will seek a level of affordable housing to reflect the provision that would have been achieved on the site as a whole had it come forward as a single scheme for the allocated or identified site. F. Planning obligations will be used to ensure that the affordable housing will remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled to alternative affordable housing provision. G. In accordance with national policy, the requirement to provide affordable housing will apply to all qualifying residential development.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24004 - 5237 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i

24042 Object**Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]****Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]**

Summary: Policy HPO5: Affordable Housing seeks to provide a portion of affordable housing on residential developments of 11 dwellings or more or on those which have a combined gross floorspace of greater than 1,000 sq. m (gross internal area). Viability is referred to, but the policy does not go far enough. We would recommend that the policy includes a clause which requires a viability assessment to be submitted and considered whereby schemes are unable to meet the full affordable provision, which is not included at present. The policy is therefore "unjustified" and unsound.

Change To Plan: Recommend that the policy includes a clause which requires a viability assessment to be submitted and considered whereby schemes are unable to meet the full affordable provision, which is not included at present. The policy is therefore "unjustified" and unsound.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24042 - 2656 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i

24298 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: We note that the SHMA provides justification for the affordable housing requirements. However, it is questionable whether the precise tenure/mix should be set out at B(a) of the Policy, given that requirements can change relatively quickly over time and the prescriptive approach may not take into account precise local needs. It is recommended that the criteria under B(a) should omit the reference to 86% and 14% proportions. It is suggested, in the alternative, that "the mix, size, type and cost of affordable homes will meet the identified housing needs of the Council's area and local needs as appropriate, established by housing need assessments including the SHMA".

Change To Plan: It is recommended that the criteria under B(a) should omit the reference to 86% and 14% proportions. It is suggested, in the alternative, that "the mix, size, type and cost of affordable homes will meet the identified housing needs of the Council's area and local needs as appropriate, established by housing need assessments including the SHMA".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24298 - 2741 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i, ii, iii, iv

24325 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: We note that the SHMA provides justification for the affordable housing requirements. However, it is questionable whether the precise tenure/mix should be set out at B(a) of the Policy, given that requirements can change relatively quickly over time and the prescriptive approach may not take into account precise local needs. It is recommended that the criteria under B(a) should omit the reference to 86% and 14% proportions. It is suggested, in the alternative, that "the mix, size, type and cost of affordable homes will meet the identified housing needs of the Council's area and local needs as appropriate, established by housing need assessments including the SHMA".

Change To Plan: It is recommended that the criteria under B(a) should omit the reference to 86% and 14% proportions. It is suggested, in the alternative, that "the mix, size, type and cost of affordable homes will meet the identified housing needs of the Council's area and local needs as appropriate, established by housing need assessments including the SHMA".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24325 - 2741 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i, ii, iii, iv

22358 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council acknowledges that affordability of housing is an acute and strategic issue for the whole of South Essex, including both Rochford and Brentwood, and considers that one of the primary objectives of the South Essex JSP should be to address the impacts that a lack of affordability is having on the health and vitality of the region, including by seeking to significantly increase the delivery of affordable housing across South Essex.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22358 - 4178 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - None

23966 Support

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: CEG supports the approach set out at paragraph 6.35 which explains that the 'need' for 86% social rent and 14% other forms of affordable housing will be used to inform negotiations between the Council and developers to determine the appropriate tenure and mix of affordable housing.

This 'need' is then expressed as an 'indicative requirement' in Figure 6.2 and a 'requirement' in Policy HP05(B). The Policy currently requires a specific tenure split (86% social rent and 14% other forms of affordable housing) which may not be appropriate for the life of the Plan or for Strategic Allocations in the Plan. CEG supports the approach set out in paragraph 6.35 to ensure there is an appropriate amount of flexibility, for example, to accommodate changing circumstances over the lifetime of the Plan; and ensure the right mix and balance is created where Strategic Allocations are concerned.

Change To Plan: Modifications are proposed to ensure that the tenure split is guided, rather than dictated, by the SHMA. Modifications are proposed below to ensure the policy is positively prepared and consistent with the intention of the Plan as set out at paragraph 6.35.

"B. In considering the suitability of affordable housing, the Council will require that:

a. the tenure split be made up of 86% Affordable/Social Rent and 14% as other forms of affordable housing (this includes starter homes, intermediate homes and shared ownership and other forms of affordable housing as described by national guidance or legislation) or having regard to the most up to date SHMA;"

"B. c. the type, mix, size and cost of affordable homes must meet should have regard to the identified housing need as reported by the Council's most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Housing Strategy"

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23966 - 5050 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i, ii, iv

24131 Support

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: We fully appreciate that there is a significant need for affordable housing in Brentwood Borough, with 35% affordable applied to major residential schemes. Ford are aware that this level of affordable housing will likely be applied as part of any future planning application for the site, however this will be subject to scheme viability. BBC have recognised this approach, outlining that they will consider this where robust viability evidence demonstrates that the full amount of affordable housing cannot be delivered. This approach is welcomed by our Client and is considered to form a sound basis for negotiating affordable housing on a site-by-site basis (in line with NPPF Paragraph 62).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24131 - 3769 - POLICY HP05: AFFORDABLE HOUSING - i, ii, iii, iv

23682 Object

Respondent: Gladman Developments [2774]

Agent: Gladman Developments (Mr. Phil Bamford) [7343]

Summary: If the Council wishes to adopt the NDSS as a policy requirement, then this should only be done in accordance with the Revised Framework footnote 46 i.e. where this would address an identified need for such properties and where the standards can be justified. The WMS dated 25th March 2015 stated that "the optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the NPPG". We have been unable to locate where the evidence of a need for these standards is contained within the evidence base. Without this evidence, these requirements should be removed from the Local Plan.

Change To Plan: Remove Nationally Described Space Standards (NDDS) from the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23682 - 2774 - POLICY HP06: STANDARDS FOR NEW HOUSING - i, ii, iii, iv

23888 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: The NPPF and NPPG are clear that the space standards can be used where there is clear need for the standards to be applied. The supporting text of HP06 refers to the need being identified in the Council's AMR. But the AMR and other evidence document contain no such reference. No assessment has been undertaken regarding the implications of delivering these standards on development. Larger properties have the potential to reduce the yield and/or result in the loss of land required to meet other standards, i.e. on-site open space, and potentially lead to failure to meet housing needs.

Change To Plan: The Council must either delete the requirement to comply with the technical standards or else provide the evidence necessary to support the policy and demonstrate the implications for development densities. This evidence should be clearly referenced in the supporting text of the policy.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23888 - 6669 - POLICY HP06: STANDARDS FOR NEW HOUSING - None

24005 Object

Respondent: CALA Homes [5237]

Agent: JB Planning Associates Ltd. (Mr. John Boyd) [469]

Summary: The policy is not supported by detailed local evidence to support the imposition of the national space standard. Table 8.3 of the Local Plan Viability Assessment (October 2018) Additional Costs of Building to the draft Approved Document M amendments included at Appendix B4' identified costs based upon national 2014 prices, which are 5 years out of date. We further note the reference on p.102 of the Viability Assessment which states "through the September 2018 consultation some concern was expressed about the need for this policy. It is beyond the scope of this study to consider need"

Change To Plan: In the absence of any detailed local evidence to demonstrate the need for setting a local space standard, or evidence that it would be viable for developments of less than 500 dwellings, paragraph A of the policy should be deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24005 - 5237 - POLICY HP06: STANDARDS FOR NEW HOUSING - None

24043 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: The nationally described space standard is an appropriate tool to use when considering the provision of good housing. However, this should not be limited to major development, but should extend to all emerging residential development, whilst allowing for the consideration of local circumstances and site-specific conditions, in order to accord the NPPF (Section 12, Achieving Well-Designed Places). The policy is therefore "unjustified" in relation to need and viability (our emphasis) in accordance with the NPPF. The adoption of nationally described space standards is also at the discretion of the LPA and should be decided upon in a local context.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24043 - 2656 - POLICY HP06: STANDARDS FOR NEW HOUSING - i

22322 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy HP06 welcomes the cross reference made to Policies BE02 Sustainable Construction and Resource Efficiency and BE08 Sustainable Drainage subject to our comments relating to these policies.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22322 - 6824 - POLICY HP06: STANDARDS FOR NEW HOUSING - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 6. Housing Provision 6.50

22393 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

The Essex Design Guide 2018 is an Essex Planning Officers' Association document, it was not prepared by Essex County Council. Paragraph 6.50 needs to be amended to ensure factual representation of the Essex Design Guide.

Change To Plan: Delete 'prepared by Essex County Council' from first sentence of paragraph 6.50.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22393 - 6776 - 6.50 - iii

23114 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objects to Paragraphs 6.52-6.62. Concerned that there is no acknowledgement in the supporting text as to how it will address any unmet needs arising from Greater Essex authorities for the provision of accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople should it arise. The Plan should recognise and support the principle of this approach going forward, to ensure that there will be a technical approach in place to support any neighbouring authorities with any potential unmet Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople need. This will ensure that the same process is applied throughout Essex making the plan more positively prepared and effective.

Change To Plan: The Essex Planning Officers' Association Protocol for Unmet Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Needs 2018 has been developed collaboratively across Essex under the Duty to Cooperate, including with Brentwood Borough Council. It should be referenced in the supporting text to Policy HP07 - within Paragraphs 6.52-6.62. This will help ensure that the Plan recognises and supports the principle of this approach going forward, underling the technical approach in place to support how any requests from neighbouring authorities with any potential unmet Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling will be considered in the future and then addressed as necessary through the Plan review process.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23114 - 369 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - ii, iv

23115 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Paragraphs 6.52-6.62: no mention of the strategic and cross-boundary matter of Transit Sites, for which there is a study underway during 2019/2020 by EPOA. Whilst the need for transit sites in Essex has not yet been robustly assessed due to data inconsistencies, an update to Essex Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Local Needs Accommodation Assessment will follow during 2019/2020. Whilst this cannot be included within Policy HE07 due to uncertainty, it is a current strategic matter for the DtC, and the Plan should indicate how any such needs identified in future updates to the GTAA will be dealt with.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan would be more effective and more consistent with the PPTS if the strategic, cross-boundary issue of transit sites, covered by the Duty to Cooperate were to be supported by a new paragraph explaining the context behind the issue and that it will be addressed as part of its first review.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23115 - 369 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - i, ii

23177 Support

Respondent: Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]

Agent: N/A

Summary: On transit sites, CCC acknowledges the GTAA's recommendations to engage, through the Duty to Cooperate, with other Essex authorities in the future to review the need for transit sites. Further work on this is also being undertaken by Essex County Council to consider the need for these sites across Essex as a whole.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23177 - 8305 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - i, ii, iii, iv

23109 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The total requirement of Gypsy and Traveller pitches is 13 pitches (6 total current need and 6 total future need and a further 10% allowance for Gypsy and Traveller whose travelling status was recorded as being "unknown").
Brentwood Council proposes to meet future needs through the regularisation of 8 existing pitches and 5 pitches towards future need. The Plan could be more effective by setting 6 pitches as the target for future need.

Change To Plan: The GTAA identified the need for an additional pitch to meet future needs and therefore whilst the Policy HP07 quotes a minimum of 5 new pitches to be provided within its minimum target, the Plan could be more effective by setting 6 pitches as the target.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23109 - 369 - POLICY HP07: PROVISION FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS - i

22359 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council supports Brentwood's commitment to meeting the identified accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers (meeting the PPTS definition) in full.
Brentwood Borough Council should, however, satisfy itself and the Inspector that the proposed policy (and other relevant policies) would be deliverable at the site-level.
Brentwood Borough Council should consider mechanisms for reviewing its policy approach if a shortfall in provision becomes evident through its monitoring, or to reflect any change in circumstances that arise through the development of a strategic approach as part of the emerging South Essex Joint Strategic Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22359 - 4178 - POLICY HP07: PROVISION FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS - None

23176 Support

Respondent: Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Is it noted that the Brentwood Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identified that there is a requirement of 13 additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches to be developed by 2033. Overall, the need is being met with the authority's administrative area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23176 - 8305 - POLICY HP07: PROVISION FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS - i, ii, iii, iv

23332 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy HP08 seeks to regularise an illegal traveller site on the Chelmsford Road. The Borough Council has failed to undertake its duty to attempt to remove the travellers from the site since they first moved in some years ago. The Council have sat back and watched the site grow without taking any action and must re-visit this. In regularising the site the council is providing open invitation for other travellers to do the same as the council will be seen to be weak, capitulating and an easy target area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23332 - 4905 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - None

24439 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy HP08 seeks to regularise an illegal travellers site on the Chelmsford Road. The borough Council has failed to undertake its duty to attempt to remove the travellers since they moved in some years ago. The Council has watched the site grow without taking any action! They must revisit this. In regularising the site the Council is providing an invitation for other traveller to do the same as the council will be seen as weak, capitulatory and an easy target area.

Change To Plan: Remove the Blackmore travellers site from the plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24439 - 8378 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

24458 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to this policy. Development in Blackmore would be damaging to the area because: There are errors in the plan, population states 829 but does not include houses past Red Rose Lane or the residents in Chelmsford Road and Traveller site. Duty to cooperate. Red Rose Lane is single track and wont cope with more traffic; Flood Risk and Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. The local school is at capacity with no room for more children. The doctors is too at capacity, waiting times are bad already. Electricity and services wont be able to cope with 70 extra houses.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24458 - 8379 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

24668 Object**Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Regularisation of travellers sites was done without prior warning, it aims solely to meet numbers and this rationale makes the plan unacceptable and unsound.

Change To Plan: * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
 * Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Forests District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
 * Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
 * Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
 * Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
 * Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
 * Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there is already a severe flooding problem which the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
 * Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24668 - 1830 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

24791 Object**Respondent: Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unauthorised travellers site will add to the impact on school, GP, local amenities in Blackmore. Has this been taken into account?

Change To Plan: I believe that R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the Blackmore village Heritage Association "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out our local housing needs to avoid further development locally.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24791 - 8175 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

25260 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy HP08 seeks to regularise an illegal traveller site on the Chelmsford Road. The Borough Council has failed to undertake its duty to attempt to remove the travellers from the site since they first moved in some years ago. The Council have sat back and watched the site grow without taking any action and must re-visit this. In regularising the site the council is providing open invitation for other travellers to do the same as the council will be seen to be weak, capitulating and an easy target area.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25260 - 7046 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - None

25289 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy HP08 seeks to regularise an illegal traveller site on the Chelmsford Road. The Borough Council has failed to undertake its duty to attempt to remove the travellers from the site since they first moved in some years ago. The Council have sat back and watched the site grow without taking any action and must re-visit this. In regularising the site the council is providing open invitation for other travellers to do the same as the council will be seen to be weak, capitulating and an easy target area.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25289 - 8501 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - None

25751 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kay Parkinson [4599]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road will add to further overcrowding in Blackmore village and an even greater pressure on all of its services.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25751 - 4599 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - None

25752 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Parkinson [8617]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road will add to further overcrowding in Blackmore village and an even greater pressure on all of its services.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25752 - 8617 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - None

25848 Object**Respondent: Mr John Hughes [4500]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy HP08 seeks to regularise an illegal traveller site on the Chelmsford Road. The Borough Council has failed to undertake its duty to attempt to remove the travellers from the site since they first moved in some years ago. The Council have sat back and watched the site grow without taking any action and must re-visit this. In regularising the site the council is providing open invitation for other travellers to do the same as the council will be seen to be weak, capitulating and an easy target area.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25848 - 4500 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

25851 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy HP08 seeks to regularise an illegal traveller site on the Chelmsford Road. The Borough Council has failed to undertake its duty to attempt to remove the travellers from the site since they first moved in some years ago. The Council have sat back and watched the site grow without taking any action and must re-visit this. In regularising the site the council is providing open invitation for other travellers to do the same as the council will be seen to be weak, capitulating and an easy target area.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25851 - 8637 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

25858 Object**Respondent: Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy HP08 seeks to regularise an illegal traveller site on the Chelmsford Road. The Borough Council has failed to undertake its duty to attempt to remove the travellers from the site since they first moved in some years ago. The Council have sat back and watched the site grow without taking any action and must re-visit this. In regularising the site the council is providing open invitation for other travellers to do the same as the council will be seen to be weak, capitulating and an easy target area.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25858 - 8638 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

25865 Object**Respondent: Mr Adam Hughes [8639]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy HP08 seeks to regularise an illegal traveller site on the Chelmsford Road. The Borough Council has failed to undertake its duty to attempt to remove the travellers from the site since they first moved in some years ago. The Council have sat back and watched the site grow without taking any action and must re-visit this. In regularising the site the council is providing open invitation for other travellers to do the same as the council will be seen to be weak, capitulating and an easy target area.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25865 - 8639 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

25984 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC (with significant support from Local Communities) went to great lengths a couple of years ago to prove the illegal occupation of the site in Chelmsford Road should not be allowed and the perpetrators should be removed. Now with no warning one individual raised the idea of formalizing the acceptability of the site, linking it to the LDP and it was passed without discussion at the infamous "Guillotine Meeting"

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25984 - 4759 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii

25994 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC (with significant support from Local Communities) went to great lengths a couple of years ago to prove the illegal occupation of the site in Chelmsford Road should not be allowed and the perpetrators should be removed. Now with no warning one individual raised the idea of formalizing the acceptability of the site, linking it to the LDP and it was passed without discussion at the infamous "Guillotine Meeting"

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25994 - 4700 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, ii, iii

26102 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I have experienced first-hand the failure of Brentwood Borough Council to exercise its duty to attempt to remove the Travellers from the site. I have sympathy obviously that the Travellers have had children who now attend the local school - but the very fact that they have been able to settle for that long just provides proof that they are no longer 'travelling'. Further proof has been sent to the Council in recent years of the fact that many 'Travellers' at that site actually own property elsewhere, which invalidates their 'Traveller' status. If this site is regularised, Brentwood is opening its doors to further illegal settlements.

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26102 - 8677 - POLICY HP08: REGULARISING SUITABLE EXISTING TRAVELLER SITES - i, iii, iv

22394 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Criteria A. c. of Policy HP10 seeks to restrict sub-division of Gypsy & Traveller sites to no more than 10 pitches per site.

Chelmsford City Council's Local Plan EIP Inspector questioned restriction. Post hearing advice-National planning policy for traveller sites requires criteria based policies should be fair and effective.

Inspector advises available evidence does not adequately demonstrate why sites should be restricted, and policy contains other criteria to consider impact and scale. Inspector recommended criterion not justified and should be deleted.

BBC should provide appropriate evidence in respect of this matter. If no supporting evidence, then recommended criterion is deleted.

Change To Plan: Consideration should be given to the Chelmsford Inspector's letter and if there is no appropriate evidence for BBC then delete criterion A. c. from Policy HP10.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22394 - 6776 - POLICY HP10: SUB-DIVISION OF PITCHES OR PLOTS - ii

CHAPTER: Chapter 6. Housing Provision POLICY HP11: PROPOSALS FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE ON WINDFALL SITES

22395 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Criteria A. i. of Policy HP11 seeks to restrict the capacity of Gypsy & Traveller sites to no more than 10 pitches per site.

Chelmsford City Council's Local Plan EIP Inspector questioned restriction. Post hearing advice-National planning policy for traveller sites requires criteria based policies should be fair and effective.

Inspector advises available evidence does not adequately demonstrate why sites should be restricted, and policy contains other criteria to consider impact and scale. Inspector recommended criterion not justified and should be deleted.

BBC should provide appropriate evidence in respect of this matter. If no supporting evidence, then recommended criterion is deleted.

Change To Plan: Consideration should be given to the Chelmsford Inspector's letter and if there is no appropriate evidence for BBC then delete criterion A. i. from Policy HP11.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22395 - 6776 - POLICY HP11: PROPOSALS FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE ON WINDFALL SITES - ii

23194 Support

Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Should contain the need for GT sites to be situated in areas that are low risk from flooding. Caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use are classed as 'Highly Vulnerable' so are not permitted in Flood Zone 3, and require the exception test in Flood Zone 2. It's also very difficult to make caravans, mobile homes and park homes safe through raising floor levels. There should be a reference to the need for any site proposal to provide confirmation that there are adequate warning and evacuation arrangements for caravan sites used for short-let or holiday use.

Change To Plan: Amend as suggested.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23194 - 8308 - POLICY HP11: PROPOSALS FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE ON WINDFALL SITES - i, ii, iii, iv

23250 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are pleased to note that the policies within the LP support our health and wellbeing objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23250 - 3791 - POLICY HP12: PLANNING FOR INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES - i, ii, iii, iv

24044 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy HP12: Planning for Inclusive Communities refers to the need to plan for and build inclusive environments that support communities. Proposals should provide access to good quality community spaces, services and infrastructure, encouraging social interaction, ensuring inclusivity and promoting safety. The policy is deemed "consistent" with NPPF (section 8) "Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities" which states that planning policies should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which promote social interaction, are safe and accessible, and support healthy lifestyles. The policy is therefore considered sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24044 - 2656 - POLICY HP12: PLANNING FOR INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES - i, ii, iii, iv

24299 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24299 - 2741 - POLICY HP12: PLANNING FOR INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES - i, ii, iii, iv

24326 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24326 - 2741 - POLICY HP12: PLANNING FOR INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES - i, ii, iii, iv

22313 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy HP13: points e and f set out the requirement for new developments to be accessible, but they appear to only cater for pedestrians and cyclists, thereby discriminating against equestrians. As mentioned in our comments against BE13, any new off-road routes created should be multi-user routes by default thereby ensuring their accessibility by all vulnerable road users, instead of catering only for pedestrians and cyclists.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, we suggest that point f is reworded thus: 'access, routes and connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians through and out from the development...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22313 - 3855 - POLICY HP13: CREATING SUCCESSFUL PLACES - i, ii, iii, iv

22377 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The policy is supported especially criterion (k) which expects developments to meet active design principles. Criteria (a), (e), (f) are also supported due to their promotion of healthy and active environments. As well as according with Government policy in paragraph 91 of the NPPF, this approach would be consistent with the 2018 Essex Design Guide which has embedded design themes such as active design and health/well-being that is referred to in the reasoned justification.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22377 - 4294 - POLICY HP13: CREATING SUCCESSFUL PLACES - None

24045 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy HP13: Creating Successful Places seeks that proposals meet high design standards, in order to deliver safe, inclusive, attractive and accessible places. Elements A-M of policy HP13 identify measures considered to create successful places, in accordance with section 12 of the NPPF on "Achieving Well-Designed Places". The NPPF (para 128) states that design quality should be considered throughout the evolution and assessment of individual proposals. Policy HP13 is therefore considered to be "consistent" with the NPPF and sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24045 - 2656 - POLICY HP13: CREATING SUCCESSFUL PLACES - i, ii, iii, iv

24300 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24300 - 2741 - POLICY HP13: CREATING SUCCESSFUL PLACES - i, ii, iii, iv

24327 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24327 - 2741 - POLICY HP13: CREATING SUCCESSFUL PLACES - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 6. Housing Provision POLICY HP14: RESPONDING TO CONTEXT

24301 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24301 - 2741 - POLICY HP14: RESPONDING TO CONTEXT - i, ii, iii, iv

24328 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24328 - 2741 - POLICY HP14: RESPONDING TO CONTEXT - i, ii, iii, iv

24303 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24303 - 2741 - POLICY HP15: PERMEABLE AND LEGIBLE LAYOUT - i, ii, iii, iv

24329 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24329 - 2741 - POLICY HP15: PERMEABLE AND LEGIBLE LAYOUT - i, ii, iii, iv

24046 Support **Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]** **Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]**

Summary: Policy HP16: Buildings Design seeks for development to be well designed and of a high quality, having regard to Development Management criteria including scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance. This policy is considered to be "consistent" with the NPPF having particular regard to Section 12 on "Achieving Well-Designed Places" and therefore sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24046 - 2656 - POLICY HP16: BUILDINGS DESIGN - i, ii, iii, iv

24304 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24304 - 2741 - POLICY HP16: BUILDINGS DESIGN - i, ii, iii, iv

24330 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24330 - 2741 - POLICY HP16: BUILDINGS DESIGN - i, ii, iii, iv

24305 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24305 - 2741 - POLICY HP17: PAVING OVER FRONT GARDENS - i, ii, iii, iv

24331 Support **Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]** **Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24331 - 2741 - POLICY HP17: PAVING OVER FRONT GARDENS - i, ii, iii, iv

22314 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy HP18 and para 6.112: no mention has been made to ensure accessibility for all throughout new developments, and paragraph 6.112 mentions joining up landscape features and open spaces to 'create coherent linked landscape networks' but again, pedestrians and cyclists are the only user groups mentioned.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, we suggest that access for equestrians is incorporated into this policy and confirmed in the reasoned justification.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22314 - 3855 - POLICY HP18: DESIGNING LANDSCAPE AND THE PUBLIC REALM - i, ii, iii, iv

23982 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: Policy HP18: Designing Landscape and the Public Realm, in combination with Policy R01(I) clause C, provide an adequate policy framework for guiding a future landscape scheme - including the provision of green infrastructure between R01 and the development of the West of Basildon.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23982 - 8351 - POLICY HP18: DESIGNING LANDSCAPE AND THE PUBLIC REALM - i

24306 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24306 - 2741 - POLICY HP18: DESIGNING LANDSCAPE AND THE PUBLIC REALM - i, ii, iii, iv

24332 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The approach set out in the PSLP for design and place-making is broadly supported. However, we note that there are effectively seven policies (HP12 - HP18) which provide the requirements against these matters. We also note that there are some areas of repetition on some of the objectives against those policies. We consider that those commenting on and determining applications should preferably have one or two identified policies to refer to and/or applicable thresholds to more succinctly set out requirements. This would ensure that planning applications can be more effectively judged against context, design and place-shaping criteria.

Change To Plan: There are seven policies on Design and Place Making. This should be reduced to one or two policies to reduce repetition and improving consistency in determining planning applications.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24332 - 2741 - POLICY HP18: DESIGNING LANDSCAPE AND THE PUBLIC REALM - i, ii, iii, iv

22396 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC should be satisfied has appropriate evidence base,such as Historic Environment Characterisation,to support its heritage strategies and Local Plan policies.

Most policies are not phrased in positive manner,contrary to NPPF paragraph 185 (plans to set out positive strategy for conservation and enjoyment of historic environment).

Should be consideration given to amending wording of heritage policies to be positive and support proposals which protect and enhance heritage assets,both designated or non-designated.

Further consideration should be given to consolidation of 5 policies,which currently address all various heritage assets separately.NPPF requires consideration of any heritage asset and its contribution made by its setting.

Change To Plan: BBC should seek to ensure the Local Plan is supported by the appropriate heritage evidence.

It is recommended that the policies are reworded positively, and that consideration be given to the potential to consolidate the policies.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22396 - 6776 - Heritage - ii, iii, iv

22397 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

The NPPF at paragraph 187 advises that LPA's should maintain or have access to a historic environment record, which should contain up-to-date evidence about the historic environment in their area.

Footnote 7 provides a link to the Historic England website to access the Historic Environment Records for Brentwood.

It is considered that a link to the Essex Historic Environment Record is more appropriate, which provides a list of heritage assets within the area and general character assessments.

Change To Plan: Amend footnote 7 to paragraph 6.120 to provide a link to the Essex Historic Environment Record <http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/gateway/>

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22397 - 6776 - 6.120 - iv

22398 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Heritage assets include all non-designated archaeological sites and deposits.

Change To Plan: Amend first sentence of paragraph 6.125 as follows -

'... local significance, or non-designated archaeological sites and deposits which ...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22398 - 6776 - 6.125 - iv

23967 Object**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Paragraph 185 of the NPPF, requires that "Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;..."

In relation to designated heritage assets, paragraphs 195 and 196 provide for harm to heritage assets to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. As such, there are circumstances where not all heritage assets will be "sustained and enhanced". A modification is proposed in our response to question no. 6 to ensure consistency with the NPPF.

Change To Plan: The following modification is proposed to ensure consistency with the NPPF:
Criterion A (a) "take account of the desirability to conserve, sustain and enhance..."

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23967 - 5050 - POLICY HP19: CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT - i, ii, iv

24025 Object**Respondent: Ward-Booth Partnership (Mr Robert Ward-Booth) [8272]****Agent: Ward-Booth Partnership (Mr Robert Ward-Booth) [8272]**

Summary: In this regard Paragraph 185 makes it clear that Plans should set out a positive strategy for conservation which should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing Heritage Assets. This guidance is extended in Paragraph 192 which makes clear that in determining applications Council's should have regard to the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of Heritage Assets. However, the NPPF does not say that there should be any prescriptive requirement that development proposals must both sustain and enhance Heritage Assets. As drafted the wording of Policy HP19 states that all development proposals that affect Heritage Assets and their setting will be required to conserve, sustain and enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets. I would respectfully suggest that this proposed wording is contrary to national guidance set out in the NPPF and that it is therefore unsound.

Change To Plan: In this respect I would request that consideration should be given to re-wording of Policy HP19 A.a to read as follows: "have regard to the desirability to conserve, sustain and enhance designated and nondesignated heritage assets including views into and out of conservation areas and their settings; and be sensitively sited and integrated in accordance with advice in accordance with national policy and guidance"

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24025 - 8272 - POLICY HP19: CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT - iv

23968 Object**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: The Policy is not consistent with the NPPF or statutory requirements as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 about listed buildings and how proposals that affect them should be assessed. Some modifications are proposed in our response to question no. 6 to address this.

Change To Plan: The following aspects of the policy require modification to ensure consistency with the NPPF and statutory requirements as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:
Criterion A. "sympathetic to its character and setting" is not consistent with NPPF.
Criterion D. "only be permitted in exceptional circumstances;" is not consistent with the NPPF or 1990 Act.
It is recommended that the policy is re-visited generally to ensure consistency with the NPPF and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23968 - 5050 - POLICY HP20: LISTED BUILDINGS - i, ii, iv

24026 Object

Respondent: Ward-Booth Partnership (Mr Robert Ward-Booth) [8272]

Agent: Ward-Booth Partnership (Mr Robert Ward-Booth) [8272]

Summary: Paragraphs 195 and 201 of the NPPF provide a carefully considered mechanism for determination of applications which affect Conservation Areas and which are based on an assessment of the impact of proposed development on the significance of the Heritage Asset. In this way the NPPF provides a mechanism which protects those elements of the Historic Built Environment which are of genuine value whilst also allowing sustainable development and change. Policy HP21 C does not make any reference to the impact of proposed development on the significance of the Conservation Area and instead seeks to impose a general requirement to preserve all existing buildings unless they are demonstrably harmful or unless they make "no material contribution" to the character and appearance of the area. By departing from the policy approach set out in the NPPF and by adopting the form of words set out in HP21 c. the practical effect of the proposed policy will be to introduce a presumption against change rather than a presumption in favour of preserving the value and significance of Heritage Assets. This will act as a barrier to sustainable development and will be contrary to NPPF policy guidance.

Change To Plan: Consider re-wording of Policy HP21 c to read as follows: "where demolition is proposed the proposed development will preserve or enhance the significance of the Conservation Area"

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24026 - 8272 - POLICY HP21: CONSERVATION AREAS - iv

24027 Object

Respondent: Ward-Booth Partnership (Mr Robert Ward-Booth) [8272]

Agent: Ward-Booth Partnership (Mr Robert Ward-Booth) [8272]

Summary: The national design guidance (examples include Historic England / CABE publication "Building In Context New Development in Historic Areas") which make it clear that good quality contemporary design and good quality contemporary materials can be successfully used in the most sensitive heritage environment. Whilst it is essential that the council should resist the use of harmful, poor quality or inappropriate materials the Local Plan should not impose barriers to good quality contemporary materials. Therefore the wording in the para is unjustified and be removed from the Local Plan.

Change To Plan: The wording in the para is unjustified and be removed from the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24027 - 8272 - 6.143 - iv

24071 Object

Respondent: Ward-Booth Partnership (Mr Robert Ward-Booth) [8272]

Agent: Ward-Booth Partnership (Mr Robert Ward-Booth) [8272]

Summary: Experience suggest that the Council's assessment as to what constitutes a building of genuine local heritage significance is not necessarily well justified (please see Appeal Ref APP/H1515/A/14/2219012) and inappropriate designation Local Heritage Assets can result in an unjustified barrier to sustainable development. Equally, it is common to find examples of buildings which do have Local historic value but which are not included on the List of Local Heritage Assets which has been prepared by the Local Planning Authority. To be consistent with National Planning policy the determining factor in applications which affect undesignated heritage assets should be the actual significance of the asset concerned (NPPF paragraph 197) and not the presence or absence of any particular building on a Council list.

Change To Plan: Consider re-wording of Policy HP22 A. to read as follows: "There is a general presumption in favour of the retention of local heritage assets, including buildings, structures, features and gardens of local interest. In addition, the Council will conserve the traditional landscape and nature conservation character of Protected Lanes."

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24071 - 8272 - POLICY HP22: LOCAL HERITAGE ASSETS - iv

23120 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council questions whether the Spatial Strategy is therefore justified and consistent with national policy. The two transport corridors dont offer comparable choices in terms of the capacity of these transport connections. Four reasonable site alternatives in the Central Brentwood Corridor have been disregarded in the Sustainability Apprial, despite having few constraints and being able to tap into the potential for movement capacity. This is considered to be in conflict with sustainable development when sites which have significant constraints to development or delivery have been included within the Plan, at the expense of sites which have fewer constraints.

Change To Plan: Using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the superior infrastructure available. This should help encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Chapter 3 should be modified as a result along with all land use allocations in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23120 - 369 - Delivering Economic Growth - i, iii

23710 Support

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: Employment land policies and land allocations are supported as sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23710 - 8337 - Delivering Economic Growth - None

23821 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Employment land policies and land allocations are supported as sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23821 - 303 - Delivering Economic Growth - None

23839 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Employment land policies and land allocations are supported as sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23839 - 4657 - Delivering Economic Growth - None

23857 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Employment land policies and land allocations are supported as sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23857 - 4656 - Delivering Economic Growth - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community

7.1

24341 Support

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Section 7: Prosperous Communities: This section of the PSLP confirms Brentwood Borough Council's Economic Strategy, which includes a number of Economic Aims and Strategic Priorities. These will help facilitate sustainable development, which is required to ensure that the Plan is sound. Paragraph 7.1 of the Plan recognises the importance of the Borough as being a high-quality environment within close proximity to London. The economic aims include the desire to encourage high value, diverse, employment uses that will provide a significant number of skilled and high-quality jobs; and to encourage the better utilisation, upgrading and redevelopment of existing land and buildings. These aims are supported and are reflected in the indicative proposed masterplan accompanying these representations.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24341 - 8371 - 7.1 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community

7.3

22401 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC needs to satisfy itself that Local Plan has clear economic strategy, with robust phasing and delivery mechanisms in place to ensure that full employment requirements can be delivered over whole Plan period, in line with NPPF paragraph 23. It is important given 55% of BBC's employment land allocation in Plan is proposed at BEP. Site still has uncertainty over access and how and when will be delivered. Furthermore, BBC's evidence base (Economic Futures 2013-2033 Report 2018) indicates there is need for site to be delivered early in Plan period, in order to accommodate local businesses that may be affected by employment land re-allocation proposed in Plan.

Change To Plan: Clarity is sought on the deliverability and phasing of employment land allocations in order to meet requirements outlined in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22401 - 6776 - 7.3 - i, ii, iii, iv

24343 Support

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: . In addition to the Economic Aims, the PSLP sets out a number of Strategic Priorities. Of these, Strategic Policies P1 and P6 are strongly supported. P1 seeks to support business development and growth. P6 seeks to promote Brentwood Borough as a place to visit and invest, thereby encouraging the visitor economy. Childerditch Industrial Estate would assist in meeting those objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24343 - 8371 - 7.3 - i, ii, iii, iv

22360 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council is broadly supportive of policy PC01 and considers it to generally align with national policy and other local and national objectives.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22360 - 4178 - POLICY PC01: CULTIVATING A STRONG AND COMPETITIVE ECONOMY - None

24105 Support

Respondent: Freeths LLP (Mr Paul Brailsford) [5642]

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Paul Brailsford) [5642]

Summary: The policy's acknowledgement of the need to "improve access to a range of employment opportunities for the borough's residents". This is consistent with our own assessment of market demand for the site which spans a range of sectors and uses beyond traditional B class employment uses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 24105 - 5642 - POLICY PC01: CULTIVATING A STRONG AND COMPETITIVE ECONOMY - iii, iv

22595 Support

Respondent: Mr P Kingston [8255]

Agent: Whirledge and Nott (Mrs Elizabeth Milne) [8254]

Summary: The land south of Brook Street and east of the M25, along with the land south of the A12 and west of the M25, should be considered for allocation in the emerging Local Plan to accommodate future employment requirements.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22595 - 8255 - 7.8 - None

23107 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The amount of proposed employment land is broadly sufficient to meet Brentwood's overall forecast employment land needs. However that the policy makes the assumption that there are no capacity issues for existing infrastructure, or any needs for supporting infrastructure to be provided and this lack of clarity will make the policy ineffective, unjustified. PC02 and PC03 should incorporate additional provisions to manage the release and expansion of the locations within the Southern Brentwood Growth Corridor, supported by an Employment Land Trajectory, to make it more effective, justified and consistent with national policy.

Change To Plan: PC02 and PC03 should be amended to incorporate a staggered delivery target for new employment land, supported by a new Employment Land Trajectory within the Plan's Appendices, to coordinate the phased release of new and expanded employment land to ensure it can be linked to specific and necessary upgrades to supporting infrastructure. This will minimise the impact growth will have on existing highway routes in particular, which could otherwise impact on cross-boundary issues within the wider South Essex economic corridor.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23107 - 369 - POLICY PC02: JOB GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT LAND - i

23751 Object

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Object to Policy PC02, at the very least it should be amended to state that the allocation of 47.39 ha of new employment land is a minimum. We have some reservations as to the quantum of employment land that is proposed under the various scenarios considered as part of the Brentwood Economic Futures 2013-2033 study. The Council should be considering the Experian based forecasts set out under Scenario A as a minimum requirement and could be more proactive by allowing for a greater buffer beyond the requirement of land set out under Scenario A.

Change To Plan: Policy PC02 should be amended to state that the allocation of 47.39 ha of new employment land is a minimum.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23751 - 5124 - POLICY PC02: JOB GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT LAND - i, iv

22361 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council is broadly supportive of policy PC02 and Brentwood Borough Council's suggested approach to delivering 47.4 hectares of new employment land. The Council does not have any detailed comments to make regarding the proposed allocation of specific sites; however, it considers that Brentwood Borough Council as part of Brentwood Borough Council's wider growth strategy, can and will be adequately mitigated, particularly for sites in proximity to key strategic routes including the A127.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22361 - 4178 - POLICY PC02: JOB GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT LAND - None

23178 Support

Respondent: Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]

Agent: N/A

Summary: CCC is supportive of BBC approach to meeting the forecasted employments needs through allocating 47.39ha employment land as set out in Policy PC03 Employment Land Allocations. The Local Plan allocates additional strategic employment land at Brentwood Enterprise Park. In addition, further employment land is allocated and policies in the Local Plan seek to protect existing employment land providing a mix and range of employment sites. Overall CCC is supportive of this approach and do not raise any objections under soundness or legal compliance.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23178 - 8305 - POLICY PC02: JOB GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT LAND - i, ii, iii, iv

23724 Support

Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: The approach of allocating more employment land than anticipated to be needed is positively prepared, providing a buffer should the loss of current employment land be greater than anticipated. Allocating further employment land could assist in providing greater flexibility should sites not come forward as intended or greater losses in employment space occur.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23724 - 6122 - POLICY PC02: JOB GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT LAND - i, iv

24011 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy PC02: Job Growth and Employment Land identifies that provision is made for at least 47.39ha of new employment land (B-use) to address the needs of the Borough up to 2033. To ensure that the Plan is more effective, it is recommended that this is followed by supporting text setting out the extent of need as derived from the Brentwood Economic Futures report (2018) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2018).

Change To Plan: Recommended that PC02 is followed by supporting text setting out the extent of need as derived from the Brentwood Economic Futures report (2018) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2018). This need is proposed to be met through allocations set out at Policy PC03: Employment Land Allocations. This includes provision of appropriate new employment development on North of A1023 (part of the Land North of Shenfield R03 land use allocation).

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24011 - 2656 - POLICY PC02: JOB GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT LAND - i, ii, iii, iv

24047 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy PC02: Job Growth and Employment Land seeks that provision is made for 5,000 additional jobs in the Borough over the Plan period at a rate of 250 per year. NPPF Section 6 on "Building a Strong, Competitive Economy" sets out that planning policies should support economic growth, in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. The strategic allocation at Land North of Shenfield supports economic growth and creates new opportunities and is "consistent" with national guidance and is sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24047 - 2656 - POLICY PC02: JOB GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT LAND - i, ii, iii, iv

24347 Support

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Job Growth and Employment Land In determining the employment land allocations necessary to ensure that an adequate number of jobs can be provided, it is important that the Plan is sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change (as required by Paragraph 11 of the NPPF), and that it does so in a manner that ensures that the boundary of the Green Belt will not need to be reviewed before the end of the Plan period (Paragraph 136 of the NPPF refers). As set out within Paragraph 2.54 of the PSLP, 89% of the Borough lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt. There is not sufficient land outside of the Green Belt for the Council to deliver the requisite level of housing and employment land. It is therefore necessary and justified to amend the boundary of the Green Belt as part of the Local Plan process. Paragraph 8.84 of the PSLP refers to the need to release land from the Green Belt in order to achieve the Council's growth strategy. This release has been carefully balanced to ensure that sustainable development can be achieved, whilst ensuring that the longer-term purpose, integrity and benefit of the Green Belt remains intact. We support the Council's approach insofar as our client's land interests are concerned and it is important to ensure that any changes to the Green Belt endure beyond the Plan period, having regard to its intended permanence, as required by Paragraph 136 of the NPPF. The PSLP sets out the proposed allocation at Childerditch Industrial Estate can come forward over the next 1 to 10 years. The indicative proposed masterplan prepared by CMP Architects provides an illustrative approach as to how the proposed allocation could come forward in conjunction with the redevelopment of the existing Park. The land is available now and there are no overriding constraints to delivery. The Plan would be justified and effective in this respect. The Brentwood Economic Futures (2013-2033) Final Report sets out 4 scenarios for quantifying the potential requirement for jobs in order to support the growth of the Plan Period. The Report provides indicative job capacity figures, which have been based on assumptions, in terms of both site capacity and B1a/b, B1c/B2, and B8 split. (Refer to table in attached copy of full representation). In respect of Childerditch Industrial Estate however, the Report has not taken into account that the existing Park can be redeveloped in a more efficient and effective manner to provide more job growth, as provided for in these representations. Overall, the proposed allocation will enable the upgrading of the existing units on the site through increased investment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24347 - 8371 - POLICY PC02: JOB GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT LAND - i, ii, iii, iv

22403 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

The Local Plan can play key role in supporting and facilitating local job creation and increasing local skills levels. ECC is currently working with EPOA on these proposals with the intention to include these in a refreshed Essex County Council Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions. The Local Plan is currently silent on this matter. ECC would welcome the Borough's support to include such provisions in the Local Plan, in order to assist in ensuring that such matters are a consideration within the planning process.

Additional wording should be added to the 'new jobs' supporting text to Policy PC02.

Change To Plan: Include the following paragraphs after paragraph 7.16 -

Facilitating the training and education of local people enables them to gain skills required to enter or remain part of the local workforce; and establishing and maintaining relationships between local businesses and local training and education providers ensures local facilities are provided to access professional and vocational training.

Larger scale developments in the Borough can support employment opportunities and increased skills levels by embedding both development and end-use phase obligations in the planning process. This would include requirements for the development of apprenticeship opportunities, educational outreach and social value.

Monetary contributions to support interventions will increase skills levels and/or employability skills supporting those hard to reach and furthest away from the job market.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22403 - 6776 - New Jobs - iii

23659 Object

Respondent: EA Strategic Land LLP [279]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has under estimated the need for B-class employment land in the Borough, and that its employment land supply is insufficiently flexible.

Change To Plan: Site West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon is fully in accordance with the spatial strategy focused on transit orientated growth and should be allocated. No significant constraints with developing an urban extension at West Horndon, in addition to Dunton Hills Garden Village was identified by the Sustainability Appraisal. If Brentwood is to attempt to meet the housing needs, this approach is required.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23659 - 279 - Employment land provision - None

23108 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The amount of proposed employment land is broadly sufficient to meet Brentwood's overall forecast employment land needs. However that the policy makes the assumption that there are no capacity issues for existing infrastructure, or any needs for supporting infrastructure to be provided and this lack of clarity will make the policy ineffective, unjustified. PC02 and PC03 should incorporate additional provisions to manage the release and expansion of the locations within the Southern Brentwood Growth Corridor, supported by an Employment Land Trajectory, to make it more effective, justified and consistent with national policy.

Change To Plan: PC02 and PC03 should be amended to incorporate a staggered delivery target for new employment land, supported by a new Employment Land Trajectory within the Plan's Appendices, to coordinate the phased release of new and expanded employment land to ensure it can be linked to specific and necessary upgrades to supporting infrastructure. This will minimise the impact growth will have on existing highway routes in particular, which could otherwise impact on cross-boundary issues within the wider South Essex economic corridor.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23108 - 369 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - i

23183 Object

Respondent: London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan does not evidence why the Brentwood Enterprise Park is would be an acceptable use at an important location in the Green Belt other than to refer the difficulties of accommodating the quantum of development within other parts of the Brentwood borough and the opportunity to capitalize on the connections in the Brentwood Growth Corridor (para. 7.23b).

Change To Plan: Policy PC03 Employment Land Allocations, Policy E11 Brentwood Enterprise Park and Site Allocation E11 Brentwood Enterprise Park should be amended:

- * to demonstrate why the proposal is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework
- * to provide explicit commentary on the likely significant implications of the proposal for the wider strategic highway network given the proximity to Havering
- * to recognize the importance of working with other stakeholders (such as Transport for London and London Borough of Havering so that there can be certainty that the impacts of the Brentwood Enterprise Park proposal are satisfactory and can be accommodated without any adverse impact on the network beyond Brentwood
- * to recognize the role of the established joint working between authorities along the A127 corridor to ensure that the significant growth along this corridor is understood, assessed and mitigated as necessary.
- * to recognize the merit of the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground or Memorandum of Understanding between relevant stakeholders to recognize the issues involved and set out a joint commitment to recognizing these and addressing them
- * to recognize that the scale of the Brentwood Enterprise Park proposal and the traffic it will generate is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts for the wider area (including Havering) and that these need to be considered and mitigated
- * to include cross reference to Policy BE11 Strategic Transport Infrastructure

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23183 - 7966 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - i

23684 Object

Respondent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Pryor) [2581]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Pryor) [2581]

Summary: McColls Headquarters Site, Ongar Road, has been identified as Site 321 as an existing employment site in the Green Belt. As a site in the Green Belt, it should rank along other sites that have been brought forward existing employment sites not previously allocated and new land allocations. The Emerging Plan has identified such sites as being released from the Green Belt. The site has within it a number of non-designated heritage assets which would benefit from some form of residential development and the site provides an opportunity for some mixed use.

Change To Plan: The failure of the Local Authority to produce an updated Proposals Map means that the Plan is not sound. The lack of completion of the Green Belt Evidence Base means that the subject site has not been properly assessed. Also, in accordance with the February 2019 NPPF, there should be revisions to the Green Belt Policy, Criteria A g Limited Infilling addition to add the words - "Not cause substantial harm to the openness of the green belt where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the Local Planning Authority". Also further, the Criteria for replacement or substantial re-building of permanently occupied dwellings are too limiting. Any reference to 30% above original habitable floor space should be deleted and the wording of the Policy more in accordance with the NPPF and relate solely to disproportionate increases.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23684 - 2581 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - ii, iv

23752 Object

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Policy PC03 contains a prescriptive list of the circumstances when non B-class uses will be permitted in respect of "Redevelopment or change of use of business, office, general industry and distribution". Given that Policy E11 refers to the possibility of development for uses other than B-class uses i.e. for "any associated employment generating sui generis uses" we assume this part of Policy PC03 relates only to existing employment sites. However, in order for the policy to be effective, the opening paragraph should be amended as suggested below.

Change To Plan: The policy should be amended so that the opening paragraph reads as follows: "Within those areas allocated for general employment and office development, set out in Figure 7.6 and on the Brentwood Policies Map, the Council will seek to achieve and retain a wide range of employment opportunities. Further details in this regard are set out in the individual site allocation policies.
In relation to existing employment sites redevelopment for non B-class uses will only be permitted where:[...]"

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23752 - 5124 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - i, iv

23942 Object

Respondent: McColl's Retail Group PLC [3662]

Agent: Smith Jenkins Ltd (Mr Samuel Dix) [8350]

Summary: Object. Clause (a) is unduly onerous and should be reworded: In reality, there is very limited likelihood of a non-B-class employment-generating use being able to demonstrate that it cannot be located elsewhere in the Borough. Also, there is no indication of what is meant by "significant employment"; this requires justification as sites such as Ashwells Road are under-occupied yet are theoretically capable of accommodating a much greater number of employees.

Change To Plan: We would suggest that in order to be sound, the above changes to the clauses within Policy PC03 should be made. The general provisions of the policy should read similar to the following:
"Within allocated employment areas, the Council will resist the loss of B-class uses. Redevelopment or change of use will only be permitted where one or more of the following criteria apply..."

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23942 - 3662 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - None

23943 Object

Respondent: McColl's Retail Group PLC [3662]

Agent: Smith Jenkins Ltd (Mr Samuel Dix) [8350]

Summary: Object. Clause (b) is unsound because it is not positively prepared. Using a criteria that allows wholly affordable schemes to be brought forward on vacant employment sites represents a very poor approach to the social aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 62 of the NPPF explains that affordable housing should contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. The policy is not effective as the existing use value of vacant employment sites will be prohibitive to the developers of 100% affordable housing schemes, particularly as such sites are likely to have abnormal costs associated with remediation.

Change To Plan: We would suggest that in order to be sound, the above changes to the clauses within Policy PC03 should be made. The general provisions of the policy should read similar to the following:
"Within allocated employment areas, the Council will resist the loss of B-class uses. Redevelopment or change of use will only be permitted where one or more of the following criteria apply..."

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23943 - 3662 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - None

23945 Object

Respondent: McColl's Retail Group PLC [3662]

Agent: Smith Jenkins Ltd (Mr Samuel Dix) [8350]

Summary: Clause (d) is not justified in setting an unrealistically exhaustive approach for proving unsuitability for employment. In particular, applicants should not be forced to speculate on whether wholesale redevelopment would improve the prospects of a site. This is an enormously costly exercise compared with the other identified approaches of re-use, adaptation, and refurbishment. Clause (d) should therefore be restricted to these options and not include reference to redevelopment being explored.

Change To Plan: We would suggest that in order to be sound, the above changes to the clauses within Policy PC03 should be made. The general provisions of the policy should read similar to the following:
"Within allocated employment areas, the Council will resist the loss of B-class uses. Redevelopment or change of use will only be permitted where one or more of the following criteria apply..."

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23945 - 3662 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - None

24132 Object

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford notes that Draft Figure 7.6 and Appendix 2 of the PSD includes Part of allocation RO4 - 'Ford offices Eagle Way' (southern parcel of the Ford owned land) as an Existing Employment Site, whereby 2ha of land is proposed to be retained for employment purposes. However, there is no further evidence and/or explanation provided for this designation, which our Client indeed questioned and requested within our previous representations to the PSA consultation. With the new employment allocations alone, BBC appear to have more than supply of employment land to meet its overall forecast needs over the plan period - questioning the requirement to retain 2ha of employment floorspace at the Ford site (whereby there appears to be very limited, or indeed no market demand for such space with no real planning basis for the 2ha figure referenced). Accordingly, it is anticipated that the new supply through the 'Proposed Allocations' should sufficiently compensate for the full release of the Ford site for residential with the Draft allocation for the Site revised accordingly including the removal for the requirement for 2ha of employment land. It is also considered that the distance from Brentwood and Shenfield town centres and train stations would not be an attractive location for commercial investment - acknowledging that typically businesses requiring commercial properties of this size today, would pursue sites within close proximity of strategic infrastructure, trunk roads and more extensive local facilities and services. As such, and in light of current national policy parameters which specifically seek to promote sustainable forms of development, Ford wishes to object to the retention of employment uses at the Site - acknowledging that such a use is not considered an appropriate, or viable use of the Site in the future (contrary to the NPPF 2018).

Change To Plan: Client respectfully requests that the Site is removed from the listed 'Existing Employment Allocations' under Draft Figure 7.6. We also note that no reference is made to the re-provision of the Council Depot which we understand is likely to be retained for employment purposes into the early years of the plan period (given its current operational status).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24132 - 3769 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

23799 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: SUPPORT & COMMENT: insofar as this includes the employment to be retained on the site, as well as the new employment opportunities created by the new village centre (which will include retail and non-retail uses).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23799 - 3738 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - None

24013 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: We fully support this aspect of the Plan including the broad strategy underpinning both the housing and employment allocations.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24013 - 2656 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

24048 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy PC03: Employment Land Allocations highlights areas allocated by the Council for general employment and office development. Para 82 of the NPPF states that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different employment sectors. The allocations set out in policy PC03 are informed by the wider spatial strategy, which aims to retain the Borough's character and encourage employment growth in suitable locations, in accordance with national planning policy. This policy is therefore deemed to be "consistent" with the NPPF and considered to be sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24048 - 2656 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

24356 Support

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The policy sets out a number of considerations that are intended to relate to existing and proposed employment sites identified in Figure 7.6 of the PSLP. This includes Childerditch Industrial Estate. However, the PSLP also includes a specific policy that relates to Childerditch Industrial Estate (Policy E12, which will be addressed later in these representations). Paragraph 7.23 of the PSLP states that due to the difficulties of accommodating the quantum of employment land within other parts of the Borough, the opportunity has been taken to capitalise on the strategic connections of the South Brentwood Growth Corridor by extending employment land around Childerditch Industrial Estate. This approach is considered to be justified and consistent with national policy, as the proposed allocation seeks to make efficient use of an existing, highly sustainable employment site.

Change To Plan: It is considered that greater clarification should be added to Paragraph 7.23, Part b. ii. on where Policy PC03 applies, as Policy E12 covers the entirety of Childerditch Industrial Estate. It should be added that the proposed allocation at Childerditch Industrial Estate allows for the redevelopment of the existing Estate and new development on the extended areas, which will provide a location for employment generating sui generis uses, as provided for by Policy E12

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24356 - 8371 - POLICY PC03: EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS - i, ii, iii, iv

**CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community**

Figure 7.6: Employment Site Allocations

23769 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Summary: Figure 7.6 of the PSLP should be amended to reflect the removal of employment land for 2ha as identified in Policy R03 (Land north of A1023) to reflected the proposed changes to Policy R03 to be solely for housing.

Change To Plan: The table included as this figure should therefore remove reference to Part of R03 - Land north of A1023 as a new employment allocation for 2ha.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23769 - 6751 - Figure 7.6: Employment Site Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

24133 Object

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford notes that Draft Figure 7.6 and Appendix 2 of the PSD includes Part of allocation RO4 - 'Ford offices Eagle Way' (southern parcel of the Ford owned land) as an Existing Employment Site, whereby 2ha of land is proposed to be retained for employment purposes. However, there is no further evidence and/or explanation provided for this designation, which our Client indeed questioned and requested within our previous representations to the PSA consultation. With the new employment allocations alone, BBC appear to have more than supply of employment land to meet its overall forecast needs over the plan period - questioning the requirement to retain 2ha of employment floorspace at the Ford site (whereby there appears to be very limited, or indeed no market demand for such space with no real planning basis for the 2ha figure referenced). Accordingly, it is anticipated that the new supply through the 'Proposed Allocations' should sufficiently compensate for the full release of the Ford site for residential with the Draft allocation for the Site revised accordingly including the removal for the requirement for 2ha of employment land. It is also considered that the distance from Brentwood and Shenfield town centres and train stations would not be an attractive location for commercial investment - acknowledging that typically businesses requiring commercial properties of this size today, would pursue sites within close proximity of strategic infrastructure, trunk roads and more extensive local facilities and services. As such, and in light of current national policy parameters which specifically seek to promote sustainable forms of development, Ford wishes to object to the retention of employment uses at the Site - acknowledging that such a use is not considered an appropriate, or viable use of the Site in the future (contrary to the NPPF 2018).

Change To Plan: Client respectfully requests that the Site is removed from the listed 'Existing Employment Allocations' under Draft Figure 7.6. We also note that no reference is made to the re-provision of the Council Depot which we understand is likely to be retained for employment purposes into the early years of the plan period (given its current operational status).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24133 - 3769 - Figure 7.6: Employment Site Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

22404 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

In paragraph 7.22 b. the use of the word 'normally' creates ambiguity as there is no definition of what constitutes 'normal' in this context. This could create opportunities for applicants to justify that their application represents a departure and that a full 24-month active marketing is not required to justify the lack of viability of the site for employment use. The word 'normally' should be deleted in line with paragraph 16 d) of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 7.22 b. to delete the word 'normally'.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22404 - 6776 - 7.22 - iv

23944 Object

Respondent: McColl's Retail Group PLC [3662]

Agent: Smith Jenkins Ltd (Mr Samuel Dix) [8350]

Summary: The supporting text for clause (c) at paragraph 7.22 reveals that in this instance the Policy is neither effective nor justified. Requiring 24 months of marketing is grossly excessive without justification. The policy is not effective as it puts the Borough at risk of its employment sites deteriorating indefinitely whilst valuable redevelopment opportunities are put on hold due to the excessive marketing requirements. We would suggest that 12 months is a more than adequate time for robust marketing to be undertaken and would allow the Local Plan to be more adaptive to windfall opportunities.

Change To Plan: We would suggest that in order to be sound, the above changes to the clauses within Policy PC03 should be made. The general provisions of the policy should read similar to the following:
"Within allocated employment areas, the Council will resist the loss of B-class uses. Redevelopment or change of use will only be permitted where one or more of the following criteria apply..."

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23944 - 3662 - 7.22 - None

22406 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC needs to satisfy itself that Local Plan has clear economic strategy, with robust phasing and delivery mechanisms in place to ensure that full employment requirements can be delivered over whole Plan period, in line with NPPF paragraph 23. It is important given 55% of BBC's employment land allocation in Plan is proposed at BEP. Site still has uncertainty over access and how and when will be delivered. Furthermore, BBC's evidence base (Economic Futures 2013-2033 Report 2018) indicates there is need for site to be delivered early in Plan period, in order to accommodate local businesses that may be affected by employment land re-allocation proposed in Plan.

Change To Plan: Clarity is sought on the deliverability and phasing of employment land allocations in order to meet requirements outlined in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22406 - 6776 - 7.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

23753 Object

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: The reference to BEP within the context of opportunities for growth within the South Brentwood Growth Corridor is welcomed and supported. However, in our view the reference to "redeveloping brownfield land" in sub-paragraph (b)(i) is unnecessary given that the BEP Site has been assessed by the Council and considered to be suitable for strategic employment development. Accordingly, for purposes of clarity we request that sub-paragraph b. i. is reworded to read as follows: "developing land at Brentwood Enterprise Park (see Policy E11)". This would also correct the typographical error of "Site E01" which should instead refer to E11.

Change To Plan: Sub-paragraph 7.23.b. i. to be reworded to read as follows: "developing land at Brentwood Enterprise Park (see Policy E11)".

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23753 - 5124 - 7.23 - i, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community 7.24

22405 Object Respondent: **Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]**

Agent: **N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

The wording in paragraph 7.24 somewhat contradicts other sustainable policies in Local Plan, particularly within the transport and connectivity section where the focus is on sustainable transport.

Change To Plan: Clarity is sought on how to resolve any conflict between the policies.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22405 - 6776 - 7.24 - iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community 7.25

23754 Support Respondent: **St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]**

Agent: **Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]**

Summary: The NPPF calls for Local Plans to make use of development opportunities. The recognition that the Lower Thames Crossing represents an opportunity which Brentwood Enterprise Park will realise is supported, as this is consistent with relevant national planning policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23754 - 5124 - 7.25 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community 7.26

22407 Object Respondent: **Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]**

Agent: **N/A**

Summary: BBC needs to satisfy itself that Local Plan has clear economic strategy, with robust phasing and delivery mechanisms in place to ensure that full employment requirements can be delivered over whole Plan period, in line with NPPF paragraph 23. It is important given 55% of BBC's employment land allocation in Plan is proposed at BEP. Site still has uncertainty over access and how and when will be delivered. Furthermore, BBC's evidence base (Economic Futures 2013-2033 Report 2018) indicates there is need for site to be delivered early in Plan period, in order to accommodate local businesses that may be affected by employment land re-allocation proposed in Plan.

Change To Plan: Clarity is sought on the deliverability and phasing of employment land allocations in order to meet requirements outlined in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22407 - 6776 - 7.26 - i, ii, iii, iv

22408 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC needs to satisfy itself that Local Plan has clear economic strategy, with robust phasing and delivery mechanisms in place to ensure that full employment requirements can be delivered over whole Plan period, in line with NPPF paragraph 23. It is important given 55% of BBC's employment land allocation in Plan is proposed at BEP. Site still has uncertainty over access and how and when will be delivered. Furthermore, BBC's evidence base (Economic Futures 2013-2033 Report 2018) indicates there is need for site to be delivered early in Plan period, in order to accommodate local businesses that may be affected by employment land re-allocation proposed in Plan.

Change To Plan: Clarity is sought on the deliverability and phasing of employment land allocations in order to meet requirements outlined in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22408 - 6776 - 7.30 - i, ii, iii, iv

22409 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is acknowledged that paragraph 7.30 recognises the need to manage transition of current employment sites, which are to be redeveloped for residential purposes, through early delivery of strategic sites within A127 corridor.

BBC needs to be satisfied that their approach to dealing with proposals for employment land loss will not undermine supply of employment land (and sites) for the borough. Employment land loss to higher value land uses, particularly residential (or retail) use, might be anticipated if effective measures are not in place to manage this process.

Considered that without such measures, strategy may not support existing businesses or deliver the jobs required within Brentwood borough.

Change To Plan: Clarity is sought on the deliverability and phasing of employment land allocations in order to meet requirements outlined in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22409 - 6776 - 7.30 - iii

23800 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: Support

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23800 - 3738 - 7.30 - None

23869 Object

Respondent: East Horndon Developments Ltd [8341]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Pryor) [2581]

Summary: Policy PC04 should not restrict new offices, development and research facilities to just in designated centres but also should allow for such facilities to come forward within the new allocated employment or existing employment sites where there are established public transport links. Suggested modification: Insert in Policy A a new sub-criteria c. "New employment allocated sites or established employment sites where there are public transport links including bus services."

Change To Plan: Recommendation: Insert in Policy A a new sub-criteria c". New employment allocated sites or established employment sites where there are public transport links including bus services."

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23869 - 8341 - POLICY PC04: DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION OF BUSINESS SPACE - i, ii, iv

23723 Object

Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Policy PC05 sets out criteria for employment development. It is currently ambiguous whether this applies to employment development coming forward on allocated employment sites. To ensure the Local Plan is effective and to avoid inconsistencies, Policy PC05 should be clear that it does not apply to allocated employment sites.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23723 - 6122 - POLICY PC05: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA - i, iv

23755 Object

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: As currently worded, the Draft Local Plan is ambiguous as to whether this policy is intended to apply to proposed as well as existing employment land. To ensure the Local Plan is effective and to avoid inconsistencies, Policy PC05 should be clear that it does not apply to allocated employment sites.

Change To Plan: Policy PC05 should be clear that it does not apply to allocated employment sites as because site specific policies have (as applicable) clear 'Development Principles' and 'Infrastructure Requirements'.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23755 - 5124 - POLICY PC05: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA - i, iv

24357 Object

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Policy PC05 does not specify whether it applies to existing and/or new employment land. The policy simply refers to development for employment uses. The wording of Policy PC05 is therefore ambiguous and is more restrictive than the site specific policy for Childerditch Industrial Estate (Policy E12). For example, Policy E12 requires provision to be made for improved walking and cycling links within the surrounding area. Policy PC05 on the other hand states that employment uses will be encouraged provided that the proposal is accessible by public transport. At present, there are no public transport connections directly available to Childerditch Industrial Estate, and whilst this may change in the future, there is no guarantee of if and when this will happen. On this basis, we object to Policy PC05 in its current form as it would not allow for an effective Plan.

Change To Plan: It is suggested that Policy PC05, Part A. a. be amended to state that proposals provide opportunities to be accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. At Childerditch Industrial Estate, opportunities are limited to provide public transport; however, in bringing forward proposals for the site, this issue can be reviewed with Brentwood Borough Council and Essex County Council.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24357 - 8371 - POLICY PC05: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA - i, ii, iii, iv

22552 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please also reference the Thames Chase Community Forest as a resource.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22552 - 7196 - 7.37 - None

22362 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council is broadly supportive of policy PC07 and considers it to be in general accordance with national policy and other local and national objectives. The Council considers the sequential approach taken to prioritising the siting of such uses to be appropriate and supports the use of a retail hierarchy that principally prioritises the siting of such uses in Brentwood's town centres. It is recognised, however, that Brentwood Borough Council may need to review its policy approach early to reflect the retail and leisure strategies of the emerging South Essex Joint Strategic Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22362 - 4178 - POLICY PC07: RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL LEISURE GROWTH - None

23801 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: SUPPORT & COMMENT: it is important to note the Brentwood Retail and Commercial Leisure Study (Dec2014) by NLP. The emerging West Horndon master plan includes a new village centre which incorporates shops and non-retail uses, such as potential health facilities. NLP suggested an additional 2000sqm of retail may be appropriate as part of the redevelopment of the industrial estate. Our latest masterplan shows around 2700sqm, but this includes non-retail uses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23801 - 3738 - POLICY PC07: RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL LEISURE GROWTH - None

22252 Support

Respondent: Wood International Agency Ltd (Mrs Clare Lamont) [8230]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Poor retail mix in town centre discouraging footfall and growth. Greater diversity is needed to drive footfall. There is a captive consumer base within the Brentwood area, high socio economic, wealthy, big spenders who are being largely ignored. The town centre does not have a high end retail offer to meet the desires and needs of these high spenders - it is a wasted opportunity. There isn't a high quality delicatessen, butcher or bakery. If rent are prohibited then a review is needed in conjunction with landlords.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22252 - 8230 - 7.48 - None

23802 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: Support

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23802 - 3738 - 7.53 - None

23117 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We cannot determine from Brentwood's published evidence as to what assessments have been carried out to determine the likely impact of installing new District Centres in West Hordon or DHGV on Laindon Town Centre which is 2km from DHGV and one stop from West Hordon station. Laindon Town Centre is undergoing a multi-million pound regeneration. Footnote 10 which states that the designation of the DHGV service centre(s) as a District Shopping Centre and/or Local Centre(s) and any PSA could be altered by the South Brentwood Masterplan is not acceptable as this is a function of policy and shouldn't be delegated.

Change To Plan: Footnote 10 of Figure 7.7 should be amended to remove reference to the South Brentwood Masterplan as the role and order of the designated centre should be established by policy only. The Plan should have been informed by evidence which has tested cross-boundary impacts of installing new District Centres in close proximity to nearby centres including Laindon Town Centre and what measures will be taken in policy to limit any impact. If this evidence does not exist, the District Centre should be removed from DHGV, retaining some local centre provision to ensure DHGV can be sustainable and to enable the Plan to be effective and justified.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23117 - 369 - POLICY PC08: RETAIL HIERARCHY OF DESIGNATED CENTRES - i, iv

23972 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Policy is confusing. Need to either designate and propose new centres or designate existing and proposed centres which appears to be the approach the Council is taking. In the latter scenario it is reasonable to defer the designation of the Primary Shopping Area to a later review once the centres are built. Whatever approach is adopted the way the District Shopping Centre and Local Centres are presented should be consistent with Policy R01.

Change To Plan: Policy PC08: Retail Hierarchy of Designated Centres

For consistency with Policy R01 the following modification is proposed:

A. The Council will promote the continued roles and functions of the existing and proposed Designated Centres to positively contribute towards their viability, vitality, character and structure....

Figure. 7.7: Brentwood - Designated Centres on the Retail Hierarchy

DHGV should be added to the list of Local Centres.

The centres at DHGV should be denoted as 'proposed' or a footnote added to clarify this.

Footnote no. 10 should be amended to state the Primary Shopping Areas will be designated in a Local Plan review.

Paragraph 7.54 iv. should be redrafted to ensure consistency with Policy R01 and Policy PC08.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23972 - 5050 - POLICY PC08: RETAIL HIERARCHY OF DESIGNATED CENTRES - i, iii

23310 Support

Respondent: Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Any significant future changes to the town centre hierarchy within the Borough, including significant new retail/leisure development, should consider any potential impacts on town centre retail/leisure provision within London as well as on the sustainability of travel patterns.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23310 - 6093 - POLICY PC08: RETAIL HIERARCHY OF DESIGNATED CENTRES - i, ii, iii, iv

23803 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: SUPPORT& COMMENT: the new village centre for West Horndon is likely to include an additional 2700sqm of retail and non-retail accommodation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23803 - 3738 - POLICY PC08: RETAIL HIERARCHY OF DESIGNATED CENTRES - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community

Figure 7.7: Brentwood Designated Centres on the Retail Hierarchy

23116 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We cannot determine from Brentwood's published evidence as to what assessments have been carried out to determine the likely impact of installing new District Centres in West Hordon or DHGV on Laindon Town Centre which is 2km from DHGV and one stop from West Hordon station. Laindon Town Centre is undergoing a multi-million pound regeneration. Footnote 10 which states that the designation of the DHGV service centre(s) as a District Shopping Centre and/or Local Centre(s) and any PSA could be altered by the South Brentwood Masterplan is not acceptable as this is a function of policy and shouldn't be delegated.

Change To Plan: Footnote 10 of Figure 7.7 should be amended to remove reference to the South Brentwood Masterplan as the role and order of the designated centre should be established by policy only. The Plan should have been informed by evidence which has tested cross-boundary impacts of installing new District Centres in close proximity to nearby centres including Laindon Town Centre and what measures will be taken in policy to limit any impact. If this evidence does not exist, the District Centre should be removed from DHGV, retaining some local centre provision to ensure DHGV can be sustainable and to enable the Plan to be effective and justified.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23116 - 369 - Figure 7.7: Brentwood Designated Centres on the Retail Hierarchy - i, iv

23973 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: DHGV should be added to the list of Local Centres. The centres at DHGV should be denoted as 'proposed' or a footnote added to clarify this.

Change To Plan: Figure. 7.7: Brentwood - Designated Centres on the Retail Hierarchy

DHGV should be added to the list of Local Centres.

The centres at DHGV should be denoted as 'proposed' or a footnote added to clarify this.

Footnote no. 10 should be amended to state the Primary Shopping Areas will be designated in a Local Plan review.

Paragraph 7.54 iv. should be redrafted to ensure consistency with Policy R01 and Policy PC08.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23973 - 5050 - Figure 7.7: Brentwood Designated Centres on the Retail Hierarchy - i, iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community

POLICY PC09: BRENTWOOD TOWN CENTRE

22410 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Linkages to Brentwood station should include all modes of sustainable transport, currently passenger transport is not included.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy PC09 Criterion I. b. as follows -

'...with priority given to passenger transport, pedestrian...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22410 - 6776 - POLICY PC09: BRENTWOOD TOWN CENTRE - iv

23916 Object

Respondent: McDonalds Restaurants LTD [8345]

Agent: Planware Limited (Mr Benjamin Fox) [5241]

Summary: We have considered proposed Policy PC10 - Mixed Use Development in Designated Centres - with regard to the principles set out within the Framework. We fully support the policy's aim of promoting healthier living and tackling obesity. However, the proposed policy approach is unsound and fails to provide an evidence-based way of achieving the policy's objective. It has also been found unsound by several planning inspectors. It is too restrictive and prevents local planning authorities from pursuing more positive policy approaches. The London Borough of Waltham Forest has had such a policy in place for over a decade and its application has proven ineffective in tackling obesity to date.

Within these broad points we have the following policy objections to draft Policy PC10:

A. The 400m exclusion zone is inconsistent with national planning policy

Change To Plan: Remove Policy PC10 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23916 - 8345 - POLICY PC10: MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT IN DESIGNATED CENTRES - ii, iv

23918 Object

Respondent: McDonalds Restaurants LTD [8345]

Agent: Planware Limited (Mr Benjamin Fox) [5241]

Summary: We have considered proposed Policy PC10 - Mixed Use Development in Designated Centres - with regard to the principles set out within the Framework. We fully support the policy's aim of promoting healthier living and tackling obesity. However, the proposed policy approach is unsound and fails to provide an evidence-based way of achieving the policy's objective. It has also been found unsound by several planning inspectors. It is too restrictive and prevents local planning authorities from pursuing more positive policy approaches. The London Borough of Waltham Forest has had such a policy in place for over a decade and its application has proven ineffective in tackling obesity to date.

Within these broad points we have the following policy objections to draft Policy PC10:

B. The policy is inconsistent, discriminatory and disproportionate.

Change To Plan: Remove policy PC10 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23918 - 8345 - POLICY PC10: MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT IN DESIGNATED CENTRES - ii, iv

23919 Object

Respondent: McDonalds Restaurants LTD [8345]

Agent: Planware Limited (Mr Benjamin Fox) [5241]

Summary: We have considered proposed Policy PC10 - Mixed Use Development in Designated Centres - with regard to the principles set out within the Framework. We fully support the policy's aim of promoting healthier living and tackling obesity. However, the proposed policy approach is unsound and fails to provide an evidence-based way of achieving the policy's objective. It has also been found unsound by several planning inspectors. It is too restrictive and prevents local planning authorities from pursuing more positive policy approaches. The London Borough of Waltham Forest has had such a policy in place for over a decade and its application has proven ineffective in tackling obesity to date.

Within these broad points we have the following policy objections to draft Policy PC10:

C. Examination of other plans have found similar policy approaches to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Remove policy PC 10 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23919 - 8345 - POLICY PC10: MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT IN DESIGNATED CENTRES - ii, iv

23920 Object

Respondent: McDonalds Restaurants LTD [8345]

Agent: Planware Limited (Mr Benjamin Fox) [5241]

Summary: We have considered proposed Policy PC10 - Mixed Use Development in Designated Centres - with regard to the principles set out within the Framework. We fully support the policy's aim of promoting healthier living and tackling obesity. However, the proposed policy approach is unsound and fails to provide an evidence-based way of achieving the policy's objective. It has also been found unsound by several planning inspectors. It is too restrictive and prevents local planning authorities from pursuing more positive policy approaches. The London Borough of Waltham Forest has had such a policy in place for over a decade and its application has proven ineffective in tackling obesity to date.

Within these broad points we have the following policy objections to draft Policy PC10:

D. There needs to be further exploration into policies that are more positive, have a reputable evidence base and that comply with the Framework.

Change To Plan: Remove Policy PC10 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23920 - 8345 - POLICY PC10: MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT IN DESIGNATED CENTRES - ii, iv

23921 Object

Respondent: McDonalds Restaurants LTD [8345]

Agent: Planware Limited (Mr Benjamin Fox) [5241]

Summary: In summary, Planware Ltd consider there is no sound justification for a policy such as Policy PC10, Point D, which imposes a blanket ban on restaurants that include an element of A5 use "proposals for new hot food takeaways (use class A5) within 400m walking distance from the entrance points of primary or secondary schools will be restricted in order to promote the health and well-being of school pupils." Point D is unsound it should be deleted from the plan.

Change To Plan: Remove Policy PC10 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23921 - 8345 - POLICY PC10: MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT IN DESIGNATED CENTRES - ii, iv

23878 Object

Respondent: Ms. Isobel McGeever [7286]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A property can only be released for disposal or alternative use by NHSPS once Commissioners have confirmed that it is no longer required for the delivery of NHS services. NHSPS estate code requires that property to be disposed of is first listed on e-PIMS, the central database of Government Central Civil Estate properties and land, which allows other public sector bodies to consider their use for it. The ability of the NHS to continually review the healthcare estate, optimise the use of land, and deliver health services is crucial. Therefore, policy PC14 should not be required of NHS facilities.

Change To Plan: Should any part of the Brentwood Community Hospital site be declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirement of the NHS in the future, then the site should be considered suitable and available for alternative use, and considered deliverable within the period 5-10 years. These representations identify the sites potential for future development, in accordance with the realignment of the Green Belt so that this significant area of development land is no longer included. It is evident, that the site does not make a positive contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, redevelopment of the site could provide a key contribution to Brentwood's housing need, which the Council have failed to justify, given the reliance on key strategic sites, and the lack of acknowledgement for unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities (Basildon and Havering). These representations therefore promote and identify parts of the Brentwood Community Hospital site as a suitable site to contribute towards these requirements. This site presents an excellent opportunity for a high quality residential redevelopment on previously developed Green Belt land. This could be achieved without compromising the character of the area as the development can act as an infill site to the existing residential development surrounding it, and without the need for significant infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also available to accommodate further health related development should the CCG seek to expand their services in this location, including the possible expansion of the hospital to provide more comprehensive services for the community. However, the site's Green Belt designation would make it difficult for any planning application proposing additional built form to provide further healthcare services to be considered acceptable. The subject site is considered available, suitable and deliverable within the 5-10 year period of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23878 - 7286 - POLICY PC14: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS - None

24672 Object

Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I strongly supported the community in making and keeping this a happy and pleasure place to live in: fighting to maintain the library, The continued designation of the Bull as a Public House-(now a Community Asset) and the denial of planning agreement for the Travellers on the Oak Tree Farm Plot 3 and Wenlock Meadow. I - like many others - could recognise the validity of the 2016 LOP proposals but the latest (Reg 19) proposals run contrary to that in both the proposals for Plots R25 and R26 and the suggestion to recognise Plots - Oak Tree Farm. NONE-OF THIS IS JUSTIFIED OR APPROPRIATE. It is therefore UNSOUND in addition to being not justified and - In view of other very local developments in Epping Forest (in Nine Ashes Road and Fingrith H.-11 Lane-all of which use and overstress facilities in Blackmore - not compliant with the duty to cooperate.

Change To Plan:

- * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
- * Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Fortes District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
- * Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
- * Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
- * Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
- * Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
- * Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there Is already a severe flooding problem which h the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
- * Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24672 - 1830 - POLICY PC14: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS - i, ii, iii, iv

22379 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This policy is supported as it seeks to protect existing community assets that would include sport and active recreation facilities while supporting the principle of the development of community facilities that would meet a strategic/local need or would allow co-location/rationalisation. This broad approach would accord with Government policy in section 8 of the NPPF and the Council's evidence base in the Built Facilities Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy for instance.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22379 - 4294 - POLICY PC14: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS - None

22524 Support

Respondent: The Theatres Trust (Mr Tom Clarke MRTPI) [302]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Trust is supportive of this policy, which provides protection for Brentwood's valued community, cultural and social facilities and is reflective of NPPF paragraph 92.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22524 - 302 - POLICY PC14: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY ASSETS - None

22381 Object

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection is made to criterion (c) of part A of the policy as it would allow in principle the change of use or redevelopment of an educational playing field if it could be demonstrated that the area of the site is in excess of Government guidelines for playing field provision. This approach is contrary to both the Council's evidence base and Government policy in paragraph 97 of the NPPF.

Objection is also made to the policy as while the reasoned justification encourages education providers to share their assets with the community, this is not reflected in the policy itself.

Change To Plan: To address these objections, the following amendments should be made to the policy:

* Criterion (c) of section A is replaced with a criterion along the lines that that playing fields are either retained for community use or replaced in accordance with policy BE23;

* An additional criterion is added to the policy which expects new educational establishments to be planned and designed to allow use by the community when not required for educational use and which encourages developments on existing establishments to facilitate new or increased community access.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22381 - 4294 - POLICY PC15: EDUCATION FACILITIES - ii, iv

22411 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy PC15 F as currently proposed allows for provision of educational facilities in Green Belt to be looked upon favourably.

Chelmsford City Council's (CCC) Local Plan EIP Inspector's view that education and community use is inappropriate development in Green Belt generally accepted. CCC suggested Main Modification (Examination Hearing Statement - Matter 9 - The Environment) to comply with NPPF (paragraphs 143 & 145), which deleted the criterion and amended the supporting text.

Recommend criterion F of Policy PC15 be deleted and supporting text is inserted/amended within Green Belt section of Local Plan.

Change To Plan: Delete criterion F of Policy PC15, and insert the following wording after paragraph 7.103 -

The Council acknowledges that due to the extent of the Green Belt in Brentwood there may be instances where new buildings related to community or educational uses may be proposed e.g. a new village hall, ancillary buildings related to an existing school. In accordance with the NPPF, these types of uses will be considered inappropriate development. However, the locational need for these types of uses will be given appropriate weight when considering whether there are very special circumstances that weigh in favour of the proposals.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22411 - 6776 - POLICY PC15: EDUCATION FACILITIES - iv

23867 Object

Respondent: Brentwood School [2575]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Pryor) [2581]

Summary: Unnecessary to have the additional wording that relates to the ECC's Developer's Guide to Infrastructure Contributions. If the proposals are clearly associated with education requirements which will be a matter of fact and degree then there is no need to turn to other schedules. Furthermore the link to the Essex County Council document does not provide a clear schedule of criteria to which the decision maker or applicant can turn. It is confusing and should be deleted. In addition, Under Policy B, delete the word 'demonstrable' before need.

Change To Plan: The link to the Essex County Council document does not provide a clear schedule of criteria to which the decision maker or applicant can turn. It is confusing and should be deleted. In addition, under Policy B, delete the word 'demonstrable' before need. We would recommend that the policy should now read "Where there is a need for new educational facilities, planning permission will be granted for appropriate and well-designed proposals."

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23867 - 2575 - POLICY PC15: EDUCATION FACILITIES - i, ii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community 7.94

22412 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.

Request additional wording to be inserted to include childcare to paragraphs 7.94 to ensure that the full range of education provision is considered.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 7.94 to read as follows -

Education in this section relates to early years and childcare, primary....',

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22412 - 6776 - 7.94 - ii

CHAPTER: Chapter 7. Prosperous
Community 7.97

22413 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.

Request additional wording to be inserted to include childcare to paragraphs 7.97 to ensure that the full range of education provision is considered.

Change To Plan: Amend first sentence of paragraph 7.97 to read as follows -

'...early years and childcare and school place planning.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22413 - 6776 - 7.97 - ii

22276 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified

Request additional paragraphs to be inserted at the end of this section to ensure that the full range of education provision is considered.

Change To Plan: Insert the following paragraph at the end of the Education and Schools section (paras 2.49-2.51), and before paragraph 7.103 -

In respect of Special Education Needs (SEN) children present with many different types of need and it is not possible to provide for every need within each District. Each special school is regarded as a regional centre of excellence for their type of need i.e. autism, severe learning difficulties etc and children attend from a wider geographical area. Some children in Brentwood with special needs travel to special schools in other areas of the County.

Endeavour School is a special school for children aged 5 years to 16 years with moderate learning difficulties and complex needs and is the only special school in Brentwood. ECC commissions places for local children with an Education Health and Care Plan at this school.

ECC has developed specially resourced provision for children with speech and language difficulties within West Horndon Primary School in Brentwood to meet the needs of a small number of children with specific speech and language difficulties who are able to access the national curriculum with specialist support.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22276 - 6776 - 7.101 - ii

22414 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.

The supporting text to Policy PC 15 should also include reference to Post 16 education and skills to ensure the full range of education provision is considered.

Change To Plan: Insert additional paragraph after paragraph 7.102 to read as follows -

All of the secondary schools within Brentwood have 6th form provision, learner's wishing to study vocational subjects either travel to South Essex College (Thurrock/Basildon), Chelmsford College with a further cohort traveling into Havering.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22414 - 6776 - 7.101 - ii

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.1

22241 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds: failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed; inadequate consultation with Epping Forest District Council and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore; failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development; adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22241 - 4376 - 8.1 - ii, iv

22605 Object

Respondent: Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Dunton Hills is an important unspoilt area for wildlife and biodiversity and should be conserved as required by legislation protecting wildlife habitats and national planning policy. An impact study should have been done before taking a decision to allow development here.

Change To Plan: remove Dunton Hills site from spacial strategy

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22605 - 4309 - 8.1 - ii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.3

22553 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support for the continued creation of the Thames Chase Community Forest should be referenced in this section alongside the Essex Wildlife Trust's Living Landscapes concept.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22553 - 7196 - 8.3 - None

22415 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Additional wording requested to ensure consideration of connectivity for wildlife and people in line with paragraph 91 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Add the following wording to the end of paragraph 8.5 -

with a commitment to improving connectivity for wildlife and people e.g. Green and Blue Infrastructure and Open Space policies.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22415 - 6776 - 8.5 - iv

25953 Object

Respondent: Mr Ben Holmes [8654]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25953 - 8654 - 8.5 - i, ii, iii

22554 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Community Forests are referenced in the 25 Year Environment Plan. The Thames Chase Community Forest plays a key role in this section. The Thames Chase Plan has direct synergy with the 25 Year Environment Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22554 - 7196 - 8.5 - None

25823 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25823 - 4693 - 8.9 - i, ii, iii

25915 Object

Respondent: Mr Luke Holmes [8652]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25915 - 8652 - 8.9 - i, ii, iii

25923 Object

Respondent: Miss Ami Holmes [8653]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25923 - 8653 - 8.9 - i, ii, iii

25961 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Holmes [8655]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25961 - 8655 - 8.9 - i, ii, iii

26045 Object

Respondent: Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: The flooding of a few years ago has just been alleviated this would cause more problems in that area. Blackmore would be unable to cope with this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26045 - 8668 - 8.9 - i, ii, iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.11

22416 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Additional wording requested to ensure consistency with paragraph 175 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Add an additional paragraph after paragraph 8.11 with the following words:

The borough also contains irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees and lowland fen. These habitats would be technically very difficult (or take a very significant time) to restore, recreate or replace once destroyed, taking into account their age, uniqueness, species diversity or rarity.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22416 - 6776 - 8.11 - iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment Protecting and Enhancing Natural Heritage

22533 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22533 - 8074 - Protecting and Enhancing Natural Heritage - i, ii, iii, iv

22872 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.

Without prejudice to the above contention, if no previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites exist, that Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate there are no or insufficient previously developed sites available outside the existing urban areas.

Change To Plan: Remove Site R24 and R26 from the plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22872 - 8074 - Protecting and Enhancing Natural Heritage - i, ii, iii, iv

22873 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.

Without prejudice to the above contention, if no previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites exist, that Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate there are no or insufficient previously developed sites available outside the existing urban areas. In any event, there are greenfield sites available (for example adjoining existing urban areas) in preferable and more sustainable locations.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22873 - 8074 - Protecting and Enhancing Natural Heritage - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment POLICY NE01: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

22417 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Additional wording requested to ensure consistency with paragraph 175 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Change D. a. to read as follows:

'...ecological survey and assessment as....'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22417 - 6776 - POLICY NE01: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT - iv

24049 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Wholly supports the principles of both NE09 and NE03; albeit as presently worded, they both contain contradictory requirements: Policy NE01 (para B) states that proposals that lead to deterioration or loss of the Borough's designated and non-designated biodiversity assets will not be permitted; whereas Policy NE01 (para C) goes on to state that where adverse impacts are unavoidable they must be adequately and proportionally mitigated (ie it appears to allow for deterioration where they are unavoidable and can be suitably mitigated). Policy NE03 (para A) contains a similar contradictory approach to the provisions of the remainder of the policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24049 - 2656 - POLICY NE01: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT - i

24512 Object

Respondent: Mrs Terri Reed [4303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sites are unsuitable for building, they are liable to flood and the road is not suitable as it is too narrow & also it regularly floods, cars get trapped. I am unaware if a housing need survey is being carried out. The infrastructure is already at bursting point. Children turned away from the local school as full; Drs surgery over stretched already; no parking in village centre. Because we are on the Brentwood borders, no account has been taken of the development being undertaken by Epping & Chelmsford RIGHT ON OUR DOORSTEP, impacting on local facilities. Alternative sites have been ignored, even when more suitable, inadequate public transport - you can't live here without a car. Most families have 2 or more.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26. Consider what Blackmore really needs not what ticks a few boxes, and what suits developers. The BHVA have worked hard to proposal alternative which are sustainable. They know the village better than the people behind the unsustainable proposal currently on the table.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24512 - 4303 - POLICY NE01: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

23303 Support

Respondent: Natural England (Ms Louise Oliver) [8299]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy is in accordance with national planning guidance and the Habitats Regulations through seeking to protect, conserve and enhance the natural environment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23303 - 8299 - POLICY NE01: PROTECTING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.16

22555 Support

Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This section should reference the wider Thames Chase Community Forest landscape.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22555 - 7196 - 8.16 - None

22418 Object	Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Agent: N/A
Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.		
Where insufficient information is provided to demonstrate the impacts (including cumulatively) of development on wildlife then the Council should refuse applications and not use conditions to secure such information.		
A Local Planning Authority needs certainty of impacts from development prior to the determination of planning applications.		
Paragraph 8.19 should be amended to make this clear.		
Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 8.19 to read as follows - '...compensation measures and refuse planning applications. The...'		
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
Tests: iv		
Examination: No		
Full Reference: O - 22418 - 6776 - 8.19 - iv		

22419 Object	Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Agent: N/A
Summary: 3. Effective.		
Paragraph 8.22 a. makes reference to the Essex Biodiversity Plan (2011). This is no longer considered 'live' by Government.		
Change To Plan: Delete a. of paragraph 8.22		
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
Tests: iii		
Examination: No		
Full Reference: O - 22419 - 6776 - 8.22 - iii		

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment POLICY NE02: RECREATIONAL DISTURBANCE AVOIDANCE AND MITIGATION STRATEGY (RAMS)

22425 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Natural England advice is that ALL residential development within RAMS Zone of Influence will need to provide mitigation and this will trigger a proportionate financial contribution.

The Essex Rams Steering Group agreed following action at its 5th February 2019 meeting - ALL to endeavour to use policy text in Chelmsford's emerging Local Plan for RAMS so that there is consistency across all LPAs involved in Essex Coast RAMS.

The wording was agreed in response to issues raised by Natural England (PS2078) in response to Chelmsford Draft Local Plan and was included in their Schedule of Additional Changes - June 2018.

Change To Plan: Replace Policy NE02 A. & B. wording with the following -

Where appropriate, contributions from developments will be secured towards mitigation measures identified in the Essex Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) which will be completed by the time the Local Plan is adopted. Prior to RAMS completion, the authority will seek contributions, where appropriate, from proposed residential development to deliver all measures identified (including strategic measures) through project level HRAs, or otherwise, to mitigate any recreational disturbance impacts in compliance with the Habitat Regulations and Habitats Directive.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22425 - 6776 - POLICY NE02: RECREATIONAL DISTURBANCE AVOIDANCE AND MITIGATION STRATEGY (RAMS) - iii

22363 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council welcomes the recognition of the Essex Coast RAMS project and acknowledges the identified need to seek financial contributions to mitigate the impact on protected habitats sites of increased recreational disturbance resulting from housing growth. The Council notes that a supplementary planning document is currently being prepared jointly by a collective of authorities, including both Rochford and Brentwood Councils. This supplementary planning document is expected to provide a robust policy mechanism for the collection of these financial contributions.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22363 - 4178 - POLICY NE02: RECREATIONAL DISTURBANCE AVOIDANCE AND MITIGATION STRATEGY (RAMS) - None

23210 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Thames Water support the content of Policy NE2 parts D and E and encourage developers proposing developments to engage with them at an early stage to discuss the wastewater infrastructure requirements for development. The proposed policy ensures that the Local Plan is consistent with Paragraphs 20 and 41 of the NPPF. Alongside the proposed amended text for Policy SP04, the policy will help ensure the effective delivery of any sewerage network reinforcement works necessary to support development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23210 - 1927 - POLICY NE02: RECREATIONAL DISTURBANCE AVOIDANCE AND MITIGATION STRATEGY (RAMS) - i, ii, iii, iv

23304 Support

Respondent: Natural England (Ms Louise Oliver) [8299]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy ensures any residential development that is likely to affect the integrity of those European Sites identified under the Essex RAMS, or Epping Forest SAC will be required to either contribute towards mitigation measures identified in the RAMS or, in exceptional circumstances, identify and implement bespoke mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the Habitat Regulations.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23304 - 8299 - POLICY NE02: RECREATIONAL DISTURBANCE AVOIDANCE AND MITIGATION STRATEGY (RAMS) - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.25

22426 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

The Essex Rams Steering Group agreed the following action at its 5th February 2019 meeting -
ALL to endeavour to use the policy text in Chelmsford's emerging Local Plan for the RAMS so that there is consistency across all LPAs involved in the Essex Coast RAMS

The wording was agreed in response to issues raised by Natural England (PS2078) in response to Chelmsford Draft Local Plan and was included in their Schedule of Additional Changes - June 2018.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 8.25 as follows -

Following consultation with Natural England, an Essex-wide Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) is being prepared to include all coastal European sites. The strategy will identify where recreational disturbance is happening and the main recreational uses causing the disturbance. New residential development that is likely to affect the integrity of the European Sites will be required to contribute towards the implementation of the mitigation. At this stage, it is considered that development allocations in this location will be required to pay for the implementation of mitigation measures to protect the interest features of European designated sites along the Essex Coast which include the Crouch and Roach Estuaries Special Protection Area, the Colne and Blackwater Estuaries SPAs and Ramsar sites and Site of Special Scientific Interest, and the Essex Estuaries Special Area of Conservation. The appropriate mechanisms will be identified in the RAMS.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22426 - 6776 - 8.25 - iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.27

22427 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

The Essex Rams Steering Group agreed the following action at its 5th February 2019 meeting -
ALL to endeavour to use the policy text in Chelmsford's emerging Local Plan for the RAMS so that there is consistency across all LPAs involved in the Essex Coast RAMS

The wording was agreed in response to issues raised by Natural England (PS2078) in response to Chelmsford Draft Local Plan and was included in their Schedule of Additional Changes - June 2018.

Change To Plan: Change paragraph 8.27 to read as follows:

Any residential development within the Zone of Influence of the Essex Coast RAMS is likely to affect the integrity of these European sites. The developer will be required to either contribute towards mitigation measures identified in the RAMS or, identify and implement bespoke mitigation measures at the Essex coastal Habitats Sites to ensure compliance with the Habitat Regulations.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22427 - 6776 - 8.27 - iii

22428 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Additional wording requested to ensure consistency with paragraph 175 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Amend A. to read as follows:

'...including irreplaceable habitats such as trees, ancient woodlands or hedgerows.'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22428 - 6776 - POLICY NE03: TREES, WOODLANDS, HEDGEROWS - iv

23889 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: The wording of this policy is such that it would prevent the loss of any tree or hedgerow within the development site. Many of the allocated sites include existing trees/hedgerows that are arguably of some value and will have some ecological value. The loss of such trees/hedgerows may be necessary to secure the satisfactory development of the site and deliver the level of development envisaged. NE03 should reflect the potential for the impact of the loss of some trees/hedgerows to be outweighed by other benefits arising from the development proposal.

Change To Plan: Amend NE03 to acknowledge that the adverse impacts arising from the loss of trees, woodlands and hedgerows will be balanced against the benefits arising from the development, especially where allocated for development. The wording of the policy can still identify a preference to retain such features within development proposals but must acknowledge the potential for some losses to be inevitable in order to deliver the site allocations or secure an otherwise satisfactory development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23889 - 6669 - POLICY NE03: TREES, WOODLANDS, HEDGEROWS - i

24050 Object

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Wholly supports the principles of both NE09 and NE03; albeit as presently worded, they both contain contradictory requirements: Policy NE01 (para B) states that proposals that lead to deterioration or loss of the Borough's designated and non-designated biodiversity assets will not be permitted; whereas Policy NE01 (para C) goes on to state that where adverse impacts are unavoidable they must be adequately and proportionally mitigated (ie it appears to allow for deterioration where they are unavoidable and can be suitably mitigated). Policy NE03 (para A) contains a similar contradictory approach to the provisions of the remainder of the policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24050 - 2656 - POLICY NE03: TREES, WOODLANDS, HEDGEROWS - i

22534 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: (see attached / comments re Chapter 3 - Vision)

Change To Plan: (see attached / comments re Chapter 3 - Vision)

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22534 - 8074 - Promoting a Clean and Safe Environment - i, ii, iii, iv

26094 Object

Respondent: Mr David Holland [8676]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local schools are struggling to cope already. More houses will increase demand. The local GP services are also struggling to cope and more homes will place even more pressure on them. The current road infrastructure will not be sufficient for more traffic. Flooding is a risk factor in the area and building more houses will aggravate this.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs as the Blackmore community is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26094 - 8676 - Promoting a Clean and Safe Environment - i, ii, iii, iv

26121 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Harris [8678]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is an unsuitable lane for this traffic as it floods.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26121 - 8678 - Promoting a Clean and Safe Environment - i, ii, iii

26126 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Harris [8679]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane floods ever time it rains.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26126 - 8679 - Promoting a Clean and Safe Environment - i, ii, iii

26133 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beverley Holla [8680]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. No trains, bus one an hour everyone must drive. In my col de sack each household has 3, 4, 5 cars. 2. The roads are very narrow and dangerous every month at least one car (a Tesco delivery lorry last week) turned upside down in ditch. 3. Cannot get appointment with doctor surgery. 4. Roads too dangerous for children to cycle. 5. Plenty of space nearer to Brentwood

Change To Plan: Remove the proposed sites field 25 and 26 from local development plan. Consult local people they know how congested and dangerous the roads are winding and very narrow.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26133 - 8680 - Promoting a Clean and Safe Environment - i, ii, iii, iv

26156 Object

Respondent: Laura Harris [8685]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is an unsuitable lane for this traffic, it floods and is unpassable every time we have heavy rain.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26156 - 8685 - Promoting a Clean and Safe Environment - i, ii, iii

26161 Object

Respondent: Susan Harris [8686]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is not suitable for this amount of traffic. It often floods.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26161 - 8686 - Promoting a Clean and Safe Environment - i, ii, iii

26356 Object

Respondent: Mrs Maureen Butler [5017]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure of the village is no capable of with standing the amount of housing being proposed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26356 - 5017 - Promoting a Clean and Safe Environment - i, ii, iii

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment POLICY NE05: AIR QUALITY

24051 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy NE05: Air Quality seeks to restrict development, which would directly or indirectly, impact air quality within the Borough. Measures to offset or mitigate those impacts are introduced as part of proposals to ensure that receptors would not be subject to unacceptable risk as a result of poor air quality. This policy is "consistent" with the objectives of the NPPF (para 181) and is therefore considered sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24051 - 2656 - POLICY NE05: AIR QUALITY - i, ii, iii, iv

24144 Support

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary: Paragraph 8.48 states as ensuring "... new development does not contribute to the worsening of air quality." However, neither the policy, nor any of the accompanying paragraphs, says much about locating new development land allocations close to existing or potential sources of air pollution. We have raised issues about air and noise pollution in relation to making development land allocations before. We note paragraph 8.50 says that "Transport generated emissions are the main source of poor air quality in the borough." In spite of this, a number of the Document's allocations are made adjacent to the A12, one of the Borough's principal sources of air pollution.

Change To Plan: We support the Policy, but would ask the Borough Council to reconsider its wording to make it simpler and clearer.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 24144 - 2788 - POLICY NE05: AIR QUALITY - None

23341 Object **Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23341 - 8313 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - None

23438 Object **Respondent: Mr Benjamin Rumary [8324]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object - in relation to sites R25 and R26

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23438 - 8324 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

23474 Object **Respondent: Mr Marc Cohen [4268]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23474 - 4268 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - None

23544 Object **Respondent: Mr David Barfoot [7177]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23544 - 7177 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - None

23557 Object **Respondent: Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: What plans have been made for surrounding infrastructure?
Which other sites in Essex have been identified?
Asking residents door to door
Green Belt land is identified as green belt for a reason. There are other areas that can be built on which do not impact on small already strained village.

Change To Plan: SCHOOL! This is a local village one form entry school, which is already oversubscribed. More houses equal more children.
TRAFFIC! Blackmore is already congested with cars and for parking, We do not want more traffic spoiling this beautiful village.
GP. Already overcrowded and will be put under more strain.
There is not a need for more houses here in such a small village

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23557 - 7200 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

23563 Object **Respondent: Ms Eleanora Barfoot [8328]**

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23563 - 8328 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - None

23570 Object	Respondent: Mrs Hayley Hammond [8329]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Object (NE06 - 8.5 - 8.64)		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23570 - 8329 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
23574 Object	Respondent: Sadie Barfoot [8330]	Agent: N/A
Summary: (no reason provided)		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23574 - 8330 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - None		Tests: None
		Examination: No
23632 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Evans [8332]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Object (no reason supplied)		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23632 - 8332 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
24052 Object	Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]	Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]
Summary: The majority of Policy NE06 therefore aligns with National guidance and therefore mostly sound. However, and as presently worded, it suggests tat applicants may be obligated to set aside land to provide flood management to benefit areas outside of that development. This is unduly onerous, inconsistent with National policy and therefore unsound. Similarly, the entirety of a development area does not need to remain operational at times of flood (such as access roads), if there is an alternative safe means of escape that is provided. Subsection c) of Policy NE06 is therefore not justified and also unsound.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24052 - 2656 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i		Tests: i
		Examination: Yes
24186 Object	Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Brentwood Council has simply not demonstrated that they have taken into account other Brownfield sites that are available which surely must take priority over the development of Green Belt Lane between Red Rose Lane and Blackmore Village.		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24186 - 7193 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Yes
24188 Object	Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Red Rose Lane regularly floods with the water coming down Nine Ashes Road like a river and into the lane. The ditches and limited drainage near to the junction simply cannot cope and a large area is regularly left under water during the winter months. Flooding has increasingly become an issue in recent years and has now started to erode the lane at the front of our house. This will also further impact the flooding risk in the village which has been an increasing problem.		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24188 - 7193 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Yes

24190 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local village school has very limited places and resources which was put under further pressure due to a large unapproved travelling community site with some 20-30 caravans and families is also impacting on the village resources available

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24190 - 7193 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24192 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* A Doctors surgery whereby I genuinely hope I do not need to request urgent care. If you want any form of response you have to continuously dial repeatedly to get assistance - comments on the website page highlights this

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24192 - 7193 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24194 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* One village shop/Post Office with very restricted parking

Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24194 - 7193 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24199 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, its position is very isolated with narrow country roads. The bus service is very limited. Parking is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24199 - 7195 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24204 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The only shop is a small Co-op which already can't cope. Not long ago our post office moved to the Co-op giving a very unsatisfactory service. There just isn't enough room to support such a service.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24204 - 7195 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24211 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The one school is already full.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24211 - 7195 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24217 Object	Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The nearby doctors surgery is severely overstretched.	
Change To Plan:	remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24217 - 7195 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24223 Object	Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Flooding is already a problem, I fear this would only get worse.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24223 - 7195 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24229 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The accessibility including Red Rose Lane in particular is not sufficient and even farm vehicles struggle and have to bypass the village. It is already difficult to park/access the single village shop/Post Office along with the influx of the tea room which uses up all of the current parking resource available. Red Rose Lane is very narrow/winding road unsuitable for any increase in traffic. It is already dangerous with no pavements and is in constant use by dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24229 - 8370 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified
24235 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The village school will not cope.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24235 - 8370 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24241 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The doctors surgery will not cope.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24241 - 8370 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24247 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose Lane regularly floods as do other areas of the village and this will be made worse by any further developments.	
Change To Plan:	remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24247 - 8370 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No

24432 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 8 (natural environment). Policy NE 06, 8.5-8.64 - para 8.85 (iv), 8.90, 8.101. Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore. Blackmore has been disproportionately targeted with a 30% increase in the current population proposed. There must be more suitable brownfield sites within the borough that having to build on Green Belt in Blackmore. The Blackmore sites of R25 and R26 are entirely unsuitable for large scale development.

Change To Plan: The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the plan should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out the Blackmore local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24432 - 8375 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24433 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy NE06 and paras 8.51-8.64 inc. Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore. Blackmore has been disproportionately targeted with a 30% increase in the current population proposed. There must be more suitable brownfield sites within the borough that having to build on Green Belt in Blackmore. The Blackmore sites of R25 and R26 are entirely unsuitable for large scale development.

Change To Plan: The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the plan should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out the Blackmore local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24433 - 8375 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24440 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy NE 06 paras 8.51 -8.64; Para 8.85 (IV); Para 8.90; Para 8.101. Blackmore sites (R25 and R26) are in a dip and is prone to flooding which has occurred a number of times over the years. The planned 70 homes will reduce the available land to soak up water, therefore flooding will increase. Policy NE06 states that in 8.52: Developing inappropriately in high risk areas can put property and lives at risk; this policy seeks to ensure this does not happen.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24440 - 8378 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24459 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: NE06 and paras 8.51 -8.64; Para 8.85 (IV); Para 8.90; Para 8.101. Development in Blackmore would be damaging and are Flood Risk issues on R25 and R26.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24459 - 8379 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24513 Object**Respondent: Mrs Terri Reed [4303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sites are unsuitable for building, they are liable to flood and the road is not suitable as it is too narrow & also it regularly floods, cars get trapped. I am unaware if a housing need survey is being carried out. The infrastructure is already at bursting point. Children turned away from the local school as full; Drs surgery over stretched already; no parking in village centre. Because we are on the Brentwood borders, no account has been taken of the development being undertaken by Epping & Chelmsford RIGHT ON OUR DOORSTEP, impacting on local facilities. Alternative sites have been ignored, even when more suitable, inadequate public transport - you can't live here without a car. Most families have 2 or more.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26. Consider what Blackmore really needs not what ticks a few boxes, and what suits developers. The BVHA have worked hard to proposal alternative which are sustainable. They know the village better than the people behind the unsustainable proposal currently on the table.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24513 - 4303 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24524 Object**Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flooding is another hazard Brentwood chooses to ignore. This village has been Badly flooded several times. The current when this happened is very strong, damage serious and life threatening but BBC are not interested.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting. It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24524 - 8388 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24554 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 8 Policy NE 06, 8.5-8.64, : Village is prone to flooding

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24554 - 8392 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24579 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24579 - 4874 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24611 Object**Respondent: Mr Pete Vince [8123]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flood issues on sites R25 and R26. Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.
Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.
Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24611 - 8123 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24616 Object

Respondent: Mr Lyall Vince [8403]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy NE06 8.5-8.64
Para 8.85 (iv)
Para 8.90
Para 8.101

Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.

Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.

Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24616 - 8403 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24628 Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A residential development such as has been submitted for Blackmore will further stretch infrastructure (roads, parking, schooling, doctors, etc). There are more sustainable locations in the borough. There are "brown field" sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. This area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23 June 2016).

Change To Plan: Do not believe Green Belt land in Blackmore should be released for this development as part of BBC local plan due to all aforementioned reasons (and probably many others!)

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24628 - 8406 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24652 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flooding and building on these and concreting them over will increase the flood risk to the rest of the village. Blackmore lies in a shallow bowl of land at the top of a gentle valley with the River Wid emerging from the south side of The Moat. So, surface water drains from the west, north and east into the village and then around The Moat to become the River Wid. This is ok in normal conditions but when rainfall is extreme the streams and drainage pipes are overwhelmed with flooding of roads which is common and sometimes with danger to homes. There was flooding of roads in the village in June 2016 after heavy rain and I am aware that the home of one of our near neighbours was flooded by waters rising from the stream that runs underneath their which Increase the speed of run-off of surface water will further Increase the risk of overwhelming the drainage systems. This seems to totally contradict policy NE06.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24652 - 8411 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24663 Object

Respondent: Mrs Edna Williams [4728]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound.
a) There has been no evidence produced to show that there is a need for this size of development in Blackmore
b) There has been no discussion or cooperation with any local bodies 30 houses have just been built just outside the village In EFDC area that will Impact on the village
c) There are many aspects that do not comply with the NPPF Guidance.
Protection of Green Belt
Development located to minimize travel
Local community not consulted
No proven local need

Change To Plan: All of the points should be reassessed with local involvement.
Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24663 - 4728 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24673 Object

Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 should not have been proposed due to an already known severe flood problem which the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
* Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Forests District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
* Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
* Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
* Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
* Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
* Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there is already a severe flooding problem which the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
* Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24673 - 1830 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24694 Object

Respondent: Mr Desmond Temple [8420]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections: 04; 08; 09: see attached. Site allocations, disproportionate growth to Blackmore, flood risk, green belt. Blackmore infrastructure cannot cope now, without all the planned dwellings, We cant park in the village, our school is full, doctors waiting time is lengthy.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24694 - 8420 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24767 Object

Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8442]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore sites R25 and R26 and prone to flooding

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites, not Green Belt, ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24767 - 8442 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24789 Object

Respondent: Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Redrose Lane is too narrow and floods severely. There were floods across village in 2015. Sewers cant cope.

Change To Plan: I believe that R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the Blackmore village Heritage Association "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out our local housing needs to avoid further development locally.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24789 - 8175 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24818 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Webb [4919]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on the Green were flooded. Additionally several of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems. (See attached photo from June 2016 of the junction of The Green and Chelmsford/Ingatestone Road).

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community. Also remove the Site GT 16 - a II 8 previously unapproved pitches. Leave Blackmore IN Green Belt and restore the classification of "Rural Village in a sparse setting (which it is for roads, Buses, etc. etc. it really is) I am very unhappy that you have chosen to issue such a difficult form to complete with wholly unnecessary/inappropriate personal elements in Section A. It has taken me an unacceptable amount of time to understand and complete. I am very tempted to believe this is a deliberate attempt to stifle meaningful comment. A lot of people who hold views exactly like mine HAVE been put off from objecting because of this.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24818 - 4919 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24823 Object

Respondent: Mr Adrian Quick [8451]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Refer to attached form. The infrastructure is already stretched, and these additional developments would have a significant negative impact to the local community including provision for medical services and schooling. Bus services to larger employment locations (Brentwood Chelmsford, Epping) are totally inadequate. The designated sites have flooding issues, a problems across wider Blackmore footprint and development will cause further problems, increasing the flood rate. There are other Brownfield sites within existing urban boundaries (and local infrastructure and transport grids) better suited to development, negating the need to destroy Green Belt environments. There has been no evidence that Blackmore has a housing need requiring such scale of development. Sites R25 and R26 should be removed form the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed form the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24823 - 8451 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

24829 Object

Respondent: Mr Ronald Quested [8452]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is not suitable location for large number of new homes. This village walk to the shops, hall, school, etc. Already a problem with speeding and parking. More traffic will exacerbate this. 30 new homes on Fingrth Hall Lane not taken into account. Other locations more sustainable and suitable. Use brownfield sites not Green Belt. Consider surrounding villages. Village is historic, Impact on school and GP surgery will be huge. Major risk of flooding in parts of village. "016across the village, homes flooded and cars stuck. More housing will exacerbate this. Where is a Blackmore Housing Needs Survey>

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP. The 'Neighbourhood Plan' from the BVHA should be looked at by the planners. This clearly sets out the local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24829 - 8452 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25049 Object

Respondent: Mr Alan Snook [8484]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is Green Belt and should be kept that way. There at not enough community facilities in the area. IE: doctors surgeries, buses, rubbish clearance, sewerage, road infrastructure is not adequate for extra traffic, The plan is totally unsound in respect of Blackmore. I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission. I wish to be represented by BVHA.

Change To Plan: I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission. I wish to be represented by BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25049 - 8484 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25071 Object

Respondent: Mrs Josephine Snook [8489]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound relating to Blackmore because; Green Belt land should not be built on. Cant get a doctors appointment as it is. The village is liable to flooding. Red Rose Lane is way too narrow for an access point, The clues in the title (lane). There are other more suitable sites.
I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission.

Change To Plan: I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25071 - 8489 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25503 Object

Respondent: Mrs Melanie Simpson [8539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26
Section 04 - Policy SP01 ad SP02
Section 08. Policy Ne06 paras 8.85; 8.90; 8.101
BBC not considered lack of infrastructure in area, schools, doctors, buses, roads, bin collection, etc. Sites are Green Belt green field, us brownfield. There was no housing need survey. Village prone to flood, more houses will exacerbate this.

Change To Plan: I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.
Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.
Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25503 - 8539 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25532 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Simpson [4462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09 Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200; Policy R26, 9.201-9.205:
Section 4 Policy SP01-D(a) D (f) Para 4.9,4.2; Policy SP02
Section 8: Policy NE 06, 8.5-8.64 - para 8.85 (iv), 8.90, 8.101; Policy NE13
As a local teacher I worry about the impact on local infrastructure that is already struggling. Schools, doctors, buses, roads. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services that cannot cope with further pressure on the services. There needs to be a housing needs survey. Brownfield sites should be used. Access from/to red Rose lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic; the village is prone to flooding and when it does Red Rose land is the only way through the village - if there are homes built will this increase the flooding? There is no clear strategy for BBC on this proposal.
Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Change To Plan: Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25532 - 4462 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25539 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04, 08 09 - R25 R26
Limited consultation on this with neighbouring authorities, no housing needs survey, stretched infrastructure - school, GO, congestion, parking, bus services. Need evidence of other sites being considered, brownfield or urban extensions, which would regenerate the High Street,. Fields in village prone to flooding, new homes would increase this. Red Rose Lane is bounded by ancient hedgerows, providing a green boundary to Blackmore. This development would destroy that.
Please refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25539 - 8107 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25546 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Ratcliffe [5040]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 04,
08 - Green Belt and Flooding
09 - R25 R26

There is no clear strategy for villages (Inc. Blackmore) in north of borough.

Principle of development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. There are modest services and infrastructure in Blackmore (an isolated village). School is full, GP waiting times are over 4 weeks, parking in the centre of the village is already a nightmare.

BBC not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met on other (allocated) sites.

There has been no housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Access on/off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic. Equally access via Woollard Way 'hammer heads' would be problematical.

Flooding in the village - proposed sites are liable to flood and therefore building on this land will also increase flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: I fully support the plan put forward by Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25546 - 5040 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25551 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Romang [6974]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Proposed sites and access roads are liable to flood and more homes increase this risk. Red Rose Lane floods regularly as does access to the village around the pond.

Change To Plan: These have been set out in the BVHA neighbourhood plan and I refer to this document.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25551 - 6974 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25558 Object**Respondent: Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 04, 08, 09 - policy R25 and R26 Blackmore village cannot cope with any further demand on its infrastructure. Presently school is at its capacity and medical centre is also struggling with patients having to wait unacceptable time to get an appointment.

Change To Plan: I agree with BVHA neighbourhood plan and planners need to heed th Blackmore local housing requirements.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25558 - 4897 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25586 Object

Respondent: Mr Simon Richardson [8562]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound.

- a) There is no proof that Blackmore needs this number of houses
- b) There has been no discussion with the villagers.
- c) No cooperation with any local neighbouring authorities. 30 houses have just been built outside the village in EFDC area that will impact on the village. 8 houses recently built at what was Nine Ashes Farm again in EFDC area.
- d) The LDP does not comply with NPPF Guidance:
 - No protection of Green Belt
 - Development is not located to minimize travel
 - Local community not consulted
 - There is no proven local need
 - There has been no Flood Risk Assessment
 - The location does not 'minimize travel' as required

Change To Plan: All of the above points should be reassessed with local involvement.
Local housing need to be assessed.
The size of the local school needs to be considered
The Doctors surgery is already oversubscribed and consideration needs to be given on to how address this.
Flooding is an issue and needs greater consideration. The Woollard Way field (R25) is often flooded.
Not an issue as a field but this surface water will need to go somewhere if the field is concreted over. (as a local villager my Father used this field and its ponds to water his horses).
Any development of this size needs to be located nearer to good transport links.
Small brownfield developments need to be considered.
Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25586 - 8562 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25591 Object

Respondent: Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policies: R25; R26; SP02; SP02; NE06; NE13

This will put intolerable pressure on GP services the local surgery fails to me demand. Blackmore is a small community based around a small number of roads that are not designed to meet the inevitable increase in traffic due to a wholly inadequate public transport service. It is the level and scale of this development that is excessive and inappropriate.

Change To Plan: A significant reduction in the scale and number of houses to be built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25591 - 8563 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25598 Object

Respondent: Mr Matthew Romang [8565]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 04; 08 - green belt flooding; 09 - R25 and R26

The strategy for rural villages like Blackmore isn't clear in the document, . Red Rose lane is unsuitable for an increase in traffic flow, due to the access onto/off of the road; the proposed sites are areas known for flooding and development will also increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore; the principle of the red rose lane development is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with limited infrastructure and poor public transport, which would struggle more.

Change To Plan: Refer to BHVA neighbourhood plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25598 - 8565 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25604 Object

Respondent: Mr David Rolfs [8566]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC have pasted houses onto a Green Belt area around Blackmore to achieve that LDP targets and failed to consider the effects on the community and infrastructure. Additional housing around Blackmore not considered (32 new homes). Has BBC discussed local development with neighbouring councils? The effect on local Highways by additional housing. Blackmore village has a vibrant centre that has congestion due visitors to this with parking on pavements, parking on double yellow lines. Also no designated disabled parking spaces. No enforcement. This will be exacerbated by new homes. BBC say the developers have undertaken a flood survey for their land, what about adjacent land with the history of flooding. The school and GP are full, with long GP waiting list which will be exacerbated. Monies collected for infrastructure will be spent elsewhere. Parish Cllrs were not allowed to debate this in the full council meeting on 08 Nov 2018, this is undemocratic. Travellers site in Chelmsford Road was deemed illegal but now LDP making it legal but on what grounds? Previous development proposals there failed due to insufficient sewerage capacity, how will this be addressed. It is apparent that the Blackmore area is the "dumping ground" to make up the numbers and imposing a housing mix without carrying out a housing need survey.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25604 - 8566 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25610 Object

Respondent: Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Insufficient consultation with neighbouring boroughs; red Rose Lane is not suitable for access; Severe flooding in village will get worse and sewage pumping station cant cope; No housing need survey; Already problems with cars - congestion, parking, poor bus service,; destroy wildlife and habitat; green belt should be protected; primary school is full; no clear housing strategy to consider other sites than R25 and R26.

Change To Plan: As there seems to be considerable doubt that all aspects of the planning process have been adhered to R26 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Leave Blackmore in the Green Belt and restore its classification as a Rural Village in a setting with non f the amenities enjoyed by areas such as Mountnessing and Ingrave i.e. a through road., regular buses over an extended time frame, a doctors surgery that can be reached on foot. BBC should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out local housing need for our already sustainable community. Please note that this was a very difficult form to fill in as many on us have limited knowledge of the planning process!

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25610 - 8567 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25622 Object

Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access off/from Red Rode Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village. Both fields (R25 and R26) are teeming with wildlife - hundreds of birds nest in the hedgerows within and around the fields. We have photographic evidence (stills and videos) of certain protected species (bats, barn owls, great crested newts).

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26 Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached Blackmore Village Survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan "available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25622 - 4874 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25789 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Agree with points raised by BVHA - lack of school places, lack of parking, poor bus service, GP full, Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy vehicles and is narrow, dangerous for children to walk to school.

The form is complicated and full of legal jargon. Not clear even after visit to council offices. BVHA helping to portray view of myself and others. The borough set the building limits for Blackmore in the 1960s, considered infrastructure and Green Belt. Since then gas has been supplied and water pressure improved. We still have power cuts. The council set the village boundary and infrastructure right in the 1960s and has helped to preserve this wonderful village. There is no justification for the need to build on Green Belt land adjoining Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25789 - 8010 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25821 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25821 - 4693 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25829 Object**Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.)and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25829 - 8136 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25844 Object**Respondent: Mr John Hughes [4500]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore sits in a dip and is prone to flooding. Prior to the major development of the village in the 1970s there were no reports of any significant flooding. In 1986 a major flood occurred causing significant damaged. Flooding has occurred numerous times since. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Developing inappropriately in areas at risk from flooding, can put property and lives at risk; therefore, this policy seeks to ensure this does not happen. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is against this policy.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25844 - 4500 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25854 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore sits in a dip and is prone to flooding. Prior to the major development of the village in the 1970s there were no reports of any significant flooding. In 1986 a major flood occurred causing significant damaged. Flooding has occurred numerous times since. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Developing inappropriately in areas at risk from flooding, can put property and lives at risk; therefore, this policy seeks to ensure this does not happen. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is against this policy.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25854 - 8637 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25861 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore sits in a dip and is prone to flooding. Prior to the major development of the village in the 1970s there were no reports of any significant flooding. In 1986 a major flood occurred causing significant damaged. Flooding has occurred numerous times since. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Developing inappropriately in areas at risk from flooding, can put property and lives at risk; therefore, this policy seeks to ensure this does not happen. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is against this policy.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25861 - 8638 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25868 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Hughes [8639]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore sits in a dip and is prone to flooding. Prior to the major development of the village in the 1970s there were no reports of any significant flooding. In 1986 a major flood occurred causing significant damaged. Flooding has occurred numerous times since. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Developing inappropriately in areas at risk from flooding, can put property and lives at risk; therefore, this policy seeks to ensure this does not happen. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is against this policy.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25868 - 8639 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25898 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Birch [8158]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There doesn't appear to be any coherent idea for the villages including Blackmore, no cohesion with neighbouring authorities. Should be considering other new development in other boroughs. The Blackmore community will be jeopardised by the proposed plan.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan. Please refer to the BHVA neighbourhood plan. Remove Blackmore from the proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25898 - 8158 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25901 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Bartrop [8650]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 08 Flood Risk and Green Belt
Section 09 R25 and R26

There doesn't appear to be any coherent strategy for the villages including Blackmore, strain on amenities, 4 weeks for GP appointment, limited bus service would mean more traffic. Brentwood Borough Council has not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increased housing density on other allocated sites, There is no housing need survey, sites are liable to flood and new homes will increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: A detailed housing needs survey needs to be undertaken for Blackmore Village and I endorse the objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25901 - 8650 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25905 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 08 Flood Risk and Green Belt
Section 09 R25 and R26

There doesn't appear to be any clear strategy for the villages including Blackmore, strain on facilities, such as school places and doctors. Very limited bus service and roads and lanes would be stretched and struggle to cope with more traffic. There is no housing need survey to say these sites are most suitable. Sites are liable to flood and new homes will increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: A detailed housing needs survey needs to be undertaken for Blackmore Village and I endorse the objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25905 - 8651 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25913 Object**Respondent: Mr Luke Holmes [8652]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25913 - 8652 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25921 Object**Respondent: Miss Ami Holmes [8653]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25921 - 8653 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25928 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, Green Belt, traffic and transport, GP, schools. Sites unsuitable. Brownfield sites more suitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25928 - 8574 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25934 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Foreman [4394]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools, Green Belt. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25934 - 4394 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25944 Object**Respondent: Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to the inclusion of Blackmore sites as strategy for site choice is not justified, impacts not details and no account of other recent development in the area.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore Sites should be removed from the Local Plan until there has been:
(1) A full housing need survey for Blackmore
(2) A proper consultation, including the BBC taking into account alternative sites
(3) A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25944 - 4547 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25952 Object**Respondent: Mr Ben Holmes [8654]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25952 - 8654 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25960 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Holmes [8655]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25960 - 8655 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25982 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are a huge number of reports and surveys already in existence that highlight the major risk to flooding that already exists in Blackmore. Developing in a known flood prone area is crazy and will also increase the risk of flooding to the existing community.

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25982 - 4759 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

25990 Object**Respondent: Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are a huge number of reports and surveys already in existence that highlight the major risk to flooding that already exists in Blackmore. Developing in a known flood prone area is crazy and will also increase the risk of flooding to the existing community.

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25990 - 4700 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

26005 Object**Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26005 - 8660 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26026 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26026 - 8662 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

26043 Object

Respondent: Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: The flooding of a few years ago has just been alleviated this would cause more problems in that area. Blackmore would be unable to cope with this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26043 - 8668 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

26053 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26053 - 7304 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26080 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Failure to mitigate the effects of traffic emissions and manage climate risk by concentrating new developments in existing cities or large town and/or ensuring they are well served by public transport.

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26080 - 4275 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26085 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carole Cole [8675]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concerns over schools in the area, ie more traffic in and round Blackmore, Doddinghurst and nearby villages. Also Dr's surgery seems difficult to get appointments now, without new housing in the area.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 out of the plan and consider the alternatives.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26085 - 8675 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii

26103 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore irrigation is almost non-existent- and actually in recent years the continual flooding has actually washed away pavements and seeped into low-lying houses on Church Street. Some of these pavements have yet to be repaired and propose considerable risk to the ageing population in the area. I also know of occasions where freshly dug graves in the churchyard have had to have water pumped out of them. Creating new houses on the proposed sites will dramatically reduce the amount of open land and large plant life able to soak up this water. Blackmore is at continual risk of flooding which makes the proposal unfit for purpose as it will create more of an issue. The council - if it wanted to build further homes in these parishes - would have to invest heavily the irrigation of the entire village to make these plans plausible.

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26103 - 8677 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, iii, iv

26176 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8691]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound because: 1. Access at Redrose Lane unsuitable for traffic. 2. Available brownfield sites should take priority over greenbelt. 3. Blackmore is not equipped to deal with more population on this scale. The school and doctors surgery are already stretched to capacity. 4. There are more suitable / sustainable locations than Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26176 - 8691 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii

26231 Object

Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Proposed sites R25 and R26 have a history of flooding and development here will only worsen the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26231 - 7016 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26242 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Capes [8702]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is already prone to flooding. Building on greenfield / Green Belt land can only worsen this situation by reducing the available drainage areas.

Change To Plan: I do not think that any modification will be able to make the plan sustainable for Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26242 - 8702 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26251 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8704]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Area is prone to flooding. The proposed development will only increase the flood risk.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. In accordance with 'local needs' some smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the choice to "downsize", redeeming their (?) home.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26251 - 8704 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26276 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Williams [8706]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Major concerns about flooding in village due to additional strain on the drainage / sewage systems.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26276 - 8706 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26281 Object**Respondent: Mrs Julie Ann Williams [8707]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Major concerns about flooding in village due to additional strain on the drainage / sewage systems.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26281 - 8707 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26324 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area is already liable to flood. Additional development will only increase flood risk.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26324 - 8720 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26365 Object**Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: sites are liable to flooding, which would increase the risk of surrounding area also.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to which sets out local needs for housing.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26365 - 4618 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26374 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kim Barber [8731]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sever impact on Blackmore of construction of dwelling as village cannot support services, i.e. school, doctors, bus service, etc.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26374 - 8731 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26382 Object**Respondent: Mr. Colin Barber [919]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sever impact on Blackmore of construction of dwelling as village cannot support services, i.e. school, doctors, bus service, etc.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26382 - 919 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26408 Object **Respondent: Mrs Ella Bradley [4875]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area prone to flooding

Change To Plan: I really can't see what modifications could be considered in view of the infrastructure of the village. In view of my previous comments - the potential flooding - the narrow lanes - the parking - schools, doctors at full capacity.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26408 - 4875 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26425 Object **Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area is prone to flooding

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26425 - 8742 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26438 Object **Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area is prone to flooding

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26438 - 8741 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26444 Object **Respondent: Mrs Wendy Dunbar [8743]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area prone to flooding

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 to be removed from the LDP and Planners to refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which details the local housing needs, etc.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26444 - 8743 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26457 Object **Respondent: Mr John Orbell [4805]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP Plan. You need to refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association for our Local Housing Needs for our sustainable community. We do not want unwanted and unjustified large scale development. There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Was is not the Brentwood Borough Council who said "we will continue to protect our key assets including the environment, heritage and character of the borough".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26457 - 4805 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26461 Object **Respondent: Mrs Karen York [8748]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area prone to flooding

Change To Plan: Please refer to the plan put together by BVHA

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26461 - 8748 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26490 Object**Respondent: Mr Surinder Panesar [8749]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: infrastructure is not strong enough to manage the proposed growth and there is a disproportionate allocation to Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out the local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26490 - 8749 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

26497 Object**Respondent: Mrs Annabelle Panesar [8750]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Impact on natural environment, flood risk.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 to be removed. BVHA neighbourhood Plan sets out the local housing needs, that are sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26497 - 8750 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

22323 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Anglian Water is supportive of the requirements for applicants to engage with the relevant sewerage companies to demonstrate that there is capacity within the foul sewerage network or that improvements can be made prior to the occupation of the development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22323 - 6824 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - None

22556 Support**Respondent: Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Thames Chase Trust is co-host of the Roding, Beam & Ingrebourne Catchment Partnership, of which Brentwood Council is a partner.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22556 - 7196 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - None

23196 Support**Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Generally support this policy but believe the supporting text should stress that any proposed development should take into consideration the impacts of climate change for the development lifetime.

Change To Plan: Supporting text should stress that any proposed development should take into consideration the impacts of climate change for the development lifetime.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23196 - 8308 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

23198 Support**Respondent: Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It could be added that we would object to any new development in Functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) as this would be against policy. Water compatible development can be allowed in Functional floodplain if, in accordance with the footnotes of Table 3: Flood risk vulnerability and flood zone 'compatibility' of the PPG, for water compatible development within Functional floodplain, the applicant has designed their development to:

- remain operational and safe for users in times of flood;
- result in no net loss of floodplain storage;
- not impede water flows and not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Change To Plan: Add to policy or supporting text as advised.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23198 - 8308 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

23205 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We are supportive of the Local Plan policies relating to Drainage and flood risk (NE06 and BE08).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23205 - 6824 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

25506 Support**Respondent: Mrs Gladys Skinner [8540]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections R04, R08 (flood and Green Belt) and R09 Blackmore Village doesn't have the infrastructure for houses in Red Rose Lane, The volume of traffic at present has already reached its limit. Also I understand that flooding could be a real possibility.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be remove from the plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 25506 - 8540 - POLICY NE06: FLOOD RISK - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.59

22429 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**Summary: 2. Justified
3. Effective
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request amendment to paragraph 8.59 to ensure factual representation of the current position, in line with paragraph 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert additional sentence at end of paragraph 8.59 to read as follows -

Updated Critical Drainage Areas were identified in 2018 and should be referenced and considered.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22429 - 6776 - 8.59 - ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment POLICY NE08: FLOODLIGHTING AND ILLUMINATION

23757 Support**Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]**

Summary: Support; although in respect of policy NE08 A a) we suggest that, in order to provide greater clarity as to how a decision maker should react to development proposals, it is acknowledged that employment land may well require the provision of lighting for security and operational purposes.

Change To Plan: NE 08 should acknowledge that employment land may well require the provision of lighting for security and operational purposes.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23757 - 5124 - POLICY NE08: FLOODLIGHTING AND ILLUMINATION - None

22532 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22532 - 8074 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

22874 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.

Without prejudice to the above contention, if no previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites exist, that Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate there are no or insufficient previously developed sites available outside the existing urban areas.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22874 - 8074 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

22875 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.

Without prejudice to the above contention, if no previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites exist, that Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate there are no or insufficient previously developed sites available outside the existing urban areas. In any event, there are greenfield sites available (for example adjoining existing urban areas) in preferable and more sustainable locations.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22875 - 8074 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

23165 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Para 8.83-84: Unclear from the published methodology, as to why, having scored highly in relation to Purpose 1 and 3, DHGV is assessed as making a "moderate to high" contribution to Green Belt purposes, when there are other parcels which make high contributions towards two of the purposes have been assessed as making a "high" contribution towards Green Belt purposes. Basildon Council does not believe that the Plan has reached a justified position in respects of whether the Green Belt evidence has informed the policies. Unclear how the risk of coalescence can be adequately mitigated.

Change To Plan: The Plan should demonstrate in more detail, through a tool such as a Topic Paper, how its site selection choices have been informed by the Green Belt Study 2018 and should any inconsistencies occurs the Plan's land use allocations and justification should be changed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23165 - 369 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, iii, iv

23402 Object

Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield land off Red Rose Lane. [Sites R25 and R26].

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighborhood plan ". [Not supplied].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23402 - 4861 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

24388 Object**Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate. Yet again green belt is being developed on. Blackmore struggles to deal with the amount of traffic and parking and will not cope with the new development. Doctors surgeries, public amenities are already at breaking point, how will they cope. Increased risk of flooding

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties,
Use parish council to communicate with the residents,
Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24388 - 8373 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

24805 Object**Respondent: Heather Eltham [8449]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The BBC has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities (Epping Council) who are in process of building c. 30 houses at top of Fingrith Hall Lane - the impact this has on the village where the infrastructure is not sound to incorporate extra traffic. There are other brownfield sites that are available and they must take priority over our precious greenbelt. The school is at full capacity and the doctors surgery would not be able to accommodate the extra numbers.

Change To Plan: I believe sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out our Housing Needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24805 - 8449 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

24839 Object**Respondent: Donna Eaton [8455]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A residential development such as has been 1. submitted for Blackmore will further stretch the infrastructure (roads, parking, schools, doctors surgeries). 2. There are other more suitable locations in the borough. 3. There are brown field sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. 4. The area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23rd June 2016). 5. Access to and from the development site entirely unsuitable for increased traffic problems

Change To Plan: We / I do not believe green belt land in Blackmore should be released for this development as part of BBC Local Plan due to all of the aforementioned reasons.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24839 - 8455 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

24908 Object**Respondent: Jacqueline Greagsby [8465]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Red Rose Lane is not suitable for urban development, Blackmore has modest services and infrastructure which are failing with the existing population. 2. Access to/from Red Rose Lane is unsustainable for the volume of traffic. 3. Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding and any construction on this site could push the problem onto current residents property.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out the local planning needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24908 - 8465 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

24927 Object**Respondent: Kay Ginivan [8468]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local plan is unsound because: 1. Blackmore is a small isolated rural village so it hasn't got the infrastructure and would affect school admissions, doctors wait times, parking, etc. 2. The Red Rose Lane is entirely unsustainable for this volume of traffic. 3. Brentwood Council hasn't looked at the used of brownfield sites that are available and take priority over the greenbelt lane off Red Rose Lane. 4. There has been no survey with regards to housing needs why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Please see BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24927 - 8468 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

25037 Object

Respondent: Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Building on greenbelt; 2. Infrastructure of school, surgery, parking, drainage; 3. Lack of consultation re local needs; 4. Local wildlife habitat leading to more flooding because of habitat removal; 5. Impact from top of Fingrith Hall Lane!!! Epping Borough. 6. More traffic pollution, risk of road accidents increases could lead to injury and deaths; 7. Local shop couldn't cope with the extra load; 8. Village will end up being part of London sprawl; 9. The profound historical nature and heritage will be deeply impacts; 10. Blackmore be a 'through' way / short cut from Red Rose at top of Fingrith Hall Road.

Change To Plan: 1. I would like the proposed sites R25 and R26 removed from local development plan. 2. Consult the BVHA neighbourhood plan for sustainable development. 3. Why doesn't Brentwood Council lead the way to protect green belt and historical heritage sites - Blackmore at the top of the list. 4. Green alternative use to those sites eg allotments, solar panels on both to serve the village.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25037 - 5024 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

25058 Object

Respondent: Ruth Jones [8485]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village school is not large enough to accommodate a large increase in numbers and if was made 2 classes larger it would lose its village school feel. It is difficult to get appointments at our GO surgery as it is. Blackmore would lose its small village feel and identity. More houses would mean more traffic and would make the roads less safe for pedestrians, particularly children. Cheaper housing would change the demographic of the area. Not all villages need to have affordable housing. I couldn't have afforded to live here when I got married but it was somewhere I aspired to and with hard work we could eventually afford to live here after a few years. The village already has a problem with flooding without building on it further.

Change To Plan: I agree with the Blackmore Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25058 - 8485 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

25062 Object

Respondent: Mr Steven Jacobs [4408]

Agent: N/A

Summary: N/A

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25062 - 4408 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

25068 Object

Respondent: Diane Jones [8488]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear strategy for Blackmore in north of BBC. Lack of consultation with nearby authorities (i.e. Epping FDC) - north part of Fingrith Hall Lane houses being built. Infrastructure - our modest services are already over stretched - school is full doctors appointments are hard to get. Traffic and parking - this will increase massively in the village will be dangerous. There are more suitable sites on and around Brentwood - i.e. old Toomey site on Ingrave Road has been empty for absolutely years as have many others in BBC Ongar Road former commercial park in town centre. No housing needs survey conducted to show why Blackmore is in the LDP. Access in/out Red Rose Lane unsuitable for volume of traffic the developments will produce accidents will happen. Proposed sites doe flood - building on these will increase flood risk elsewhere in village

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 need to be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25068 - 8488 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

25161 Object

Respondent: Iris Jones [8495]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is narrow and winding, cars have to slow down to pass. There are ditches on either side and no footpaths. The exit onto Nine Ashes Road often floods and is a particularly junction, right by the school. An increase in traffic would be a great risk. Blackmore is a very small village and despite being very isolated has a minimal bus service. There is one shop a full school that is already over stretched and a doctor surgery that isn't cope now. The narrow roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and already car parking problems. Blackmore village cannot possibly cope with the strem of the proposed developments on its infrastructure. I therefore consider the plan to be unsound. Why choose Blackmore greenbelt when there are other locations within Brentwood Borough Council more sustainable.

Change To Plan: is narrow and winding, cars have to slow down to pass. There are ditches on either side and no footpaths. The exit onto Nine Ashes Road often floods and is a particularly junction, right by the school. An increase in traffic would be a great risk. Blackmore is a very small village and despite being very isolated has a minimal bus service. There is one shop a full school that is already over stretched and a doctor surgery that isn't cope now. The narrow roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and already car parking problems. Blackmore village cannot possibly cope with the strem of the proposed developments on its infrastructure. I therefore consider the plan to be unsound. Why choose Blackmore greenbelt when there are other locations within Brentwood Borough Council more sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25161 - 8495 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii

25450 Object

Respondent: Hazel Mills [8523]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Epping Forest District Council was not consulted about the 30 homes being built at the top of Fringrith Hall Lane, hence no consideration was given to the impact this will have on our village. No clear strategy has been outlined for Blackmore in the north of the borough. Our doctors surgery is oversubscribed - no more patients please!! The school is full, don't ruin it by overfilling the classrooms. Where would the excess water go? There's nowhere to park as it is! We love the wildlife here - please don't destroy their homes.

Change To Plan: Remove plans for sites R25 and R26. Suggest the Planners refer to the BVH Neighbourhood Plan which illustrates the villages housing needs relevant to maintaining a sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25450 - 8523 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

25454 Object

Respondent: Edward Mills [8524]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village infrastructure is insufficient to deal with a significant increase in population in terms of oversubscribed school and doctor surgery. I totally disapprove of building on greenfield sites.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 need to be removed from the Local Development Plan. We need housing that fulfils a sustainable community as outlined in BVH Neighbouring Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25454 - 8524 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26122 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Harris [8678]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and development of this size on green belt land is inappropriate.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26122 - 8678 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii

26127 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Harris [8679]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and development of this size one green belt land is inappropriate

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26127 - 8679 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii

26134 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beverley Holla [8680]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. No trains, bus one an hour everyone must drive. In my col de sack each household has 3, 4, 5 cars. 2. The roads are very narrow and dangerous every month at least one car (a Tesco delivery lorry last week) turned upside down in ditch. 3. Cannot get appointment with doctor surgery. 4. Roads too dangerous for children to cycle. 5. Plenty of space nearer to Brentwood.

Change To Plan: Remove the proposed sites field 25 and 26 from local development plan. Consult local people they know how congested and dangerous the roads are winding and very narrow.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26134 - 8680 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26157 Object**Respondent: Laura Harris [8685]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and development of this size on Green Belt land is inappropriate.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26157 - 8685 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii

26162 Object**Respondent: Susan Harris [8686]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and development on green belt land is inappropriate.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26162 - 8686 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii

26191 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Susan Miers [8695]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Building on green belt is inappropriate. No report on these two sites in Blackmore have taken into account the biodiversity of impact on the local wildlife using these two greenfield sites which have not been in productive arable use for the last 20 years at least, and therefore are vital corridors for wildlife. Any development on these two greenfield sites will seriously affect the following bird species on the Birds of Conservation and Concern 4 (BOCC4) endangered listings. Red List . Starling, Song Thrush, House Sparrow, Tree Sparrow, Linnet, Twite, Yellowhammer. And on the BOCC4 Amber List. Dunnock, Bullfinch. All the above endangered species can be seen in and around these sites

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26191 - 8695 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26222 Object**Respondent: Mr John Caton [4881]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development should take place on brownfield sites and greenbelt land protected.

Change To Plan: BBC planners should refer to the Blackmore Village neighbourhood plan, which was properly composed and states what the village and villagers need. Far too many of what might have been thought of as affordable, have been extended, modified to the maximum and are no longer affordable. There are very few properties left in Blackmore of smaller, single storey bungalow type. The sites R25 and R26 should be taken out of the local development plan for the reasons given.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26222 - 4881 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26233 Object**Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: New development will affect the wildlife. On many occasions I have seen barn owls flying around the proposed development. Cyclist, walkers come to Blackmore village to escape the hustle and bustle of towns. The new developments will change the whole feel of the village. There are very few, small, unspoilt villages left. People come to the countryside to get away from the pollution of towns.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26233 - 7016 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26243 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susan Capes [8702]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed development is on Green Belt land when there are Brown Belt area more usefully located closer to Brentwood and Shenfield.

Change To Plan: I do not think that any modification will be able to make the plan sustainable for Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26243 - 8702 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26253 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8704]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites within BBC's authority have not been considered over Green field sites.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. In accordance with 'local needs' some smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the choice to "downsize", redeeming their (?) home.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26253 - 8704 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26277 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Williams [8706]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Building on green belt is not acceptable when brown fill sites are available.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26277 - 8706 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26282 Object**Respondent: Mrs Julie Ann Williams [8707]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Building on green belt is not acceptable when brown fill sites are available.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26282 - 8707 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26291 Object**Respondent: Mr Neil Warner [8709]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I understand that there has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. There should be clear evidence that all brownfield sites in the Borough have been fully utilised in an development plan. There is insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the planned housing expansion.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26291 - 8709 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26295 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Gillian Warner [8710]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites in the Borough as a whole should be developed before ever considering green field and green belt sites.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26295 - 8710 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26352 Object**Respondent: Mr Arthur Birch [4769]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore has only modest facilities and would struggle to accommodate these developments

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26352 - 4769 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26445 Object**Respondent: Mrs Wendy Dunbar [8743]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is greenbelt and should remain as such. BBC should develop all brownfield sites first before considering greenbelt development.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 to be removed from the LDP and Planners to refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which details the local housing needs, etc.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26445 - 8743 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26458 Object**Respondent: Mr John Orbell [4805]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green belt should be protected. Build on brownfield sites first.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP Plan. You need to refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association for our Local Housing Needs for our sustainable community. We do not want unwanted and unjustified large scale development. There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Was is not the Brentwood Borough Council who said "we will continue to protect our key assets including the environment, heritage and character of the borough".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26458 - 4805 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26462 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen York [8748]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green belt should be protect.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the plan put together by BVHA

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26462 - 8748 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

26491 Object**Respondent: Mr Surinder Panesar [8749]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: infrastructure is not strong enough to manage the proposed growth and there is a disproportionate allocation to Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out the local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26491 - 8749 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

25710 Support**Respondent: Ms Norma Jennings [5444]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: While it concerns me that the LPD has proved necessary to utilize the green belt for development, I admire the council for sticking to its guns to ensure the green belt is protected to provide defensible boundaries to prevent urban sprawl.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 25710 - 5444 - Green Belt and Rural Development - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.80

22586 Support

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Agreed, and that is why the Green Belt must remain undeveloped and permanent.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22586 - 4539 - 8.80 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.81

22587 Object

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: National Planning Policy allows a local authority to NOT meet the "huge demand and pressure" on the grounds that to do so would damage the Green Belt. In fact, the whole point of the Green Belt is precisely to prevent urban sprawl and redirect the "demand and pressure" to other parts of the country.

Change To Plan: Commit to not altering the boundaries of the Green Belt at all, and to a blanket ban on inappropriate development on the Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22587 - 4539 - 8.81 - ii

24178 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary: In Chapter 9 neither the text nor the individual allocations, for example RO3, Land north of Shenfield, a Green Belt site, make any reference to Green Belt boundary changes and their justification.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place... 4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24178 - 7948 - 8.81 - i, ii, iii, iv

24179 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary: In Chapter 9 neither the text nor the individual allocations, for example RO3, Land north of Shenfield, a Green Belt site, make any reference to Green Belt boundary changes and their justification.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place...4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24179 - 7948 - 8.82 - i, ii, iii, iv

24180 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary: In Chapter 9 neither the text nor the individual allocations, for example RO3, Land north of Shenfield, a Green Belt site, make any reference to Green Belt boundary changes and their justification.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place...4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24180 - 7948 - 8.83 - i, ii, iii, iv

22585 Object

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

The definition of "brownfield" land is too loose. For example, the former site compound around J29 of the M25 was always supposed to be only temporary, yet the Council has used that as a justification to label it "brownfield". Whilst I agree that brownfield sites should be developed in preference to greenfield sites, the definition of "brownfield" must be far more constrained, and must not include open spaces such as sports pitches.

Change To Plan:

Restrict the definition of "brownfield" to sites which have genuinely already had heavy development, and exclude sports pitches, temporary site compounds, and other developments which do not currently encroach on the "open" nature of the Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference:

O - 22585 - 4539 - 8.84 - ii

24143 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary:

The paragraph says that after giving priority to brownfield sites and what it refers to as "previous development land", it has been necessary to review Green Belt boundaries, resulting in the release of some 1% of the District's Green Belt land for development. In the context of paragraph 8.84, it is not clear what is meant by "previous development land". It could mean one of three things:
☐ allocations made in the existing Local Development Plan that have not yet been developed
☐ major developed sites in the Green Belt
☐ brownfield land also referred to as previously developed land.
We are assuming it means the first of these.
We believe that a number of allocations made in the Pre-Submission Document are unsound for reasons that are set out in our representations on both the overall growth strategy and individual allocations. The balance between allocations in areas outside the Green Belt and in the Green Belt is unsound. It should be corrected by releasing a larger percentage of Green Belt land.

Change To Plan:

The sentence in paragraph 8.84 beginning:
"These exceptional circumstances have resulted in a 1% release of land from the Green Belt ...".
should be altered to read:
"These exceptional circumstances have resulted in a 1.5% release of land from the Green Belt ...".

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

O - 24143 - 2788 - 8.84 - i, ii, iii

24181 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary:

In Chapter 9 neither the text nor the individual allocations, for example RO3, Land north of Shenfield, a Green Belt site, make any reference to Green Belt boundary changes and their justification.

Change To Plan:

Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place...4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

O - 24181 - 7948 - 8.84 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment Purpose of the Green Belt

23711 Support

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: The release from the Green Belt and Green Belt policy is supported. Particularly regarding site R07

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23711 - 8337 - Purpose of the Green Belt - None

23822 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The release from the Green Belt and Green Belt policy is supported. Particularly regarding site R07

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23822 - 303 - Purpose of the Green Belt - None

23838 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The release from the Green Belt and Green Belt policy is supported. Particularly regarding site R07

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23838 - 4657 - Purpose of the Green Belt - None

23856 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The release from the Green Belt and Green Belt policy is supported. Particularly regarding site R07

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23856 - 4656 - Purpose of the Green Belt - None

24434 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 8.85 (iv) and 8.90, 8.101: Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore. Blackmore has been disproportionately targeted with a 30% increase in the current population proposed. There must be more suitable brownfield sites within the borough that having to build on Green Belt in Blackmore. The Blackmore sites of R25 and R26 are entirely unsuitable for large scale development.

Change To Plan: The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the plans should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out the Blackmore local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24434 - 8375 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

25822 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25822 - 4693 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii

25831 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25831 - 8136 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

25914 Object

Respondent: Mr Luke Holmes [8652]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25914 - 8652 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii

25922 Object

Respondent: Miss Ami Holmes [8653]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25922 - 8653 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii

25954 Object**Respondent: Mr Ben Holmes [8654]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25954 - 8654 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii

25962 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Holmes [8655]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25962 - 8655 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii

26006 Object**Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26006 - 8660 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

26027 Object**Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26027 - 8662 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii

26044 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: The flooding of a few years ago has just been alleviated this would cause more problems in that area. Blackmore would be unable to cope with this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26044 - 8668 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii

26054 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26054 - 7304 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

26081 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Failure to comply with the NPPF by setting out strategic policies to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape. No 'positive strategy for the 'conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment', including those heritage assets that are most at risk. Assets should be recognised as being an 'irreplaceable resource' that should be conserved in a 'manner appropriate to their significance', taking account of 'the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits' that conservation can bring, whilst also recognising the positive contribution new development can make to local character and distinctiveness.

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26081 - 4275 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

26104 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Some of the proposed sites in Blackmore are incredibly vital to the survival of certain types of wildlife in the English countryside -we have seen a huge decline in the hedgehog population countrywide in the last few years and the green sites around Blackmore provide a safe haven for these creatures

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26104 - 8677 - 8.85 - i, iii, iv

26328 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brownfield site should be developed. No development on green belt should be permitted.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26328 - 8720 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

26366 Object

Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC should be consulting with other local authorities to increase development on already allocated brownfield sites, where a far better infrastructure is already in place, including roads and public services. This would home a far lesser impact on the surrounding environment than building on greenbelt lane, which should be considered as the last resort for development.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to which sets out local needs for housing.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26366 - 4618 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

26426 Object

Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brownfield sites should be developed first before developing greenbelt. BBC have not utilized all available brownfield site.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26426 - 8742 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

26437 Object

Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brownfield sites should be developed first before developing greenbelt. BBC have not utilized all available brownfield site.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26437 - 8741 - 8.85 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.87

22315 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Para 8.87 Green Belt Local Context: this paragraph acknowledges the benefits of the Thames Chase Community Forest and how it provides informal recreation, and we note that the Council intends to support and encourage this use. We would therefore like to see more clarity in this justification; where the aspiration to improve access is mentioned we would prefer to see this made accessible to more user groups than at present, specifically equestrians and cyclists as far as possible.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, we would like to see the aspiration to enhance accessibility to the Thames Chase Community Forest to include ALL user groups, including equestrians and cyclists.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22315 - 3855 - 8.87 - i, ii, iii, iv

25832 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25832 - 8136 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii, iv

26007 Object

Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26007 - 8660 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii, iv

26028 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26028 - 8662 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii

26055 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26055 - 7304 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii, iv

26082 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Failure to comply with the NPPF by setting out strategic policies to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape. No 'positive strategy for the 'conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment', including those heritage assets that are most at risk. Assets should be recognised as being an 'irreplaceable resource' that should be conserved in a 'manner appropriate to their significance', taking account of 'the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits' that conservation can bring, whilst also recognising the positive contribution new development can make to local character and distinctiveness.

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26082 - 4275 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii, iv

26105 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Some of the proposed sites in Blackmore are incredibly vital to the survival of certain types of wildlife in the English countryside -we have seen a huge decline in the hedgehog population countrywide in the last few years and the green sites around Blackmore provide a safe haven for these creatures

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26105 - 8677 - 8.90 - i, iii, iv

26329 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brownfield site should be developed. No development on green belt should be permitted.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26329 - 8720 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii, iv

26367 Object**Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC should be consulting with other local authorities to increase development on already allocated brownfield sites, where a far better infrastructure is already in place, including roads and public services. This would home a far lesser impact on the surrounding environment than building on greenbelt lane, which should be considered as the last resort for development.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to which sets out local needs for housing.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26367 - 4618 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii, iv

26427 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites should be developed first before developing greenbelt. BBC have not utilized all available brownfield site.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26427 - 8742 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii, iv

26436 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites should be developed first before developing greenbelt. BBC have not utilized all available brownfield site.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26436 - 8741 - 8.90 - i, ii, iii, iv

24024 Object

Respondent: Ms. Isobel McGeever [7286]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The redevelopment of the Brentwood Community Hospital site would only seek for the removal of a small element of existing Green Belt land which is currently a mix of hardstanding car parking and woodland. This removal would enable efficient and maximum redevelopment of a brownfield site, without contradicting the purposes of the Green Belt. The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in "exceptional circumstances". The Housing White Paper seeks to clarify this further and states that land which has been previously developed should be considered first. Therefore, the 25% of the Brentwood Community Hospital which currently lies within the green belt should be removed to permit future development as it does not perform the five purposes of greenbelt as support by the Council Green Belt Assessment.

Change To Plan: Should any part of the Brentwood Community Hospital site be declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS in the future, then the site should be considered suitable and available for alternative use, and considered deliverable within the period 5- 10 years. These representations identify the sites potential for future development, in accordance with the realignment of the Green Belt so that this significant area of developed land is no longer included. It is evident, that the site does not make a positive contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, redevelopment of this site could provide a key contribution to Brentwood's housing need, which the Council have failed to justify, given the reliance on key strategic sites, and the lack of acknowledgement for unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities (Basildon and Havering). These representations therefore promote and identify parts of the Brentwood Community Hospital site as a suitable site to contribute towards these requirements. This site presents an excellent opportunity for a high quality residential redevelopment on previously developed Green Belt land. This could be achieved without compromising the character of the area as the development can act as an infill site to the existing residential development surrounding it, and without the need for significant infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also available to accommodate further health related development should the CCG seek to expand their services in this location, including the possible expansion of the hospital to provide more comprehensive services for the community. However, the site's Green Belt designation would make it difficult for any planning application proposing additional built form to provide further healthcare services to be considered acceptable. The subject site is considered available, suitable and deliverable within the 5-10 year period of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24024 - 7286 - POLICY NE9: GREEN BELT - None

25971 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, there is no clear strategy for villages and has not considered brownfield sites which should be prioritised over Green Belt sites, this is developer led and not thought through by BBC, ignored adjacent authority development, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, the number of homes will overwhelm village - school and GP. Parking already a problem and shops, cafes, pubs already insufficient. Extend the urban development to Brentwood town instead.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. In accordance with local needs smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the chance to down size releasing their larger homes.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25971 - 8657 - POLICY NE9: GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

22704 Support

Respondent: Mrs Christine Blythe [4718]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The current pre-submission document is both a sound plan and legally compliant. It is the result of a positively framed, technically researched, participatory process that began some ten years ago. I support the sequential land-use approach, in particular Policy NE9 and Policy NE13.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22704 - 4718 - POLICY NE9: GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23759 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: It is considered necessary that the Local Plan makes clear where land is being removed from the Green Belt (such as in respect of the allocation contained in Policy E11). It is suggested that text is added to this policy to clarify that the Local Plan is altering the Green Belt boundaries.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23759 - 5124 - POLICY NE9: GREEN BELT - i, iv

24053 Support**Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]****Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]**

Summary: Policy NE09: Green Belt seeks that the Metropolitan Green Belt within Brentwood Borough will be preserved from inappropriate development so that it continues to main openness and serve key functions. Policy NE09 states that all development proposals within the Green Belt will be considered in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of the NPPF on "Protecting Green Belt Land". It is therefore considered that policy NE09 is "justified" and sound, in the light of national policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24053 - 2656 - POLICY NE9: GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24358 Support**Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]**

Summary: Policy NE9 is supported. The Council has recognised the need to release some land from the Green Belt in order to meet its housing and employment needs. However, the land that will remain within the Green Belt should be protected throughout the Plan period and Policy NE9 achieves this, in accordance with the NPPF.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24358 - 8371 - POLICY NE9: GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment POLICY NE10: NEW DEVELOPMENT, EXTENSION AND REPLACEMENT OF BUILDINGS IN THE GREEN BELT

22430 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Policy NE10 A. b. as currently proposed considers the provision of education and community uses as an exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

It is recommended that criterion A. b. of Policy NE10 is deleted (see earlier comments in relation to Policy PC15 - Education Facilities).

Change To Plan: Delete criterion A. b. from Policy NE10.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22430 - 6776 - POLICY NE10: NEW DEVELOPMENT, EXTENSION AND REPLACEMENT OF BUILDINGS IN THE GREEN BELT - iv

23804 Object**Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]****Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]**

Summary: COMMENT: West Horndon is not within green belt, so it is unclear what purpose reference to it in this policy serves.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23804 - 3738 - POLICY NE10: NEW DEVELOPMENT, EXTENSION AND REPLACEMENT OF BUILDINGS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

22382 Support**Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This policy is supported due to the exception made for the principle of new buildings/structures for outdoor sport in the Green Belt. The encouragement of the beneficial use of the Green Belt including opportunities for improving outdoor sport and recreation is also welcomed. The policy approach is considered to accord with the Government's policy approach to outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt in the NPPF.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22382 - 4294 - POLICY NE10: NEW DEVELOPMENT, EXTENSION AND REPLACEMENT OF BUILDINGS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.98

22431 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Paragraph 8.98 b. refers to new buildings or extension for education and community uses which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green belt location as an exception to inappropriate development, as set out in paragraphs 145 and 146 of the NPPF. The NPPF does not include this exception.

It is recommended that criterion b. of paragraph 8.98 is deleted (see earlier comments in relation to Policy PC15 - Education Facilities).

Change To Plan: Delete criterion b. from paragraph 8.98.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22431 - 6776 - 8.98 - iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.99

22432 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

It is recommended that paragraph 8.99 is amended (see earlier comments in relation to Policy PC15 - Education Facilities).

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 8.99 as follows -

The Council acknowledges that due to the extent of the Green Belt in Brentwood there may be instances where new buildings related to community or educational uses may be proposed e.g. a new village hall, ancillary buildings related to an existing school. In accordance with the NPPF, these types of uses will be considered inappropriate development. However, the locational need for these types of uses will be given appropriate weight when considering whether there are very special circumstances that weigh in favour of the proposals.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22432 - 6776 - 8.99 - iv

25824 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25824 - 4693 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii

25833 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.)and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25833 - 8136 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii, iv

25916 Object

Respondent: Mr Luke Holmes [8652]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25916 - 8652 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii

25925 Object

Respondent: Miss Ami Holmes [8653]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25925 - 8653 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii

25955 Object

Respondent: Mr Ben Holmes [8654]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25955 - 8654 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii

25963 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Holmes [8655]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25963 - 8655 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii

26008 Object**Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26008 - 8660 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii, iv

26029 Object**Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26029 - 8662 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii

26046 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: The flooding of a few years ago has just been alleviated this would cause more problems in that area. Blackmore would be unable to cope with this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26046 - 8668 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii

26056 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26056 - 7304 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii, iv

26084 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Failure to comply with the NPPF by setting out strategic policies to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape. No 'positive strategy for the 'conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment', including those heritage assets that are most at risk. Assets should be recognised as being an 'irreplaceable resource' that should be conserved in a 'manner appropriate to their significance', taking account of 'the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits' that conservation can bring, whilst also recognising the positive contribution new development can make to local character and distinctiveness.

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26084 - 4275 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii, iv

26106 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Some of the proposed sites in Blackmore are incredibly vital to the survival of certain types of wildlife in the English countryside -we have seen a huge decline in the hedgehog population countrywide in the last few years and the green sites around Blackmore provide a safe haven for these creatures

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26106 - 8677 - 8.101 - i, iii, iv

26330 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brownfield site should be developed. No development on green belt should be permitted.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26330 - 8720 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii, iv

26368 Object**Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC should be consulting with other local authorities to increase development on already allocated brownfield sites, where a far better infrastructure is already in place, including roads and public services. This would have a far lesser impact on the surrounding environment than building on greenbelt land, which should be considered as the last resort for development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to which set out local needs for housing

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26368 - 4618 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii, iv

26428 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites should be developed first before developing greenbelt. BBC have not utilized all available brownfield site.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26428 - 8742 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii, iv

26435 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites should be developed first before developing greenbelt. BBC have not utilized all available brownfield site.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26435 - 8741 - 8.101 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment POLICY NE11: ESTABLISHED AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT AND STRUCTURES IN THE GREEN BELT

22433 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Policy NE11 B. as currently proposed considers the provision of education and community uses as an exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The NPPF does not include this exception.

It is recommended that criterion B. of Policy NE11 is deleted (see earlier comments in relation to Policy PC15 - Education Facilities).

Change To Plan: Delete criterion B. from Policy NE11.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22433 - 6776 - POLICY NE11: ESTABLISHED AREAS OF DEVELOPMENT AND STRUCTURES IN THE GREEN BELT - iv

23890 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]

Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]

Summary: Criterion A(d) requires the provision of community benefits in order to redevelop PDL in the Green Belt. This is not a requirement set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF and therefore it is inconsistent with national policy. Criterion A(e) requires the provision of travel links. This is a potentially onerous requirement for the scale of development that may be proposed and again is not a requirement set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF. It is therefore inconsistent with national policy.

Change To Plan: Delete Criteria A(d) and (e) in order to comply with the NPPF.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23890 - 6669 - POLICY NE12: PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND IN GREEN BELT - i

23712 Support

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: Policy NE12 is supported as it would better reflect the use of previously developed land in the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23712 - 8337 - POLICY NE12: PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND IN GREEN BELT - None

23823 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy NE12 is supported as it would better reflect the use of previously developed land in the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23823 - 303 - POLICY NE12: PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND IN GREEN BELT - None

23855 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy NE12 is supported as it would better reflect the use of previously developed land in the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23855 - 4656 - POLICY NE12: PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND IN GREEN BELT - None

22490 Object

Respondent: Hallam Land Management Limited [8258]

Agent: Marrons Planning (Dan Robinson-Wells) [7959]

Summary: In order to meet the Borough's minimum housing need and address unmet needs elsewhere, the Draft Plan should be providing more land for housing and thereby releasing more land from its Green Belt in order to promote sustainable patterns of development as required by Paragraph 138 of the Framework.

Land at Calcott Hall Farm warrants release from the Green Belt as its development would contribute towards sustainable development and meeting housing needs where they arise, without undermining the integrity of the Green Belt within the Borough.

Additional land should be safeguarded to meet longer term development needs.

Change To Plan: The Plan needs to consider safeguarding land in order to meet longer term development needs.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22490 - 8258 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23342 Object

Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23342 - 8313 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23439 Object

Respondent: Mr Benjamin Rumary [8324]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object: in relation to sites R25 and R26

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23439 - 8324 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23475 Object

Respondent: Mr Marc Cohen [4268]

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23475 - 4268 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23546 Object

Respondent: Mr David Barfoot [7177]

Agent: N/A

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23546 - 7177 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23558 Object**Respondent: Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green Belt land is identified as green belt for a reason. There are other areas that can be built on which do not impact on small already strained village.

Change To Plan: SCHOOL! This is a local village one form entry school, which is already oversubscribed. More houses equal more children.
TRAFFIC! Blackmore is already congested with cars and for parking, We do not want more traffic spoiling this beautiful village.
GP. Already overcrowded and will be put under more strain.
There is not a need for more houses here in such a small village

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23558 - 7200 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23567 Object**Respondent: Ms Eleanora Barfoot [8328]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23567 - 8328 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23571 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hayley Hammond [8329]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object (no reason given)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23571 - 8329 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23575 Object**Respondent: Sadie Barfoot [8330]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23575 - 8330 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23633 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Evans [8332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object (no reason supplied)

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23633 - 8332 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23760 Object**Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]**

Summary: The policy should be amended to provide clarity that sites are being removed to enable employment needs to be met, in addition to housing. It should be recognised that the development of employment uses has intrinsic community benefits, with resultant social and economic gains.

Change To Plan: Amend to provide clarity that sites are being removed to enable employment needs to be met, in addition to housing.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23760 - 5124 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23891 Object**Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]****Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]**

Summary: Criterion A of this policy requires the delivery of significant community benefits and the wording of the supporting text advises that this is to 'repay' the loss of Green Belt. The release of these sites is to meet housing needs and therefore is self-evidently provide significant community benefits. The requirement for additional provision above and beyond this suggests that the developer has a choice of sites to develop, which is clearly not the case. This requirement is therefore unreasonable, unjustified and inconsistent with national policy.

Change To Plan: delete criterion A

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23891 - 6669 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i

23892 Object**Respondent: Redrow Homes [6669]****Agent: Pegasus Group (Ms Nicky Parsons) [6706]**

Summary: Criterion B advises that allocated sites 'will be' deallocated from the Green Belt. As the removal of land from the Green Belt can only come about through the preparation of a development plan this de-allocation must happen upon adoption of the plan and not presented as a future intention.

Change To Plan: Amend 'will be' in criterion B to 'are'.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23892 - 6669 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i

24006 Object**Respondent: CALA Homes [5237]****Agent: JB Planning Associates Ltd. (Mr. John Boyd) [469]**

Summary: Strongly object. Policy fails to accord with what tests for seeking Planning Obligations set out in Paragraph 56 of the NPPF. It would be both inappropriate and unreasonable to expect developers and landowners to make provision to meet the needs of surrounding existing communities, rather than addressing the actual needs that would arise from new development. Such an approach would be unlawful. Opportunities for onsite provision of new "significant" community facilities on smaller scale Green Belt releases are limited and any contributions made towards offsite provision should not go beyond CIL.

Change To Plan: The following amendments are proposed to the text of Policy NE13:

Paragraph A: delete the whole paragraph the deletion of Section A of the policy in order that the wording is compliant with national policy.

Paragraph B: amend as follow: These sites will be removed from the Green Belt to allow development to take place and provide new defensible boundaries to protect the open countryside for future generations. Site boundaries to form the new Green Belt boundaries are set out on relevant sites in Appendix 2.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24006 - 5237 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

24076 Object**Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]****Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]**

Summary: Object to NE 13 text "expected to provide significant community benefits, both for surrounding existing communities and those moving into new homes on site" as aspirational and unjustified. Need to release Green Belt to ensure meeting boroughs local housing need. Policy not sound, or justified as it doesn't seek significant community benefits as required by NPPF, paras55-57.

Change To Plan: LLLP conclude that Point A of Policy NE13 should be deleted. Paragraph 8.114 should also be deleted or re-drafted to be explicit and entirely clear that the community benefits sought from meeting housing needs on sites released from the Green Belt will only be secured in accordance with the relevant statutory tests and national planning policies.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24076 - 8362 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - ii, iii

24183 Object**Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]****Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]**

Summary: In Chapter 9 neither the text nor the individual allocations, for example RO3, Land north of Shenfield, a Green Belt site, make any reference to Green Belt boundary changes and their justification. Policy NE13, Site Allocations in the Green Belt, provides firstly for such sites to provide significant community benefits and secondly that: "These sites will be de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place and provide new defensible boundaries to protect the open countryside for future generations. Site boundaries to form the new Green Belt boundaries are set out on relevant sites in Appendix 2." short para (8.117) provides some explanation for the quoted section of the policy: "This policy also sets out the principles of removing allocated Green Belt development sites from the Green Belt. This de-allocation will allow for planning applications to be considered within the context of policies within this Plan as well as national policy and guidance." The term "will be" in the policy and the references to setting out the principles and planning applications in the supporting text make it unclear whether the Green Belt boundary changes are affected in the Draft Plan or they need to be justified by subsequent planning applications.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place...4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24183 - 7948 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24205 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The only shop is a small Co-op which already can't cope. Not long ago our post office moved to the Co-op giving a very unsatisfactory service. There just isn't enough room to support such a service.

Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24205 - 7195 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24206 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, its position is very isolated with narrow country roads. The bus service is very limited. Parking is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24206 - 7195 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24212 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The one school is already full.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24212 - 7195 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24218 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The nearby doctors surgery is severely overstretched.

Change To Plan: remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24218 - 7195 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24224 Object	Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Flooding is already a problem, I fear this would only get worse.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24224 - 7195 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv	
24230 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The accessibility including Red Rose Lane in particular is not sufficient and even farm vehicles struggle and have to bypass the village. It is already difficult to park/access the single village shop/Post Office along with the influx of the tea room which uses up all of the current parking resource available. Red Rose Lane is very narrow/winding road unsuitable for any increase in traffic. It is already dangerous with no pavements and is in constant use by dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24230 - 8370 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv	
24236 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The village school will not cope.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24236 - 8370 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv	
24242 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The doctors surgery will not cope.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24242 - 8370 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv	
24248 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose Lane regularly floods as do other areas of the village and this will be made worse by any further developments.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24248 - 8370 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv	
24307 Object	Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]	Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]
Summary:	We welcome the PSLP's intentions to remove sites R23 and R24 from the Green Belt. This calls into question the need for Policy NE13. The requirements set out by criterion A and B are dealt with by other policies in the Plan. If there are site specific requirements relating to sites, these should be covered within the specific policies relating to those sites.	
Change To Plan:	Delete Policy NE13	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24307 - 2741 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv	

24333 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: We welcome the PSLP's intentions to remove sites R23 and R24 from the Green Belt. This calls into question the need for Policy NE13. The requirements set out by criterion A and B are dealt with by other policies in the Plan. If there are site specific requirements relating to sites, these should be covered within the specific policies relating to those sites.

Change To Plan: Delete Policy NE13

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24333 - 2741 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24359 Object

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: It is considered that Policy NE13 should be removed from the PSLP. The criteria of the policy can be included other policies, such as the site specific policy for Childerditch Industrial Estate (Policy E12), and it is therefore not considered necessary to have a standalone policy duplicating these points. Furthermore, it is queried why the policy refers to the benefits of housing sites only and no other land uses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24359 - 8371 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24423 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There must be more suitable brownfield sites within the borough that having to build on Green Belt in Blackmore. Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore. Blackmore has been disproportionately targeted with a 30% increase in the current population proposed. The Blackmore sites of R25 and R26 are entirely unsuitable for large scale development

Change To Plan: The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the plans should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out the Blackmore local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24423 - 8375 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24441 Object

Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24441 - 8378 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24460 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26 should not be allocated. There are errors in the plan, population states 829 but does not include houses past Red Rose Lane or the residents in Chelmsford Road and Traveller site. Duty to cooperate. Red Rose Lane is single track and won't cope with more traffic; Flood Risk and Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R26. The local school is at capacity with no room for more children. The doctors is too at capacity, waiting times are bad already. Electricity and services won't be able to cope with 70 extra houses.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24460 - 8379 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24473 Object**Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound: Green field sites being proposed when there is alternative brownfield sites available in the borough ie Stondon Massey & South Weald

Change To Plan: Refer to BHVA Neighbourhood Plan - remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24473 - 8380 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24481 Object**Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are in the green belt and should not be allocated.

Change To Plan: See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24481 - 8381 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24493 Object**Respondent: Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green Belt land should not be used for building houses. The building of the proposed houses is totally unacceptable in this village. There doesn't seem to be any thought given to the local area.

Change To Plan: The use of brownfield sites to build a modest amount of houses would be much more acceptable to most people in the local areas.
DO NOT build on Green Belt or Green Field sites for the good of the environment and wildlife. [Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24493 - 8002 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24497 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Reed [4708]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound. Infrastructure already fails local needs: flood risk, school and doctors surgery at over capacity & struggle to cope, poor (virtually non existent) bus service, roads not suitable, insufficient parking in village centre. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities (ie: Epping and Chelmsford). Sites mentioned not suitable, Alternative sites (that are better suited have been ignored. There has been no "housing needs" survey.

Change To Plan: The only practical solution is to remove sites R25 and R26. Take heed of the BVHA neighbourhood plan which identifies the actual requirement of local residents and proposes better suited alternative sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24497 - 4708 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24504 Object**Respondent: Dr Belinda Dunbar [8382]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to sites R25 and R26.

Local GP services and schools are already struggling to cope. There is no consideration of increasing the GP services to cope with additional houses.

The access roads are not adequate to take the increased volume of traffic the extra homes will bring.

Flooding occurs in the area during heavy rainfall, building more homes will add to these problems.

Green Belt should be retained.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 & R26 from the Local Plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which sets out our local housing needs and that the Blackmore community is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24504 - 8382 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24505 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Robinson [4899]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: As far as I am aware no "housing needs survey" has been performed to show why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Blackmore is an established village and it would appear that an increase in demand on the infrastructure is not viable. I understand that the village school s full and the Deal Tree medical centre is reported to have one of the highest patient to practitioner ratios in certainly Essex. The access onto and off Red Rose Lane will not be suitable for the anticipated increase in traffic. The sites R25 and R26 have over the years suffered from persistent flooding. I believe that around 30 houses are being or will be constructed at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 need to be removed from the plan. I suggest the lanners need to read the BVHA neighbourhood plan which includes the Blackmore local housing requirements for what is clearly an existing sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24505 - 4899 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24527 Object**Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a great village but it will not cope with another mass of houses building on this piece of Green Belt will only encourage more farmers to sell once they cross the line this village will spread. BBC have broken the Green Belt rules.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting. It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24527 - 8388 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24546 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul De Rosa [8393]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24546 - 8393 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24555 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 8 Para 8.85, 8.90. 8.101; Policy NE13
Green Belt land, unacceptable to build on. Wildlife destroyed

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24555 - 8392 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24580 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development.. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24580 - 4874 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24612 Object

Respondent: Mr Pete Vince [8123]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.

Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.

Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24612 - 8123 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24617 Object

Respondent: Mr Lyall Vince [8403]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.

Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.

Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24617 - 8403 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24622 Object

Respondent: Mrs Tina Wilding [8405]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound because: Doctors, School, Green Belt Land, Local transport - buses. Green Belt Land. The area the houses are being built on Green Belt land so the beautiful village will become overcrowded and the countryside ruined, so it affects all the local wildlife and wild animals too.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24622 - 8405 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24630 Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A residential development such as has been submitted for Blackmore will further stretch infrastructure (roads, parking, schooling, doctors, etc). There are more sustainable locations in the borough. There are "brown field" sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. This area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23 June 2016).

Change To Plan: A residential development such as has been submitted for Blackmore will further stretch infrastructure (roads, parking, schooling, doctors, etc). There are more sustainable locations in the borough. There are "brown field" sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. This area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23 June 2016).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24630 - 8406 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24640 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Wilding [8409]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services being overwhelmed: schools; doctors; transportation hubs; more crime ie: not enough police; more demand on firefighters. More cars on road leading to very dangerous conditions for young children on footpaths.

Change To Plan: Cancel the project. Blackmore and its environs are already in danger of forever being changed. There are plenty of other brownfield sites in Brentwood to consider, we have already had our fair share of new builds in Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24640 - 8409 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24653 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Both R25 and R26 are in Green Belt, in Blackmore a settlement Category 3. Adding 70 homes here is neither appropriate to the rural setting nor is it brown field development. There is also no justification as to why Blackmore, amongst a number of other settlements should be "excluded from the Green Belt" (paragraph 8.90).

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24653 - 8411 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24664 Object**Respondent: Mrs Edna Williams [4728]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26: The plan is unsound.

a) There has been no evidence produced to show that there is a need for this size of development in Blackmore

b) There has been no discussion or cooperation with any local bodies 30 houses have just been built just outside the village in EFDC area that will impact on the village

c) There are many aspects that do not comply with the NPPF Guidance.

Protection of Green Belt

Development located to minimize travel

Local community not consulted

No proven local need

Change To Plan: All of the points should be reassessed with local involvement.

Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24664 - 4728 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24674 Object

Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The removal of Blackmore from the designated Green Belt areas is unsound and the very suggestion that it be counted with Mountnessing and Ingrave in being suitable for additional development is unsound and frankly perverse in that there are poor public transport and only minor roads (several of which have notices to say they are unsuitable for heavy traffic) and other infrastructure in Blackmore village compared to these other towns on A roads with all day frequent bus services. The developments assigned to Villages to the North of Brentwood with poor infrastructure, amenity (full schools, GP surgery under pressure already etc.) and transport links (and concentrated principally on Blackmore in the Green Belt) falls most tests of rationality or lack coherent Justification. "Least worst" Is not an acceptable rationale when thoroughly acceptable alternatives are being denied.

Change To Plan:

- * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
- * Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Forest District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
- * Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
- * Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
- * Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
- * Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
- * Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there Is already a severe flooding problem which the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
- * Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24674 - 1830 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24678 Object

Respondent: Ms Shirley Dearlove [8415]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 combined with developments in Epping Forest DC area will put extreme pressure on the infrastructure and facilities of Blackmore. There has been inadequate consultation between Brentwood BC and Epping Forest DC. Blackmore should be a category 4 (small village) not 3 (large village) due to it's low population (829), it only has one shop and one small primary school. The existing doctors surgery is already struggling and will be made worse by these proposals. Existing recorded flooding issues will be exacerbated. No housing needs survey has been carried out. Contradicts previous 2016 iteration of the Local Plan which sought to limit growth in rural areas to retain local character. Development should be located in more sustainable locations such as Brentwood or Dunton Hills.

Change To Plan: The above sites should be removed from the LDP and the planners should refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan. This clearly sets out the village's local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24678 - 8415 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24684 Object

Respondent: Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound. It will put pressure on rural infrastructure. The character of the village will be impacted. It is currently enjoyed by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. It will put pressure on local lanes. Bus services are infrequent. Medical centre, shop and school also impacted adversely. Other areas such as brownfield land should be developed first.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Heritage Village Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24684 - 8417 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24695 Object**Respondent: Mr Desmond Temple [8420]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections: 04; 08; 09: see attached. Site allocations, disproportionate growth to Blackmore, flood risk, green belt. Blackmore infrastructure cannot cope now, without all the planned dwellings, We cant park in the village, our school is full, doctors waiting time is lengthy.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24695 - 8420 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24739 Object**Respondent: Mrs Patricia Dean [8434]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I do not think the houses should be built on Green Belt land in Blackmore. It would put untold pressure on an already busy doctors surgery, on the small local school, public transport, parking etc.
There are more suitable sites sustainable locations. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services.

Change To Plan: I fully agree with the objectives of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24739 - 8434 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24768 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8442]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites , not Green Belt, ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 form plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24768 - 8442 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24790 Object**Respondent: Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for villages, why Blackmore and not others that have no special historic centre. Other locations must be more sustainable and suitable. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities, 30 homes on Fingrith Hall Lane. Blackmore Village is isolated, school is full, GP is 4 weeks for an appointment, parking in village in dangerous. Children and pensioners are at risk from this. Bus service is infrequent. More residents = more vehicles. More traffic will cause more air pollution bad for people and historic buildings. Sites are on Green Belt land, should use brownfield, not identified by BBC. Redrose Lane too narrow and floods severely, June 2016 floods across village. Sewers can't cope. Should increase densities on other proposed sites. Will increase village by 30%. Unauthorised travellers site will add to the impact on school, GP, local amenities. Has this been taken into account?

Change To Plan: I believe that R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the Blackmore village Heritage Association "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out our local housing needs to avoid further development locally.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24790 - 8175 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24819 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Webb [4919]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are Brownfield sites available nearby (Red Rose Farm as one example) but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong. The infrastructure (bus services, roads, village facilities, doctors, school) simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

11. Other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore which is not a sustainable development proposal. The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community. Also remove the Site GT 16 - a II 8 previously unapproved pitches. Leave Blackmore IN Green Belt and restore the classification of "Rural Village in a sparse setting (which it is for roads, Buses, etc. etc. it really is) I am very unhappy that you have chosen to issue such a difficult form to complete with wholly unnecessary/inappropriate personal elements in Section A. It has taken me an unacceptable amount of time to understand and complete. I am very tempted to believe this is a deliberate attempt to stifle meaningful comment. A lot of people who hold views exactly like mine HAVE been put off from objecting because of this.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24819 - 4919 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24824 Object

Respondent: Mr Adrian Quick [8451]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Refer to attached form. The infrastructure is already stretched, and these additional developments would have a significant negative impact to the local community including provision for medical services and schooling. Bus services to larger employment locations (Brentwood Chelmsford, Epping) are totally inadequate. The designated sites have flooding issues, a problems across wider Blackmore footprint and development will cause further problems, increasing the flood rate. There are other Brownfield sites within existing urban boundaries (and local infrastructure and transport grids) better suited to development, negating the need to destroy Green Belt environments. There has been no evidence that Blackmore has a housing need requiring such scale of development. Sites R25 and R26 should be removed form the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed form the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24824 - 8451 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24830 Object

Respondent: Mr Ronald Quested [8452]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is not suitable location for large number of new homes. This village walk to the shops, hall, school, etc. Already a problem with speeding and parking. More traffic will exacerbate this. 30 new homes on Fingrth Hall Lane not taken into account. Other locations more sustainable and suitable. Use brownfield sites not Green Belt. Consider surrounding villages. Village is historic, Impact on school and GP surgery will be huge. Major risk of flooding in parts of village. "016across the village, homes flooded and cars stuck. More housing will exacerbate this. Where is a Blackmore Housing Needs Survey.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP> The 'Neighbourhood Plan' from the BVHA should be looked at by the planners. This clearly sets out the local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24830 - 8452 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25007 Object

Respondent: Mr John Ginivan [8476]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is rural and isolated with inadequate services and infrastructure to accommodate planned development. Brentwood BC have not look at the use of brownfield sites to take priority over greenfield (and Green Belt) land off Red Rose Lane. No survey has been carried out to justify why Blackmore needs to be developed. Access onto Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for the proposed volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25007 - 8476 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25013 Object**Respondent: Miss Claire Grant [8478]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Will increase existing flooding issues in and around village.
 Proposals should be reduced to 30 dwellings to allow community to cope.
 Facilities are already struggling.
 Should focus building in Brentwood.
 The recent development in Epping Forest DC is on the same road.
 Traffic will be a nightmare as Blackmore is already used as a cut through.
 No housing needs survey;
 Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy traffic.

Change To Plan: Road network to be improved, including road widening from A414 to the village. Suitable drainage, speed restrictions etc.
 Increased NHS facilities as it is impossible to get a doctors appointment at Deal Tree health centre.
 Development of local school facility to cope with an increase of 100 families in the area.
 The current local shop/post office is inadequate in size to cope and will need to increase.
 Increases in public transport.
 Flood improvements and preventative measures to be put in place.
 Increase parking facilities (nightmare as it is already!)

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25013 - 8478 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25015 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Sanders [8474]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan unsound because: needs a housing survey no consideration of infrastructure is given, school is full, 6-8 week wait for GP appointment, no local employment, limited public transport, local roads narrow and cant cope with more traffic, village becomes gridlocked due to parking.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey to be undertaken, build on Brownfield sites first, build types of houses needed in Blackmore. I support the BVH mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25015 - 8474 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25033 Object**Respondent: Ms Victoria Sanders [8482]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan unsound because: needs a housing survey no consideration or research of infrastructure is given, regarding lack of public transport, condition of roads, no parking in village, School oversubscribes and over 8 week wait for GP appointment. This will be made worse by increased population and not considered or tackled.
 Build on brownfield sites first and conduct a housing survey. Build the types of houses which are needed by the people of Blackmore. The reasons are self explanatory. I support the BHVA.

Change To Plan: Build on brownfield sites first and conduct a housing survey. Build the types of houses which are needed by the people of Blackmore. The reasons are self explanatory. I support the BHVA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25033 - 8482 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25050 Object**Respondent: Mr Alan Snook [8484]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This is Green Belt and should be kept that way. There at not enough community facilities in the area. IE: doctors surgeries, buses, rubbish clearance, sewerage, road infrastructure is not adequate for extra traffic, The plan is totally unsound in respect of Blackmore.
 I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission. I wish to be represented by BVHA.

Change To Plan: I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission. I wish to be represented by BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25050 - 8484 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25072 Object

Respondent: Mrs Josephine Snook [8489]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound relating to Blackmore because; Green Belt land should not be built on. Cant get a doctors appointment as it is. The village is liable to flooding. Red Rose Lane is way too narrow for an access point, The clues in the title (lane). There are other more suitable sites.
I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission.

Change To Plan: I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25072 - 8489 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25374 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Sanders [4923]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound, needs housing need survey, infrastructure not sufficient, school, GP appointment delay, no employment in village, non existent public transport, lanes narrow and unsuitable, grid locked village centre already, parking problems.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey should be completed, build on brownfield sites, build type of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25374 - 4923 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25400 Object

Respondent: Mrs Debbie Stevens [8509]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. No consultation with adjoining boroughs, Huge effect on Blackmore primary school almost full, health centre almost full. As a parent we are able to walk to primary school. In 13 years I am more worried of number of illegally parked vehicles outside the school, Woollard Way is near school, the increase in the number of speeding vehicles. More residents would make traffic worse. More traffic exiting Woollard Way 100 yards from already busy school. This is a risk that should not be taken, This whole project is a business deal with not consideration at all to the residents - the people!

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25400 - 8509 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25402 Object

Respondent: Mr Craig Stevens [4958]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. No consultation with adjoining boroughs, new homes wil drain resources, impact on local school, already at capacity, as is GP. Will increase local traffic by at least 300 vehicles, Increase local traffic, road risks, road damage, and local roads not suitable for this r plant machinery. BBC failed to demonstrate that there aren't more suitable locations, already more suitable brownfield sites before green belt. Level 3 flood risk in village, new development will increase this risk downstream, roads and homes. No strategy on this impact on Blackmore. Blackmore is of historical heritage and importance new homes will heavily impact on this. These changes will be damaging and irrevocable and seemed to have been totally ignored by the planners to date.

Conduct a meaningful local housing survey with residents and listen to and respond to the concerns and needs of local residents before any planning decisions are made, It is my opinion that after meaningful consultation with local residents and a large and appropriate reduction in proposed development, small scale sympathetic development would be welcomed and supported.

Change To Plan: Conduct a meaningful local housing survey with residents and listen to and respond to the concerns and needs of local residents before any planning decisions are made, It is my opinion that after meaningful consultation with local residents and a large and appropriate reduction in proposed development, small scale sympathetic development would be welcomed and supported.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25402 - 4958 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25406 Object

Respondent: Mrs Malanie Sanders [8511]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. Unsound plan: no housing need survey, not sustainable as no infrastructure consideration, particularly as school full, 6-8 week wait for GP, no jobs available in village, no public transport, roads narrow and unsuitable, in area by shop it gets gridlocked due to parked cars.
Housing needs survey should be undertaken, build on brownfield sites first, build the types of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey should be undertaken, build on brownfield sites first, build the types of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25406 - 8511 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25428 Object**Respondent: Mrs Anne Sands [8514]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 4, 8, 9 - R25 and R26. Unsound because: too much traffic in the village, Blackmore school is bursting plus morning traffic is increasing and dangerous, Flood risk, not enough parking in the village, doctors appointments already like gold dust, narrow lanes, risk for the cyclists and horse riders.
Take R25 and R26 OUT of the LDP and please consider BVHA consultation plan.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 OUT of the LDP and please consider BVHA consultation plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25428 - 8514 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25464 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Sands [8525]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 4,8, 9_ policies R25 and R26. Unsound. Protect Green Belt, my house id built on a building envelope and for this I paid a premium, flood rick, unsuitable roads, health risk form more traffic, parking issues, GP over run, village attracts and encourages cyclists, impact to existing village wildlife increase on local services - rubbish collection, recycling.

Change To Plan: Sections 4,8, 9_ policies R25 and R26. Blackmore is an historic village renowned for its village feel and qualities. The reason it has remained jewel in Essex is because of the protected Green Belt land. The government encourage "brownfield" site to be built on and there are many more suitable site, which would not impact on this traditional English village, Access in these medieval country lanes is not suitable for the increase volume of cars, The school & doctors would be unable to cope with this large growth in the population, and this would have an impact of the villagers wellbeing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25464 - 8525 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25504 Object**Respondent: Mrs Melanie Simpson [8539]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26
Section 04 - Policy SP01 ad SP02
Section 08. Policy Ne06 paras 8.85; 8.90; 8.101
BBC not considered lack of infrastructure in area, schools, doctors, buses, roads, bin collection, etc. Sites are Green Belt green field, us brownfield. There was no housing need survey. Village prone to flood, more houses will exacerbate this.

Change To Plan: I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.
Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.
Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25504 - 8539 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii

25507 Object**Respondent: Mrs Gladys Skinner [8540]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections R04, R08 (flood and Green Belt) and R09 Blackmore Village doesn't have the infrastructure for houses in Red Rose Lane, The volume of traffic at present has already reached its limit. Also I understand that flooding could be a real possibility.
Sites R25 and R26 should be remove from the plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be remove from the plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25507 - 8540 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25533 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Simpson [4462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09 Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200; Policy R26, 9.201-9.205:

Section 4 Policy SP01-D(a) D (f) Para 4.9,4.2; Policy SP02

Section 8: Policy NE 06, 8.5-8.64 - para 8.85 (iv), 8.90, 8.101; Policy NE13

As a local teacher I worry about the impact on local infrastructure that is already struggling. Schools, doctors, buses, roads. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services that cannot cope with further pressure on the services. There needs to be a housing needs survey. Brownfield sites should be used. Access from/to red Rose lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic; the village is prone to flooding and when it does Red Rose land is the only way through the village - if there are homes built will this increase the flooding? There is no clear strategy for BBC on this proposal.

Change To Plan: Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25533 - 4462 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25540 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04, 08 09 - R25 R26

Limited consultation on this with neighbouring authorities, no housing needs survey, stretched infrastructure - school, GO, congestion, parking, bus services. Need evidence of other sites being considered, brownfield or urban extensions, which would regenerate the High Street,. Fields in village prone to flooding, new homes would increase this. Red Rose Lane is bounded by ancient hedgerows, providing a green boundary to Blackmore. This development would destroy that.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25540 - 8107 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25547 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Ratcliffe [5040]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04,
08 - Green Belt and Flooding
09 - R25 R26

There is no clear strategy for villages (Inc. Blackmore) in north of borough.

Principle of development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. There are modest services and infrastructure in Blackmore (an isolated village). School is full, GP waiting times are over 4 weeks, parking in the centre of the village is already a nightmare.

BBC not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met on other (allocated) sites.

There has been no housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Access on/off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic. Equally access via Woollard Way 'hammer heads' would be problematical.

Flooding in the village - proposed sites are liable to flood and therefore building on this land will also increase flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: I fully support the plan put forward by Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25547 - 5040 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

25552 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Romang [6974]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear strategy for rural communities in borough. Blackmore has been stripped of public services. No consideration of development already occurring around Blackmore, recent planning decisions in Blackmore to reduce the housing stock whilst 30 new homes on Fingrith Hall Lane with their impact on village. Neighbouring Councils not consulted. Development is ill considered as village has reduced public services, poor infrastructure, inadequate transport links, oversubscribed school and GP, parking problems, all cant cope with existing community. Parking controls not enforced, roads often unpassable. Development will push village envelop out into surrounding agricultural land and set an endless precedent for developers. This development, not mentioned in previous LDP drafts, does not demonstrate an example of sustainable development and more suitable sites appear to be available in Shenfield and Brentwood. Brownfields sites do not appear to have ben investigated fully and should take precedent over green belt. The ancient hedgerow boundary to Red Rose Lane also appears not to have been considered. It has been cut back hard for the first time in decades. Document doesn't demonstrate required housing density? For Brentwood cannot be included as part of the provision identified in other allocated sites in the borough. Housing needs survey not been done, so why was Blackmore selected for development and how would housing type be decided? Existing road infrastructure inadequate - congestion, parking, road sizes. Proposed sites and access roads are liable to flood and more homes increase this risk. Red Rose Lane floods regularly as does access to the village around the pond. Changes have been set out in the BVHA neighbourhood plan and I refer to this document. Happy to be represented by the BVHA and Roger Keeble

Change To Plan: Changes have been set out in the BVHA neighbourhood plan and I refer to this document. Happy to be represented by the BVHA and Roger Keeble

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25552 - 6974 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25559 Object

Respondent: Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04, 08, 09 - policy R25 and R26Blackmore village cannot cope with any further demand on its infrastructure. Presently school is at its capacity and medical centre is also struggling with patients having to wait unacceptable time to get an appointment.

Change To Plan: I agree with BVHA neighbourhood plan and planners need to heed th Blackmore local housing requirements.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25559 - 4897 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25592 Object

Respondent: Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policies: R25; R26; SP02; SP02; NE06; NE13
This will put intolerable pressure on GP services the local surgery fails to me demand. Blackmore is a small community based around a small number of roads that are not designed to meet the inevitable increase in traffic due to a wholly inadequate public transport service. It is the level and scale of this development that is excessive and inappropriate.
A significant reduction in the scale and number of houses to be built.

Change To Plan: A significant reduction in the scale and number of houses to be built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25592 - 8563 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii

25599 Object

Respondent: Mr Matthew Romang [8565]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 04; 08 - green belt flooding; 09 - R25 and R26
The strategy for rural villages like Blackmore isn't clear in the document, . Red Rose lane is unsuitable for an increase in traffic flow, due to the access onto/off of the road; the proposed sites are areas known for flooding and development will also increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore; the principle of the red rose lane development is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with limited infrastructure and poor public transport, which would struggle more.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25599 - 8565 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25605 Object

Respondent: Mr David Rolfs [8566]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC have pasted houses onto a Green Belt area around Blackmore to achieve that LDP targets and failed to consider the effects on the community and infrastructure. Additional housing around Blackmore not considered (32 new homes). Has BBC discussed local development with neighbouring councils? The effect on local Highways by additional housing. Blackmore village has a vibrant centre that has congestion due visitors to this with parking on pavements, parking on double yellow lines. Also no designated disabled parking spaces. No enforcement. This will be exacerbated by new homes. BBC say the developers have undertaken a flood survey for their land, what about adjacent land with the history of flooding. The school and GP are full, with long GP waiting list which will be exacerbated. Monies collected for infrastructure will be spent elsewhere. Parish Cllrs were not allowed to debate this in the full council meeting on 08 Nov 2018, this is undemocratic. Travellers site in Chelmsford Road was deemed illegal but now LDP making it legal but on what grounds? Previous development proposals there failed due to insufficient sewerage capacity, how will this be addressed. It is apparent that the Blackmore area is the "dumping ground" to make up the numbers and imposing a housing mix without carrying out a housing need survey.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25605 - 8566 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25611 Object

Respondent: Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Insufficient consultation with neighbouring boroughs; red Rose Lane is not suitable for access; Severe flooding in village will get worse and sewage pumping station cant cope; No housing need survey; Already problems with cars - congestion, parking, poor bus service,; destroy wildlife and habitat; green belt should be protected; primary school is full; no clear housing strategy to consider other sites than R25 and R26.

Change To Plan: As there seems to be considerable doubt that all aspects of the planning process have been adhered to R26 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Leave Blackmore in the Green Belt and restore its classification as a Rural Village in a setting with non f the amenities enjoyed by areas such as Mountnessing and Ingrave i.e. a through road., regular buses over an extended time frame, a doctors surgery that can be reached on foot. BBC should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out local housing need for our already sustainable community. Please note that this was a very difficult form to fill in as many on us have limited knowledge of the planning process!

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25611 - 8567 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii

25623 Object

Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are more suitable and/or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions or Brentwood, (Eg Honeypot Lane) and the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Green Field/Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore Village is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26 Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached Blackmore Village Survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan "available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25623 - 4874 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25666 Object

Respondent: Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 70 homes could end up with 280 people (4 people per household) plus at least 200 cars (or more). Infrastructure will not be able to cope with this amount. Schools, hospitals, doctors, traffic and litter and at the end of the day we have lost our Green Belt. Blackmore will end up the same as Billericay, a sprawl of estates.

Change To Plan: Please refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25666 - 8597 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25671 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Newcombe [8598]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The history of Blackmore many years ago was known as the black swamp and was a very wet area. This is why it is not a large village due to flood risk. Most of the land is given over to Green Belt because of this reason. There are many brown sites which could be used without flood risk.

Change To Plan: Please refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25671 - 8598 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25676 Object

Respondent: Miss Charlotte Newton [8599]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no discussions with the village regarding proposed development.
Should find out what needs improving before adding houses to the village.
Plenty of places elsewhere that need new housing.
Property in the village is not affordable but that's what makes it a lovely place to live.
Adding more houses has a negative effect on local/government services (e.g. schools, doctors, hospitals, teachers etc).
Would more building work be needed at the school to accommodate growth.
The village has small narrow roads not equipped for builders/machinery.
There is an issue with parking around the village especially during school term.

Change To Plan: Site that need removing from the LDP as follows: R26 and R25.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25676 - 8599 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25790 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Agree with points raised by BVHA - lack of school places, lack of parking, poor bus service, GP full, Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy vehicles and is narrow, dangerous for children to walk to school.

The form is complicated and full of legal jargon. Not clear even after visit to council offices. BVHA helping to portray view of myself and others. The borough set the building limits for Blackmore in the 1960s, considered infrastructure and Green Belt. Since then gas has been supplied and water pressure improved. We still have power cuts. The council set the village boundary and infrastructure right in the 1960s and has helped to preserve this wonderful village. There is no justification for the need to build on Green Belt land adjoining Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25790 - 8010 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25830 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25830 - 8136 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25902 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Bartrop [8650]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 08 Flood Risk and Green Belt
Section 09 R25 and R26

There doesn't appear to be any coherent strategy for the villages including Blackmore, strain on amenities, 4 weeks for GP appointment, limited bus service would mean more traffic. Brentwood Borough Council has not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increased housing density on other allocated sites, There is no housing need survey, sites are liable to flood and new homes will increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: A detailed housing needs survey needs to be undertaken for Blackmore Village and I endorse the objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25902 - 8650 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25906 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 08 Flood Risk and Green Belt
Section 09 R25 and R26

There doesn't appear to be any clear strategy for the villages including Blackmore, strain on facilities, such as school places and doctors. Very limited bus service and roads and lanes would be stretched and struggle to cope with more traffic. There is no housing need survey to say these sites are most suitable. Sites are liable to flood and new homes will increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: A detailed housing needs survey needs to be undertaken for Blackmore Village and I endorse the objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25906 - 8651 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25929 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25929 - 8574 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25935 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Foreman [4394]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools, Green Belt. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25935 - 4394 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25945 Object**Respondent: Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to the inclusion of Blackmore sites as strategy for site choice is not justified, impacts not detailed and no account of other recent development in the area.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore Sites should be removed from the Local Plan until there has been:
(1) A full housing need survey for Blackmore
(2) A proper consultation, including the BBC taking into account alternative sites
(3) A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25945 - 4547 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25967 Object

Respondent: Mr John Caton [4881]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, there is no clear strategy for villages and has not considered brownfield sites which should be prioritised over Green Belt sites, this is developer led and not thought through by BBC, ignored adjacent authority development, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, the number of homes will overwhelm village - school and GP. Parking already a problem and shops, cafes, pubs already insufficient. Extend the urban development to Brentwood town instead.

Change To Plan: Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan, which was properly composed and states what the village and villagers need. Far too many of what might have been thought of as affordable, have been extended, modified to the maximum and are no longer affordable. There are very few properties left in Blackmore of a smaller, single storey bungalow type. The sites R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP for the reasons give.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25967 - 4881 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25974 Object

Respondent: Mr Eugene Cullen [8658]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, not demonstrated that housing could not be reached by increasing housing elsewhere, there must be more suitable sites/locations like urban extension to Brentwood, there is no clear strategy for villages in north of borough, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, area prone to flooding and more homes will make this worse.

Change To Plan: Support BVHA in its mission

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25974 - 8658 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

25983 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The LDP states 8.90 that Blackmore & others are excluded from the Green Belt. There is no evidence provided for the comment and I would challenge the veracity of it. In fact BBC have classified in the LDP 4.23 Blackmore & Hook End developments as "Green Belt Land - Larger Villages". I can see an advantage for BBC if it were true, as it would avoid them having to come up with tortuous reasons to breach the rules for building on Green Belt. In conversations and meetings with BBC & their planning team they have never challenged our assertions that they are wrong to build on Green Belt. Policy NE13 A requires that Sites allocated to meet housing needs in the Green Belt will be expected to provide significant community benefits, both for the existing community and the new homes. The Blackmore sites provide no benefit for the existing community and in fact it would be a negative change.

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25983 - 4759 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii

25991 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The LDP states 8.90 that Blackmore & others are excluded from the Green Belt. There is no evidence provided for the comment and I would challenge the veracity of it. In fact BBC have classified in the LDP 4.23 Blackmore & Hook End developments as "Green Belt Land - Larger Villages". I can see an advantage for BBC if it were true, as it would avoid them having to come up with tortuous reasons to breach the rules for building on Green Belt. In conversations and meetings with BBC & their planning team they have never challenged our assertions that they are wrong to build on Green Belt. Policy NE13 A requires that Sites allocated to meet housing needs in the Green Belt will be expected to provide significant community benefits, both for the existing community and the new homes. The Blackmore sites provide no benefit for the existing community and in fact it would be a negative change.

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25991 - 4700 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii

26010 Object

Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26010 - 8660 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26031 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26031 - 8662 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii

26057 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26057 - 7304 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26086 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carole Cole [8675]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concerns over schools in the area, ie more traffic in and round Blackmore, Doddinghurst and nearby villages. Also Dr's surgery seems difficult to get appointments now, without new housing in the area.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 out of the plan and consider the alternatives.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26086 - 8675 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii

26087 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Failure to comply with the NPPF by setting out strategic policies to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape. No 'positive strategy for the 'conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment', including those heritage assets that are most at risk. Assets should be recognised as being an 'irreplaceable resource' that should be conserved in a 'manner appropriate to their significance', taking account of 'the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits' that conservation can bring, whilst also recognising the positive contribution new development can make to local character and distinctiveness

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26087 - 4275 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26107 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Some of the proposed sites in Blackmore are incredibly vital to the survival of certain types of wildlife in the English countryside -we have seen a huge decline in the hedgehog population countrywide in the last few years and the green sites around Blackmore provide a safe haven for these creatures

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26107 - 8677 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, iii, iv

26171 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Jones [8690]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26, Green Belt policy in section 08. the green Belt was set up to stop villages being changed for ever by over-building. I feel 70 houses is far too many but also feel a smaller number say 20 would be reasonable. The local schools and doctors will be overstretched. There is not enough public transport to sustain this number of houses proposed.

Change To Plan: I agree with the Blackmore Village heritage Association plans.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:Not Specified Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26171 - 8690 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26177 Object

Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8691]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound because: 1. Access at Redrose Lane unsuitable for traffic. 2. Available brownfield sites should take priority over greenbelt. 3. Blackmore is not equipped to deal with more population on this scale. The school and doctors surgery are already stretched to capacity. 4. There are more suitable / sustainable locations than Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26177 - 8691 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii

26180 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janet Jacobs [8692]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to 09 [R25 and R26], 04, 08

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26180 - 8692 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26199 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Owen [4760]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

Section 04

Section 08

Section 09 - policies R25 and R26.

Local plan is unsound due to failure to consult with Epping Forest District Council RE: 30 houses being built at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and impact on village.

There is not clear strategy for the village including Blackmore in the north of the borough.

Red Rose Lane is a narrow dangerous lane not road with a band which is blind for pedestrians and traffic with no pavement facilities. School parking is congested in this area impeding traffic into the village, at entry to Redrose Lane in Nine Ashes Road.

Doctors waiting lists for appointment is 4 weeks at times. The village is an unsafe area for pedestrians due to narrow uneven pavements and parking. Blackmore school is full to capacity. Buses for commuters without cars (teenagers etc) is unsatisfactory - no later than 7PL. Counted 8 Skylarks in fields adjacent to Nine Ashes Road last year, will they remain with heavier traffic on Rod? Blackmore Road floods (above waist high).

Change To Plan:

Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community. Such plans will merge Blackmore into an urban sprawl, something counter to Brentwood's statement to preserve our environment, heritage and character.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26199 - 4760 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26327 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

Brownfield site should be developed. No development on green belt should be permitted.

Change To Plan:

Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26327 - 8720 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26369 Object**Respondent: Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

BBC should be consulting with other local authorities to increase development on already allocated brownfield sites, where a far better infrastructure is already in place, including roads and public services. This would home a far lesser impact on the surrounding environment than building on greenbelt lane, which should be considered as the last resort for development.

Change To Plan:

Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan should be referred to which sets out local needs for housing.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26369 - 4618 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26375 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kim Barber [8731]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

Sever impact on Blackmore of construction of dwelling as village cannot support services, i.e. school, doctors, bus service, etc.

Change To Plan:

Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26375 - 8731 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26383 Object**Respondent: Mr. Colin Barber [919]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

Sever impact on Blackmore of construction of dwelling as village cannot support services, i.e. school, doctors, bus service, etc.

Change To Plan:

Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26383 - 919 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26429 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites should be developed first before developing greenbelt. BBC have not utilized all available brownfield site.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26429 - 8742 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

26434 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites should be developed first before developing greenbelt. BBC have not utilized all available brownfield site.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26434 - 8741 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

22705 Support**Respondent: Mrs Christine Blythe [4718]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The current pre-submission document is both a sound plan and legally compliant. It is the result of a positively framed, technically researched, participatory process that began some ten years ago. I support the sequential land-use approach, in particular Policy NE9 and Policy NE13.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22705 - 4718 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23713 Support**Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]****Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]**

Summary: NE 13 A and NE 13 B Supported as it makes clear that allocated sites are being taken out of the Green Belt, providing that the benefits sought as set out in para. 8.114 are realistic and do not harm viability of development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23713 - 8337 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23824 Support**Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: NE 13 A and NE 13 B Supported as it makes clear that allocated sites are being taken out of the Green Belt, providing that the benefits sought as set out in para. 8.114 are realistic and do not harm viability of development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23824 - 303 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23836 Support**Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: NE 13 A and NE 13 B Supported as it makes clear that allocated sites are being taken out of the Green Belt, providing that the benefits sought as set out in para. 8.114 are realistic and do not harm viability of development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23836 - 4657 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23837 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy NE12 is supported as it would better reflect the use of previously developed land in the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23837 - 4657 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23854 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: NE 13 A and NE 13 B Supported as it makes clear that allocated sites are being taken out of the Green Belt, providing that the benefits sought as set out in para. 8.114 are realistic and do not harm viability of development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23854 - 4656 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

23906 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: We support the release of sites from the Green Belt for development as a justified approach given the lack of alternatives in the Borough. This is consistent with national policy, namely paragraph 136 of the NPPF, which makes allowance for the alteration of Green Belt boundaries through the preparation or updating of Plans where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23906 - 2509 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23912 Support

Respondent: Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust [8344]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: Support the release of sites from the Green Belt for development as a justified approach given the lack of alternatives in the Borough. This is consistent with national policy, namely paragraph 136 of the NPPF, which makes allowance for the alteration of Green Belt boundaries through the preparation or updating of Plans where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23912 - 8344 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

23999 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: Our clients support the strategic release of greenbelt sites in sustainable locations. To date there is no evidence that it would be possible to meet the Borough's acute housing needs without amending the Green Belt boundaries as proposed in the draft plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23999 - 8351 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i

24054 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Policy NE13 states that sites allocated to meet housing need, within the Green Belt, will be expected to provide significant community benefits. These are the "exceptional circumstances" for sites to be removed from the Green Belt to allow development to take place, providing new defensible boundaries and protecting the open countryside. The NPPF (para 138) states that, where it has been concluded necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed and/or is well-served by public transport. Policy NE13 is "consistent" with the NPPF and sound.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24054 - 2656 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - i, ii, iii, iv

24156 Support

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary: We believe this policy is basically sound in expecting some community return for the release of land from the Green Belt, and the creation of defensible boundaries for the longer term beyond the Plan period.

We note the type of community benefits being sought as set out in paragraph 8.114. We have been promoting our client's site at Crow Green Lane, Pilgrims Hatch and have consistently included in our proposals provision for a community facility. The type of facility provided would be determined in consultation with the local community. Paragraph 8.115 mentions a need for smaller units to provide an option to older people wanting to downsize. Again we have consistently included provision within our proposals to meet exactly this particular housing need.

Policy NE13 calls for proposals on Green Belt allocations to establish long term defensible boundaries. Again we have consistently explained how good defensible boundaries can be established around our client's land.

Change To Plan: Support the Policy as worded.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 24156 - 2788 - POLICY NE13: SITE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GREEN BELT - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.114

24656 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no indication within the LDP as to how the proposed Policy R25 and R26 developments around Blackmore will be "repaid through significant benefits to the new and existing communities" (paragraph 8.114)- In fact due to the size of the proposals It would seem to be to the detriment of the existing community through the addition traffic, congestion and flood risk that would result from these policies.

Change To Plan: Sites R2S and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that Just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan In cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24656 - 8411 - 8.114 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 8. Natural Environment 8.117

24182 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary: In Chapter 9 neither the text nor the individual allocations, for example RO3, Land north of Shenfield, a Green Belt site, make any reference to Green Belt boundary changes and their justification. Policy NE13, Site Allocations in the Green Belt, provides firstly for such sites to provide significant community benefits and secondly that: "These sites will be de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place and provide new defensible boundaries to protect the open countryside for future generations. Site boundaries to form the new Green Belt boundaries are set out on relevant sites in Appendix 2." short para (8.117) provides some explanation for the quoted section of the policy: "This policy also sets out the principles of removing allocated Green Belt development sites from the Green Belt. This de-allocation will allow for planning applications to be considered within the context of policies within this Plan as well as national policy and guidance." The term "will be" in the policy and the references to setting out the principles and planning applications in the supporting text make it unclear whether the Green Belt boundary changes are affected in the Draft Plan or they need to be justified by subsequent planning applications.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place... 4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24182 - 7948 - 8.117 - i, ii, iii, iv

22606 Object	Respondent: Mark Jackson Planning (Mr Mark Jackson) [2004]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Remove the text from para 8.127 that stated the Council would generally apply a presumption in favour of employment generating uses as such approach is outdated and not NPPF compliant.	
Change To Plan:	Omission, completely of the following wordings from paragraph 8.127: "The Council will generally apply a presumption in favour of employment generating uses. Residential conversions will only be permitted where every reasonable effort has been made to secure a suitable business use, or the residential use is a subordinate part of a business re-use, or the use is required for an agricultural or forestry worker. Residential conversions may be appropriate in certain circumstances including where they are adjacent to, or within, existing groups of buildings."	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?: No
		Tests: None
		Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 22606 - 2004 - POLICY NE15: RE-USE AND RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION OF RURAL BUILDINGS - None		

22242 Object**Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds: failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed; inadequate consultation with Epping Forest District Council and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore; failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development; adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22242 - 4376 - 9.1 - ii, iv

22260 Object**Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I do not believe the full impact of building up to 75 dwellings on the site off of Priests Lane has been fully considered

Change To Plan: Reduce the number of dwellings substantially to reduce traffic congestion and strain on local facilities such as doctors and schools

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22260 - 5765 - 9.1 - i, ii

22564 Object**Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to the inclusion of site R19 Priests Lane.
Access to the site is unsafe, the traffic assessment is flawed and no provision has been made for the additional traffic flow.
Full information has been supplied by the PRNLA and I fully support their finding and I support their request to be participate in the oral part of the EiP.

Change To Plan: Remove the Priests Lane R19 site from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22564 - 5332 - 9.1 - i, ii, iii, iv

22569 Object**Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to the inclusion of the Priests Lane site in the Local Development Plan for several reasons most significantly road safety, traffic congestion, associated air pollution and site access.

Change To Plan: Site R19 Priests Lane should be removed from The Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22569 - 5332 - 9.1 - ii, iii, iv

23734 Object**Respondent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587]****Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587]**

Summary: Land at Playfield at Brentwood Ursuline (Site ID:19b) should be removed from the designation of Protected Urban Open Space (PUOS) and be considered for development as it does not make a meaningful contribution to PUOS. The site is in a central urban area and very well located to the town centre, public transport network, public open space and other services.

Change To Plan: Publication of the Policies Proposals Map to enable it to be consulted upon and to provide context to the references to it within the draft Submission Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23734 - 2587 - 9.1 - ii, iv

23975 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Paragraphs 9.1 - 9.7

CEG supports the general approach outlined in these paragraphs and agrees that the site allocations, including Dunton Hills Garden Village, reflect the spatial strategy and strategic objectives set out earlier in the Local Plan.

CEG supports the approach of setting out of each policy by the sub-headings specified, although representations are made below on what is set out for DHGV in Policy R01.

CEG supports the cross-reference to other policies in paragraph 9.4 to avoid unnecessary repetition in the Local Plan, but it should be noted CEG has submitted objections to Policy HP04. Consistent with paragraph 6.36 of the Local Plan, and to ensure the Plan is effective, the approach to affordable housing, including mix and tenure, should allow for some flexibility to provide for possible changes in circumstances over the lifetime of the Plan. This should then be carried forward into paragraph 9.17 iii, with reference made to viability as an important aspect which will inform the delivery approach, including the phasing of infrastructure, and legacy management. Modifications are proposed in our response to question no. 6 to this effect.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23975 - 5050 - 9.1 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.4

22205 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Garside [8210]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Affordable housing based on current salaries is normally not provided in new developments. Councils bow down to profiteering housing developers and must insist that appropriate numbers of affordable housing is developed at the same time as housing developed for profit. It doesn't cost very much to build a house!!

Change To Plan: Build affordable housing at the same time and in % proportion to other housing.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22205 - 8210 - 9.4 - i

22567 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object to the inclusion of the Priests Lane site in the Local Development Plan for several reasons most significantly road safety, traffic congestion, air pollution, site access and the loss of a Protected Urban Space.

Change To Plan: The Priests Lane site should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22567 - 5332 - 9.4 - i, ii, iii, iv

23981 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Paragraph 9.4 should be amended for consistency with paragraph 6.36 and to ensure the Plan is effective. as follows:

"Affordable housing should be provided in line with Policy HP05, as well as considerations for specialist housing, Policy HP04. Some flexibility may be required in relation to the approach to affordable housing and the phased delivery of infrastructure to ensure viable proposals come forward over the life of the Plan."

Change To Plan: Paragraph 9.4 should be amended for consistency with paragraph 6.36 and to ensure the Plan is effective. as follows:

"Affordable housing should be provided in line with Policy HP05, as well as considerations for specialist housing, Policy HP04. Some flexibility may be required in relation to the approach to affordable housing and the phased delivery of infrastructure to ensure viable proposals come forward over the life of the Plan."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23981 - 5050 - 9.4 - i, ii, iii, iv

22568 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object to the inclusion of the Priests Lane site in the Local Development Plan for the loss of a Protected Urban Space. I fully support the information supplied by the PRNLA which details why the Priests Lane site should be removed for solid, justifiable reasons which the council have failed to address.

Change To Plan: The Priests Lane site R19 should be removed from the plan.
The site should remain a protected urban space and used for the community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22568 - 5332 - 9.5 - i, ii, iii

24138 Object

Respondent: Mr Iain Low [5329]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]

Summary: The subject land in the ownership of Mr Low, site plan enclosed at Appendix A, has an area 6.5 acres. The site comprises of Mr Low's residential property and adjoining land which lies immediately adjacent to the junction of the A128 / A127. Mr Low supports the allocation of the site and the removal of the land from the Green Belt as identified in the Draft Local Plan. Mr Low is keen to work with the Planning Authority and the promoter of the Garden Village in bringing forward the land for development. There is, however, no formal agreement between Mr Low and CEG in place in regard to future proposals on this site. It is surprising that the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage yet there remains uncertainty regarding the role of the landowners and promoters in respect of the Garden Village. This calls in question the deliverability of the landholding and Mr Low is keen that this matter is clarified in advance of the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State. The Strategic Housing Allocation R01 incorporates the subject site owned by Mr Low. However contrary to the statement at 9.6 of the Local Plan, there is no reference to joint working between landowners in the Local Plan Policy R01. This needs to be clarified and addressed as the policy in its current form is undeliverable given there is more than one party involved in the garden village allocation. In terms of the tests of soundness this omission in the Draft Local Plan results in the policy not being justified or effective as it is currently prepared.

Change To Plan: the Local Plan should reflect the fact that there is more than one party involved in DHGV allocation. Mr Low would welcome greater formal commitment from CEG regarding the future of the site, in advance of the Examination in Public on the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24138 - 5329 - 9.6 - i, ii, iii, iv

22345 Object**Respondent: Wingfield Planning Consultancy (Mr. Ben Willis) [2794]****Agent: Wingfield Planning Consultancy (Mr. Ben Willis) [2794]**

Summary: See supporting statement

Change To Plan: See supporting statement - In summary, we believe our clients site at Hatch Road has been soundly tested at appeal and represents a more logical green belt allocation for growth

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22345 - 2794 - 9.7 - None

22594 Object**Respondent: Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brenwood Council have planned development South of the A127 where severe strain on road, rail and education infrastructure is already coming from development in Basildon, Thurrock and elsewhere. They are not allowing the considerable government funding in the A12 and Crossrail to unlock the economic development needed along the A12 corridor. This is unsustainable under the policies of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: remove the Dunton Hills Garden Village development. Add development along the A12 corridor instead.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22594 - 4309 - 9.7 - ii, iv

23695 Object**Respondent: Catherine Williams [7454]****Agent: Catherine Williams [7454]**

Summary: Land owned by MM Properties on Wyatt's Green Road should be allocated as part of the Local Plan sites, as it is suitable and available to be developed. Although the site is currently designated green belt whilst part of the site is brownfield. The site is self-contained and provides limited functions towards achieving the five green belt purposes. Furthermore, the Council's OAN is based on the 2016 HDT and during the consultation period the MHCLG determined that the 2014 projections should be used thus resulting in a deflated housing need figure by 24%.

Change To Plan: This site should be included as part of the site allocations within the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23695 - 7454 - 9.7 - i, ii, iii, iv

23805 Support**Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]****Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]**

Summary: SUPPORT the reference to R02 on the list of Strategic Housing Allocations.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23805 - 3738 - 9.7 - None

22388 Object**Respondent: Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Dunton Hills Garden Village will destroy an important section of green belt which is preventing the eventual coalescence of East London with Basildon and beyond.

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village from Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22388 - 4309 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iv

23125 Object**Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Thurrock Council considers that there are key strategic issues and cross-boundary matters of importance in relation to the preparation of the Brentwood Local Plan that remain outstanding and should be addressed through further effective engagement and collaboration between Brentwood Council and Thurrock Council and with the other South Essex authorities under the Duty to cooperate. The key matters include:

- * Confirmation of the Brentwood Objectively Assessed need and whether the borough can accommodate its need;
- * The spatial strategy and alternative options within the A12 and A127 corridors to accommodate the growth;
- * The Thurrock Council concerns regarding the justification of Dunton Garden Village and the need to consider alternative options including at West Horndon;
- * Transport and other infrastructure Issues;
- * Further development of the Brentwood Local Plan evidence base;
- * The development of the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan and evidence.

In particular in recognition of the Thurrock concern about Dunton Hills Garden Village and due to its location close to and adjoining the boundaries between the two authorities Thurrock Council requests further engagement on this development and considerations of alternative options along the A127 Corridor and elsewhere.

Change To Plan: To ensure more effective collaboration and joint working it is suggested that Brentwood Council should progress key strategic matters through the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan process as well as with individual local authorities on cross-boundary matters.

Brentwood Council will need to consider how much additional evidence base for housing need and capacity can be prepared in partnership with adjoining authorities and the other South Essex authorities. In addition to the preparation of the SGLS study which includes a high level housing land and capacity assessment, the South Essex authorities are in the course of commissioning of additional elements of evidence base to support the preparation of the joint strategic planning including a review of the South Essex SHMA, a Strategic Green Belt review and further infrastructure studies.

The outcome of these studies and the preparation of the joint strategic planning will have implications for the nature and scale of housing provision across South Essex including Brentwood and the future approach to be taken in the Local Plan.

Section 3.6 of the Brentwood Local Plan should identify the key cross-boundary issues and challenges between Brentwood and adjoining authorities including Thurrock. It should set out how the plan seeks to address these including any future reviews of the plan and through joint working on the South Essex JSP.

Brentwood Council should prepare Statements of Common Ground on strategic cross- boundary matters in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Guidance.

Notwithstanding any additional text to the plan setting out key cross-boundary issues it is considered that the Duty to Cooperate has not been met as Brentwood Council has not undertaken effective and on-going engagement regarding the Dunton hills Garden village.

The Brentwood Pre-Submission Local Plan has also therefore not been prepared with a positive and justified strategy.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23125 - 2461 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - i, ii, iii

23298 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is vital that as linkages between West Horndon and DHGV are undertaken by non-vehicular modes, especially when the proposed primary school provision will be at DHGV. However there is no clear and credible plan for developing walking and cycling linkages between West Horndon and DHGV. With dedicated cycle routes in the order of 3km required to link West Horndon station into and through DHGV, an allowance of £1.8m for walkways and cycleways appears to be a gross under-estimate. The lack of certainty is reinforced by the IDP referring to 'feasibility studies' which is not available.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23298 - 381 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23299 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Brentwood Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) 2018 identifies that large sections of the area around West Horndon, including the land to the east which connects it to the DHGV site, are considered to be high risk flood areas. In light of this and the fact that these events are occurring with increasing regularity (and scientific evidence making clear that a major cause of this is climate change), it is considered vital that a precautionary approach is taken to considering the impact of flooding.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23299 - 381 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23384 Object

Respondent: BJ Associates [8317]

Agent: Gerald Eve LLP (Mr. Peter Dines) [3762]

Summary: An annual housing rate of 310 per year to 2023 reflects poor and unrealistic housing site choices.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23384 - 8317 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iii

23428 Object

Respondent: Ms Rachael Mellor [8321]

Agent: N/A

Summary: You are ruining green land, destroying the appeal of living in a nice area such as Langdon hills, West horndon, Bulphan. The area will become a concrete jungle. There is a need for houses but this volume on green land is not right.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23428 - 8321 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23429 Object

Respondent: Ms Rachael Mellor [8321]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This development could not be further away from Brentwood, it's Brentwood allocation using basildon and thurrocks services.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23429 - 8321 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23431 Object

Respondent: Ms Rachael Mellor [8321]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear plan for infrastructure: there is no regular bus service so elderly who cannot drive often rely on ambulances to get to hospital appointments.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23431 - 8321 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23433 Object**Respondent: Ms Rachael Mellor [8321]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear plan for infrastructure: the kids in this area don't have a good local school instead all go to variety of schools in Essex.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23433 - 8321 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23435 Object**Respondent: Ms Rachael Mellor [8321]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is a rising number of burglaries in Basildon. It's crazy that you plan on adding such a massive volume of residents that will likely be from outside of Essex or buy to rent owners without any consideration for the current residents or improvements to the area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23435 - 8321 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23437 Object**Respondent: Ms Rachael Mellor [8321]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The A127 is already a nightmare and it is the only way in and out of Southend, placing more stress on the A13 is not a viable option.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23437 - 8321 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23592 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The envisaged Plan is not robust because it places excessive reliance on one site, Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV), which at best could not deliver homes in the timeframe expected and at worst could prove a completely unviable location. DHGV was selected to meet the majority of the Borough's housing need within the Plan period and beyond (paragraph 5.90 of the Plan).

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan effective DHGV should be removed as a development site and the housing growth distributed to more viable sites in the Borough where the delivery of homes can be assured.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23592 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iii

23593 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV), together with Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment area, would further reduce the narrowest and most critical section of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Metropolitan Green Belt has an irregular shape but is in broad terms about 20 miles wide. At the point between Basildon and Upminster it measures only 5 miles. This is the narrowest and most vulnerable point of the Metropolitan Green Belt. To make an incursion into the Green Belt at this point would cause severe damage to the Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23593 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iv

23594 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Of the potential Green Belt development sites in the Borough the Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) site has been professionally assessed as one of the most harmful to the Green Belt and least suitable for development. An independent consultant, Crestwood Environmental, instructed by the Authority, carried out a Borough-wide Green Belt Assessment in 2016 and assessed the DHGV site as High, the highest of the 5 levels used. "High", in the assessment, signified that the area scored particularly well as to fulfilling the five recognised purposes of the Green Belt. Accordingly development would be particularly damaging to the Green Belt at the DHGV site. Only 4% of the 203 sites assessed were judged High. In terms of harm to the Green Belt the DHGV site is therefore among the 4% worst places to develop in the Borough

Change To Plan: Of the potential Green Belt development sites in the Borough the Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) site has been professionally assessed as one of the most harmful to the Green Belt and least suitable for development.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23594 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23595 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Developments in the Dunton/West Horndon area would promote the coalescence of Southend with London. Southend-on-Sea, the seventh most densely populated area of the Kingdom outside London, lies to the east of Basildon. It is separated to a degree from Basildon by farmland at North Benfleet and Bowers Gifford, but the only truly open expanse of countryside between Southend and Greater London is the (already relatively narrow) gap between Basildon and Upminster.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV, Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan, and the housing and employment growth reallocated to sites elsewhere in the Borough where they will not cause settlement coalescence.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23595 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23596 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) together with the series of employment sites proposed on the A127 corridor would constitute ribbon development. DHGV, the East Horndon employment site and Brentwood Enterprise Park would create a shallow band of development along the A127 from Laindon to the M25. The Authority is therefore promoting ribbon development, one of the most objectionable forms of urban expansion.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan consistent with national policy, DHGV, Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan, and the housing and employment growth reallocated to sites elsewhere in the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23596 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iv

23597 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Interfering with the edges of the Green Belt as proposed would replace a strong Green Belt boundary with a weak one. Green Belts should have boundaries that are defined clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and are likely to be permanent (paragraph 139(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework).

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan consistent with national policy, DHGV, Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan, and the housing and employment growth reallocated to sites elsewhere in the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23597 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iv

23598 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Dunton Hills area does not exhibit any of the four characteristics that indicate potential suitability for Green Belt boundary adjustment. It would not be infill, it would not be well contained by the landscape, it would cause very great harm to the distinctiveness of West Horndon and Dunton Waylets and would create a weak boundary to the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan consistent with national policy, DHGV, Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan, the Green Belt boundary in the area between Basildon and the M25 should remain unchanged and the housing and employment growth reallocated to sites elsewhere in the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23598 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iv

23599 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) development would be adjacent to a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline. The eastern edge of the proposed DHGV site coincides with the Bacton to Horndon-on-the-Hill gas transmission line. This pipeline is classified as a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified DHGV should be removed from the Plan, and housing growth directed to safer areas of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23599 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii

23600 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) development would lie in an area of exceptionally poor air quality.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV should be removed from the Plan, and housing growth reallocated to less polluted areas in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23600 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23601 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) site is a Historic Environment Zone, meaning that it is highly sensitive to medium to large-scale development. DHGV would cause severe harm to that environment. (As described in the Essex Thames Gateway Historical Environment Characterisation Project, 2007. Area 107_1.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV should be removed from the Plan, and housing growth re-allocated to areas of the Borough that are less historically sensitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23601 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23602 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The developments at Dunton Hills and East Horndon would ruin the setting of All Saints' Church East Horndon, a Grade I listed building.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan and housing and employment growth reallocated to less damaging areas of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23602 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23603 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The developments at Dunton Hills and East Horndon would harm the setting of several Grade II listed buildings.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan, and housing and employment growth re-allocated to less damaging areas of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23603 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23604 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The numbers for Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) would not justify schools at the site, and so the site is not sustainable. At a Duty to Co-operate meeting between the Authority and Basildon Council and Essex County Council on 28th June 2017 Essex County Council indicated that the numbers for DHGV were only "borderline" to justify the proposed schools. That was at a time when Basildon Council was planning for 1,000 homes at Dunton on its side of the boundary and when the concept agreed between the two councils was that one school would serve the new homes on both sides of the border. Now that Basildon Council's intended allocation at Dunton has been reduced to 300, DHGV is unlikely to justify its own school. The transportation of children to schools in other settlements would lead to significant additional vehicle movements. In this respect DHGV is not a sustainable location.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV should be removed from the Plan and housing growth reallocated to sustainable sites within the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23604 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23605 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local road network could not absorb the increase in vehicle movements resulting from Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV). The A128 is a heavily used single-carriageway road forming a link between the A13 and the A127. There are no plans to upgrade it. The only feasible access point for DHGV would be an unsatisfactory junction with the A128 handling an excessive volume of traffic. The junction on the opposite side of the A128 (feeding West Horndon) is overloaded at peak times. Neither the access road itself nor the A128 could adequately cope with the traffic from a 2,500-home development.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified DHGV should be removed from the Plan and housing growth directed to areas of the Borough not reliant on the A127 or A128.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23605 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii

23606 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A 2,500-home development at the Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) site would be effectively inaccessible. Access from the north (A127) would need to be via a grade-separated junction with the A127. The presence of ancient woodland would make it difficult to construct such a junction. Furthermore the existing junctions at Dunton and the Halfway House are only two kilometres apart. It would not be possible to interpose a further junction without breaching national standards for minimum weaving-length. Access from the west (A128). The western part of the site lies within Flood Zone 3. A report by consultants Odyssey Markides commented that providing an access road through flood zones 2 or 3 is costly both in terms of construction and maintenance and does not usually represent a viable access strategy.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan effective DHGV should be removed from the Plan and the housing growth reallocated to sites within the Borough which are accessible for the size of development involved.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23606 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iii

23607 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) development would reduce much-needed public access to open space. The countryside to the west of Dunton Wayletts provides a publicly accessible and sustainable link between Langdon Hills Country Park and Thorndon Country Park. A network of country lanes, footpaths and bridleways enables people to walk from one to the other without encountering a main road except for the unavoidable need to pass over the A127 and A128.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV should be removed from the Plan and housing growth reallocated to areas of the Borough where developments would not reduce access to open space or negate the value of such access.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23607 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23608 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) development would bisect an important wildlife connectivity corridor. The open land between Dunton Wayletts and West Horndon forms a wildlife connectivity corridor between Thorndon Country Park and Langdon Hills Country Park. DHGV, together with the East Horndon employment site, would cut into the corridor. The developments would interfere with the passage of wildlife between habitats at the two parks (see Essex Wildlife Trust's response to the Authority's Strategic Growth Options Report).

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan, and housing and employment growth redirected to less ecologically sensitive areas of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23608 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23609 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) development would intrude into the Mardyke Valley, a valued landscape. The northern (south-flowing) tributary of the Mardyke runs through the DHGV area. Thurrock Council, in its Sustainability Appraisal 2007, identified two Special Landscape Areas: the Mardyke Valley and Langdon Hills. These were adopted because of their landscape importance in a regional or County-wide context.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV should be removed from the Plan, and growth redirected to some of the many areas of the Borough that are of no recognised landscape value.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23609 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23610 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) and Brentwood Enterprise Park developments would frustrate the objectives of the Thames Chase Community Forest. The Mardyke Valley, in which the proposed DHGV and Brentwood Enterprise Park sites lie, is one of the backbones of the Thames Chase Community Forest. Thames Chase is not a single forest but a network of woods, forests and country parks linked by open countryside. The Mardyke Valley is a corridor of countryside linking Thorndon Country Park, at the northernmost end of Thames Chase, with country parks and other sites further south.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV and Brentwood Enterprise Park should be removed from the Plan, and housing and employment growth redirected to areas further north in the Borough and away from the Borough's only community forest.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23610 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23611 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) development would threaten ancient woodlands. The corridor of land, running roughly north-south through the proposed DHGV site along the path of the Mardyke, is ancient woodland. It is the southern leg of the ancient woodland at Eastlands Spring, the whole wood being a Local Wildlife Site. The Association has reason to believe that the coppice a little to the north of the centre of the proposed DHGV site is also ancient woodland.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV should be removed from the Plan and housing growth redirected to an area or areas of the Borough without ancient woodlands.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23611 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23612 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) development and the East Horndon employment site would be unacceptably close to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The proposed DHGV and East Horndon sites are in close proximity to the SSSI at Thorndon Country Park. These proposed developments would reduce the buffer zone to the south-east of the SSSI to well under one mile and would therefore have an adverse impact on the SSSI. The inclusion in the Plan of DHGV and the East Horndon employment site therefore contravenes paragraph 174(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV and the East Horndon employment site should be removed from the Plan and growth redirected away from the SSSI at Thorndon Park.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23612 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23613 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) development would lie in a high-risk flood zone. The centre of the DGHV site, roughly following the route of the Mardyke (or Eastland Spring as that stretch is often known) is designated by the Environment Agency as an area at the greatest risk ("high") of surface water flooding.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV should be removed from the Plan and the housing growth redirected to some of the many areas of the Borough at low risk of flooding.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23613 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23614 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton area is required to be left undeveloped for aviation purposes. The sky above the open land to the west of Dunton Wayletts is used for aerial acrobatics. Any urban development in that area would constitute congestion for the purposes of the Rules of the Air Regulations 2014 and is not permissible. The flight-path for the Heathrow arrival stream follows the A127. The southward departure stream from Stansted intersects it as it passes over the open countryside in the vicinity of Dunton Wayletts. To add to this, aircraft held in the Lambourne Stack pass through the same airspace.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan consistent with national policy DHGV should be removed from the Plan and the housing growth redirected to areas of the Borough away from the open countryside in the Dunton area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23614 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - iv

23615 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A development on the scale proposed would dominate this rural area and overwhelm the adjacent villages. The Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) site extends to the boundary with Basildon Council and would lie only about 200 metres away from the westernmost properties in Dunton Wayletts, a village of 250 homes. A development on the scale proposed would dominate this rural area and overwhelm the adjacent village.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified and consistent with national policy DHGV should be withdrawn from the Plan and the housing growth redistributed in such a way that new developments respect adjacent settlements and are proportionate in size to those settlements.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23615 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iv

23616 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Breaking the circle of open land around London would be unlawful. Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) would effectively bridge the gap between Basildon and West Horndon. Brentwood Enterprise Park would effectively bridge the gap between West Horndon and the M25. The circle of open land would thus be broken. But a local authority's power in regard to removing land from the Green Belt is limited to altering its boundaries. Removing so much land from a Green Belt that it ceases to exist as a continuous circle would be unlawful.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan legally compliant DHGV and Brentwood Enterprise Park should be removed from the Plan and alternative sites found outside the gap between Basildon and the M25.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23616 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23617 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The decision-making process leading to the selection of the Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) site has been casual, arbitrary, disorganised and not based on proper evidence. Evidence gathered after the decision was made, which has highlighted the unsuitability of the site for development, has simply been ignored. The DHGV concept has its roots in the ill-conceived Dunton Garden Suburb (DGS) proposal in early 2015.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified it should be withdrawn. In the new Plan the siting of areas for development should be based on an objective assessment of their suitability. The evidence revealing the impracticality and disadvantages of locating large-scale development at Dunton Hills should be properly considered, and more appropriate sites selected elsewhere in the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23617 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii

23618 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Authority has cynically offloaded its housing and other needs to an edge of the Borough where a neighbouring borough will shoulder the infrastructure burden. The Authority has ignored the fact that the infrastructure on the Basildon-Southend corridor cannot realistically be improved.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified it should be withdrawn. It should be reformulated with a proper and objective assessment of infrastructure capacity across the Borough. The new Plan should locate housing and employment growth in a way that is sensitive to the impact on the Borough of Basildon.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23618 - 6185 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii

23648 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]**

Summary: DHGV is beset with the problem of a lack of technical evidence to support the proposed new settlement. It shares concerns similar to Uttlesford's Local Plan, about potential gaps in the timing and funding of large critical infrastructure associated with the proposed Garden Communities that are central to the overarching strategy of the Plan, in particular the delivery of housing.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23648 - 250 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23649 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]**

Summary: In the absence of a clear delivery plan, the Plan is subject to criticism from adjacent authorities: Basildon questions whether the scale of development proposed at Dunton could be supported by infrastructure, and Thurrock cites a lack of technical evidence and failure to test fully all the reasonable options given the decision to rely on a new settlement rather than urban extensions closer to existing infrastructure.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23649 - 250 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23974 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Paragraphs 9.1 - 9.7

CEG supports the general approach outlined in these paragraphs and agrees that the site allocations, including Dunton Hills Garden Village, reflect the spatial strategy and strategic objectives set out earlier in the Local Plan.

CEG supports the approach of setting out of each policy by the sub-headings specified, although representations are made below on what is set out for DHGV in Policy R01.

CEG supports the cross-reference to other policies in paragraph 9.4 to avoid unnecessary repetition in the Local Plan, but it should be noted CEG has submitted objections to Policy HP04. Consistent with paragraph 6.36 of the Local Plan, and to ensure the Plan is effective, the approach to affordable housing, including mix and tenure, should allow for some flexibility to provide for possible changes in circumstances over the lifetime of the Plan. This should then be carried forward into paragraph 9.17 iii, with reference made to viability as an important aspect which will inform the delivery approach, including the phasing of infrastructure, and legacy management. Modifications are proposed in our response to

Change To Plan: CEG sets out the modifications it considers are necessary to make Policy R01 sound, the reasons for which are explained in question no. 5 above.

Other comments outlined above relating to the supporting text to Policy R01 are left for the Council to consider by way of minor modifications. The modification of Policy R01 in the manner set out below may require some of the supporting text to be aligned accordingly, in the manner described in response to question no. 5.

Proposed Modifications to Chapter 9. Site Allocations

Paragraph 9.4 should be amended for consistency with paragraph 6.36 and to ensure the Plan is effective. as follows:

"Affordable housing should be provided in line with Policy HP05, as well as considerations for specialist housing, Policy HP04. Some flexibility may be required in relation to the approach to affordable housing and the phased delivery of infrastructure to ensure viable proposals come forward over the life of the Plan."

Paragraph 9.17 iii. should be amended for the same reasons, as follows:

"The Delivery Approach and Legacy Management - setting out the expectations for how the phased delivery of the scheme should be approached to ensure proposals are viable and embed an ethos of co-design and participation, timely and good governance in delivery, and an embedded legacy management of the village assets.

Proposed Modifications to Policy R01

Policy R01 (I) Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation

A. In line with Policy SP02, land at Dunton Hills (east of the A128, south of the A127 and north of the C2C railway line, approximately 259.2 ha in size) is allocated for residential-led development to deliver Dunton Hills Garden Village.

B. The development will deliver a mix of uses to comprise at least 2,700 homes in the plan period (as part of an overall indicative capacity of around 4,000 homes with the remainder to be delivered beyond 2033) together with the necessary community, employment, utility, transport and green and blue infrastructure (GBI) to support a self-sustaining, thriving and healthy garden village.

C. Successful development of the site allocation will require:

a. the masterplan to be underpinned by Garden Community principles and qualities

b. proposals to creatively address the key site constraints and sensitively respond to the unique qualities and opportunities afforded by the historic landscape and environmental setting to deliver a distinctive and well-designed garden village in line with the Spatial Vision and Strategic Aims and Objectives for Dunton Hills Garden Village; and

c. a holistic and comprehensive locally-led masterplan and design guidance to be developed, co-designed with relevant stakeholders to frame and guide the consistent quality and delivery across the site by different contractors over the delivery period.

D. The proposed development will be required to deliver all the necessary supporting spatial components and infrastructure to address the specific site constraints, potential impacts of development and harness the site opportunities as set out by the strategic Dunton Hills aims and objectives. Permission for mixed-use development will be granted subject to the parameters and components specified below:

- a. delivery of at least 2,700 dwellings in the plan period providing a balanced variety of housing typologies and tenure and includes provision of self-build plots in line with Policy HP01; specialist accommodation in line with Policy HP04; and affordable housing in line with Policy HP05;
- b. the provision of a minimum of 5 serviced Gypsy and Traveler pitches, in line with Policy HP07(b);
- c. land (circa 5.5 ha) for employment space (in line with Policy PC03) to accommodate a creative range of creative employment uses suitable for a vibrant village centre and a predominantly residential area, including use class A1-A5 and appropriate B class uses;
- d. land (circa 7.9 hectares) for a co-located secondary school (Use Class D1);
- e. land (circa 2.1 hectares each) for two co-located primary school and early years and childcare nurseries, preferably co-located (Use Class D1);
- f. land (circa 0.13 hectares each) for two stand-alone further early years and childcare nurseries (Use Class D1);
- g. community and health infrastructure proportional to the scale of development, and in line with best practice principles of healthy design;
- h. green and blue infrastructure to be a minimum of circa 50% of the total land area including private gardens and green roofs;
- i. retail the provision of main town centre uses to form the vibrant village core in the form of a 'District Shopping Centre' with additional Local Centre(s) in line with Policy PC08, as appropriate to the scale and phasing of the development;
- j. the provision of new and enhanced transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of development and to support sustainable modes of travel to ensure connectivity to key destinations, increase transport choice, support changes in travel behaviour, and to minimise the impact of traffic on the local and wider network, in line with Policy BE16 and as detailed in R01(ii) G-J; and
- k. strategically designed and appropriately phased infrastructure, employing the most up to date technologies to ensure a smart, sustainable and a resilient basis for drainage and flood management in line with Policy BE08, water management including potable/non-potable and opportunities for grey water harvesting in line with BE03, efficient and cost saving energy networks in line with Policy BE04, superfast broadband in line with Policy BE10.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23974 - 5050 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - i, ii, iii, iv

24146 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: The eastern edge of the DHGV allocation follows the Borough boundary with Basildon. The new settlement would adjoin Basildon's Green Belt, leaving a narrow strip between DHGV and the existing built up area of Basildon. At one point, both Councils intended to locate new settlements in this location, however, Basildon no longer propose this, which calls into question whether the authorities have complied with the duty to co-operate.

Change To Plan: The Plan places significant reliance on the timely delivery of Dunton Hills Garden Village. This is not a positive strategy for meeting housing need and does not provide the flexibility required to address changes in circumstances. The allocation should be complemented by the allocation of small sites, to improve deliverability.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24146 - 8368 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - ii, iii, iv

24249 Object

Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object to DHGV because Brentwood residents want development in north of the borough, North Brentwood, Pilgrims Hatch and Greenfield sites North of A12 to keep families together and to provide Affordable/Social Housing.

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village from Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24249 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24250 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to DHGV because Brentwood residents want development in north of the borough as easy to build and have major new roads e.g. to M25 and others upgraded etc.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24250 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24251 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to DHGV because Brentwood residents want development in north of the borough as these areas have superb Infrastructure, Air Quality and other major benefits.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24251 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24252 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The council state nothing is your problem to confirm is safe & risk free. You will not be providing any funding for anything. Infrastructure is always someone else's problem: NHS; Essex County Council, Bus Companies, C2C's etc.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24252 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24254 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood describe Dunton as: - (A) Considered Outside of Brentwood's District & (B) importantly describe it as Fenland (Meaning low marshy area & together with their reports likely to Flood/Have Surface Water besides Soil & Water Contamination besides the Major Gas Pipe-Line but state is not Brentwood Councils problem). Is actually the worst site considered (which is a critical drainage area) confirming is unsuitable for development but considers is the most profitable and keeps residents out of Brentwood's main area.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24254 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24255 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: NEW TOWN: Currently reported 4,000 New Homes, in their January 2018 Local Plan (as advised intend to bring forward further proposed development and then increased further as understand site could double in size as far more land available to them).

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24255 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24256 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The costs to ensure no problems at DHGV alone means site is unviable but then Brentwood's Political Bias & Greed takes over. DHGV is quoted as a self-sufficient site; however, Brentwood's Director of Strategic Planning has stated will rely on Basildon's Infrastructure. Thereby, all income profits go to Brentwood Council and year on year maintenance costs and problems fall on Basildon Council and its Residents. For Brentwood Council is a WIN - WIN situation: will receive over £36,000,000 from government and vast council tax with little outlay.

Change To Plan: Remove DSHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24256 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24257 Object

Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Council now advise after over 4 years is producing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will provide an overview of the infrastructure requirements associated with the Local Plan and how Brentwood intend to support the development. However unable to supply any information to back the IDP comment!

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24257 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24258 Object

Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Council is aware their Local Plan (at least in part) especially regarding DHGV is unsound.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24258 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24259 Object

Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: [The plan] Again proves that the Planning Department officers lied when supplying information and why unable to answer simple basic questions. It appears the council deliberately want to proceed even though the facts quoted cannot be factually backed up as currently appear flawed and rigged. Appears council and the Council Leader, Louise McKinley are trying their utmost to push through DHGV, without proper scrutiny, as concerned would not be passed by Planning Inspectorate if actual facts known. From their actions appears they do not want General Public or Residents to obtain information.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24259 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24260 Object

Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Council including Planning and Louise McKinley, council leader, unable to answer relevant questions with factual information, only waffle. Brentwood Council and the council leader are deliberately not responding to outstanding questions or emails (some nearly 2 months, well overdue) as appear extremely concerned that then could easily prove Reports have been Fabricated/Manipulated to misrepresent the best areas for development and in fact where the best areas are. E.g. Brentwood Council dismissed building 2,300 New Homes at Pilgrims Hatch for reasons given, however, the same and worse applies to Dunton.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24260 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24261 Object

Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Council admit unable to supply Masterplan or what Infrastructure will actually be provided (and have lied about for over 4 years) as is currently only their thinking, ifs/maybes and may never be built. In the submission for the £528,000 grant, listed 10 Key Milestones to be completed by October 2018, yet the council have admitted have not carry out any, so how can Brentwood Council be trusted.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24261 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24262 Object

Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: All consultations on Brentwood Councils Local Plan, have been bought into disrepute as no-one knows the real details/facts on the various proposed sites as Brentwood Council 'Keep On Moving The Goalposts', so how can anyone accurately comment? What are the facts and which are fiction! Have requested information NOW so have time to check the facts and stop this unethical development in its tracks, unless the council can supply accurate documentation which stands up to scrutiny!

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24262 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24263 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Factual information has been rigged / amended, given a different slant / representation by Brentwood Council. There are more points but this is enough for now, without listing them all. BRENTWOOD COUNCIL ARE LIKE THE PROVERB, 'A ROLLING STONE GATHERS NO MOSS', thereby they change details/comments at whim to whatever suits their purpose. VISIT WWW.DUNTONEXPLOITATION.CO.UK FOR MORE ACCURATE INFORMATION

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24263 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24264 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Councils Local Plan, January 2018, shows 4,000 New Homes and advised wish built in current planning period. (16,000 people and 8,000 vehicles besides over 30+ Travellers/Gypsy pitches). But understand may well double in size in future.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24264 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24265 Object**Respondent: Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Intend to build well over 50% of their New Homes target (appears nearly 65%), SOUTH of the A127 which they consider OUTSIDE of Brentwood Districts AREA. It is obvious that Brentwood intends to build a New Town rather than a Village and will use every means at their disposal to build DHGV even though the Local Development Plans details after scrutiny do not stack up.

Change To Plan: Remove DGHV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24265 - 5004 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24272 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to DHGV because Brentwood Council intend to build well over 50% of their New Homes target (appears nearly 65%), SOUTH of the A127 which they consider OUTSIDE of Brentwood Districts area. It is obvious what Brentwood Council intend to the detriment of the adjacent Basildon Borough Council.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24272 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24273 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to DHGV because Brentwood borough Intend to build well over 50% of their New Homes target (appears nearly 65%), SOUTH of the A127 which they consider OUTSIDE of Brentwood Districts AREA. It is obvious that Brentwood Council intends to build a New Town rather than a Garden Village and will use every means at their disposal to build DHGV even though; the Local Development Plans details after scrutiny, do not stack up. Brentwood Council's Local Development Plan will heavily impact on my life and more detailed structure including Infrastructure should be formalised prior to introduction.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24273 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24274 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to DHGV because Brentwood residents want development in north of the borough, North Brentwood, Pilgrims Hatch and Greenfield sites North of A12 to keep families together and to provide Affordable/Social Housing.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24274 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24275 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to DHGV because Brentwood residents want development in north of the borough as these areas have superb Infrastructure, Air Quality and other major benefits.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24275 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24276 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to DHGV because Brentwood residents want development in north of the borough as easy to build and have major new roads e.g. to M25 and others upgraded etc.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24276 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24278 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The council state nothing is your problem to confirm is safe & risk free. You will not be providing any funding for anything. Infrastructure is always someone else's problem: NHS; Essex County Council, Bus Companies, C2C's etc.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV form plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24278 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24279 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The councils lack of professionalism is certainly outstanding, as no-one can trust your facts without checking. For better information and accurate facts, rather than Brentwood Councils waffle visit WWW.DUNTONEXPLOITATION.CO.UK

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24279 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24280 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood describe Dunton as: - (A) Considered Outside of Brentwood's District & (B) importantly describe it as Fenland (Meaning low marshy area & together with their reports likely to Flood/Have Surface Water besides Soil & Water Contamination besides the Major Gas Pipe-Line but state is not Brentwood Councils problem). Is actually the worst site considered (which is a critical drainage area) confirming is unsuitable for development but considers is the most profitable and keeps residents out of Brentwood's main area.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24280 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24281 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: NEW TOWN: Currently reported 4,000 New Homes, in their January 2018 Local Plan (as advised intend to bring forward further proposed development and then increased further as understand site could double in size as far more land available to them).

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24281 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24282 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The costs to ensure no problems at DHGV alone means site is unviable but then Brentwood's Political Bias & Greed takes over. DHGV is quoted as a self-sufficient site; however, Brentwood's Director of Strategic Planning has stated will rely on Basildon's Infrastructure. Thereby, all income profits go to Brentwood Council and year on year maintenance costs and problems fall on Basildon Council and its Residents. For Brentwood Council is a WIN - WIN situation: will receive over £36,000,000 from government and vast council tax with little outlay.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24282 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24283 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council now advise after over 4 years is producing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will provide an overview of the infrastructure requirements associated with the Local Plan and how Brentwood intend to support the development. However unable to supply any information to back the IDP comment!

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24283 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24284 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: [The plan] Again proves that the Planning Department officers lied when supplying information and why unable to answer simple basic questions. It appears the council deliberately want to proceed even though the facts quoted cannot be factually backed up as currently appear flawed and rigged. Appears council and the Council Leader, Louise McKinley are trying their utmost to push through DHGV, without proper scrutiny, as concerned would not be passed by Planning Inspectorate if actual facts known. From their actions appears they do not want General Public or Residents to obtain information.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24284 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24285 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council including Planning and Louise McKinley, council leader, unable to answer relevant questions with factual information, only waffle. Brentwood Council and the council leader are deliberately not responding to outstanding questions or emails (some nearly 2 months, well overdue) as appear extremely concerned that then could easily prove Reports have been Fabricated/Manipulated to misrepresent the best areas for development and in fact where the best areas are. E.g. Brentwood Council dismissed building 2,300 New Homes at Pilgrims Hatch for reasons given, however, the same and worse applies to Dunton.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24285 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24286 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council admit unable to supply Masterplan or what Infrastructure will actually be provided (and have lied about for over 4 years) as is currently only their thinking, ifs/maybes and may never be built. In the submission for the £528,000 grant, listed 10 Key Milestones to be completed by October 2018, yet the council have admitted have not carry out any, so how can Brentwood Council be trusted.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24286 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24288 Object

Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]

Agent: N/A

Summary: All consultations on Brentwood Councils Local Plan, have been bought into disrepute as no-one knows the real details/facts on the various proposed sites as Brentwood Council 'Keep On Moving The Goalposts', so how can anyone accurately comment? What are the facts and which are fiction! Have requested information NOW so have time to check the facts and stop this unethical development in its tracks, unless the council can supply accurate documentation which stands up to scrutiny!

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24288 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24289 Object

Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Factual information has been rigged / amended, given a different slant / representation by Brentwood Council. There are more points but this is enough for now, without listing them all.
BRENTWOOD COUNCIL ARE LIKE THE PROVERB, 'A ROLLING STONE GATHERS NO MOSS', thereby they change details/comments at whim to whatever suits their purpose. VISIT WWW.DUNTONEXPLOITATION.CO.UK FOR MORE ACCURATE INFORMATION Brentwood Councils Local Plan, January 2018, shows 4,000 New Homes and advised wish built in current planning period. (16,000 people and 8,000 vehicles besides over 30+ Travellers/Gypsy pitches). But understand may well double in size in future.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24289 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

24290 Object

Respondent: Mr Max Aitkins [5790]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Intend to build well over 50% of their New Homes target (appears nearly 65%), SOUTH of the A127 which they consider OUTSIDE of Brentwood Districts AREA. It is obvious that Brentwood intends to build a New Town rather than a Village and will use every means at their disposal to build DHGV even though the Local Development Plans details after scrutiny do not stack up.

Change To Plan: Remove DHGV from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24290 - 5790 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23714 Support

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: Policy R01, Dunton Hills Garden Village is not in principle objected to provided that no further development in dwelling numbers are allocated to this very large site. At 2,700 dwellings these are a substantial number and part of meeting local housing need and these will take time to build and supply. It is all the more important that smaller, readily developable sites, such as that at Sow N Grow Nursery and land at 346 Ongar Road can be brought forward quickly and readily and without undue constraints to accord with para. 68 of the NPPF

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23714 - 8337 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - None

23998 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: The TA identifies a number of junctions that would need to be improved across the Borough to support the development proposed in the Local Plan. However, the Local Plan Submission Version does not include reference to these. As an example, the following table contains the identified improvements in the surrounding roads to Dunton Hills Garden Village: (see attachment). The IDP contains a similar table for highway infrastructure improvements and those relevant to Dunton Hills Garden Village are listed in Table 3 below: (see attachment).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23998 - 8351 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - i

24000 Support

Summary: Dunton Hills Garden Village has followed a robust Green Belt review; Sustainability Appraisal; and site selection process. The draft plan does not allocate land between Dunton Hills Garden Village and West Horndon; therefore it maintains physical separation and avoids the coalescence of the new settlement and existing built up area of West Horndon.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24000 - 8351 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation - i

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations

Background

23976 Object

Summary: Background, paragraphs 9.8 - 9.14

CEG supports the selection of DHGV as a Strategic Allocation, which is consistent with policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which the Local Plan refers to in paragraph 9.8.

CEG supports the strategy that in Brentwood the supply of new homes can best be achieved by the planning of DHGV in the way proposed by the Council in combination with the other allocations. The site of DHGV is well located, the proposals will be well designed and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities, in accordance with paragraph 72 of the NPPF.

It is noted that the Local Plan (paragraph 9.10) refers to the fact that the Strategic Allocation at Dunton Hills was selected to meet the 'majority' of Brentwood's housing need, but this overstates the position as it gives the impression it will deliver more than half. The Strategic Allocation will meet 35% of the housing need over the plan period - which would be more appropriately described as a 'significant proportion' of Brentwood's housing need. The significant majority of the need will be met from a range of other sites across the Borough. A minor modification is suggested to clarify this matter.

CEG supports the Council's general approach to determining where housing needs should be met and the unique opportunity to deliver a sustainable new settlement at DHGV. CEG also agrees that this approach aligns with the Borough of Villages character explained elsewhere in the Local Plan, and would continue to maintain characteristics of Green Belt openness.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23976 - 5050 - Background - i, ii, iii, iv

22204 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Garside [8210]

Agent: N/A

Summary: At 06:30 in the morning the A127 is crawling with traffic London bound. The link roads to the A13 are insufficient to carry traffic via that route. Trains through West Horndon are already full at 07:00 in the morning. No additions to infrastructure are stated in the plan.

Change To Plan: Put the infrastructure in first.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22204 - 8210 - 9.10 - i

22334 Object

Respondent: Miss Caroline May [7169]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object to this statement as Dunton Hills Garden Village site is not sustainable due to the size of the development. This is not sustainable due to the proposal being in a high flood risk area with no proper plan in place to mitigate against future flooding. It is also not sustainable in terms of infrastructure. The road network can not cope with current levels of traffic, let alone a development of this size. How this could reasonably be accommodated has not been evaluated. The rail network again can not cope with this size of development area. Generally the environmental impact is huge.

Change To Plan: The proposed development on this site the is simply too large. It is trying to focus significant build all in one area where it it not feasible to do so for some very practical reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22334 - 7169 - 9.10 - i, iii

22584 Object

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I do not want any reduction in Green Belt Boundaries ever. Not now, not in the next Plan period. According to the NPPF, the Green Belt is supposed to be "permanent". Making such a massive reduction would set a precedent for the Green Belt being regarded as a "managed reduction in green space" rather than a "permanent" amenity.

Previous consultations have shown an overwhelming majority against any development of this sort.

Change To Plan: Eliminate proposal for Dunton Hills Garden Village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22584 - 4539 - 9.10 - ii

23978 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: DHGV Strategic Aims and Objectives, paragraphs 9.19 - 9.22

CEG generally supports the three Strategic Aims and Objectives and the contents of each of them. However, the relationship of these Strategic Aims and Objectives (paragraphs 9.20 - 9.22), the three policy domains (paragraph 9.17), and the Development Principles (paragraph 9.23) is unclear.

In paragraph 9.19 it indicates that the three overarching aims, each supported by sub-objectives, provide the link between the vision - presumably the Spatial Vision for Dunton Hills - and the development strategy. It then states that these form the fundamental development principles to help shape and inform the development of a masterplan and guide decision-taking.

CEG considers clarity should be provided in the text at paragraph 9.19, on how the Strategic Aims and Objectives inform Policy R01, this being the policy against which a masterplan and a planning application for development at DHGV will ultimately be determined. Such clarity could be provided by stating that the Strategic Aims and Objectives underpin the requirements of the Policy R01 and the supporting text in paragraphs 9.24 - 9.89 provides further guidance on the application of that policy.

With respect to paragraph 9.20 (iii) the wording is potentially onerous and inconsistent with national policy. It relates to heritage assets so the reference to natural assets should be removed or the title changed. With respect to the heritage aspects it should refer to the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets in line with paragraph 185 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23978 - 5050 - A Spatial Vision for Dunton Hills - i, ii, iii, iv

23977 Support

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: A Spatial Vision for Dunton Hills, paragraphs 9.14 - 9.18

CEG supports the spatial vision as expressed in this part of the Local Plan (paragraphs 9.14 - 9.18), and as set out in the three interrelated policy domains, namely site requirements; the spatial design; and the delivery approach and legacy management. These three domains are then carried forward into the presentation of Policy R01 itself, and this approach is generally supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23977 - 5050 - 9.14 - i, ii, iii, iv

23980 Object **Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]** **Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Paragraph 9.4 should be amended for consistency with paragraph 6.36 and to ensure the Plan is effective. as follows:

"Affordable housing should be provided in line with Policy HP05, as well as considerations for specialist housing, Policy HP04. Some flexibility may be required in relation to the approach to affordable housing and the phased delivery of infrastructure to ensure viable proposals come forward over the life of the Plan."

Paragraph 9.17 iii. should be amended for the same reasons, as follows:

"The Delivery Approach and Legacy Management - setting out the expectations for how the phased delivery of the scheme should be approached to ensure proposals are viable and embed an ethos of co-design and participation, timely and good governance in delivery, and an embedded legacy management of the village assets.

Change To Plan: "The Delivery Approach and Legacy Management - setting out the expectations for how the phased delivery of the scheme should be approached to ensure proposals are viable and embed an ethos of co-design and participation, timely and good governance in delivery, and an embedded legacy management of the village assets.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23980 - 5050 - 9.17 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations DHGV Strategic Aims and Objectives

22525 Support **Respondent: Mr Adam Smith [8264]** **Agent: Brooks Leney (Mr David Brooks) [8263]**

Summary: The landowner fully supports the allocation for DHGV and will co-operate with the Local Planning Authority and other affected landowners to help bring the proposal to fruition

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22525 - 8264 - DHGV Strategic Aims and Objectives - None

22316 Object**Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We have already made reference within the main body of the Plan regarding the need to provide safe, off-road routes for ALL vulnerable road users - pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians and the disabled, rather than the walker/cyclists bias that this Plan states at the moment.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, we suggest that the strategic policies for DHGV incorporate multi-user paths suitable for ALL users as default, and to ensure connectivity for all vulnerable road users across the major roads/railway forming the site's boundary.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22316 - 3855 - 9.20 - i, ii, iii, iv

22399 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: DH01b: LANDSCAPE-LED.

With regards to DH01b, we are disappointed to note that there is no mention of net gains. In order to accord with the NPPF and to deliver a genuinely sustainable development, there must be a policy commitment to deliver no net loss, and aim to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity.

We would advise that the policy should be amended to include this.

Change To Plan: ...to deliver a healthy, walkable and climatically adapted public realm and "richly biodiverse" multi-functional green and blue infrastructure, amongst the backdrop views of the Essex countryside.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22399 - 2414 - 9.20 - iv

22435 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

To be consistent with the wording associated with DH01f the title should include the word 'Active'.

Change To Plan: Amend DH01f as follows -

DH01f: Active and Sustainable Travel

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22435 - 6776 - 9.20 - iii

22436 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: 2. Justified
4. Consistent with National Policy.

The type or types of school that will best serve Dunton have yet to be properly considered and cannot be determined at this stage. The important consideration at this stage is ensuring appropriate opportunities for all learners of all ages. The DfE regulations for establishing a new school include appropriate consultation requirements that would be prejudiced by an assumption that any new school must be 'all through'.

DH02b should be amended to reflect this.

Change To Plan: Amend DH02b as follows -

DH02b: ALL THROUGH LEARNING. Development that delivers exemplar education facilities that meet the needs of all types of learners through life, from nursery to adult learning opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22436 - 6776 - 9.21 - ii, iv

23979 Object **Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]** **Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: the relationship of the Development Principles (paragraph 9.23) with the three policy domains (paragraph 9.17) and the Strategic Aims and Objectives (paragraphs 9.20 - 9.22) is unclear. CEG questions whether the Development Principles are necessary or couldn't be incorporated within the Strategic Aims and Objectives, notwithstanding the fact it generally supports what they are seeking to achieve.

CEG considers that if the Development Principles are retained further clarity should be provided in the text at paragraph 9.23, on the relationship with Policy R01, this being the policy against which a masterplan and a planning application for development at DHGV will ultimately be determined.

CEG objects to paragraph 9.23 (i) where Green Belt, landscape capacity and environmental impacts are conflated within a development principle entitled Design and Build with Nature. New Green Belt boundaries will be clearly defined with the Strategic Allocation using physical features that are readily recognisable and Green Belt isn't a landscape or environmental designation, in any event. The reference to Green Belt should be removed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23979 - 5050 - 9.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

23988 Object **Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]** **Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: the relationship of the Development Principles (paragraph 9.23) with the three policy domains (paragraph 9.17) and the Strategic Aims and Objectives (paragraphs 9.20 - 9.22) is unclear. CEG questions whether the Development Principles are necessary or couldn't be incorporated within the Strategic Aims and Objectives, notwithstanding the fact it generally supports what they are seeking to achieve.

CEG considers that if the Development Principles are retained further clarity should be provided in the text at paragraph 9.23, on the relationship with Policy R01, this being the policy against which a masterplan and a planning application for development at DHGV will ultimately be determined.

CEG objects to paragraph 9.23 (i) where Green Belt, landscape capacity and environmental impacts are conflated within a development principle entitled Design and Build with Nature. New Green Belt boundaries will be clearly defined with the Strategic Allocation using physical features that are readily recognisable and Green Belt isn't a landscape or environmental designation, in any event. The reference to Green Belt should be removed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23988 - 5050 - 9.23 - i, ii, iii, iv

22383 Support **Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sport England supports the 'Healthy' development principle as this would be consistent with Government policy in paragraph 91 of the NPPF in relation to planning policies enabling and supporting healthy lifestyles.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22383 - 4294 - 9.23 - None

22400 Support **Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The development should protect and retain existing wildlife habitats, such as Eastlands Spring LoWS, hedgerows, etc. and connect them with wildlife-rich gardens, verges, amenity green space, cycle paths and walkways. The aim should be to create a network of natural green corridors weaving through the development, into the surrounding urban and rural landscapes and contributing to the wider ecological network.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22400 - 2414 - 9.23 - None

22187 Object**Respondent: Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Dunton Hills Garden Village poses a flood risk to West Horndon, Bulphan and areas in Thurrock around the Mardyke Valley. This has not been adequately addressed in cooperation with Thurrock council. See attachment for full details.

Change To Plan: Remove about 1000 homes from the development to allow for a suitable wash area or attenuation pond for flood management.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22187 - 4309 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - ii, iv

22384 Object**Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The policy is objected to because it has not addressed the need to either demonstrate that Dunton Hills Golf Centre is surplus to requirements through a golf course needs assessment or make provision for retaining/replacing the golf centre if the needs assessment shows that all or parts of the golf centre should be protected for meeting community golf facility needs.

Change To Plan: To address this objection, the policy should be amended to add an additional policy criterion requiring the loss of Dunton Hills Golf Centre to be addressed through demonstrating that the facility is surplus to requirements or provision being made for its retention or replacement with equivalent/better facilities as part of the development.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22384 - 4294 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - ii, iv

22437 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified
4. Consistent with National Policy.

The DHGV allocation is now based on an overall 4,000 homes rather than the 3,500 ECC have previously tested. BBC has previously been advised that the higher number would require a further 2.1ha site for a primary school. This amendment needs to be made to point D(e) & (f).

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R01 (I) D. e. & f. as follows -

e. land (circa 2.1 hectares each) for three co-located primary school and early years and childcare nurseries (Use Class D1)
f. land (circa 0.13 hectares each) for one stand-alone early years and childcare nursery (Use Class D1)

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22437 - 6776 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - ii, iv

22438 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Reference to garden communities should be consistent with the guidance referred to in paragraph 9.14, and in paragraph 72 of the NPPF.

Recommend amending criterion C. a. of Policy R01 (I) to reflect this.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R01 (I) C. a. as follows -

The masterplan to be underpinned by Garden City Principles and qualities;

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22438 - 6776 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - iv

22439 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

In respect of DHGV, ECC strongly support the masterplan approach and the reference to Garden City Principles, together with the integration of the provision of education, employment space and community facilities within the site allocation. However due to its location the site will need to rely upon and embed sustainable transport measures, as required in the DHGV policies, to mitigate impacts on the highway network. Such measures will be informed by the outputs of the transport evidence, which is still to be completed.

Change To Plan: BBC need to include within the Plan evidence, particularly in respect of transport, the site specific, local and cumulative impact on the local and strategic transport network, to demonstrate that the spatial strategy is the most appropriate.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22439 - 6776 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - iii

22836 Object**Respondent: Lisa Atkinson [2991]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The C2C rail line only has two tracks and the trains are already well above capacity at peak times. The roads around the village (A127, A128) are characterised by standstills and queues in both the morning and evening peaks. An additional 500 cars would have a very material impact on already severely strained and congested roads. It is not feasible for these roads to cope with the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village and the proposed development by other councils, even with investment. It is also impossible to see how the train capacity could be upgraded sufficiently.

Change To Plan: The C2C rail line only has two tracks and the trains are already well above capacity at peak times. The roads around the village (A127, A128) are characterised by standstills and queues in both the morning and evening peaks. An additional 500 cars would have a very material impact on already severely strained and congested roads. It is not feasible for these roads to cope with the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village and the proposed development by other councils, even with investment. It is also impossible to see how the train capacity could be upgraded sufficiently.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22836 - 2991 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22842 Object**Respondent: Mr Ian Atkinson [2993]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The C2C rail line only has two tracks and the trains are already well above capacity at peak times. The roads around the village (A127, A128) are characterised by standstills and queues in both the morning and evening peaks. An additional 500 cars would have a very material impact on already severely strained and congested roads. It is not feasible for these roads to cope with the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village and the proposed development by other councils, even with investment. It is also impossible to see how the train capacity could be upgraded sufficiently.

Change To Plan: The C2C rail line only has two tracks and the trains are already well above capacity at peak times. The roads around the village (A127, A128) are characterised by standstills and queues in both the morning and evening peaks. An additional 500 cars would have a very material impact on already severely strained and congested roads. It is not feasible for these roads to cope with the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village and the proposed development by other councils, even with investment. It is also impossible to see how the train capacity could be upgraded sufficiently.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22842 - 2993 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22894 Object**Respondent: Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are far too many homes: 4,000 in the overall timeframe will produce in the region of 10,000 inhabitants, 8,000 vehicles. It will impact on the already overloaded A127, A13, A128. The A128 is a single track road. Local roads will not be able to accommodate the vast increase in vehicles and vehicle movements. The additional volume of traffic will cause congestion, and unhealthy and dangerous levels of toxicity. Parking at West Horndon and Laindon stations do not have the capacity.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22894 - 4361 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22895 Object**Respondent: Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Schools: the local infrastructure will be unable to cope with the increase in population numbers.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22895 - 4361 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22896 Object**Respondent: Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Doctor surgeries: the local infrastructure will be unable to cope with the increase in population numbers.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22896 - 4361 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22897 Object**Respondent: Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This is destruction of precious greenfield site in an area that has to be retained to assist in keeping the air that we breathe as pure as possible, especially in these times of high levels of pollution.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22897 - 4361 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22898 Object**Respondent: Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This development will displace, and most likely kill several protected species of wildlife.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22898 - 4361 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22899 Object**Respondent: Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This development will destroy the ancient Dunton Wayletts settled community.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22899 - 4361 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22900 Object**Respondent: Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This development is being used as a apolitical pawn, and is bearing the major load of the Brentwood additional homes (initially 2,000 rising to 4,000) in the Local Plan, which is far out of balance with the spread of housing numbers in other parts of the Borough.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22900 - 4361 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22945 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Green Belt around West Horndon and Dunton is meant to prevent the urban sprawl of London creeping along the A127 and A13 corridors. This is the most important part of the green belt in the whole country due to the extreme pressure on housing needs in the South East of England. To state that the Green Belt area around the A12/Shenfield area is somehow more important or of greater character is risible and frankly insults the intelligence. The Green Belt area around West Horndon is so far unaffected but will be completely ripped apart by this plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22945 - 2712 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22947 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No surveys or work have been carried out prior to the issue of the LDP with reference to the flooding. West Horndon and Dunton are in a geographical dip between higher ground in all directions. In the past we have experienced several floods including my own property. It is not sensible to put all this additional housing in flood prone areas and to consider doing this without even basic land surveys is poor practise to say the very least.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22947 - 2712 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22949 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: West Horndon and Dunton are adjacent to Basildon and Thurrock Boroughs. Both Boroughs are also considering the Dunton area for their own housing expansion needs so Dunton Village could end up as Dunton Town. Both councils have stated that there has been very limited consultation about perceived infrastructure or transport planning and do not seem to be very much in favour of Brentwood Borough future local development proposals. This is at odds with the statement in your LDP about local joint consultations with neighbouring boroughs. This is symptomatic of a lack of joined up thinking in the planning process.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22949 - 2712 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

23130 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The DHGV is within close proximity with Basildon & Thurrock Boroughs and it is considered that there may be implications for the future geographical extent of both the Brentwood and South Essex Housing Market Areas as the housing markets evolve. The attached table has been prepared using Figure 6.1 from the Plan and the South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment that has informed the Basildon Borough Local Plan 2014-2034 and it is considered both these SHMA's should instead be used to inform the housing mix policy for DHGV.

Change To Plan: It is considered the stark contrast between the house size requirements for Basildon and Brentwood in DHGV, which is on a boundary location, means it needs to have taken into account the South Essex SHMA in determining the housing mix for DHGV so that it can better sit within the landscape of the strategic context of South Essex, which is not reflective of the wider Brentwood Borough HMA. Policy HP01 and R01 should be amended in light of this.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23130 - 369 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, iii, iv

23139 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy R01(D)(h) set a target to retain 50% of the strategic allocation for green and blue infrastructure. However, Basildon Council questions whether this is intended to be a permanent resource, given it also determines that a further 2,300 homes could be brought forward in the strategic location after 2033; taking its indicative total to around 4,000 homes. It is considered that if it is not explained clearly in any published evidence, as to whether any of the retained space for green and blue infrastructure would need to be used to meet this higher development scale after 2033.

Change To Plan: Clarify within R01 and its supporting text whether the Green Infrastructure proposed to amount to 50% of the land area is a permanent resource or whether the projected growth in the area beyond the plan-period would need to utilise any of the green infrastructure for growth. If the latter, the percentage should be adjusted accordingly.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23139 - 369 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, iii

23161 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Thurrock Council considers the Brentwood Local Plan is unsound due to the proposal for a large free-standing settlement identified as Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV). Thurrock Council has made representations setting out its concern at the previous consultation stages of the Brentwood Local Plan in 2016 and 2018 and in its correspondence and meetings with Brentwood Council officers. Other representations covering issues relating to DHGV are covered under Duty to Cooperate and Spatial Strategy and the evidence base.

Specifically: Lack of technical evidence; Concept of a free standing village; Masterplanning approach; Green Belt Issues; Landscape Impact; Deliverability and phasing; Viability; Impact on Thurrocks Housing Market; Infrastructure and Public Expenditure Funding; Road Traffic and Transport Evidence; Sustainability Appraisal of the Site; Duty to Cooperate.

Change To Plan: It is considered the Brentwood Draft Local Plan and supporting evidence base will require further major revision and consultation with ongoing duty to cooperate with adjoining local authorities. In particular the preparation of the draft Brentwood Local Plan should be reviewed to take account of the outcome of testing of other spatial options being considered including the evidence by the South Essex authorities as part of the preparation of a Joint Strategic Plan.

Further work is required to develop the evidence base including the justification for the selection of the spatial options and dismissal of reasonable alternatives, housing capacity and supply further transport evidence and other infrastructure.

Due to the issues highlighted in this response and to the earlier documents it is considered that Brentwood Council needs to carefully consider how it proceeds with the preparation of the Local Plan and the timetable for its production. It is recommended that the Brentwood Plan with its current spatial strategy and site allocations should not be submitted for Examination.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23161 - 2461 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii

23164 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unclear from the published methodology, as to why, having scored highly in relation to Purpose 1 and 3, DHGV is assessed as making a "moderate to high" contribution to Green Belt purposes, when there are other parcels which make high contributions towards two of the purposes have been assessed as making a "high" contribution towards Green Belt purposes. Basildon Council does not believe that the Plan has reached a justified position in respects of whether the Green Belt evidence has informed the policies. Unclear how the risk of coalescence can be adequately mitigated.

Change To Plan: The Plan should demonstrate in more detail, through a tool such as a Topic Paper, how its site selection choices have been informed by the Green Belt Study 2018 and should any inconsistencies occurs the Plan's land use allocations and justification should be changed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23164 - 369 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, iii, iv

23168 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan and the Transport Assessment fails to investigate the possible impacts on Basildon's road and rail infrastructure arising from commuters or other road users choosing to access facilities within the Basildon Borough instead. The need for new connections into Basildon was not mentioned as being necessary to make it sustainable. No evidence was present to demonstrate that DHGV's growth demands have been evaluated in combination with the projected demands from Basildon Local Plan. The Plan should not assume that such growth can just be absorbed by the nearby infrastructure and services in Basildon and investment through developer contributions.

Change To Plan: The Plan should be modified to recognise that some impacts are likely to be cross boundary and additional provisions should be incorporated into SP04 and RO1(I) that will support using S106/CIL arising from development in Brentwood Borough to be used for investment outside the Brentwood Borough, where it can be proven that there is reasonable likelihood of a direct or residual impacts otherwise being caused that need to be mitigated. This will make the Plan more effective, justified and in accordance with national policy.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23168 - 369 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i

23170 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Delivery of DHGV will commence in 2022/23 at a rate of 100 homes per annum, climbing to 300 homes per annum by 2026/27. This seems overly optimistic given that the allocation is currently within Green Belt, requires masterplanning and will need to go through a planning application and elements of the condition discharge process before development can commence. No evidence is provided as to how the housing trajectory has been developed. No evidence or any form of a development framework / masterplan for DHGV explains how the proposed accelerated rate of delivery will be possible.

Change To Plan: Basildon Council therefore seeks for evidence to be provided demonstrating the realistic delivery trajectory for DHGV so that the potential short-medium term pressures on services and facilities in nearby settlements can be assessed, understood and planned for by service providers and neighbouring authorities. This will help ensure adequate mitigation provisions can be put in place to reduce any potential negative impacts on Basildon Borough residents living nearby. This will make the Plan justified and effective.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23170 - 369 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, iv

23301 Object

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Appendix K of the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) notes that "a large portion of... (Dunton Garden Suburb) is identified by the SWMP as having limited potential to deliver 'infiltration' measures as part of sustainable drainage strategy." Whilst the requirement of Policy RO1.D.k on DHGV for "strategically designed and appropriately phased infrastructure, employing the most up to date technologies to ensure a smart, sustainable and a resilient basis for drainage and flood management" is welcomed, such measures have not been scoped out in more depth to ascertain whether they do not undermine the viability of the overall development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23301 - 381 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

23347 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Minter [2999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Regarding Potential dedicated bus routes: The Council are living in Never Never Land if they think people will use alternative forms of transport to the car people will use cars! West Horndon station is a 2 platform station which barely copes (in the rush hour) with the sudden impact of hundreds of people descending on such a tiny space. There is very little parking space and nowhere to allocate further spaces.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23347 - 2999 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

23989 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: CEG generally supports Policy R01(I) and what it is seeking to achieve, subject to the representations outlined below.

Criterion A

There is a very small difference between the size of the site set out in criterion A (and paragraph 9.12) and that contained in Appendix 2. The difference is insignificant but a minor modification would ensure consistency.

Criterion B

CEG proposes wording changes to ensure the presentation of the number of new homes is consistent with criterion D, insofar as the number to be provided over the plan period is presented as a minimum, and to ensure the plan is positively prepared in this regard.

Criterion D

CEG proposes wording changes for reasons of clarity and to provide some limited flexibility, for example, in the amount of land to be provided for employment space, consistent with the approach adopted elsewhere in the policy for other uses.

With respect to sub-criterion (a) CEG supports reference to the provision of a variety of housing typologies and tenures which will help create a holistic new settlement in line with garden community principles and assist in delivering the new homes at DHGV.

With respect to sub-criterion (d) and (e) CEG objects to the references to co-location which are considered too prescriptive and the policy is not justified. CEG considers that sub-criterion (e) should refer to two primary schools, 'preferably co-located' with early years and childcare nurseries, which would make this consistent with the wording of paragraph 7.100 of the Local Plan.

As far as sub-criterion (d) is concerned CEG considers that the reference to co-location should be removed, with the location of the secondary school left to be determined in the masterplan process, in consultation with relevant stakeholders including Essex County Council; or reference made in the Social Infrastructure section to the potential benefits of co-location in Policy R01 (II) which deals with the Spatial Design of DHGV.

With respect to sub-criterion (h) CEG generally supports the proportion of the total land area of the Strategic Allocation that policy requires for green and blue infrastructure (GBI). However, CEG objects to the fact the figure is presented as a minimum requirement which is prescriptive and considers that some limited flexibility is required in this figure, consistent with how other land uses are presented in the policy. CEG also considers that policy should clarify that GBI includes private gardens and green roofs to make the measurement basis clearer.

CEG considers that there is considerable opportunity for high quality GBI which will be a significant feature of DHGV and central to the achievement of garden community principles. CEG fully supports its inclusion and generally supports the policy relating to the spatial design for GBI outlined in Policy R01 (II). CEG considers this should inform the overall amount of GBI that is provided, as well its design; and that the precise amount and design of GBI should flow out of the masterplan process. This will ensure the Plan is positively prepared.

This approach is consistent with guidance on this matter from the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA), which states that, "As a general rule, 50% of the land total in a new Garden City should be green infrastructure, including private gardens and green roofs and this should be clearly stated in local planning policy". (Practical Guides for Creating Successful New Communities, Guide 7: Planning for Green and Prosperous Places, TCPA, January 2018, page 17)

With respect to sub-criterion (i) CEG objects to the reference to "retail provision to form the vibrant village core" as this is not consistent with the NPPF which states that the range of uses permitted should be defined as part of a positive strategy for the future of each centre (NPPF, paragraph 85. (b)).

The provision of a District Centre and Local Centre(s) within DHGV is supported by CEG as they will form the heart of the new garden community. To provide for the needs of the new community these centres should provide a mix of main town centre uses as defined by the glossary in the NPPF. Policy currently refers only to retail provision, which could be interpreted as only Class A1 uses, when a mix of uses should be encouraged. This will ensure the plan is positively prepared.

Change To Plan: A. In line with Policy SP02, land at Dunton Hills (east of the A128, south of the A127 and north of the C2C railway line, approximately 259.2 ha in size) is allocated for residential-led development to deliver Dunton Hills Garden Village.

B. The development will deliver a mix of uses to comprise at least 2,700 homes in the plan period (as part of an overall indicative capacity of around 4,000 homes with the remainder to be delivered beyond 2033) together with the necessary community, employment, utility, transport and green and blue infrastructure (GBI) to support a

self-sustaining, thriving and healthy garden village.

C. Successful development of the site allocation will require:

- a. the masterplan to be underpinned by Garden Community principles and qualities
- b. proposals to creatively address the key site constraints and sensitively respond to the unique qualities and opportunities afforded by the historic landscape and environmental setting to deliver a distinctive and well-designed garden village in line with the Spatial Vision and Strategic Aims and Objectives for Dunton Hills Garden Village; and
- c. a holistic and comprehensive locally-led masterplan and design guidance to be developed, co-designed with relevant stakeholders to frame and guide the consistent quality and delivery across the site by different contractors over the delivery period.

D. The proposed development will be required to deliver all the necessary supporting spatial components and infrastructure to address the specific site constraints, potential impacts of development and harness the site opportunities as set out by the strategic Dunton Hills aims and objectives. Permission for mixed-use development will be granted subject to the parameters and components specified below:

- a. delivery of at least 2,700 dwellings in the plan period providing a balanced variety of housing typologies and tenure and includes provision of self-build plots in line with Policy HP01; specialist accommodation in line with Policy HP04; and affordable housing in line with Policy HP05;
- b. the provision of a minimum of 5 serviced Gypsy and Traveler pitches, in line with Policy HP07(b);
- c. land (circa 5.5 ha) for employment space (in line with Policy PC03) to accommodate a creative range of creative employment uses suitable for a vibrant village centre and a predominantly residential area, including use class A1-A5 and appropriate B class uses;
- d. land (circa 7.9 hectares) for a co-located secondary school (Use Class D1);
- e. land (circa 2.1 hectares each) for two co-located primary school and early years and childcare nurseries, preferably co-located (Use Class D1);
- f. land (circa 0.13 hectares each) for two stand-alone further early years and childcare nurseries (Use Class D1);
- g. community and health infrastructure proportional to the scale of development, and in line with best practice principles of healthy design;
- h. green and blue infrastructure to be a minimum of circa 50% of the total land area including private gardens and green roofs;
- i. retail the provision of main town centre uses to form the vibrant village core in the form of a 'District Shopping Centre' with additional Local Centre(s) in line with Policy PC08, as appropriate to the scale and phasing of the development;
- j. the provision of new and enhanced transport infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of development and to support sustainable modes of travel to ensure connectivity to key destinations, increase transport choice, support changes in travel behaviour, and to minimise the impact of traffic on the local and wider network, in line with Policy BE16 and as detailed in R01(ii) G-J; and
- k. strategically designed and appropriately phased infrastructure, employing the most up to date technologies to ensure a smart, sustainable and a resilient basis for drainage and flood management in line with Policy BE08, water management including potable/non-potable and opportunities for grey water harvesting in line with BE03, efficient and cost saving energy networks in line with Policy BE04, superfast broadband in line with Policy BE10.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23989 - 5050 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii, iv

24082 Object**Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]****Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]**

Summary: Policy R01 (1) should be amended to reduce the overall amount of housing to be delivered at DHGV in the plan period. This needs to be more realistic with commencements of completions no earlier than 2025/2026, with a total delivery of 1950 in this period. The SA and Appendix 1 should be amended accordingly.

Change To Plan: Policy R01 (1) should be amended to reduce the overall amount of housing to be delivered at DHGV in the plan period. This needs to be more realistic with commencements of completions no earlier than 2025/2026, with a total delivery of 1950 in this period.
The Housing Trajectory at Appendix 1 also therefore requires modification for DHGV to remove the completion of dwellings in the period 2022/23 - 2025/26 which are considered to be unrealistic given the time necessary to resolve planning, land control and funding matters fully. The overall quantum should be reduced accordingly rather than further backloaded in the DHGV trajectory.
Other reasonable alternative sites (as identified in the Sustainability Appraisal), including LLLP's land interest at Honeypot Lane, Brentwood should be included within the Local Plan allocations to assist in meeting the housing requirements and acute shortage in the early part of the Plan period given the changes needed in total delivery and phasing trajectory for DHGV. Additional technical evidence, testing and evaluation of the DHGV proposals in terms of transport, community and green infrastructure requirements costs and funding, is required to support the Local Plan's proposed allocation of the site and to ensure that this is proposed on a comprehensive and realistic basis. Policy R01 (1) should be modified accordingly.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24082 - 8362 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - ii, iii

24137 Object**Respondent: Mr Iain Low [5329]****Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]**

Summary: The subject land in the ownership of Mr Low, site plan enclosed at Appendix A, has an area 6.5 acres. The site comprises of Mr Low's residential property and adjoining land which lies immediately adjacent to the junction of the A128 / A127. Mr Low supports the allocation of the site and the removal of the land from the Green Belt as identified in the Draft Local Plan. Mr Low is keen to work with the Planning Authority and the promoter of the Garden Village in bringing forward the land for development. There is, however, no formal agreement between Mr Low and CEG in place in regard to future proposals on this site. It is surprising that the Local Plan is now at an advanced stage yet there remains uncertainty regarding the role of the landowners and promoters in respect of the Garden Village. This calls in question the deliverability of the landholding and Mr Low is keen that this matter is clarified in advance of the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State. The Strategic Housing Allocation R01 incorporates the subject site owned by Mr Low. However contrary to the statement at 9.6 of the Local Plan, there is no reference to joint working between landowners in the Local Plan Policy R01. This needs to be clarified and addressed as the policy in its current form is undeliverable given there is more than one party involved in the garden village allocation. In terms of the tests of soundness this omission in the Draft Local Plan results in the policy not being justified or effective as it is currently prepared.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan should reflect the fact that there is more than one party involved in DHGV allocation. Mr Low would welcome greater formal commitment from CEG regarding the future of the site, in advance of the Examination in Public on the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24137 - 5329 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii, iv

24142 Object**Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]****Agent: Swords (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]**

Summary: Whilst we do not object to the principle of a new settlement, we do not consider that it should be relied upon to deliver such a significant proportion of the Borough's housing need within the timeframe envisaged. There are both generic and site-specific constraints to delivery, the reliance on this strategic allocation to demonstrate and maintain a five-year supply in the early Plan period would result in the Plan to fail the tests of soundness. Such a significant reliance on a single site within a Local Plan is not a sustainable approach to meet housing need.

Change To Plan: The Plan places significant reliance on the timely delivery of Dunton Hills Garden Village. This is not a positive strategy for meeting housing need and does not provide the flexibility required to address changes in circumstances. The allocation should be complemented by the allocation of small sites, to improve deliverability.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24142 - 8368 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - ii, iii, iv

22245 Support**Respondent: Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Will supply a new village environment with many new houses to fulfill residents needs. The location is ideal for current plan with room for growth.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22245 - 4610 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22324 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy R01: we welcomes the cross reference made to Policies BE02 Sustainable Construction and Resource Efficiency and BE08 Sustainable Drainage subject to our comments relating to these policies.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22324 - 6824 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

22366 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council does not object to the principle of allocating land at Dunton Hills for a new garden village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22366 - 4178 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

23206 Support

Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are supportive of the Local Plan policies relating to Dunton Hills strategic allocation (RO1 (I) and RO1 (III)).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23206 - 6824 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii, iv

23251 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As a result of development on site R01 and R02, development of a new health facility will be required to be phased to align with housing delivery trajectory. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23251 - 3791 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii, iv

23278 Support

Respondent: c2c Rail (Chris Atkinson) [8280]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The importance placed on providing effective public transport links from the Dunton Hills Garden Village to West Horndon station in the draft Plan is welcomed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23278 - 8280 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii, iv

23279 Support

Respondent: c2c Rail (Chris Atkinson) [8280]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We are aware that Thurrock Council is considering significant development to the south of the railway line. There is currently no access to the station from the south, so such development there would also mean significant investment is required. We recommend a joint approach between c2c, Brentwood, Thurrock and the relevant developers would be the most effective way forward to ensure a suitable station is constructed that delivers value for money for all parties. We are committed to playing a full role in this process in the future.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23279 - 8280 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii, iv

23283 Support

Respondent: Wood (on behalf of National Grid) (Ms Lucy Bartley) [8094]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site is crossed or in close proximity to National Grid gas transmission asset FM05. Please see enclosed plan referenced GT111. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect National Grid's assets.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23283 - 8094 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii, iv

23305 Support

Respondent: Natural England (Ms Louise Oliver) [8299]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy incorporates measures to avoid significant adverse impacts on designated sites including those identified under Essex RAMS, arising from this new development (subject to a well-designed masterplan being produced which includes all relevant and necessary measures).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23305 - 8299 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i, ii, iii, iv

23825 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy R01, Dunton Hills Garden Village is not in principle objected to provided that no further development in dwelling numbers are allocated to this very large site. At 2,700 dwellings these are a substantial number and part of meeting local housing need and these will take time to build and supply. It is all the more important that smaller, readily developable sites, such as that at Sow N Grow Nursery and land at 346 Ongar Road can be brought forward quickly and readily and without undue constraints to accord with para. 68 of the NPPF

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23825 - 303 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

23835 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy R01, Dunton Hills Garden Village is not in principle objected to provided that no further development in dwelling numbers are allocated to this very large site. At 2,700 dwellings these are a substantial number and part of meeting local housing need and these will take time to build and supply. It is all the more important that smaller, readily developable sites, such as that at Sow N Grow Nursery and land at 346 Ongar Road can be brought forward quickly and readily and without undue constraints to accord with para. 68 of the NPPF

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23835 - 4657 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

23853 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy R01, Dunton Hills Garden Village is not in principle objected to provided that no further development in dwelling numbers are allocated to this very large site. At 2,700 dwellings these are a substantial number and part of meeting local housing need and these will take time to build and supply. It is all the more important that smaller, readily developable sites, such as that at Sow N Grow Nursery and land at 346 Ongar Road can be brought forward quickly and readily and without undue constraints to accord with para. 68 of the NPPF

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23853 - 4656 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

23983 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: Policy HP18: Designing Landscape and the Public Realm, in combination with Policy R01(I) clause C, provide an adequate policy framework for guiding a future landscape scheme - including the provision of green infrastructure between R01 and the development of the West of Basildon.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23983 - 8351 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i

23984 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: Clause B uses the term "self-sustaining" - this is currently an undefined term in the context of the facilities that may be required by future residents. It is likely that services and schooling would also be accessed in Basildon and so the policy should also recognise the importance with connectivity to nearby allocations and settlements in Basildon Borough. Whilst appreciating the need for a garden village to be separate, it should also be appropriately connected and complimentary to nearby settlements.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23984 - 8351 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i

23985 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: There is a slight inconsistency between policy clauses A and D in the use of "around 2,700 homes" and "at least 2,700 homes" in the plan period. Our clients would favour the more positive "at least" in light of the pressing housing needs in the area.

Change To Plan: Favour the more positive use of "at least" instead of "around 2,700 homes" in the plan period in light of the pressing housing needs in the area.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23985 - 8351 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - None

23986 Support

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: Clause D(c) currently expresses a requirement for employment land as 5.5ha. An alternative approach would be to also reference a jobs figure, employment densities are not fixed and the policy will need to remain flexible.
Clause D(d) references a co-located Secondary school, but this term is not defined in terms of what facilities could be appropriately co-located or any indication on forms of entry etc.
Clause D(h) states 50% of the "total land area", this term is not defined and may have implications for the net developable area. This appears needlessly onerous.
Suggest removal of a specific percentage .

Change To Plan: As suggested above.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23986 - 8351 - POLICY R01 (I): DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION - i

22320 Object**Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The five points made refer to issues that do not consider access for all user groups and should be amended.

Change To Plan: 1.To make this Plan sound, we suggest that any such green open space and buffer created within this development is made fully accessible for all user groups including equestrians.

2.To make this Plan sound, we suggest that the words 'fully accessible for all user groups as far as practicable' are included within this Policy.

3. To make this Plan sound, we suggest that point 7 incorporates 'multi-user routes' rather than cycle lanes throughout this development so as not to discriminate against equestrians. After all, this development should cater for both leisure and utility/commuting journeys.

4. To make this Plan sound, a dedicated multi-user crossing be created over the A127 and potentially Pegasus crossings on the two busy roads east and west of the site.

5. To make this Plan sound, we suggest that the Street Hierarchy caters for ALL users by default rather than enhancing routes which connect back to pedestrian routes; the aim should be a fully-connected multi-user network throughout the new development. Point c should therefore be reworded thus: '...enhancement and upgrading of public footpaths and other public rights of way (such as Nightingale Lane, an existing definitive Byway) and any bridleways throughout the GBI network, to coherently connect back to both residential pedestrian links and multi-user links; and...'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22320 - 3855 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - i, ii, iii, iv

22402 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The development should provide:

- * Real, measurable gains for wildlife and biodiversity
- * Effective water management, pollution and climate control
- * Connectivity between wild spaces
- * Improved health, wellbeing and quality of life
- * Easy access to high quality, wildlife-rich, natural green space

Change To Plan: Ecological Networks, Biodiversity Net Gain, Green Infrastructure and Public Realm

C.

a. a highly connected and biodiverse ecological network that incorporates existing habitats of value and natural features, "delivers a net measurable gain in biodiversity", and where relevant new habitats such as trees, tree lines and hedges, hedgerows, ponds and lakes...

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22402 - 2414 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - iv

22440 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**Summary: 2. Justified
3. Effective.

Policy R01 (II) J. b. makes reference to the A127 as an access to the site. The remainder of the DHGV policies do not define access to the site, which is inconsistent with all other site allocation policies. Appendix 2 does refer to access from A128 Tilbury Road. ECC do not support access to the site from the A127, and reference to the A127 should be deleted from this policy.

Change To Plan: Delete reference to 'A127' in Policy R01 (II) J. a.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22440 - 6776 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - ii, iii

23166 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Although the Plan includes specific references that the joint borough boundary needs a degree of landscape and Green Belt treatment to maintain a visual separation, it does not elaborate as to how this will be achieved. It is disappointing that the joint study in 2017, Dunton Area Landscape Corridor Design Options Study, does not form part of the referenced and published evidence base for the Plan, nor do the outcomes from this work appear to have informed Policy R01(II) as sought through the earlier Duty to Cooperate engagement. The Council therefore objects to Policy R01(II) and Paragraph 9.36.

Change To Plan: The measures set out in the Joint Dunton Area Landscape Corridor Design Options 2017 should be acknowledged in Paragraph 9.36 and incorporated into Policy 9.36 to make it more justified and effective at mitigating the impact the development would otherwise have on the Basildon Borough. This would lead to an effective policy outcome identified as being necessary during Duty to Cooperate engagement to manage this cross-boundary issue. It is considered that as a matter of principle, this would help address the Council's previous Regulation 18 objections as to how the boundary would be treated and how the new community could exist side by side the existing smaller settlement of Dunton Waylets in the Basildon Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23166 - 369 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - i, iv

23172 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Basildon Council would like to seek assurances written into Policy R01(II) that it will be invited by Brentwood Council to become more involved in the detailed design and delivery of the new village. This will ensure that the strategic and cross-boundary impacts covered by the Duty to Cooperate and raised during the Council's response to the Plan at Regulation 18 and 19 stages are managed effectively during the development's implementation stages (assuming it is considered sound), alongside the Basildon Borough Local Plan's own implementation.

Change To Plan: The Council would like a criterion added into Policy R01(II) under a new heading "Collaborative Approach" that will make it a requirement for neighbouring authorities to be engaged during the detailed design stages of DHGV to ensure strategic and cross boundary impacts are managed effectively during implementation.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23172 - 369 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - i, ii, iv

23181 Object

Respondent: London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section H refers to mitigations necessary to support the DHGV proposal but these do not adequately address the strategic implications on the wider highway network. The focus of the measures is about 'fitting' the proposal into the network with local measures rather than ensuring that the considerable traffic it may generate could be accommodated on the wider highway network as well as all the other growth planned for east London and south Essex. It is welcome that these issues are noted in the explanatory text to Policy BE11 (paragraph 5.97-5.102) but they should be referenced in the DHGV proposal.

Change To Plan: Policy R01 : Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation should be amended :

- * to provide explicit commentary on the likely significant implications of the proposal for the wider strategic highway network
- * to recognize the importance of working with other stakeholders (such as Transport for London and London Borough of Havering so that there can be certainty that the impacts of the DHGV proposal are satisfactory and can be accommodated without any adverse impact on the network beyond Brentwood
- * to recognize the role of the established joint working between authorities along the A127 corridor to ensure that the significant growth along the corridor is understood, assessed and mitigated as necessary.
- * to recognize the merit of the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground or Memorandum of Understanding between relevant stakeholders to recognize the issues involved and set out a joint commitment to recognizing these and addressing them
- * to recognize that the scale of the proposal and the traffic it will generate is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts for the wider area (including Havering) and that these need to be considered and mitigated
- * to include cross reference to Policy BE11 Strategic Transport Infrastructure (where the Local Plan addresses some issues relating to the wider highways network albeit without referring to DHGV)

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23181 - 7966 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - i, ii, iv

23182 Object

Respondent: London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no recognition in the proposal about the likely adverse environmental impacts of significant additional traffic along the A127 (including within Havering) resulting from the proposal such as noise, vibration and reductions in air quality.

Change To Plan: Section H refers to mitigations necessary to support the DHGV proposal but these do not adequately address the strategic implications on the wider highway network. The focus of the measures is about 'fitting' the proposal into the network with local measures rather than ensuring that the considerable traffic it may generate could be accommodated on the wider highway network as well as all the other growth planned for east London and south Essex. It is welcome that these issues are noted in the explanatory text to Policy BE11 (paragraph 5.97-5.102) but they should be referenced in the DHGV proposal.

Changes to Plan:

Policy R01 : Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation should be amended :

- * to provide explicit commentary on the likely significant implications of the proposal for the wider strategic highway network

- * to recognize the importance of working with other stakeholders (such as Transport for London and London Borough of Havering so that there can be certainty that the impacts of the DHGV proposal are satisfactory and can be accommodated without any adverse impact on the network beyond Brentwood

- * to recognize the role of the established joint working between authorities along the A127 corridor to ensure that the significant growth along the corridor is understood, assessed and mitigated as necessary.

- * to recognize the merit of the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground or Memorandum of Understanding between relevant stakeholders to recognize the issues involved and set out a joint commitment to recognizing these and addressing them

- * to recognize that the scale of the proposal and the traffic it will generate is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts for the wider area (including Havering) and that these need to be considered and mitigated

- * to include cross reference to Policy BE11 Strategic Transport Infrastructure (where the Local Plan addresses some issues relating to the wider highways network albeit without referring to DHGV)

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23182 - 7966 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - i, ii, iv

23199 Object

Respondent: Highways England (Heather Archer) [8309]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Highways England has concerns in regards to the Local Plan developments impacts on the Strategic Road Network. Although policies BE11 and BE16 identify the need that "any significant impacts from the development on the highway network on highway safety must be effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree". The transport impacts of Dunton Hills and the Brentwood Enterprise Park site policies imply that they will be assessed in isolation. This assessment should be done as part of the wider Local Plan picture.

Change To Plan: For clarity, we suggest that the wording is amended to reflect that there is a need to mitigate the impacts of the full Local Plan rather than the developments within it individually. Any single development may have no discernible impact whereas cumulatively the Local Plan impacts may require mitigation. Accordingly we are looking for evidence on the cumulative impacts of the Local Plan. Similarly, you may wish to amend the wording of policies relating to individual allocations, particularly the strategic allocations for Dunton Hills in Policy R01 (ii) under Transport Impact Mitigations and Brentwood Enterprise Park in Policy E11. These two policies suggest that impacts for these two developments will be assessed in isolation rather than as part of a bigger Local Plan picture.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23199 - 8309 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - None

23987 Object

Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]

Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]

Summary: Policy clause C(f) states: "a green infrastructure [...] zone." This matter needs careful consideration in advance of submission in light of Basildon's representations and their erroneous position on Green Belt coalescence and countryside encroachment in their draft plan (which fails to allocate sufficient land to meet needs). Brentwood should provide further clarity that this separation can be achieved without sterilising large tracts of the allocation. Policy clause D(c) states "pathways through [...] points". It is premature at this stage to place overly restrictive pathway design where they may be sound place-making reasons for not following this approach in all areas. Policy clause I(a) states that emphasis will be given to: "incorporating car sharing clubs and electric vehicle only development". Whilst the principle is supported, this may not be appropriate for all areas of this large allocation and would be overly restrictive. Policy clause L(b) includes a small typo for BREEAM. This clause should make clear that BREEAM is for certain types of building only.

Change To Plan: A modest multifunctional green gap running north-south in close proximity to the Borough boundary would be a proportionate response in this location.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23987 - 8351 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - i

23990 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: Suggested wording changes are proposed for reasons of clarity to ensure consistency with other parts of the policy.

Criterion C

As was stated above CEG generally supports the policy relating to the spatial design for GBI outlined in criterion C. However, CEG objects to sub-criterion (f) as it is inconsistent with national policy. The Strategic Allocation involves the release of the land from the Green Belt so the GBI on the eastern boundary that forms part of allocation cannot reinforce the beneficial purpose and use of the Green Belt in that zone, as policy requires. Amendments are proposed which rewords the policy so that it can assist in achieving objectives of visual separation of settlements and improving landscape and habitat value, whilst forming a robust and clearly defined boundary using physical features that are likely to be permanent. This is in accordance with paragraph 139(f) of the NPPF.

Criterion E

CEG supports the approach of safeguarding and maintaining key views within the development. In relation to criterion E(a) a small change is proposed to reflect that it is visual corridors that are important rather than landscape corridors. This acknowledges that not all visual corridors need to be landscape driven. In relation to criterion E(b) a minor change is suggested to make it clear that the visual separation is between DHGV and Basildon. Lastly, in relation to criterion E(c), it is proposed to remove this criterion as this does not relate to 'views' and is in any event already addressed elsewhere in the plan by virtue of Policy BE02(a).

Criterion F

With respect to criterion F, CEG objects to the wording of the policy as it is inconsistent with national policy and modifications are proposed to bring it in line with the NPPF. Paragraph 185 of the NPPF, requires that "Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;..."

In relation to designated heritage assets, paragraphs 195 and 196 provide for harm to heritage assets to be weighed against the public benefits of a proposal. As such, there are circumstances where not all heritage assets will be "sustained and enhanced". A modification is proposed in our response to question no. 6 to ensure consistency with the NPPF.

With respect to sub-criterion (b) CEG objects to the prescriptive nature of the requirement to integrate the listed farmstead as part of the Dunton Hills Village Centre, as it is considered that this isn't justified. The NPPF emphasises that the conservation of designated heritage assets is of great weight and that less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme; there are therefore a number of acceptable design solutions that respect the setting of the listed farmhouse. The reference to the historic core overstates the position as there is only a small collection of farm buildings. The policy should refer to the integration of the farmstead with new development at DHGV more generally, so that the solution flows out of the masterplan process and a consideration of the landscape and heritage assessments referred to in the policy. This would allow the farmstead to be integrated into the Village Centre but also allow an alternative to be pursued if a better option emerges.

With respect to criterion F(c) detailed matters relating to any alterations of listing buildings to accommodate new uses would be considered via planning and listed building consent applications and this should be simplified to aid clarity.

The proposed modifications to deal with the issues outlined above would have knock-on effects on the explanatory text which we consider below.

Criterion G and H

CEG considers that criterion G and H relating to sustainable travel and transport aren't positively prepared as they don't fully recognise changing patterns of travel and mobility that will reduce the need for travel and impact on the spatial design of DHGV.

Criterion G should recognise that 'virtual mobility' which includes internet shopping and working from home or locally are good sustainable ways of living and don't involve 'transport' or reduce the need for it. Furthermore, an amendment is proposed to discourage single occupancy car use rather than reference being made to short internal trips. The length of trip is less relevant and multi-occupancy car trips may be more sustainable than other forms of motorised travel and should not be discouraged. Sequentially the priority is: virtual mobility; active travel (walking and cycling); shared travel (shared cars, buses and trains); and then single occupancy cars.

With respect to criterion H, CEG considers for this to be positively prepared it should refer to 'transport improvements' rather than 'mitigations'. This is consistent with the amendments proposed to criterion G, as mitigation is required to in relation to impacts whereas this spatial design intention should be to minimise impacts through design and management. There is also a need to provide some flexibility to respond to changes in public transport infrastructure over the plan period.

With respect to sub-criterion (d) to ensure the plan is positively prepared an amendment is proposed to reflect the fact the developer of DHGV cannot provide the improvements sought directly, but can provide a financial contribution towards their provision. This is consistent with the approach adopted in sub-criterion (c).

Criterion K

CEG has made representations to criterion D (i) above relating to positively planning for main town centre uses in the district and local centres in DHGV and these should be carried through to criterion K for the same reasons. Furthermore, for the policy to be effective greater clarity should be provided over the form of assessment to ensure the Plan is positively prepared. Any study should assess the needs of the new community considering existing provision in the surrounding area, which would include the existing centres of Laindon and West Horndon, and the new village centre proposed with Policy R02 on land at West Horndon Industrial Estate.

CEG considers sub-criterion (a) should be deleted in line the representations above in relation to criterion F.

Change To Plan: Policy RO1 (II) Spatial Design of Dunton Hills Garden Village

A. The locally-led garden village will be developed collaboratively to achieve a high quality Dunton Hills Garden Village development. Consent for Development will be permitted Planning permission will be granted if the masterplan and supporting design guidance for the development demonstrates how the spatial vision, design principles as well as Policies HP12 - HP18 on securing high-quality of placemaking is achieved to guide a coherent development across the whole allocation site.

Distinctive Character, Harmonic Design, Compact Density

B. Proposals must demonstrate how they will meet and embed key qualities to ensure distinctive, harmonic and popular design is achieved, by ensuring:

- a. the unique character of Dunton Hills is informed by its distinct spatial, landscape and heritage qualities;
- b. the design of sub-neighbourhoods and streets, that may take on their own unique character, are harmoniously integrated to form an overall Dunton Hills Garden Village identity - through the coherent and complementary use of materials and design of the public realm in line with Policy HP18; and
- c. an appropriate range of densities are achieved across the site to ensure a compact and highly networked, walkable and fine-grained environment with a highly connected street-based layout. This should be demonstrated by an accompanying density plan.

Ecological Networks, Biodiversity Net Gain, Green Infrastructure and Public Realm

C. A green and blue infrastructure (GBI) plan should be submitted that demonstrates how the design of GBI will be an integral part of the masterplan layout to achieve multi-functional, coherent and connected GBI in line with Policy BE18. The GBI plan should be informed by a comprehensive wildlife and habitat survey and heritage and landscape character assessment. The GBI Plan should incorporate the following:

- a. a highly connected and biodiverse ecological network that incorporates existing habitats of value and natural features, and where relevant new habitats such as trees, tree lines and hedges, hedgerows, ponds and lakes, among others, in line with Policy NE01, NE03 and NE04;
- b. a variety of activity nodes and treatments for recreation and leisure opportunities throughout the GBI, including public natural parkland, pockets of village greens, local nature reserve, allotment sites, sports pitches and fields;
- c. a streetscape that continues the green infrastructure through the residential areas and village centre with creative landscape schemes including tree-lined streets, grass verges and rain gardens;
- d. an appropriate amount, height and depth of green infrastructure screening adjacent to A127, A128, rail tracks to mitigate noise and air pollution;
- e. well-designed interfaces between the green open space and the built structures should ensure passive surveillance, with coherent and gradual transitions and clear boundaries and vistas; and
- f. a green infrastructure buffer/wedge on the eastern boundary with Basildon Borough to help achieve visual separation between the two settlements and to help significantly improve the landscaped and habitat value by reinforcing the existing woodland, trees and hedgerows with new planting. thus reinforcing the beneficial purpose and use of the green belt in that zone.

Sport, Recreational, Leisure and Public Open Space

D. The provision for leisure, recreation and sport opportunities must be an integral part of the GBI Plan; it should incorporate as a minimum the following provision:

- a. an appropriate amount of sports and recreation provision to provide a variety of pitch sizes and facilities in line with Policy BE23;

- b. the GBI following Nightingale Lane should incorporate a heritage trail with signage and history information boards;
- c. pathways through the GBI network will be made of permeable material and follow a coherent treatment throughout the village. The pathways will all connect into a circular walk, with interconnected shortcut routes and be signposted offering directions to key destination points; and
- d. an appropriate number of play spaces shall be incorporated throughout the GBI network, with an emphasis on quality natural play provision to encourage outdoor adventure play and learning.

Views

E. Key views shall be safeguarded and maintained and become distinctive features on of the new development. This should be informed by a key views assessment and proposals should demonstrate the following:

- a. how the urban layout will incorporate safeguarded views in terms of the structure, morphology and how the streets and avenues are orientated to maintain the visual landscape corridors;
- b. how visual separation with Basildon will be achieved on the eastern boundary of the site; and
- c. how the settlement orientations might also take advantage of opportunities for passive heating and cooling.

Embedding Heritage Assets

F. Development should take account of the desirability to sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets retain, integrate and where appropriate enhance both designated and non-designated heritage assets to provide an attractive and distinctive garden village in line with Policies HP19, HP20 and HP22. Incorporation of these assets should be informed by a Landscape Character Assessment and a Heritage Statement Assessment in line with guidance, having key consideration which should provide for the following provisions:

- a. protection and enhancement of existing public rights of way;
- b. the integration of the historic core and listed buildings of the farmstead with new development are well integrated as part of the Dunton Hills Village Centre; and
- c. protection of listed buildings during the construction phase. and during any retrofitting to ensure the structures are fit-for-purpose for new uses.

Sustainable Travel

G. Priority should be given to cycle and pedestrian movements and access to public transport. Development should therefore, promote and incorporate sustainable mobility and transport measures in line with Policy BE12, Policy BE13, and Policy BE14. The development will be required to integrate 'Active by Design' measures throughout the street network to promote healthy travel options. The development will be required to incorporate a dedicated segregated cycle lane to ensure cycling is safe for all ages and to help discourage single occupancy car use for short internal trips. Where appropriate, this should be integrated with the off-street cycle routes throughout the GBI network to ensure safe routes to schools and to other recreation facilities and key destinations.

Transport Improvements Impact Mitigations

H. The proposed development will be required to demonstrate that through design and management it makes the best use of this sustainable location by maximising mobility and hence social inclusion in order of movement priority set out in G and mitigate any predicted transport impacts consistent with measures identified in Policies BE11 and BE16. It will be required to demonstrate the degree of effect on movement and travel within the local area and the importance of those effects in the context of current national planning policy. This should be informed by the latest a Transport Assessment, which should be monitored and re-evaluated throughout the lifespan of the build-out, to account for changes in transport technology and wider strategic transport network changes. As a minimum, improvements mitigations will include:

- a. New junctions to access the garden village along with junction improvements where appropriate on the highway network, including any necessary traffic calming measures at key gateways, to create a sense of arrival;

- b. public shared travel systems, which may incorporate fixed route buses and demand responsive buses, connecting the development with potential dedicated bus route(s) connecting the development with West Horndon station, nearby employment locations and other key social infrastructure;
- c. IT platforms for private and public shared travel systems;
- d. public and/or private shared travel systems to nearby school facilities prior to the delivery of on-site school facilities;
- d. financial contribution towards improvements at West Horndon station for vehicular, segregated cycle and public transport access from surrounding developments as well as cycle storage and a bus interchange facility; and
- e. illustrative plans to indicate key connections to the surrounding green infrastructure destinations and key nearby employment sites.

Clean Vehicle Alternatives

- I. The development should promote car-limiting and clean vehicle alternatives in line with Policies BE12 and BE15. Emphasis Support will be given to:
 - a. incorporating car sharing clubs and electric vehicle only development;
 - b. time limiting car parking in the central locations; and clean air zones around the main schools and community buildings.

Street Hierarchy

- J. The street hierarchy shall be designed to promote a highly connected, permeable garden village that promotes walking and cycling, yet accommodate the vehicular accessibility requirements for servicing, refuse, emergency access and bus routing. Proposals should demonstrate how they are incorporating the following provisions:
 - a. the development shall be a 20 mile an hour zone ensuring the safety of the public realm;
 - b. main street(s) into the garden village from the main arterial routes (A127/A128) will adopt a tree-lined boulevard approach and be designed to slow down the traffic, making it clear that it is now a neighbourhood zone;
 - c. enhancement of public footpaths, public rights of way routes (such as Nightingale Lane) and any bridleways throughout the GBI network, to coherently connect back to the residential pedestrian links; and
 - d. residential streetscape should be designed to incorporate grass medians, verges and trees/tree lined avenues to help slow down the traffic and give the road an instant village feel.

Village Centre(s) - Retail Town centre uses, Community and Employment Opportunities

- K. Proposals for the placement and design of the village centre(s) should be informed by a an appropriate retail hierarchy study that assesses the needs of the new community taking into account existing provision in the surrounding area village centre needs, based on the supply and demand of the surrounding area. As a minimum this should incorporate the following:
 - a. the location of the main village centre should incorporate the historic farmstead in the centre of the site, creating a heritage legacy for the village centre;
 - a. the village centre(s) should be designed to be mixed-use, with a range of commercial and community uses along ground floor frontages and a mix of uses on upper floors including residential and small-scale employment;
 - b. the village centre(s) should provide localised opportunities for employment with a variety of work spaces, including flexible incubator/affordable spaces that are complementary to district-level service centre uses; and
 - c. delivery of employment spaces should demonstrate a healthy-by-design approach, informed by leading industry guidance on the design of healthy and productive workplaces.

Social Infrastructure

L. Proposals for the design of social infrastructure such as schools, health facilities and community spaces must demonstrate how they have incorporated key learning points and knowledge from the interior design sectors to deliver environments conducive to human health and social wellbeing. Design proposals which demonstrate the following will be supported:

- a. design informed by the latest knowledge and principles of human-centred design, biophilic design, and sustainable healthcare;
- b. design which demonstrates the adoption of relevant industry standards, such as BREEAM or WELL standard; and
- c. facilities that are designed to be flexible to allow for wider community uses; for example, the use of the school in out-of-school hours for activities such as adult learning classes, other community activities, or the use of the school playing fields for community sports.

Locally-led Garden Village

A. As a locally-led garden village, the private sector should work pro-actively and collaboratively with the public sector to plan and design the masterplan and design principles for the Dunton Hills site allocation. This will require:

- a. community involvement to inform the design and delivery requirements from the outset; the approach should be outlined in a supporting Community Engagement Strategy; partnership working with key industry and public sector stakeholders is encouraged, especially to inform the evolution of the masterplan and determine the complex infrastructure requirements, in line with county level requirements; and
- b. implementation of a Jobs Brokerage Scheme to ensure that new jobs created on site go to local people.

Development Phasing

B. The development and phased delivery of DHGV must ensure the timely delivery of the required on-site and off-site infrastructure to address the impact of the new garden village and help the early establishment of a cohesive community. Proposals should be accompanied by a phasing plan to demonstrate how delivery will be phased, managed, accelerated and governed, without compromising quality or viability.

Stewardship

C. At the appropriate time, planning applications must include a supporting statement setting out Planning permission will be granted for development provided that the long-term sustainable governance and stewardship arrangements (management, maintenance and renewal) for the community assets including green-blue infrastructure, the public realm and community and other relevant facilities to be funded by the developer. Considerations should be given to devices such as legal covenants in deeds to establish responsibilities over certain matters of care, such as front gardens, communal gardens, public realm.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23990 - 5050 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - i, ii, iii, iv

24084 Object

Respondent: LaSalle Land Limited Partnership [8362]

Agent: Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr Mike Taylor) [8361]

Summary: Policy R01 (II): Spatial Design of Dunton Hills Garden Village. Policy seems aspirational rather than based on clear testing and evidence or needs and impacts. Requirements such as a green buffer/wedge purpose is unclear, no landscape or visual impact assessment is considered. Transport Mitigation is not detailed, Viability assessment has a zero cost for 3,500 rather than the proposed 2,700 in the plan. A new viability analysis is needed.

Change To Plan: There needs to be prepared an updated, comprehensive viability analysis of the DHGV proposals including all costs, site specific infrastructure requirements, CIL and modelling of the effects of all of the proposed design and land use requirements set out in the Local Plan, including those stated in Policy R01 (I) and R01 (II), policy needs redrafting in light of evidence.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24084 - 8362 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - ii, iii

22385 Support

Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The approach to the spatial design of the Dunton Hills Garden Village is supported especially in relation to:

- * Green Infrastructure - section C
- * Sport, Recreational, Leisure and Public Open Space - section C
- * Sustainable Travel - section G
- * Social Infrastructure - section L

This approach would be considered to accord with Government policy in section 8 of the NPPF in relation to 'promoting healthy and safe communities. The reference in paragraph 9.52 of the reasoned justification to the principles of active design guiding the evolution of the village layout, street hierarchy and connectivity is particularly welcomed.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22385 - 4294 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - None

23806 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: Policy R01 (II) d- SUPPORT

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23806 - 3738 - POLICY R01 (II): SPATIAL DESIGN OF DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE - None

22326 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We note that Policy R01 (III) include reference to the preparation of a masterplan as part of a collaborative process working with the private sector including Anglian Water which is supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22326 - 6824 - POLICY R01 (III): SCHEME DELIVERY AND LEGACY MANAGEMENT - None

23207 Support**Respondent: Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We are supportive of the Local Plan policies relating to Dunton Hills strategic allocation (RO1 (I) and RO1 (III)).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23207 - 6824 - POLICY R01 (III): SCHEME DELIVERY AND LEGACY MANAGEMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

23991 Support**Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]****Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: CEG generally supports the third part of Policy R01. Several minor amendments are proposed which will give the policy greater clarity and ensure its consistent with other parts of the plan. The reference to a Jobs Brokerage Scheme should be defined in the Glossary or a scheme mentioned in more general terms the aim of which is to ensure jobs go to local people. This aim is supported by CEG.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23991 - 5050 - POLICY R01 (III): SCHEME DELIVERY AND LEGACY MANAGEMENT - i, ii, iii, iv

23992 Support**Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]****Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]**

Summary: Clause B states: "The development and phased delivery [...] new garden village". Whilst supported and the timely delivery on infrastructure is essential in the creation of a sense of community, off-site infrastructure may be beyond the control of the primary land owners/promoter, and risks stalling development if a Grampian condition is envisaged. An explicit policy clause is urgently required to ensure for a no ransom position. The primary developer must build roads up to the boundary of Crest Nicholson and Bellway Homes landholding. Without this added clause the allocation would be ineffective based upon the tests of soundness.

Change To Plan: An explicit policy clause is urgently required to ensure for a no ransom position. The primary developer must build roads up to the boundary of Crest Nicholson and Bellway Homes landholding. Without this added clause the allocation would be ineffective based upon the tests of soundness.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23992 - 8351 - POLICY R01 (III): SCHEME DELIVERY AND LEGACY MANAGEMENT - i

23993 Object **Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]** **Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Paragraphs 9.24 - 9.89
Please refer to CEG's representations above on DHGV Strategic Aims and Objectives, paragraphs 9.19 - 9.22.
In relation to paragraph 9.40, some modifications are proposed to remove reference to the 'significance' of landscape features and key views, instead requiring them to be retained and enhanced. This recognises that not all landscape features or key views will have a heritage interest and the use of 'significance' in the NPPF specifically relates to heritage assets. We have suggested that paragraph 9.40 becomes two paragraphs as the last sentence does not relate to landscape features and key views. CEG's representations outlined above would have some knock-on implications on what is contained within these paragraphs, albeit quite limited. For example, CEG generally supports paragraphs 9.45 - 9.50 dealing with Embedding Heritage Assets into the new development. No reference is made in this section to the need for listed farmhouse being incorporated into the village or district centre. For the reasons stated above we consider this is a matter that should flow from the outcome of the masterplan process. However, in the section on Social Place, in paragraph 9.60 it does refer to the farmstead being incorporated into the village core and for the reasons set out above, we consider such a reference should be deleted.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference: O - 23993 - 5050 - 9.24 - i, ii, iii, iv

23995 Object **Respondent: Bellway Homes and Crest Nicholson [8351]** **Agent: AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]**

Summary: Paragraph 9.30 includes a reference to 'Medium' density- but this is not defined. The allocation location is in close proximity to Basildon and West Horndon and the potential for sustainable modes of transport lends itself to higher densities in district and local centres.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes
Full Reference: O - 23995 - 8351 - 9.30 - i

22434 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified
3. Effective
4.Consistent with National Policy.

Request additional paragraph after paragraph 9.40 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert the following paragraph after paragraph 9.40 -

The proposed development area is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding From Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 22434 - 6776 - URBAN LAYOUT / PUBLIC REALM - ii, iii, iv

23169 Object **Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Although the Plan includes specific references that the joint borough boundary needs a degree of landscape and Green Belt treatment to maintain a visual separation, it does not elaborate as to how this will be achieved. It is disappointing that the joint study in 2017, Dunton Area Landscape Corridor Design Options Study, does not form part of the referenced and published evidence base for the Plan, nor do the outcomes from this work appear to have informed Policy R01(II) as sought through the earlier Duty to Cooperate engagement. The Council therefore objects to Policy R01(II) and Paragraph 9.36.

Change To Plan: The measures set out in the Joint Dunton Area Landscape Corridor Design Options 2017 should be acknowledged in Paragraph 9.36 and incorporated into Policy 9.36 to make it more justified and effective at mitigating the impact the development would otherwise have on the Basildon Borough. This would lead to an effective policy outcome identified as being necessary during Duty to Cooperate engagement to manage this cross-boundary issue. It is considered that as a matter of principle, this would help address the Council's previous Regulation 18 objections as to how the boundary would be treated and how the new community could exist side by side the existing smaller settlement of Dunton Waylets in the Basildon Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23169 - 369 - 9.36 - i, iv

22325 Object **Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Paragraph 9.37: we are very pleased to see in point (b) that horse riding has been acknowledged - this is good news - but WHY has this only been mentioned in one place within this Plan??? Outdoor recreation is an important part of this Plan but the need to cater for All users must be embedded throughout rather than what appears to be an afterthought.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, ensure that access for ALL users is fully embedded within this whole Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22325 - 3855 - 9.37 - i, ii, iii, iv

23994 Object **Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]** **Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]**

Summary: Paragraph 9.40 is unclear and an additional paragraph is needed regarding viewpoints and landscape features

Change To Plan: In relation to paragraph 9.40, the following amendments are proposed:

"Distinctive The significance of the landscape features and key views, including those to the such as London skyline and Langdon Hills, and others identified must should be retained and enhanced as part of the development. The development will also provide new publicly accessible viewpoints and characteristic landscape features as part of the Green and Blue Infrastructure across the site."

New paragraph 9.41:

"Grassy meridians down the middle of streets should be used as a traffic calming tactic, especially on the larger roads which spur off the main A roads, to create lane separation for different transport modes."

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23994 - 5050 - 9.40 - i, ii, iii, iv

22441 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Additional wording requested to ensure consistency with paragraph 175 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Change paragraph 9.43 to read as follows -

Proposals will need to retain irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodlands, veteran trees and fens'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22441 - 6776 - 9.43 - iv

22327 Object

Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Paragraph 9.52/53/54: it is very disappointing to see yet again that cyclists are the only ones catered for here. Starting from a blank canvas gives the opportunity to ensure ACCESS FOR ALL, not just cyclists. All new routes should be designated as multi-user and not footway/cycleway which preclude the use by equestrians.

Change To Plan: To make this Plan sound, all new routes should be designated as multi-user and not footway/cycleway which preclude the use by equestrians.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22327 - 3855 - 9.52 - i, ii, iii, iv

23996 Object

Respondent: CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]

Agent: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mrs Pauline Roberts) [8354]

Summary: In the section on Social Place, in paragraph 9.60 it does refer to the farmstead being incorporated into the village core, we consider such a reference should be deleted for consistency with other policies

Change To Plan: Delete reference to in Para 9.60 that refers to the farmstead being incorporated into the village core.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23996 - 5050 - 9.60 - i, ii, iii, iv

22442 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified
3. Effective.

The type or types of school that will best serve Dunton have yet to be properly considered and cannot be determined at this stage. The important consideration at this stage is ensuring appropriate opportunities for all learners of all ages. The DfE regulations for establishing a new school include appropriate consultation requirements that would be prejudiced by an assumption that any new school must be 'all through'.

Paragraph 9.72 should be amended to reflect this.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 9.72 as follows -

Strategic Objective DH02b (all through learning) will deliver exemplar education facilities that meet the needs of all types of learners through life, from nursery to adult learning opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22442 - 6776 - 9.72 - ii, iii

22443 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

In order to strengthen the supporting text in paragraph 9.82 in relation to employment and skills reference to the adoption of Employment and Skills Plans should be referenced.

Change To Plan: Insert additional sentence after the first sentence of paragraph 9.82 as follows -

This could be achieved by adopting Employment and Skills Plans, through the planning process, which will require local developments, subject to meeting relevant thresholds, to obligate for activities such as apprenticeship opportunities, work experience placements as well as school and college outreach, particularly in construction but also at end-use. It will also factor contributions to support skills and employability for those hard to reach and furthest away from the job market.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22443 - 6776 - 9.82 - iii

25839 Object**Respondent: Mr Timothy Webb [5612]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Strongly object to all non-brownfield proposed housing site allocations. The local plan fails to fulfil the prescribed criteria because it involves a deliberate wanton, massive, wholesale destruction, despoliation, violation and vandalism of the countryside and the green Belt in contravention of the Town and Country Planning Acts and the five main purposes of the Green Belt as stipulated by the National Planning Policy Framework.

This is with regard to Dunton Hills Garden Village (R01), Shenfield (R03), Blackmore (R25 and R26), two schemes at Kelvedon Hatch (R23 and R24), Doddinghurst Road (R16 and R17)

Additionally the plan fails to satisfy the objectives of the sustainability appraisal with regard to Soils, Heritage, Landscape, Biodiversity.

The Duty to Cooperate has not be met in that the views of statutory bodies have not been met regarding Dunton Hills Garden Village.

The concerns of Blackmore Parish Council on R25 and R26 have been treated with contempt.

Change To Plan: Planning are building according only to absolute irrefutable necessity and not based on hypothetical projections of dubious accuracy way into the future.

Rejecting all development in the countryside/Green Belt, thereby respecting and upholding relevant statutes.

Concentrating unavoidable development on brownfield sites. eg West Horndon industrial estate R02, Warley (R04 and R05) and Wates Way industrial estate (R15), followed in order of priority by Ingatestone (former Garden Centre R21 and other R22) and town centre car parks (R10, R11, R14) in each case seeking greater yield by increasing density and constructing additional storeys.

Complying with the prescribed objectives of the sustainability appraisal.

Respecting council taxpayers, and the democratic process by rejecting any, all developments where there is significant local opposition.

All policy - local, regional, national, international should be predicated primarily on the need to restrict and ultimately reverse unsustainable population growth, not pander to it.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25839 - 5612 - Strategic Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

23715 Support**Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]****Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]**

Summary: Other larger housing site allocations are likewise not objected to, provided that there is no significant additional dwelling allocations added to them, either by way of additional land, or by way of significant additional density and dwelling provision, to the larger allocated sites.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23715 - 8337 - Strategic Housing Allocations - None

23826 Support**Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Other larger housing site allocations are likewise not objected to, provided that there is no significant additional dwelling allocations added to them, either by way of additional land, or by way of significant additional density and dwelling provision, to the larger allocated sites.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23826 - 303 - Strategic Housing Allocations - None

23833 Support**Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: With the suggested minor amendments, and the noting of the ownership position, then Policy R07 and Allocated Site Plan and other references to the site in the Local Plan Submission Copy can be fully supported. Without such amendments the Policy is still supported but it is considered, given the land ownership position, that this would better clarify the Policy, and therefore the implementation of the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23833 - 4657 - Strategic Housing Allocations - None

23852 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Other larger housing site allocations are likewise not objected to, provided that there is no significant additional dwelling allocations added to them, either by way of additional land, or by way of significant additional density and dwelling provision, to the larger allocated sites.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23852 - 4656 - Strategic Housing Allocations - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations West Horndon Industrial Estate

23346 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Minter [2999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council are living in Never Never Land if they think people will use alternative forms of transport to the car people will use cars! West Horndon station is a 2 platform station which barely copes (in the rush hour) with the sudden impact of hundreds of people descending on such a tiny space. There is very little parking space and nowhere to allocate further spaces. The addition of buses coming in from Dunton Garden Suburb would exacerbate the problem further.

Change To Plan: I believe the plan to be unsound and not thought out thoroughly with common sense in mind. It is full of "ideas" that have not been sensibly thought through. Development at West Horndon and Dunton is unrealistic and unworkable.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23346 - 2999 - West Horndon Industrial Estate - None

22590 Support

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Given that this is an (underutilised) brownfield site, this seems like a sensible development, provided that it is of a suitably high density to reflect its proximity to West Horndon railway station. Also, it is vital that the displacement of the employment/industrial use is NOT utilised to justify inappropriate development elsewhere.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22590 - 4539 - West Horndon Industrial Estate - None

22423 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The policy should include a clear statement on delivering a measurable net gain in biodiversity.

Change To Plan: f. provision for new multi-functional green infrastructure, including public open space, "to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity"

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22423 - 2414 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - iv

22444 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective

4. Consistent with National Policy.

ECC welcome that BBC has recognised the importance of ensuring that this site allocation should provide well-connected road layouts which allow for good accessibility. However, such a size of development should also be seeking to ensure that such layouts can accommodate passenger transport. This would be consistent with other policies contained within the Local plan including Policy BE14, and in line with paragraph 102 of the NPPF.

Criterion B. e. of Policy R02 should therefore include reference to passenger transport.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R02 B. e. as follows -

provide well-connected internal road layouts which allow for good accessibility including for passenger transport;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22444 - 6776 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - iii, iv

22835 Object**Respondent: Lisa Atkinson [2991]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The C2C rail line only has two tracks and the trains are already well above capacity at peak times. The roads around the village (A127, A128) are characterised by standstills and queues in both the morning and evening peaks. An additional 500 cars would have a very material impact on already severely strained and congested roads. It is not feasible for these roads to cope with the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village and the proposed development by other councils, even with investment. It is also impossible to see how the train capacity could be upgraded sufficiently.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22835 - 2991 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22837 Object**Respondent: Lisa Atkinson [2991]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flood risk is already a problem in the village and would create significant issues when considering larger scale development around the village.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22837 - 2991 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22841 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Atkinson [2993]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The C2C rail line only has two tracks and the trains are already well above capacity at peak times. The roads around the village (A127, A128) are characterised by standstills and queues in both the morning and evening peaks. An additional 500 cars would have a very material impact on already severely strained and congested roads. It is not feasible for these roads to cope with the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village and the proposed development by other councils, even with investment. It is also impossible to see how the train capacity could be upgraded sufficiently.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22841 - 2993 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22843 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Atkinson [2993]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Flood risk is already a problem in the village and would create significant issues when considering larger scale development around the village.

Change To Plan: I urge Brentwood Borough Council to rethink its current proposals and to come up with a revised plan that spreads the housing needs more fairly and equally across the Borough so that no one community is impacted so severely as in the current Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22843 - 2993 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22917 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The A128 and A127 are already extremely congested and at the limit of sustainability. There are no plans to improve the A128 despite advanced plans for a second Thames Crossing which can only worsen the situation. Placing a small town of 500 plus houses directly on these roads is a disastrous idea, especially with all the road improvements taking place on the A12 corridor. To live in West Horndon you must have a car but the already badly congested A127 and A128 make travel anywhere difficult and the Dunton Village proposal will make this situation far worse.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22917 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22923 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The West Horndon to Fenchurch Street line is already at capacity with no scheduled improvements planned in the near future. However, at Shenfield there will be the Elizabeth Line connection and major developments planned but obviously only for the elite selected few. The big housing area is at the wrong side of Brentwood obviously.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22923 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22927 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Bus transport in West Horndon is already poor service and the village children now have to be funded by parents to get to school. This is a very poor state of affairs which will be made worse by the 300 extra houses planned for this village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22927 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22930 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: West Horndon and Dunton are adjacent to Basildon and Thurrock Boroughs. Both Boroughs are also considering the Dunton area for their own housing expansion needs so Dunton Village could end up as Dunton Town. Both councils have stated that there has been very limited consultation about perceived infrastructure or transport planning and do not seem to be very much in favour of Brentwood Borough future local development proposals. This is at odds with the statement in your LDP about local joint consultations with neighbouring boroughs. This is symptomatic of a lack of joined up thinking in the planning process.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22930 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22935 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: In previous neighbourhood consultations Brentwood residents have stated their priorities which were:-
a) protection of the green belt
b) protection of local character
c) Re-use of existing buildings in Brentwood Town Hutton and Pilgrims Hatch

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22935 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22936 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It seems that the residents views only matter if they comply with the councils wishes but can be ignored if they do not.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22936 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22937 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This plan will also change the local character as it will put a small town in Dunton and change West Horndon from a small village into a small town used as a stopping off point for the Dunton Town residents. This is a major hypocrisy to the espoused Borough statement of a Borough of Villages.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22937 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22939 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Green Belt around West Horndon and Dunton is meant to prevent the urban sprawl of London creeping along the A127 and A13 corridors. This is the most important part of the green belt in the whole country due to the extreme pressure on housing needs in the South East of England. To state that the Green Belt area around the A12/Shenfield area is somehow more important or of greater character is risible and frankly insults the intelligence. The Green Belt area around West Horndon is so far unaffected but will be completely ripped apart by this plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22939 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22943 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: What happened to the original spatial Option One for centralised growth in and around Brentwood Town Centre with re-use of Brownfield sites and expansion of the Town? What happened to spatial Option Two for a transport corridor led growth along the A12 and A128 area of the Borough? Were they just planning pie in the sky and a bit too difficult to carry out with a much easier option being to move the problem somewhere else a bit farther away?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22943 - 2712 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

23344 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Minter [2999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: West Horndon currently suffers from surface water flooding. A further 580 homes, together with all the extra infrastructure required to accommodate this volume of people, will exacerbate this problem. The Tillingham Hall development in the 1990s was abandoned, in part, due to this problem.

Change To Plan: I believe the plan to be unsound and not thought out thoroughly with common sense in mind. It is full of "ideas" that have not been sensibly thought through. Development at West Horndon and Dunton is unrealistic and unworkable.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23344 - 2999 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22247 Support

Respondent: Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Ideal area for growth and development near an existing small hamlet.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22247 - 4610 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22368 Support

Respondent: Rochford District Council (Planning Policy) [4178]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council is broadly supportive of the proposed housing allocations within the draft Plan but suggests that Brentwood Borough Council should satisfy itself and the Inspector that the cumulative impacts of planned and unplanned growth on local and strategic infrastructure can and will be mitigated, both within Brentwood Borough and across South Essex as a whole.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22368 - 4178 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

22589 Support

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Given that this is an (underutilised) brownfield site, this seems like a sensible development, provided that it is of a suitably high density to reflect its proximity to West Horndon railway station. Also, it is vital that the displacement of the employment/industrial use is NOT utilised to justify inappropriate development elsewhere.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22589 - 4539 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

23252 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As a result of development on site R01 and R02, development of a new health facility will be required to be phased to align with housing delivery trajectory. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance are required as part of mitigation within Care Homes. The exact nature and scale of mitigation required to meet augmented needs of proposed developments will be calculated at an appropriate time, as and if schemes come forward.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23252 - 3791 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - i, ii, iii, iv

23286 Support

Respondent: West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Parish Council supports the allocation of the land at West Horndon Industrial Estate (Policy R02) for residential, care home and appropriate employment uses.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23286 - 381 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

23650 Support

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Andrew Martin Planning Ltd (Mr Andrew Martin) [6623]

Summary: Growth at West Horndon rather than Dunton Hills has historically been supported by Thurrock and Basildon in their response to the emerging Plan for Brentwood. Reasons include its proximity to existing infrastructure such as a railway station, less impact in landscape terms and in relation to the key purposes of the Green Belt, such as coalescence (with Basildon). Crucially, land at West Horndon would be able to deliver much needed housing in the first five years of the Local Plan.

Change To Plan: The SA and evidence base do not support the spatial strategy for growth set out in the Local Plan. The Local Plan process should be suspended to allow a fundamental review of the SA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23650 - 250 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

23807 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: SUPPORT & COMMENT: Hermes' draft masterplan for the whole site includes a variety of dwelling types, including flats (making up the proposed village centre, nearest to the Station Road entrance and West Horndon station) and 2, 3 & 4 bed houses. At present, the R02 site measures 17.6 hectares gross, which nets down to 15 hectares (after allowing for 15% POS and landscaping) in the latest draft of the masterplan. The current layout is nearer 750 dwellings, which is well over the figure of "around 580 new homes" set out in the policy.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23807 - 3738 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

23810 Support

Respondent: Mr Carl Croll [8053]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Miss Charlotte Williams) [6668]

Summary: Our client's site is referenced as Site 152 in the Council's Emerging Local Plan and HELAA. In the previous Preferred Site Allocations Document (Regulation 18), there were some minor inconsistencies regarding the extent of the site proposed for allocation when compared to the client's land ownership. Following Strutt & Parker's previously submitted representations, we are happy to confirm that these inconsistencies no longer remain. Subject to the progress of the intended masterplan process as set out at Policy R02, there is an opportunity to bring forward the site earlier in the plan period.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23810 - 8053 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - None

25799 Support

Respondent: Mr Matthew Ionescu [8576]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Agree with development of West Horndon Industrial Estate.

Change To Plan: Has considered local opinion to an extent but requires further local consultation with residents.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 25799 - 8576 - POLICY R02: LAND AT WEST HORNDON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - iii

23345 Object **Respondent: Mrs Carol Minter [2999]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Station Road is already unable to cope with the current volume of traffic. It is a country lane with a sharp double bend where the road crosses the railway line. This part of the road is a major hazard with frequent accidents. 580 new properties will result in a minimum of 580 cars exiting onto what is already a major danger spot. Station Road is also used as a "rat run" when the M25, A127 and A13 are closed, running slowly, or congested.

Change To Plan: I believe the plan to be unsound and not thought out thoroughly with common sense in mind. It is full of "ideas" that have not been sensibly thought through. Development at West Horndon and Dunton is unrealistic and unworkable.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23345 - 2999 - 9.91 - None

22445 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified
3. Effective
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.97 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.97 with the following wording:

The site falls within 2 Critical Drainage Areas (CDA) Hor2 and Hor3 and is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early Engagement with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22445 - 6776 - 9.97 - ii, iii, iv

22209 Object**Respondent: D Westfall [5310]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Little or no extra local transport infrastructure with regards to main road or rail links. The existing nearby road and rail links are near bursting point already, esp at rush hour(s).

Change To Plan: Fewer houses to be built, the total is far too many in too short a period of time.
OR provide the required supporting service first, i.e. extra local hospitals, more local doctors/dentists, much better rail links, much better bus links etc, and then build your new town.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22209 - 5310 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - iii

22392 Object**Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sport England objects to part of the allocation of Land north of Shenfield, for residential development in the local plan as it would potentially result in the loss of operational playing field sites at Shenfield High School and Alexander Park that are used extensively by the community and Shenfield High School without any proposals for mitigation in the site allocation policy. This would be contrary to Government policy in the NPPF, policy BE23 of the emerging local plan and Sport England's playing fields policy that is used as a statutory consultee.

Change To Plan: The removal of the Shenfield High School and Alexander Park playing fields from the R03 from the local plan would be the preferred solution to addressing this objection. However, as an alternative, potential may exist for this objection to be addressed in accordance with paragraph 97 of the NPPF, policy BE23 of the local plan and Sport England's playing fields policy if the playing fields were acceptably replaced as a requirement of the site allocation policy. To address this, the development principles in the site allocation policy would need to set out that the playing fields and supporting facilities at Shenfield High School and Alexander Park would either need to be retained unless replacement playing field provision (including ancillary facilities such as the pavilion and car parking) was made which was equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality on the wider site allocation prior to any development commencing. Any replacement provision would need to avoid prejudicing Shenfield High School or the community from meeting their needs.

The authority will be aware that Sport England would be a statutory consultee on any future planning application for development on this site which affects the playing fields. As the principle of development on this site will be considered through the local plan rather than a planning application, it will be important that the Council engages Sport England with a view to reaching a mutually agreeable solution through the local plan process. We would wish to avoid a potential scenario where we would have no option but to object to a future planning application due to the matters set out above not being satisfactorily addressed through the local plan. This scenario is likely to result in uncertainties and delays with respect to the delivery of development on this site.

To take this matter forward with a view to reaching a mutually agreeable solution in advance of the matter being considered at the local plan examination, the Council are urged to engage with Sport England to explore a potential solution.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22392 - 4294 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - ii, iv

22424 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: g. provision for new multi-functional green infrastructure including public open space;

The above statement should be amended to include a commitment to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity.

i. protect and where appropriate enhance the Local Wildlife Site (Arnold's Wood).

The caveat "where appropriate" in the above statement should be deleted. It is unnecessary and potentially creates ambiguity which could provide a loophole for developers to do nothing. There should be a clear policy commitment to ensure no net loss in habitat quality of the local wildlife site and preferably a measurable net gain.

Change To Plan: g. provision for new multi-functional green infrastructure including public open space "to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity";

i. protect and enhance the Local Wildlife Site (Arnold's Wood) to deliver a measurable net gain in habitat quality and biodiversity.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22424 - 2414 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - iv

22446 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. d. of Policy R03 seeks a potential diversion of Alexander Lane to create a quiet lane for pedestrians and cyclists. This would appear to be contradictory to criterion B. c. which proposes vehicular from Chelmsford Road and Alexander Lane. A development of this scale requires more than one access, and whilst Chelmsford Road would be the main access, Alexander road would need to provide vehicular access.

Clarification is sought on how this conflict can be resolved, and that the site is provide with the required and appropriate accesses.

Change To Plan: Clarity is sought on how to resolve any conflict between criteria B. c and B. d. in order to ensure the site can provide the required and appropriate accesses.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22446 - 6776 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - iii

22447 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Criterion B. f. of Policy R03 should include reference to passenger transport (see comments to Policy R02 - Land at West Horndon Industrial Estate).

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R03 B. f. as follows -

provide well-connected internal road layouts which allow for good accessibility including for passenger transport;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22447 - 6776 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - iii, iv

22954 Object**Respondent: D Westfall [5310]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Far too many houses with no apparent provision for extra supporting services i.e. school places, Doctors/Dentists surgeries, local shops to serve the new estate etc.

Change To Plan: Fewer houses to be built, the total is far too many in too short a period of time.
OR provide the required supporting service first, i.e. extra local hospitals, more local doctors/dentists, much better rail links, much better bus links etc, and then build your new town.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22954 - 5310 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - iii

22955 Object**Respondent: D Westfall [5310]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Little or no extra local transport infrastructure with regards to main road or rail links. The existing nearby road and rail links are near bursting point already, esp at rush hour(s).

Change To Plan: Fewer houses to be built, the total is far too many in too short a period of time.
OR provide the required supporting service first, i.e. extra local hospitals, more local doctors/dentists, much better rail links, much better bus links etc, and then build your new town.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22955 - 5310 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - iii

23765 Object**Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]**

Summary: The proposed provision of employment uses on this site has not been justified and is not effective. The provision of 2ha on this site is not required to meet the Borough's identified employment need and conflicts with the deliverability of new homes on the site to meet the Council's housing need.

Change To Plan: The provision of 2ha of land for employment purposes should be removed from the policy. In order to make Policy R03 effective, it is proposed that the wording in part (e) of the Policy is removed in its entirety, and for part A of Policy R03 to read: a) Amount and type of development; b) Provision for at least 825 new homes of mixed size and type, including affordable housing; c) Provision of land (circa 2.1 hectares) for a co-located primary school and early years and childcare nursery (Use Class D1); d) Provision for a residential care home (around 60 bed scheme as part of the overall allocation); and e) Provision for 5% self-build and custom build across the entire allocation area. The Policy wording should also be changed to state that "at least..." rather than "around 825 homes".

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23765 - 6751 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - i, ii, iii, iv

24141 Object**Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]****Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]**

Summary:

R03 is one of the Pre-Submission Document's strategic allocations. Much of this allocation seems sensible and logical. It is bounded to the north-west by the A12 and south-east by the main railway line. As with Policy R16 and R17, R03 says new development should consider providing for:

"appropriate landscaping and buffers along sensitive boundary adjoining the A12."

As with Policy R16 and R17, Policy R03 should be more strongly worded to insist on appropriate mitigation measures.

Two parts of the allocation which should be removed and left in the Green Belt. The first is the elliptical shaped piece of land between the A1023 Chelmsford Road and the A12 Marylands Interchange, unless it is specifically reserved for the employment uses mentioned in Policy R03, the second is an area to the north of the site bounded by the Marylands Interchange to the north, the railway line to the south-east, a part of Arnold's Wood to the south-west and Chelmsford Road to the north-west. They would provide poor and unhealthy environment, being close to the interchange and main railway. Residential development this close to Arnolds Wood can only be detrimental. R03, R16, R17, R21, R22 allocations are all bounded by the A12 to a greater or lesser extent. As noted in our representations on Policy NE05, the Pre-Submission Document's paragraph 8.50 states that transport generated emissions are the prime source of air pollution in the Borough. We have consistently questioned the wisdom of locating new housing next to the A12 on the grounds of public health. All these proposed allocations, in whole or part, have significant issues resulting from their proximity to principal sources of air and noise pollution. There is conflict with the Pre-Submission Document's own policies on these issues, including Policy NE05. Consequently we are suggesting a number of modifications to the relevant policies.

Change To Plan: We propose the following modifications for the reasons outlined in our response to the Local Plan consultation. Strengthen the wording of all policies to ensure that appropriate air and noise pollution measures form an integral part of any development proposals. Wherever there is reference to either the A12, or the mainline railway, the related criterion should read as follows:
"appropriate measures, including barriers, embankments and landscaping, to reduce air and noise must be provided along the site's boundary(ies) with the A12 and/or the mainline railway."
Removal of R17 from Policy R16 and R17.
Removal from proposed allocation R03 of the elliptical shaped piece of land between the A1023 Chelmsford Road and the A12 Marylands Interchange, and the area to the north of the site bounded by the Marylands Interchange to the north, the railway line to the south-east, a part of Arnold's Wood to the south-west and Chelmsford Road to the north-west.
Removal of Allocation R21 on grounds of poor physical environment, isolation from the main settlement of Ingatestone and coalescence with the village of Mountnessing.
Removal of Allocation R22 on grounds of poor physical environment.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24141 - 2788 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - ii, iii

25796 Object

Respondent: Mr John Walker [8572]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan is unsound with respect to R03 Land north of Shenfield. This lane is green belt and should not be considered for housing as there area areas of brownfield sites within the borough.
In proposing to build 800 houses in this location will create a number of problems on the surrounding areas.
With newly completed Mountnessing estate, the proposed development of the Ingatestone Garden centre site - an additional 2000 vehicles could be using the local roads with journeys to and from Shenfield railway station.
The Chelmsford main road is often congested with the no of vehicles using the road during peak rush hour and on the numerous occasions when the A12 has problems. This can increase traffic using the Shenfield Park estate to find alternative roads into Brentwood or to Shenfield railway station. This already adds to the poor air quality and atmosphere with the CO2 emissions under the railway bridges.
With this additional traffic on the Chelmsford road, this can cause further problems with burst water mains and may effect the aging water, gas and sewage systems.
With this development a new primary school is planned, but I believe there is no provision for a new doctors surgery. At present the waiting time for appointments the Shenfield surgeries is long and frustrating.

Change To Plan: Consideration should be given to development of smaller sites with reduced number of homes in each location. Maximum use of Brownfield sites within the borough.
Change of use for existing vacant retail properties to housing of flats. Consideration for further housing on the William Hunter Way site.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25796 - 8572 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - i

25797 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Walker [2825]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object as the site is Green Belt, it will cause congestion, road safety issues, air quality problems, parking problems, loss of green space, pressure on sewerage and water supply Whilst proposing a new school it isn't proposing more GP facilities. With libraries closing and pressure on other facilities there will be a lack of facilities for new residents. The developer has too much say in the sort of housing that is built rather than the council.

Change To Plan: Remove site R03 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25797 - 2825 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - iii

23253 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R03 and R20 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration, possible relocation of an existing service/s or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23253 - 3791 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - i, ii, iii, iv

23947 Support

Respondent: Shenfield High School [4419]

Agent: Shenfield High School (Mr Stuart Roberts) [8353]

Summary: Support. Have been working with Croudace and Hutton FC to provide solutions to the need for an increase in education provision and to provide a football ground, and to identify locations for shared spaces (green space and/or community opportunities).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23947 - 4419 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - None

24014 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Largely supportive, however there are some aspects we do not consider to be "sound". In particular:
*Criterion b under Amount and Type of Development: Earlier/recent work undertaken by the High School (and others) considered the anticipated need for a new 1FE Primary School. The proposed policy wording should clarify that it is now proposing a 2FE Primary School.
*Criterion d, under Amount and Type of Development: the evidence base and local need should be fully assessed before any commitment is made to the provision of Custom and Self Build in this location. Suggest policy is amended to "up to" 5%

Change To Plan: Amend criteria b and d under Amount and Type of Development as followed:
b. Provision of land (circa 2.1 hectares) for a co-located 2FE primary school and early years and childcare nursery (Use Class D1). To be located adjacent to Alexander Lane.
d. Provision for up to 5% self-build and custom build across the entire allocation area.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24014 - 2656 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - None

24015 Support

Respondent: Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]

Agent: Barton Willmore LLP (Ms Helen Robertson) [8357]

Summary: Support requirements with regards to: a care home provision, although this should be subject to the balanced and reasonable distribution of other infrastructure across the Site; 2ha of employment land; provision of a comprehensive masterplan and phasing strategy; vehicular access via Chelmsford road and Alexander Lane; potential diversion of Alexander Lane in terms of pedestrian safety and improved access; provision of green infrastructure and open space; maintenance and enhancement of the existing PRoW; Local Wildlife Site; pedestrian and cycle crossing points across Chelmsford Road; provision of an improved bus service; surface water flooding mitigation scheme.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24015 - 2656 - POLICY R03: LAND NORTH OF SHENFIELD - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.98

22588 Object

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As stated elsewhere, I object in the strongest terms to any damage to the green belt. It is even more perverse where such damage takes the form of low-density development. Given the excellent public transport, the Council should adopt a policy of requiring that any new development near Shenfield must be blocks of flats, not houses.

Change To Plan: No development on Officer's Meadow. Add policy that any development in/near Shenfield must be blocks of flats, not houses, since public transport excellent.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22588 - 4539 - 9.98 - ii

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.100

22448 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

The second sentence in paragraph 9.100 refers to community services and facilities being accessible 'to the majority of residents in the development'. Policy BE13 requires sustainable modes of transport to be facilitated through new developments to promote accessibility and integration into the wider community and existing networks. It is considered that the wording in paragraph 9.100 contradicts this and should be deleted.

Change To Plan: Delete the following words from the end of paragraph 9.100 -

'to the majority of residents in the development.'

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22448 - 6776 - 9.100 - iii

22449 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] **Agent:** N/A

- Summary:
- 2. Justified.
 - 3. Effective.
 - 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request amendment to second sentence of paragraph 9.105 and full paragraph of 9.170 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace second sentence of paragraph 9.105 and the full paragraph 9.170 with the following wording -

The site falls within the Shenfield CDA and is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding From Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early Engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?: No	Tests: ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 22449 - 6776 - 9.105 - ii, iii, iv				

22451 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Criterion B. c. of Policy R04 and R05 should therefore include reference to passenger transport (see comments to Policy R02 - Land at West Horndon Industrial Estate).

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R04 and R05 B. c. as follows -

provide well-connected internal road layouts which allow for good accessibility including for passenger transport;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22451 - 6776 - POLICY R04 AND R05: FORD HEADQUARTERS AND COUNCIL DEPOT - iii, iv

22452 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Policy R04 and R05 B. d. covers 2 separate matters (community facilities and open space) and should be split into two criteria.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R04 and R05 as follows to separate into two criteria -

d. integrate existing community facilities within new development;

e. provision for new multi-functional green infrastructure including public open space;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22452 - 6776 - POLICY R04 AND R05: FORD HEADQUARTERS AND COUNCIL DEPOT - iii

22570 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The policy wording is ambiguous and lacks a commitment to deliver a net gain in biodiversity.

Change To Plan: Remove the caveat "where appropriate". This is unnecessary and ambiguous, creating a loophole for developers to do nothing.

g. protect and enhance the Local Wildlife Sites (Barrack Wood/Donkey Lane Plantation) and deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22570 - 2414 - POLICY R04 AND R05: FORD HEADQUARTERS AND COUNCIL DEPOT - iii, iv

23584 Object**Respondent: Brentwood Bus and Rail Users' Association (Cllr David Jobbins) [4922]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Ford Offices, although served by buses, is too far for most people to consider the station walkable while Brentwood High St most certainly is not. It is assumed that most people would find it possible to walk to Brentwood station and to the High Street.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23584 - 4922 - POLICY R04 AND R05: FORD HEADQUARTERS AND COUNCIL DEPOT - None

24123 Object

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford objects to the retention of 2ha of employment floorspace specifically at the land south of Eagle Way in the absence of robust evidence to justify this, in tandem with acknowledging that the Site is no longer suitable for such uses. It is also apparent that BBC actually have a surplus of employment supply over the plan period, including at other more suitable sites across the Borough, whereby there is no logical or sound reasoning for the retention of 2ha of employment floorspace at the main Ford site. Ford also wishes to challenge the inclusion of a 60-bed care home and 5% custom build housing across the wider RO4 and RO5 Draft allocation - in the absence of any sound justification for this. Ford wish to highlight that it is not possible to feasibility accommodate the amount of development currently included across the collective allocation - in the form which the market demands, whereby the provision of a care home and 2ha of employment floorspace significantly reduces the net developable area and ability to deliver up to 350 new homes on the Ford owned land. Therefore, we object to the inclusion of these additional land uses in the interests of ensuring that the Site can be maximised for much needed housing development.

Change To Plan: Seek to have the Council's owned land (the Depot) and the Ford site be separated to allow for the Ford site to come forward earlier on in the Plan period to provide residential development.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24123 - 3769 - POLICY R04 AND R05: FORD HEADQUARTERS AND COUNCIL DEPOT - i, ii, iii, iv

23213 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23213 - 1927 - POLICY R04 AND R05: FORD HEADQUARTERS AND COUNCIL DEPOT - i, ii, iii, iv

23255 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R04&05, R06, R08, R09, R10 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23255 - 3791 - POLICY R04 AND R05: FORD HEADQUARTERS AND COUNCIL DEPOT - i, ii, iii, iv

24118 Support

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford wishes to voice support in principle for the Draft allocation in the PSD for future residential development - including up to 350 new dwellings on the Ford owned land. This is highlighted with specific regards to the Site's situation within the Brentwood / Urban Area settlement boundary; comprising of previously developed brownfield land whereby the NPPF (2018) and PSD (2019) acknowledges that housing growth should be directed as a matter of priority in promoting sustainable development (providing a sound policy basis under the test of soundness within the NPPF). The need for BBC to identify additional land for housing is also required in order to address cross-boundary pressures such as London's future housing growth, which has been exemplified within relevant London Plan EiP hearing sessions. In this context, the Mayor of London has confirmed that local planning authorities within the wider south east, where the housing market is influenced by that of London should be working collaboratively with the GLA to significantly boost the supply of housing and ensure that Local Plans meet full objectively assessed needs.

Change To Plan: Ford request that the Draft allocation is revised to reflect the Ford owned land being available and deliverable earlier in the plan period - notably, 1-5 years versus the 9-17 years currently referenced within the PSD under the collective allocation with the Council Depot. This will help to deliver a significant degree of Brentwood's housing requirement in the short term (in line with the key objective of the NPPF with regards to boosting the supply of housing without delay).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24118 - 3769 - POLICY R04 AND R05: FORD HEADQUARTERS AND COUNCIL DEPOT - iii, iv

22175 Support

Respondent: Ms Susan Henry [6847] Agent: N/A

Summary: Glad you have considered the band in the consultation, concerned of possible complaints regarding noise and parking issues from the new residents. What was the thinking of the consultation team regarding these points.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22175 - 6847 - 9.108 - None

22453 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.112 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.112 with the following wording:

The northern part of the site (R05) falls within the Thrift Green CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early Engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

The southern part of the proposed development area (R04) is not within areas identified at risk of flooding. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22453 - 6776 - 9.112 - ii, iii, iv

22535 Object**Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Detailed objection to spatial strategy that puts forward objection to R25 and R26 in Blackmore.
 In summary: 6.1. Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing need cannot be met on existing previously developed land/sites in existing urban areas or by increasing densities on proposed allocated sites.
 6.2. Without prejudice to the above contention, if no such sites exist, that Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate there are no or insufficient previously developed sites available outside the existing urban areas.
 6.3. In any event, there are greenfield sites available (for example adjoining existing urban areas) in preferable and more sustainable locations.
 6.4. Moreover, R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable developments because of (1) inadequate access, (2) flooding, (3) it will result in disproportionate increase in the housing stock, and, (4) the development would not be sustainable.

Change To Plan: (see attached / comments re Chapter 3 - Vision)

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22535 - 8074 - Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

22932 Object**Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 6. No evidence of effect developments in adjacent areas will have on Blackmore services, or of Brentwood's consultation with those Councils

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22932 - 8240 - Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

23386 Object**Respondent: BJ Associates [8317]****Agent: Gerald Eve LLP (Mr. Peter Dines) [3762]**

Summary: The Roamn Road, Mountnessing site is available for development, free from constrains and there is a clear commitment to provide affordable housing and/or specialist housing for older people on this site. The site is not of high landscape value and any development would be distant from heritage assets in the area and public parks. The only point against the option is its location in the policy defined Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Allocation of the Roman Road Site for Housing and or Specialist accommodation for older people

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23386 - 8317 - Housing Allocations - iii

23564 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hayley Hammond [8329]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object (no reason given)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23564 - 8329 - Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

23637 Object**Respondent: Tesco [5252]****Agent: GL Hearn (Mr Roland Brass) [4809]**

Summary: Hopefield site should be released from the Green Belt for housing as it provides: significant community benefit by securing the future of Hopefield Animal Sanctuary; A great legacy; High quality and attractive new residential scheme within landscaped setting to meet local needs; Significantly improved accessibility and connectivity; Limited impact on highways; Highways proposals are supported by Essex County Council; Suitable and sustainable location; Developable; Bring direct and indirect economic benefits to Brentwood town and the wider area; Proposals respect Brenwood's character and identity; No/limited impact on the overall role and function of the Green Belt and landscape.

Change To Plan: Identify the Hopefield Site as a Housing Allocation in the new Local Plan as part of the revised and sound development strategy. This is required to address the above matters especially in relation to delivering the growth strategy and meeting five year housing land supply.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23637 - 5252 - Housing Allocations - None

23653 Object**Respondent: EA Strategic Land LLP [279]****Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]**

Summary: Plan is not consistent with the NPPF, which is clear that where the plan-maker has identified that exceptional circumstances exist to release land from the Green Belt the 'first consideration' should be given to land which is 'previously developed and/or well-served by public transport'. The Plan itself seeks 'transport orientated growth' yet remains steadfast against allocating site west of Thorndon Avenue, which meets NPPF requirements: it is self-contained with strong defensible boundaries, enclosed by existing industrial and residential development and roads.

Change To Plan: Site West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon is fully in accordance with the spatial strategy focused on transit orientated growth and should be allocated. No significant constraints with developing an urban extension at West Horndon, in addition to Dunton Hills Garden Village was identified by the Sustainability Appraisal. If Brentwood is to attempt to meet the housing needs, this approach is required.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23653 - 279 - Housing Allocations - None

23661 Object**Respondent: EA Strategic Land LLP [279]****Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]**

Summary: The Green Belt Study; the Sustainability Appraisal; the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study and the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment all support the allocation of the land West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon for housing. The Council's own landscape assessment considers due to the characteristics of the subject site, that it should be prioritised for housing development. There is no technical evidence accompanying the Plan which identifies any fundamental constraints in bringing this site forward.

Change To Plan: Site West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon is fully in accordance with the spatial strategy focused on transit orientated growth and should be allocated. No significant constraints with developing an urban extension at West Horndon, in addition to Dunton Hills Garden Village was identified by the Sustainability Appraisal. If Brentwood is to attempt to meet the housing needs, this approach is required.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23661 - 279 - Housing Allocations - None

23685 Object**Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: Site 073 at Mountnessing should be allocated. The village of Mountnessing falls within the settlement classification 3 which is identified as being able to accommodate urban extensions, therefore Mountnessing should be considered a sustainable location to assist in the delivery of the spatial strategy. Site has accessibility to infrastructure and surrounding settlements; its location next to the A12 represents potentials to maximise opportunities around existing transport infrastructure and networks and to support the 'Transit-orientated Growth' strategy.

Change To Plan: Site 073 at Mountnessing should be allocated.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23685 - 8054 - Housing Allocations - None

23689 Object**Respondent: Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]**

Summary: Site 146 should be allocated for older people housing. Site is located adjacent to Ingrave's existing settlement boundary, in a sustainable location, served by regular buses and numerous services and facilities. The HELAA 2018 found it to be suitable, available and achievable and able to deliver housing within the first five years of the plan period. Although the revised Green Belt assessment found the site to have a moderate/high contribution towards Green Belt, it does not represent open countryside, its development would not entail encroachment into the countryside. Other benefits include parking and extended school playground for the nearby school.

Change To Plan: Land at Hillcrest Nurseries should be allocated to deliver retirement housing to meet the needs of older people and allow them to stay in their local community in housing suited to their needs, with the further benefit of releasing typically family housing back into the housing market.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23689 - 2930 - Housing Allocations - None

23694 Object

Respondent: Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Miss Emma Gladwin) [6745]

Summary: The site north of Wyatts Green Lane was previously assessed as suitable, available and achievable and it is considered nothing has changed which should have altered this assessment. It is served by regular bus services to Doddinghurst which offers a greater level of services, facilities and amenities. However, the Council decided to exclude sites within category 4 villages, resulting in the site not being specifically assessed in the Green Belt Assessment or the detailed site assessments. Such an approach is contrary to the NPPF which set out that Councils should enhance or maintain the vitality of rural areas.

Change To Plan: The allocation of and north of Wyatts Green Lane could furthermore provide housing to enhance the vitality of the rural area.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23694 - 7463 - Housing Allocations - None

23706 Object

Respondent: BPM Investments Ltd [8338]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]

Summary: Site 067a and 067b land at Salmonds Grove should be allocated to: provide for more homes which would assist with meeting the persistent undersupply of housing in Brentwood, and to ensure the sustainable growth of Ingrave, a Category 3 settlement. Site makes a Low contribution to the Green Belt purposes, and it could be developed in the manner proposed without compromising the objectives of the wider Green Belt. The Council's own evidence base states that the site is suitable, available and achievable for development. The reasons given for the rejection of the site are spurious and based on erroneous conclusions.

Change To Plan: Site of less importance to the Green Belt, such as Salmonds Grove should be allocated.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23706 - 8338 - Housing Allocations - None

23789 Object

Respondent: RS2 Properties Ltd [8339]

Agent: Mr. Stuart Willsher [7331]

Summary: Land at 41 Shenfield Road, despite being in the Green Belt, is an appropriate site for residential development and should be allocated for between 21-46 dwellings. Site lies within Settlement Category 1, in a sustainable location, within walking distance of Brentwood Town Centre, Brentwood Rail Station, Brentwood Community Hospital and Brentwood School. Green Belt Study Part 3 considers that the site makes a 'moderate' contribution towards the Green Belt. A number of sites within the Green Belt which the Green Belt Study confirms as making a 'moderate' contribution to the Green Belt, similar to 41 Shenfield Road, have been allocated.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan should allocate Land at 41 Shenfield Road for 24 dwellings.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23789 - 8339 - Housing Allocations - None

23828 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Summary: Site ref: 078 was rejected and considered unjustified. The allocation of land south of the B1002, Ingatestone, for residential development would represent a sustainable and deliverable proposal to help meet housing needs over the coming plan period.

Change To Plan: To ensure the Local Plan is sound, further suitable sites within Ingatestone should be allocated to ensure the sustainable growth, including Site 078.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23828 - 6713 - Housing Allocations - ii, iii, iv

23874 Object

Respondent: Brentwood School [2575]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Pryor) [2581]

Summary: Brentwood School has consistently raised the point that it has future need to provide for a specialist form of housing, i.e. for teachers' accommodation and also to land that is previously developed land within the School grounds and all which provides no useful educational function. Land around Mill Hill House and Millman Lodge is a unique piece of Green Belt which no longer fulfills a Green Belt function but only that of open urban space. It is important to a major education provider and raises no other issues in relation to any other part of the Local Plan.

Change To Plan: The written text of the Plan could provide for specialist housing for School purposes/key worker accommodation. Publish Policies and Proposals Map and release land around Mill Hill House and Millman Lodge from the Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23874 - 2575 - Housing Allocations - i

23876 Object

Respondent: Ms. Isobel McGeever [7286]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The land adjoining Brentwood Community Hospital to the east benefits from a draft allocation in the Local Plan consultation document. Although this site has similar characteristics to the Brentwood community Hospital site, including being previous NHS site, it is not designated as Green Belt. The allocation on site 186, Land at Crescent Drive, Shenfield, identifies that the 1.54ha site can provide for around 55 dwellings, anticipated to be delivered between 2021/22 and 2023/24. It will provide a mix of size and type of homes including affordable in accordance with the Council's policy requirements.

Change To Plan: Should any part of the Brentwood Community Hospital site be declared as surplus to the operational healthcare requirement of the NHS in the future, then the site should be considered suitable and available for alternative use, and considered deliverable within the period 5-10 years. These representations identify the sites potential for future development, in accordance with the realignment of the Green Belt so that this significant area of development land is no longer included. It is evident, that the site does not make a positive contribution towards the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. Accordingly, redevelopment of the site could provide a key contribution to Brentwood's housing need, which the Council have failed to justify, given the reliance on key strategic sites, and the lack of acknowledgement for unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities (Basildon and Havering). These representations therefore promote and identify parts of the Brentwood Community Hospital site as a suitable site to contribute towards these requirements. This site presents an excellent opportunity for a high quality residential redevelopment on previously developed Green Belt land. This could be achieved without compromising the character of the area as the development can act as an infill site to the existing residential development surrounding it, and without the need for significant infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also available to accommodate further health related development should the CCG seek to expand their services in this location, including the possible expansion of the hospital to provide more comprehensive services for the community. However, the site's Green Belt designation would make it difficult for any planning application proposing additional built form to provide further healthcare services to be considered acceptable. The subject site is considered available, suitable and deliverable within the 5-10 year period of the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23876 - 7286 - Housing Allocations - None

24062 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The rejection of site 030A land at Bayleys Mead is unjustified. Site measures approximately 2.36 hectares, with a net developable area of 1.66 hectares, able to provide an estimated 30 dwellings. The site is situated within the Green Belt. Development of the site is supported by a wealth of technical evidence that confirms its suitability, including in relation to the lack of harm of its development to the purposes of the Green Belt. As a minimum, site 030A should be safeguarded for future Green Belt release as and when a need may arise given its highly sustainable location and suitability.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24062 - 250 - Housing Allocations - None

24067 Object

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: Hutton was identified as Category 1 - an 'urban neighbourhood'. Irrespective of the above, the PSLP proposes no growth for Hutton, in contrast to the level of growth afforded to other settlements identified as Category 1 settlements, or also those below Hutton, within the Borough's settlement hierarchy. We have concerns therefore that the PSLP fails to support the sustainable growth of Hutton and that this omission is unjustified and inconsistent with national policy.

Change To Plan: To ensure the soundness of the Local Plan, land should be allocated in Hutton to protect the future of this settlement and ensure sustainable growth.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24067 - 250 - Housing Allocations - None

24106 Object

Respondent: Marden Homes Ltd [8363]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: The rejection of Site 284 land adjacent to 7 Hanging Hill Lane was unjustified. Site is sustainable and deliverable and would help meet housing need. Development of the site would not impact on the function of the Green belt as it is immediately adjacent to Hutton, a 'main town' with the facilities and services that could support sustainable growth in Brentwood. Development here would also accord with the Brentwood Borough Council Spatial Strategy. The accompanying studies evidence the deliverability, achievability and suitability of the site. Any impact on historical sites and settings, landscapes, ecology and ecological designations could be mitigated.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24106 - 8363 - Housing Allocations - i

24160 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: Site 183 is already serviced by water, sewerage and electricity. Residents of the site would have opportunities to make sustainable journeys. The unnamed road outside the site frontage is classified as a Public Bridleway; accommodating pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. This provides a pleasant walking route between the site and village of Ingrave. There are also a number of Public Footpaths in the vicinity of the site which provide access to nearby towns and villages such as Brentwood, Shenfield and Billericay which offer a wider range of local amenities. The nearest school and Shenfield station are in walking distance.

Change To Plan: In light of the higher housing numbers required, the Plan should be revised to re-assess all sites which do not meet the distance thresholds from existing settlements, and to take into account opportunities offered by smaller sites in the Green Belt, which could offer sustainable transport modes, and make a small but important contribution to meeting housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24160 - 8368 - Housing Allocations - i, iii, iv

24163 Object

Respondent: Clearview Residential & Lardpam Ltd [8369]

Agent: hgh consulting (Mr Matthew Robinson) [8040]

Summary: Despite being discounted, Clearview & Lardpam remain committed to the site's development for a high-quality residential-led scheme capable of supporting:
+ Enhanced green spaces for sport and recreation with improved connections to surrounding infrastructure;
+ Approximately 750 new and deliverable homes (including 35% affordable) to meet demonstrable needs;
+ Integration of the existing office building for BT and/or other businesses; and
+ An element of local needs retail and leisure facilities to serve both new and existing communities.
St. Faith's provides a strategic development opportunity within the Crossrail/A12 corridor that should be identified to support sustainable economic growth.

Change To Plan: St. Faith's site to be released from the Green Belt and allocated for residential-led development in this Local Plan.
Given the likely need for additional housing to support sustainable economic growth in the sub-region, coupled with the historically constrained nature of Brentwood due to the Green Belt, it is considered "necessary" to identify sufficient "safeguarded land" to meet longer-term development needs and ensure that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period as per NPPF2.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24163 - 8369 - Housing Allocations - None

24171 Object

Respondent: Turn2us [6753]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]

Summary: A considerable amount of technical work demonstrate that land at Rayleigh Road is sustainable, suitable, available and achievable site to help meet the Borough's housing need. Notably, the Council's evidence base supports the view that the Site is suitable, available and achievable for development. The SA commentary states that is heavily constrained in heritage terms; however no details are provided to explain in what way there fore the SA does not provide a justified reason for the rejection of the Site.

Change To Plan: The rejection of Site 219 is unjustified, and overlooks an opportunity to correct other soundness deficiencies in respect of the Local Plan, including in relation to the overall quantum of housing proposed and the lack of support for any growth of Hutton. The allocation of Site 219 for development will assist in curing defects in respect of the Local Plan, enabling it to be a sound plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24171 - 6753 - Housing Allocations - None

24185 Object

Respondent: Doddinghurst Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [374]

Agent: N/A

Summary: With no significant development within Doddinghurst, the Parish Council wish to make know their concerns should their be any changes to the Plan. Doddinghurst village is a self-contained community with a clear identity and well-defined boundaries to its built up area. The Parish Council wish to express its view that the maintenance of both of these are paramount and would not wish to see any development that would be inconsistent with present nature of the village or that would extend or blur the boundary to current built up area. Particularly because: There is no main road access to the village. Apart from the A128, All other access routes to the village are little more than winding country lanes of limited capacity, particularly for larger vehicles. Access for any proposed development, ad-hoc or otherwise, must be directly onto one of the larger through roads within the village. There is limited public transport to the village. The doctors surgery is already finding it difficult to cope with present demand. The public utilities, particularly water and gas, are regularly under repair and it is understood that the sewerage system is at capacity.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24185 - 374 - Housing Allocations - None

24386 Object**Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate. Yet again green belt is being developed on. Blackmore struggles to deal with the amount of traffic and parking and will not cope with the new development. Doctors surgeries, public amenities are already at breaking point, how will they cope. Increased risk of flooding

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties,
Use parish council to communicate with the residents,
Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24386 - 8373 - Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

24393 Object**Respondent: Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance [2627]****Agent: Stutt & Parker (Mr Rory Baker) [8242]**

Summary: Hutton is the second largest settlement in the Borough. In 2011, the town had a population of 15,578 and a total of 6,564 dwellings (Census 2011). It is a large, established community and a local centre which benefits from a range of services, facilities, access to public transport, and employment opportunities. Hutton is situated approximately 30 kilometres from Central London, 12 kilometres from Chelmsford and in a position well related to regional and national infrastructure. Hutton lies in close proximity to Brentwood and Shenfield on the A12 corridor. Hutton has strong service and education provision. The settlement benefits from excellent access to Shenfield High Street on the Hutton Road which adjoins Rayleigh Road and runs centrally through the settlement on an east-west axis. The High Street provides a variety of services, shops and businesses. The PSLP sets out the Borough's settlement hierarchy. Hutton is identified as Category 1 - Main Town. It is clearly a sustainable location to which a proportion of the Borough's housing need should be directed. In addition, as an established community, it is important that the Local Plan manages the growth of the settlement to ensure the vitality of the community is sustained or enhanced. However, notwithstanding the above, the PSLP proposes to direct no housing growth to Hutton. This contrasts sharply with the proposed approach to the other settlements identified as Category 1 - Main Towns. It is also notable that a considerable amount of growth is being directed to settlements below Hutton within the settlement hierarchy. The PSLP fails to support the sustainable growth of Hutton. The proposal to direct none of the Borough's housing need to Hutton is unjustified, and inconsistent with national policy. To ensure the Local Plan is sound, paragraph 2.10 and the associated Table should be amended to ensure that Hutton delivers a scale of growth appropriate to its position within the hierarchy as a Category 1 Settlement. the Council's evidence base supports the view that the site is suitable and achievable for development, as confirmed through the assessment of the Site within the Brentwood Borough Council Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (October 2018) (HEELA). We would however disagree with the assessment of the Site's availability as a reason for the Site being discounted. The findings suggest that the Site is 'unavailable' due to a lack of active promotion from the landowner; the site has been promoted through previous consultations of the Local Plan review process at Call for Sites and Preferred Options. The site is therefore available for development.

Change To Plan: The proposals map should be modified to remove Site 033 from the Green Belt and identified for the delivery of residential development.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24393 - 2627 - Housing Allocations - ii, iv

24453 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: To outline my views and concerns over the plan and point out why the development in Blackmore would be incredibly detrimental to the area.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24453 - 8378 - Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

25840 Object

Respondent: Mr Timothy Webb [5612]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Strongly object to all non-brownfield proposed housing site allocations. The local plan fails to fulfil the prescribed criteria because it involves a deliberate wanton, massive, wholesale destruction, despoliation, violation and vandalism of the countryside and the green Belt in contravention of the Town and Country Planning Acts and the five main purposes of the Green Belt as stipulated by the National Planning Policy Framework. This is with regard to Dunton Hills Garden Village (R01), Shenfield (R03), Blackmore (R25 and R26), two schemes at Kelvedon Hatch (R23 and R24), Doddinghurst Road (R16 and R17) Additionally the plan fails to satisfy the objectives of the sustainability appraisal with regard to Soils, Heritage, Landscape, Biodiversity. The Duty to Cooperate has not be met in that the views of statutory bodies have not been met regarding Dunton Hills Garden Village. The concerns of Blackmore Parish Council on R25 and R26 have been treated with contempt.

Change To Plan: Planning are building according only to absolute irrefutable necessity and not based on hypothetical projections of dubious accuracy way into the future. Rejecting all development in the countryside/Green Belt, thereby respecting and upholding relevant statutes. Concentrating unavoidable development on brownfield sites. eg West Horndon industrial estate R02, Warley (R04 and R05) and Wates Way industrial estate (R15), followed in order of priority by Ingatestone (former Garden Centre R21 and other R22) and town centre car parks (R10, R11, R14) in each case seeking greater yield by increasing density and constructing additional storeys. Complying with the prescribed objectives of the sustainability appraisal. Respecting council taxpayers, and the democratic process by rejecting any, all developments where there is significant local opposition. All policy - local, regional, national, international should be predicated primarily on the need to restrict and ultimately reverse unsustainable population growth, not pander to it.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25840 - 5612 - Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

26067 Object

Respondent: Mr. Keith Creffield [8001]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local plan is unsound and totally unsuitable for the village of Blackmore: the facilities of Blackmore is not sustainable for more dwellings, the impact on local wildlife, the proposed sites are liable to flood, traffic around the village, impact on the GP and school. Totally against building work in Blackmore

Change To Plan: Totally against building work in Blackmore

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26067 - 8001 - Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

26312 Object

Respondent: Ms Jean Bury [8716]

Agent: N/A

Summary: [no reasons given]

Change To Plan: [no reasons given]

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26312 - 8716 - Housing Allocations - None

23180 Support

Respondent: Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sites of local in proximity to the Chelmsford area are around 161 dwellings (R21) and around 57 dwellings (R22) to be provided on new Local Plan allocations in Ingatestone, together with around 40 dwellings (R25) and around 30 dwellings (R26) allocated on sites in Blackmore. CCC supports BBC's proposed approach to housing and employment allocations which are unlikely to have any obvious adverse cross-boundary impacts on Chelmsford.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23180 - 8305 - Housing Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

24116 Support

Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]

Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]

Summary: Given the Local Plan does not adhere to the housing requirements (does not use the 2014 housing figures for calculating housing need using the standard methodology), Brentwood will require additional housing allocations to be consistent with national policy. Therefore, land south of Hook End Road should be allocated for residential development. Appendix 1 of the Local Plan sets out the Council's anticipated Housing Trajectory, which we do not fully agree with. The Council's calculations of when sites will be delivered, and how many dwellings will be delivered each year, appears ambitious. In particular, Dunton Hills Garden Village is identified as being capable of delivering 2,700 dwellings during the plan period, with the site being capable of delivering 100 dwellings starting from 2022/23 (i.e. within 3 years), and then between 150 - 300 dwellings each year thereafter. This level of growth from such a strategic allocation does not appear realistic and no evidence has been put forward to date to support this forecast. The Local Plan does not comply with paragraphs 59 and 68 of the NPPF (which indicate that local authorities should boost significantly housing supply). We would therefore request that the Local Authority reviews its housing supply, and particularly its approach to small sites, and allocate suitable smaller sites which can be brought forward early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: It is considered that additional sites should be allocated to ensure that the Local Authority can meet its housing requirement to 2033. Even if the Inspector agrees with the Council's objectively assessed need, it is likely that additional sites will be required to be brought forward given the Council's overly optimistic approach to its housing trajectory, particularly with regards to Dunton Hills Garden Village. Furthermore, the Local Plan does not allocate a sufficient number of 'small sites' to contribute towards the housing requirement, as per paragraph 68 of NPPF3. It is considered that land south of Hook End Road, Hook End, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 0HA is an appropriate site for residential development and should be allocated for appropriate new residential development.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24116 - 8359 - Housing Allocations - None

24117 Support

Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]

Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]

Summary: According to the Council's Green Belt evidence identifies the Hook End site as serving a moderate contribution to the green belt purposes. A number of other sites within the Local Plan were recorded as moderate and were designated as housing allocations. Our assessment of the site's green belt function concludes that 1. the site is well contained by existing built development and mature trees. Development would be seen as a logical extension to the physical extent of the village and would have a very limited encroachment into the countryside; 2. countryside separation would be retained; 3. The site has no specific countryside function and would utilise a well-contained parcel of land surrounded by residential development; 4. The site has no physical relationship with any historic town. Therefore, Hook End is suitable for development.

Change To Plan: we would request that the Local Plan be modified to allocate land south of Hook End Road for appropriate new residential development in line with the prevailing character and density of neighbouring residential areas.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24117 - 8359 - Housing Allocations - None

22571 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy wording lacks a commitment to deliver a net gain in biodiversity.

Change To Plan: Policy wording should be amended as follows:

c. provision for "multifunctional" public open space "to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity"; and

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22571 - 2414 - POLICY R06: LAND OFF NAGS HEAD LANE - iv

23214 Support**Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23214 - 1927 - POLICY R06: LAND OFF NAGS HEAD LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23256 Support**Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R04&05, R06, R08, R09, R10 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23256 - 3791 - POLICY R06: LAND OFF NAGS HEAD LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23284 Support**Respondent: Wood (on behalf of National Grid) (Ms Lucy Bartley) [8094]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The site is crossed or in close proximity to a gas transmission asset: FM18. Please see enclosed plan referenced GT112. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect its assets.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23284 - 8094 - POLICY R06: LAND OFF NAGS HEAD LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23899 Support**Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]****Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]**

Summary: Support the principle of the proposed allocation of land at Nags Head Lane under Policy R06 but object to the allocation's indicative dwelling capacity. Site is strategically well-placed, suitable, available and deliverable, its allocation for residential development is justified and consistent with national policy. However, the indicative dwelling capacity of 125 dwellings would be unnecessarily restrictive of the deliverable quantum of development and is therefore ineffective. This underplays the deliverable quantum of development the site could accommodate. The accompanying Design Development Framework articulates how approximately 150 dwellings could be delivered on the Site in a generously landscaped scheme

Change To Plan: Having taken the above design-led approach and determined that a quantum of development of approximately 150 dwellings is entirely achievable, the emerging Plan allocation and Policy R06 should reflect this in order to ensure best use of land and maximise the development potential.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23899 - 2509 - POLICY R06: LAND OFF NAGS HEAD LANE - i, ii, iv

22216 Object **Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: With flawed and missing evidence, in particular transport impact, more education and health infrastructure is needed, site location unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22216 - 5538 - 9.115 - i, ii, iii, iv

22217 Object **Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: With flawed and missing evidence, in particular transport impact, more education and health infrastructure is needed, site location unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Please see previous comments on above page

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22217 - 5538 - 9.116 - i, ii, iii, iv

22454 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.116 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.116 with the following wording:

The site falls partially within the Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. It should be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22454 - 6776 - 9.116 - ii, iii, iv

23703 Object**Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]****Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]**

Summary: Land in the R07 Sow and Grown nursery site is partly owned by Mrs Dunbar and should be developed separately to provide homes more quickly. This area is considered to be previously developed land, with para 234 confirming this is brownfield land. More homes could be built on R07, especially with the smaller area being developed more quickly. The separate land ownership needs to be respected in policy development to facilitate this. Policies BE18 and BE20 which seek to protect and improve Green and Blue infrastructure should ensure that the trackway to the allotments is maintained.

Change To Plan: Separate out the sub area of R07 to speed up delivery.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23703 - 8337 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23704 Object**Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]****Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]**

Summary: It is understood that Policy BE21 will only apply to garden land not forming part of an allocated site for development. If it is considered by the Examiner that as drafted BE21 is not clear, then it is requested that there is a clarification by way of an explanatory paragraph to exclude the application of Policy BE21 to parts of sites in garden land use, such as identified in Policy R07. Likewise para. 5.174 refers to the NPPF 2018 and the exclusion of gardens from the definition of previously developed land. However Annex 2 Glossary to the NPPF 2018 states with regard to previously developed land, land that is excluded includes: "land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks .. ". As land in site R07 includes residential garden land to the Bungalow and dwelling at Sow N Grow Nursery, and also to the adjoining 346 Ongar Road, which is currently outside the development/settlement boundary and in the countryside/green belt, it will be previously developed land. When it is brought into the settlement boundary and out of the green belt upon adoption there may be a need to clarify the application of this explanatory paragraph which forms part of the emerging Local Plan; as referred to above.

Change To Plan: Clarify policy BE21 with regard to Site R07.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23704 - 8337 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23709 Object**Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]****Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]**

Summary: Density proposed for R07 is too low, the words "at least" should replace "around" in this policy. It conflicts with policy HB03B which states densities should be at least 35 dwellings per hectare.

Change To Plan: Amend policy to maximise opportunities for site R07

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23709 - 8337 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23820 Object**Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Density proposed for R07 is too low, the words "at least" should replace "around" in this policy. It conflicts with policy HB03B which states densities should be at least 35 dwellings per hectare.

Change To Plan: replace around with "at least"

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23820 - 303 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23841 Object**Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Density proposed for R07 is too low, the words "at least" should replace "around" in this policy. It conflicts with policy HB03B which states densities should be at least 35 dwellings per hectare.

Change To Plan: Replace around with at least.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23841 - 4657 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23851 Object

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: With the suggested minor amendments, and the noting of the ownership position, then Policy R07 and Allocated Site Plan and other references to the site in the Local Plan Submission Copy can be fully supported. Without such amendments the Policy is still supported but it is considered, given the land ownership position, that this would better clarify the Policy, and therefore the implementation of the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23851 - 4656 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23858 Object

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Density proposed for R07 is too low, the words "at least" should replace "around" in this policy. It conflicts with policy HB03B which states densities should be at least 35 dwellings per hectare.

Change To Plan: Replace around with at least

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23858 - 4656 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23215 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23215 - 1927 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - i, ii, iii, iv

23696 Support

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: Support site proposal as the owner of land which forms part of the proposed site, confirms that is willing to bring that part of the sites defined in the plan within her ownership forward for development separately in within the first five years of the development plan period. With access separate from main part of site, could be built out by small builder. The land allocated in the Sow N Grow Site owned by Mrs Dunbar comprises part of the garden to Rose Cottage. Note that the allotment access track is not owned by Armitage or Dunbar. Propose change to Green Belt boundary to facilitate this.

Change To Plan: Minor amendment to Green Belt boundary to include this area

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23696 - 8337 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23697 Support

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: It is important that the Local Plan delivers the housing needed over the Plan period in a sustainable manner by the selection of appropriate sites for development well served by public transport, by way of smaller sites, especially within and next to urban neighbourhoods, and comprising previously developed land. Pilgrims Hatch has been appropriately defined as such a neighbourhood in the Settlement Hierarchy. This is supported. Where there is previously developed land, this should be allocated for development as a priority, even if within the green belt; especially where located next to urban neighbourhoods where local services and public transport are available. The Sow N Grow site is just such a site and accordingly, the green belt boundaries can be amended accordingly, reflecting the exceptional circumstances prevailing. The approach is sound and effective, and this is also supported.

Change To Plan: Minor amendment to Green Belt boundary to include this location

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23697 - 8337 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23701 Support

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: The identification and allocation of the Sow N Grow Nursery Site and the land adjoining at 346 Ongar Road is a good example of positive and proactive planmaking reflecting the status and priority of the land as previously developed land where it can be sustainably redeveloped. The exceptional circumstances that direct that the Green Belt Boundary should be amended have been recognised by the Local Planning Authority and are supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23701 - 8337 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23716 Support

Respondent: Ms Heather Dunbar [8337]

Agent: MR ALAN WIPPERMAN [8060]

Summary: With the suggested minor amendments, and the noting of the ownership position, then Policy R07 and Allocated Site Plan and other references to the site in the Local Plan Submission Copy can be fully supported. Without such amendments the Policy is still supported but it is considered, given the land ownership position, that this would better clarify the Policy, and therefore the implementation of the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23716 - 8337 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23813 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support site proposal as the owner of land which forms part of thi proposed site, confirms that is willing to bring that part of the sites defined in the plan within her ownership forward for development separately in within the first five years of the development plan period. With access separate from man part of site, could be built out by small builder. The land allocated in the Sow N Grow Site owned by Mrs Dunbar comprises part of the garden to Rose Cottage. Note that the allotment assess track is not owned by Armitage or Dunbar. Propos change to Green Belt boundary to facilitate this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23813 - 303 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23814 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is important that the Local Plan delivers the housing needed over the Plan period in a sustainable manner by the selection of appropriate sites for development well served by public transport, by way of smaller sites, especially within and next to urban neighbourhoods, and comprising previously developed land. Pilgrims Hatch has been appropriately defined as such a neighbourhood in the Settlement Hierarchy. This is supported. Where there is previously developed land, this should be allocated for development as a priority, even if within the green belt; especially where located next to urban neighbourhoods where local services and public transport are available. The Sow N Grow site is just such a site and accordingly, the green belt boundaries can be amended accordingly, reflecting the exceptional circumstances prevailing. The approach is sound and effective, and this is also supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23814 - 303 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23815 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The identification and allocation of the Sow N Grow Nursery Site and the land adjoining at 346 Ongar Road is a good example of positive and proactive planmaking reflecting the status and priority of the land as previously developed land where it can be sustainably redeveloped. The exceptional circumstances that direct that the Green Belt Boundary should be amended have been recognised by the Local Planning Authority and are supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23815 - 303 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23816 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Land in the R07 Sow and Grown nursery site is partly owned by Mrs Dunbar and should be developed separately to provide homes more quickly. This area is considered to be previously developed land, with para 234 confirming this is brownfield land. More homes could be built on R07, especially with the smaller area being developed more quickly. The separate land ownership needs to be respected in policy development to facilitate this. Policies BE18 and BE20 which seek to protect and improve Green and Blue infrastructure should ensure that the trackway to the allotments is maintained.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23816 - 303 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23827 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: With the suggested minor amendments, and the noting of the ownership position, then Policy R07 and Allocated Site Plan and other references to the site in the Local Plan Submission Copy can be fully supported. Without such amendments the Policy is still supported but it is considered, given the land ownership position, that this would better clarify the Policy, and therefore the implementation of the Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 23827 - 303 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23834 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Other larger housing site allocations are likewise not objected to, provided that there is no significant additional dwelling allocations added to them, either by way of additional land, or by way of significant additional density and dwelling provision, to the larger allocated sites.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23834 - 4657 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23846 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Land in the R07 Sow and Grown nursery site is partly owned by Mrs Dunbar and should be developed separately to provide homes more quickly. This area is considered to be previously developed land, with para 234 confirming this is brownfield land. More homes could be built on R07, especially with the smaller area being developed more quickly. The separate land ownership needs to be respected in policy development to facilitate this. Policies BE18 and BE20 which seek to protect and improve Green and Blue infrastructure should ensure that the trackway to the allotments is maintained.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23846 - 4657 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23847 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The identification and allocation of the Sow N Grow Nursery Site and the land adjoining at 346 Ongar Road is a good example of positive and proactive planmaking reflecting the status and priority of the land as previously developed land where it can be sustainably redeveloped. The exceptional circumstances that direct that the Green Belt Boundary should be amended have been recognised by the Local Planning Authority and are supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23847 - 4657 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23848 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is important that the Local Plan delivers the housing needed over the Plan period in a sustainable manner by the selection of appropriate sites for development well served by public transport, by way of smaller sites, especially within and next to urban neighbourhoods, and comprising previously developed land. Pilgrims Hatch has been appropriately defined as such a neighbourhood in the Settlement Hierarchy. This is supported. Where there is previously developed land, this should be allocated for development as a priority, even if within the green belt; especially where located next to urban neighbourhoods where local services and public transport are available. The Sow N Grow site is just such a site and accordingly, the green belt boundaries can be amended accordingly, reflecting the exceptional circumstances prevailing. The approach is sound and effective, and this is also supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23848 - 4657 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23849 Support

Respondent: Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support site proposal as the owner of land which forms part of thi proposed site, confirms that is willing to bring that part of the sites defined in the plan within her ownership forward for development separately in within the first five years of the development plan period. With access separate from man part of site, could be built out by small builder. The land allocated in the Sow N Grow Site owned by Mrs Dunbar comprises part of the garden to Rose Cottage. Note that the allotment assess track is not owned by Armitage or Dunbar. Propos change to Green Belt boundary to facilitate this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23849 - 4657 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23862 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Land in the R07 Sow and Grown nursery site is partly owned by Mrs Dunbar and should be developed separately to provide homes more quickly. This area is considered to be previously developed land, with para 234 confirming this is brownfield land. More homes could be built on R07, especially with the smaller area being developed more quickly. The separate land ownership needs to be respected in policy development to facilitate this. Policies BE18 and BE20 which seek to protect and improve Green and Blue infrastructure should ensure that the trackway to the allotments is maintained.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23862 - 4656 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23863 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The identification and allocation of the Sow N Grow Nursery Site and the land adjoining at 346 Ongar Road is a good example of positive and proactive planmaking reflecting the status and priority of the land as previously developed land where it can be sustainably redeveloped. The exceptional circumstances that direct that the Green Belt Boundary should be amended have been recognised by the Local Planning Authority and are supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23863 - 4656 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23864 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is important that the Local Plan delivers the housing needed over the Plan period in a sustainable manner by the selection of appropriate sites for development well served by public transport, by way of smaller sites, especially within and next to urban neighbourhoods, and comprising previously developed land. Pilgrims Hatch has been appropriately defined as such a neighbourhood in the Settlement Hierarchy. This is supported. Where there is previously developed land, this should be allocated for development as a priority, even if within the green belt; especially where located next to urban neighbourhoods where local services and public transport are available. The Sow N Grow site is just such a site and accordingly, the green belt boundaries can be amended accordingly, reflecting the exceptional circumstances prevailing. The approach is sound and effective, and this is also supported.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23864 - 4656 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

23865 Support

Respondent: Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support site proposal as the owner of land which forms part of the proposed site, confirms that is willing to bring that part of the sites defined in the plan within her ownership forward for development separately in within the first five years of the development plan period. With access separate from main part of site, could be built out by small builder. The land allocated in the Sow N Grow Site owned by Mrs Dunbar comprises part of the garden to Rose Cottage. Note that the allotment access track is not owned by Armitage or Dunbar. Propose change to Green Belt boundary to facilitate this.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23865 - 4656 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

25842 Support

Respondent: Mr Jack Nicholls [8579]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 25842 - 8579 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26404 Support

Respondent: Mr Stephen J Bancroft [8026]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26404 - 8026 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26405 Support

Respondent: Miss Christine Green [8580]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26405 - 8580 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26406 Support

Respondent: Mr Peter Overy [8581]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26406 - 8581 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26468 Support

Respondent: Mrs Gemma Harvey [8582]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26468 - 8582 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26469 Support

Respondent: Mr Zak Harvey [5877]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26469 - 5877 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26470 Support

Respondent: Mrs Rosa Dwyer [5891]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.
I may wish to appear at the Examination in due course and would like to reserve my decision on this to later in the year when the hearing dates are published.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26470 - 5891 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26471 Support

Respondent: Mrs Shirley Fraser [5679]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26471 - 5679 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26472 Support

Respondent: Mr Philip Porter [8583]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26472 - 8583 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26473 Support**Respondent: Mr David Dunbar [8584]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26473 - 8584 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26474 Support**Respondent: Miss Sam Hayman [8585]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26474 - 8585 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26475 Support**Respondent: Mr Michael Fraser [8586]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26475 - 8586 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26476 Support**Respondent: Mrs Indira Brewerton [8587]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26476 - 8587 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26477 Support**Respondent: Mr Ian Sweetlove [8588]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26477 - 8588 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26478 Support

Respondent: Mr Mark McSweeney [8589]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26478 - 8589 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26479 Support

Respondent: Mrs Pauline Hewitt [7996]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26479 - 7996 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26480 Support

Respondent: Mr Leslie Kirk [8590]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26480 - 8590 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26481 Support

Respondent: Mr Jake Brewerton [8592]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26481 - 8592 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26482 Support

Respondent: Mr Brett Hewitt [8593]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26482 - 8593 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26483 Support**Respondent: Mr Alan Sullivan [8017]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26483 - 8017 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26484 Support**Respondent: Mrs Deborah Overy [8594]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26484 - 8594 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26485 Support**Respondent: Mr Daniel Gray [8595]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26485 - 8595 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26486 Support**Respondent: Ms Rasa Fergyse [8596]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26486 - 8596 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26487 Support**Respondent: Mrs Magaret Gurton [7993]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26487 - 7993 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

26488 Support

Respondent: Mrs Barbara Wooders [8009]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The selection of this site for Pilgrims Hatch is an example of a soundly prepared Plan that will be effective, legally compliant and in accordance with the NPPF 2018. It will be good for Pilgrims Hatch by improving the appearance of the local area and delivering much needed housing early in the plan period.

Change To Plan: I am not seeking any modifications. I understand some small modifications are being suggested by the site owners, which I support, if the Inspector agrees they are needed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 26488 - 8009 - POLICY R07: SOW AND GROW NURSERY - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.121

22455 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.121 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.121 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Pilgrims Hatch CDA and is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22455 - 6776 - 9.121 - ii, iii, iv

23216 Support**Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. We do not envisage network infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site on a basis that it wont be any surface water connection into a public foul sewer system.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23216 - 1927 - POLICY R08: LAND AT MASCALLS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23257 Support**Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R04&05, R06, R08, R09, R10 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23257 - 3791 - POLICY R08: LAND AT MASCALLS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23783 Support**Respondent: Stonebond Properties Ltd [5948]****Agent: Mr. Stuart Willsher [7331]**

Summary: There is no constraint to development of this site that would withhold development. The site has previously been the subject of an application for 11 dwellings under reference 13/01351/OUT, which was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal on matter of principle being located within the Green Belt. Site is in a highly sustainable location, suitable, available and achievable, makes a 'Low-Moderate' contribution to the Green Belt. Site can be delivered within two years of Local Plan adoption.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23783 - 5948 - POLICY R08: LAND AT MASCALLS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23784 Support**Respondent: Stonebond Properties Ltd [5948]****Agent: Mr. Stuart Willsher [7331]**

Summary: Part C identifies the site is within a critical drainage area and this needs to be considered in respect of surface water flooding and may require an individually designed mitigation scheme. However, a report undertaken by our engineers (Appendix 4) illustrates that the site is not located within a Critical Drainage Area as confirmed by the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. However, a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) would be included with any future application to address this issue. Therefore, this aspect of the policy is incorrect but will nonetheless be satisfied by a DIA.

Change To Plan: The site is not located within a Critical Drainage Area as confirmed by the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23784 - 5948 - POLICY R08: LAND AT MASCALLS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22456 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22456 - 6776 - 9.125 - ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations **POLICY R09: LAND OFF WARLEY HILL**

23217 Support **Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water. As this is a brown field site, we expect significant reduction in surface water runoff.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23217 - 1927 - POLICY R09: LAND OFF WARLEY HILL - i, ii, iii, iv

23258 Support **Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R04&05, R06, R08, R09, R10 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23258 - 3791 - POLICY R09: LAND OFF WARLEY HILL - i, ii, iii, iv

23913 Support **Respondent: Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust [8344]** **Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]**

Summary: Fully support the allocation of Site R09 for residential development and EPUT is committed to the delivery of the site in accordance with policy R09. The site is sustainably located, previously developed, surplus to its former public sector requirements and is currently vacant, representing an excellent opportunity to deliver homes on brownfield land. The site's removal from the Green Belt is fully justified. Development of the site would contribute towards sustainable patterns of development and contribute towards the 5-year housing land supply. Site can deliver a high-quality development scheme incorporating substantial areas of landscaping and open space.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23913 - 8344 - POLICY R09: LAND OFF WARLEY HILL - i, ii, iii, iv

22457 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] **Agent:** N/A

- Summary:
- 2. Justified.
 - 3. Effective.
 - 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22457 - 6776 - 9.130 - ii, iii, iv

22246 Object**Respondent: Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Station car parking area should not be used as a housing development as a greater need to parking and encouragement to use public transport.

Change To Plan: Do not consider this area for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22246 - 4610 - POLICY R10: BRENTWOOD RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK - ii

22464 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. d. of Policy R10, Criterion B. g. of Policy R11, Criterion B. f. of Policy R13, and Criterion B. g. of Policy R14 seek to ensure that the current level of Town Centre public parking spaces is maintained. BCC should be satisfied that this can be achieved and does not conflict with other policies in the Local Plan, such as BE12 and BE13.

Change To Plan: BBC should be satisfied that this requirement can be achieved and does not conflict with the other policies in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22464 - 6776 - POLICY R10: BRENTWOOD RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK - iii

24119 Object**Respondent: Network Rail [1902]****Agent: Savills UK (Mr Oliver Milne) [8364]**

Summary: R10 is a brownfield site, adjacent to Brentwood Rail Station, comprises surface level parking and light industrial unit. The R10 allocation doesn't include all of the car park. The attached map show area needed to bring forward comprehensive redevelopment - new homes, infrastructure of station and public benefits. The allocation for around 100 new homes is an ineffective use of land contrary to the NPPF. In this location a higher density can be accommodated. 150 new homes is feasible. Anticipated new homes can be delivered from 2024; policy should be amended to reflect this and the removal of the need for open space as the location is inappropriate.

Change To Plan: In the first instance we note that the site allocation plan at Appendix 2 of the draft Local Plan (page 327) doesn't include the full extent of the Station Car Park (i.e. Network Rail's ownership). Please find enclosed a red line plan showing the area that Solum is looking to bring forward for comprehensive redevelopment. Such an approach, rather than a piecemeal approach, will ensure that a well-designed development is delivered in this part of the town that maximises the ability of the site to deliver new homes, key pieces of station infrastructure as well as public benefits. As such, it is respectfully requested that the site allocation plan at Appendix 2 be amended to reflect the enclosed.

Notwithstanding the above, we strongly support the proposed allocation of the site for residential development. The site is a key brownfield site in highly accessible and sustainable town centre location. Best of use of such a site should be made to relieve pressure on less suitable sites within the Borough to meet its needs.

In the context of making effective use of land, the allocation accords with the guiding principles of the NPPF which states that planning policies and decisions should give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, as well promoting and supporting the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively.

In light of the above, the identified amount of development (i.e. 'around 100 new homes') represents an ineffective use of land which is contrary to the NPPF. Given the site's highly accessible and sustainable location, and given the context of the residential blocks to the immediate north of the site, it is considered that the site can accommodate a far greater density of residential dwellings. It is therefore respectfully requested that the wording of Policy R10 be amended to read 'provide for a minimum of 150 new homes...'.

In terms of delivery, we note that the supporting text to Policy R10 states that the new homes are anticipated to be delivered between 2029/30 and 2032/33. As mentioned above, Network Rail owns the freehold of the site and Solum has been tasked with pursuing proposals for its development. It is anticipated that new homes could come be delivered from 2024. It is therefore respectfully requested that the supporting text be amended to reflect this.

In terms of development principles, whilst we fully support the wider aspiration to increase public open space within the town, we question whether such provision is appropriate on this site. The site is relatively long and thin. As such, the provision of public open space has the potential to significantly limit the quantum of development which, as discussed above, would be contrary to making effective use of land in accordance with the NPPF. We therefore respectfully request that this development principle be removed from Policy R10.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24119 - 1902 - POLICY R10: BRENTWOOD RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK - ii, iii, iv

24147 Object

Summary: R10 station car park: many such car parks cannot cope with existing demand as passenger numbers rise. Further parking provision will be required during the plan period, with multi-storey as one option. The would affect both redevelopment options and the potential number of new dwellings, if any, the site could provide. Unless the Council can provide a clear commitment to redevelopment on behalf of the owners that would provide the 100 homes being asked for then it should be removed. The late delivery period is noted and suggest there is a strong degree of wishful thinking in proposing this land for residential allocation. The general point we are making here is that a number of the Pre-Submission Document's brownfield allocations have been under consideration for ten years or more. Some of them, like the town centre car parks, will be complicated to redevelop. We have emphasised throughout the Local Plan process that many of these sites were unlikely to make early contributions to meeting housing supply requirements, unlike our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch that is straightforward to develop and in a single, willing ownership. The problem remains, and supports our contention that the Plan needs more easier to develop sites, with an ownership ready to start. Our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch is more straightforward and ready to start.

Change To Plan: Removal of Allocation R20. This is a small site and should be categorised as a potential windfall site. At present, there appears to be no certainty about its availability. We also think that, without any direct evidence of intent on behalf of the landowner, Allocation R10 should also be removed.
Policy R11 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.137 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
"The site will provide for around 45 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25".
Policy R13 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.146 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
"The site will provide for around 31 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25".
Please

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24147 - 2788 - POLICY R10: BRENTWOOD RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK - i, ii, iii

23219 Support

Summary: The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application.

Change To Plan:

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23219 - 1927 - POLICY R10: BRENTWOOD RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

23237 Support

Summary: TfL CD supports the principal of the allocating of Brentwood railway station car park as a strategic housing allocation. The site is a well contained underutilised brownfield site with excellent transport accessibility and should therefore be a focus for growth.

Change To Plan:

Respondent: TfL Commercial Development (Mr Luke Burroughs) [8312]

Agent: N/A

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23237 - 8312 - POLICY R10: BRENTWOOD RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

23238 Support

Summary: The approximate capacity for 100 homes, equating to an indicative density of 104 dph is not in line with the Draft Brentwood Town Centre Design Guide which identifies that it can accomodate up to 405 units per hectare. The site is brownfield, in a town centre location and adjacent to a significant transport interchange. In addition, if development at this site will need to re-provide existing commuter car parking, it is also highly likely that higher density residential development would be required to fund the additional infrastructure associated with parking uses. Density on this site should therefore be optimised.

Change To Plan: High level feasibility studies for this site indicate that a decked design could allow a greater density to be achieved on the site whilst still providing a compatible and neighbourly form of development. Taking into account the town centre location and prevailing form of development, we consider that the site could support a higher density form of development than that suggested.

Respondent: TfL Commercial Development (Mr Luke Burroughs) [8312]

Agent: N/A

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23238 - 8312 - POLICY R10: BRENTWOOD RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK - i

Page 463 of 991

23259 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R04&05, R06, R08, R09, R10 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23259 - 3791 - POLICY R10: BRENTWOOD RAILWAY STATION CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.136

22469 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.136 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.136 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Brentwood CDA and is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22469 - 6776 - 9.136 - ii, iii, iv

22248 Object**Respondent: Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Car parks are not a viable site for housing development as Brentwood needs the vehicle parking spaces.

Change To Plan: Exclude this site for housing development

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22248 - 4610 - POLICY R11: WESTBURY ROAD CAR PARK - i

22466 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. d. of Policy R10, Criterion B. g. of Policy R11, Criterion B. f. of Policy R13, and Criterion B. g. of Policy R14 seek to ensure that the current level of Town Centre public parking spaces is maintained. BCC should be satisfied that this can be achieved and does not conflict with other policies in the Local Plan, such as BE12 and BE13.

Change To Plan: BBC should be satisfied that this requirement can be achieved and does not conflict with the other policies in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22466 - 6776 - POLICY R11: WESTBURY ROAD CAR PARK - iii

24148 Object**Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]****Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]**

Summary: R11 Westbury Road. Town centre car parks controlled by the council. R11, R13 and R14 provide nearly 600 or 45% of publicly available parking in the town centre. The caveat maintaining current parking levels is noted, This suggests a high degree of cooperation is needed to achieve this. All three sites have been under consideration since 2009. No applications have been received for R11 or R13 in the last 5 years. They are unlikely to deliver in 1-2 years as the plan suggests. Lead in time for R14 is longer but not proposals have been submitted in the last 5 years. The latest Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement is for 31 March 2018, published in November 2018. It demonstrates a 4.1 year supply. Around half of the supply required (820 dwellings) during the period 2018 to 2023 is to come from allocations set out in the Pre-Submission Document. We believe there is considerable doubt over R11, R13 and R20's ability to deliver during this period. The general point we are making here is that a number of the Pre-Submission Document's brownfield allocations have been under consideration for ten years or more. Some of them, like the town centre car parks, will be complicated to redevelop. We have emphasised throughout the Local Plan process that many of these sites were unlikely to make early contributions to meeting housing supply requirements, unlike our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch that is straightforward to develop and in a single, willing ownership. The problem remains, and supports our contention that the Plan needs more easier to develop sites, with an ownership ready to start. Our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch is more straightforward and ready to start.

Change To Plan: Removal of Allocation R20. This is a small site and should be categorised as a potential windfall site. At present, there appears to be no certainty about its availability. We also think that, without any direct evidence of intent on behalf of the landowner, Allocation R10 should also be removed.

Policy R11 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.137 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:

"The site will provide for around 45 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25".

Policy R13 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.146 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:

"The site will provide for around 31 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25".

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24148 - 2788 - POLICY R11: WESTBURY ROAD CAR PARK - i, ii, iii

23220 Support**Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water. As this is a brown field site, we expect significant reduction in surface water runoff.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23220 - 1927 - POLICY R11: WESTBURY ROAD CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

23260 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23260 - 3791 - POLICY R11: WESTBURY ROAD CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.141

22458 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22458 - 6776 - 9.141 - ii, iii, iv

22286 Object Respondent: Mr. Richard J Baker [2862] Agent: N/A

Summary: This policy proposes such a high density in an established residential area it is not taking account of its neighbours

Change To Plan: Reduce the density

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22286 - 2862 - POLICY R12: LAND AT HUNTER HOUSE - i, ii, iii, iv

25696 Object Respondent: MRS LESLEY LYNN [5591] Agent: N/A

Summary: I am writing to you to object to the density of housing Brentwood Council is proposing on the office site in Western Road which equates to something like 229 dwellings per Hectare, which is far the biggest of any of the proposed sites and can only possibly be achieved with high rise blocks of flats, which is inappropriate in a residential street of houses with a maximum height of two and a half stories. I understand that there other sites which also fall short of policy in the Local Development Plan to which I object. Development of this scale goes against Policy HP03.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25696 - 5591 - POLICY R12: LAND AT HUNTER HOUSE - i, ii, iii

25713 Object Respondent: Ms Norma Jennings [5444] Agent: N/A

Summary: I have previously objected to development at this site. There were as follows: More traffic debouching on to an already congested Western Road close to its inadequate junction with Weald Road. The design of the building did not blend with the appearance of the Edwardian /Victorian buildings. The plans showed that this block of appartments more resembled the high-rise.Although this might be a legal loophole, it appears unethical to me because I understand it will be subject to a different policy to that which affects a normal planning application. It suggests that the developer wants to avoid the more stringent measures involved in the latter such as the design of the building and the fact that, in such a restricted area, the only alternative would be to build upwards which would totally conflict with the entire tenor of other homes in the road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25713 - 5444 - POLICY R12: LAND AT HUNTER HOUSE - i, ii, iii, iv

26508 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary:

R12 is land at Hunter House, with anticipated delivery of 48 dwellings between 2024/25 and 2026/27. We assume the number of dwellings is based on the application submitted in 2017, and regarded by the Council as finally disposed by notice dated 10 January this year. Paragraph 9.142 referring to Allocation R12 states that the site will provide " a mix of size and type of homes including affordable in accordance with the Council's policy requirements." It would appear that the applicants' decision not to provide affordable housing in their proposed scheme was one of the main issues of contention. The general point we are making here is that a number of the Pre-Submission Document's brownfield allocations have been under consideration for ten years or more. Some of them, like the town centre car parks, will be complicated to redevelop. We have emphasised throughout the Local Plan process that many of these sites were unlikely to make early contributions to meeting housing supply requirements, unlike our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch that is straightforward to develop and in a single, willing ownership. The problem remains, and supports our contention that the Plan needs more easier to develop sites, with an ownership ready to start.

Change To Plan:

Removal of Allocation R20. This is a small site and should be categorised as a potential windfall site. At present, there appears to be no certainty about its availability.

R10 - We also think that, without any direct evidence of intent on behalf of the landowner, Allocation R10 should also be removed.

Policy R11 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.137 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
"The site will provide for around 45 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25"

Policy R13 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.146 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
"The site will provide for around 31 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25"

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

O - 26508 - 2788 - POLICY R12: LAND AT HUNTER HOUSE - i, ii, iii

23221 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Surface water to be addressed according to the Drainage hierarchy. As this is a brown field site, we expect significant reduction in surface water runoff.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference:

S - 23221 - 1927 - POLICY R12: LAND AT HUNTER HOUSE - i, ii, iii, iv

23261 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference:

S - 23261 - 3791 - POLICY R12: LAND AT HUNTER HOUSE - i, ii, iii, iv

22284 Object

Respondent: Mr. Richard J Baker [2862]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is inappropriate, excessively dense overbearing development in an established residential area of homes a maximum two and a half storeys high. This is not what the residents want. Previous requests to reduce the density and overbearing effect on local residents have been continually ignored in previous consultations; in fact the opposite has happened. Originally proposed was 22 dwellings, then 44 and now 48 dwellings on a 0.21Ha site which equates to some 229 dwellings per Ha. This can only be achieved by excessively high development leading to overlooking and an over bearing effect on the neighbours.

Change To Plan: The housing density proposed for this site should be drastically reduced so that an aesthetically pleasing suitable development of houses or even flats no higher than the surrounding dwellings can replace the existing offices.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22284 - 2862 - 9.142 - i, ii

22285 Object

Respondent: Mr. Richard J Baker [2862]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This road, despite what Essex County Council think, (as i am sure they haven't been down Western Road) is a busy road at most times and a proposal for a large underground car park to serve 48 dwellings is inappropriate and will cause additional congestion and danger to road users and pedestrians, particularly school children who use it to walk to the local schools.

Change To Plan: Reduce the proposed development size to something smaller and more appropriate and safer in the area.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22285 - 2862 - 9.143 - i, ii, iv

22459 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22459 - 6776 - 9.145 - ii, iii, iv

22249 Object**Respondent: Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Existing car parks are not acceptable as future housing developments

Change To Plan: Exclude this site from developers.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22249 - 4610 - POLICY R13: CHATHAM WAY CAR PARK - i

22467 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. d. of Policy R10, Criterion B. g. of Policy R11, Criterion B. f. of Policy R13, and Criterion B. g. of Policy R14 seek to ensure that the current level of Town Centre public parking spaces is maintained. BCC should be satisfied that this can be achieved and does not conflict with other policies in the Local Plan, such as BE12 and BE13.

Change To Plan: BBC should be satisfied that this requirement can be achieved and does not conflict with the other policies in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22467 - 6776 - POLICY R13: CHATHAM WAY CAR PARK - iii

22518 Object**Respondent: Mr David Marchant [7090]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concerns over noise, traffic and lack of concern for current residents in the immediate vicinity.

Change To Plan: Restricting height of properties to 2 stories.

Ensure no eating or drinking establishments are catered for on Crown Street or Regency Court

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22518 - 7090 - POLICY R13: CHATHAM WAY CAR PARK - i

22613 Object**Respondent: Gita Mackintosh [7214]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It will bring heavy traffic to the town centre. Omitting a car park to replace with housing will make the area congested and limit vulnerable and older residents getting into town.

Change To Plan: Reduce number of homes planned for the site or leave car park as is. There will be a reduction in footfall to town centre which will have a negative impact on retail given the high street as a whole in the UK is in national decline.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22613 - 7214 - POLICY R13: CHATHAM WAY CAR PARK - None

24149 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary:

R13 Chatham Way. Town centre car parks controlled by the council. R11, R13 and R14 provide nearly 600 or 45% of publicly available parking in the town centre. The caveat maintaining current parking levels is noted, This suggests a high degree of cooperation is needed to achieve this. All three sites have been under consideration since 2009. No applications have been received for R11 or R13 in the last 5 years. They are unlikely to deliver in 1-2 years as the plan suggests. Lead in time for R14 is longer but not proposals have been submitted in the last 5 years. The latest Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement is for 31 March 2018, published in November 2018. It demonstrates a 4.1 year supply. Around half of the supply required (820 dwellings) during the period 2018 to 2023 is to come from allocations set out in the Pre-Submission Document. We believe there is considerable doubt over R11, R13 and R20's ability to deliver during this period. The general point we are making here is that a number of the Pre-Submission Document's brownfield allocations have been under consideration for ten years or more. Some of them, like the town centre car parks, will be complicated to redevelop. We have emphasised throughout the Local Plan process that many of these sites were unlikely to make early contributions to meeting housing supply requirements, unlike our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch that is straightforward to develop and in a single, willing ownership. The problem remains, and supports our contention that the Plan needs more easier to develop sites, with an ownership ready to start. Our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch is more straightforward and ready to start.

Change To Plan:

Removal of Allocation R20. This is a small site and should be categorised as a potential windfall site. At present, there appears to be no certainty about its availability. We also think that, without any direct evidence of intent on behalf of the landowner, Allocation R10 should also be removed. Policy R11 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.137 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows: "The site will provide for around 45 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25". Policy R13 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.146 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows: "The site will provide for around 31 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25".

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

O - 24149 - 2788 - POLICY R13: CHATHAM WAY CAR PARK - i, ii, iii

23222 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water. As this is a brown field site, we expect significant reduction in surface water runoff.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference:

S - 23222 - 1927 - POLICY R13: CHATHAM WAY CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

23262 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference:

S - 23262 - 3791 - POLICY R13: CHATHAM WAY CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

22461 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22461 - 6776 - 9.149 - ii, iii, iv

22468 Object**Respondent:** Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. d. of Policy R10, Criterion B. g. of Policy R11, Criterion B. f. of Policy R13, and Criterion B. g. of Policy R14 seek to ensure that the current level of Town Centre public parking spaces is maintained. BCC should be satisfied that this can be achieved and does not conflict with other policies in the Local Plan, such as BE12 and BE13.

Change To Plan: BBC should be satisfied that this requirement can be achieved and does not conflict with the other policies in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22468 - 6776 - POLICY R14: WILLIAM HUNTER WAY CAR PARK - iii

22599 Object**Respondent:** Cllr Philip Mynott [8283]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: There has been a history of trying to overdevelopment the William Hunter Way site on the part of the council. This is simply continuing, without having learned any lessons, in this plan.

Change To Plan: Development on site R14 should be on a reasonable scale only.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22599 - 8283 - POLICY R14: WILLIAM HUNTER WAY CAR PARK - iii, iv

22611 Object**Respondent:** Gita Mackintosh [7214]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Omitting a car park to replace with housing will make the area congested. Limit vulnerable and older residents getting into town. Surrounding houses are likely to be affected by light, congestion and rubbish.

Change To Plan: Reduce number of homes planned for the site or leave car park as is. This will make local plan more sound and justified.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22611 - 7214 - POLICY R14: WILLIAM HUNTER WAY CAR PARK - None

22612 Object**Respondent:** Gita Mackintosh [7214]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Unsound - There will be a reduction in footfall to town centre which will have a negative impact on retail given the high street as a whole in the UK is in national decline.

Change To Plan: Reduce number of homes planned for site R14 William Hunter Way or leave car park as is.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22612 - 7214 - POLICY R14: WILLIAM HUNTER WAY CAR PARK - None

26509 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary:

R14 . Town centre car parks controlled by the council. R11, R13 and R14 provide nearly 600 or 45% of publicly available parking in the town centre. The caveat maintaining current parking levels is noted, This suggests a high degree of cooperation is needed to achieve this. All three sites have been under consideration since 2009. No applications have been received for R11 or R13 in the last 5 years. They are unlikely to deliver in 1-2 years as the plan suggests. Lead in time for R14 is longer but not proposals have been submitted in the last 5 years. The general point we are making here is that a number of the Pre-Submission Document's brownfield allocations have been under consideration for ten years or more. Some of them, like the town centre car parks, will be complicated to redevelop. We have emphasised throughout the Local Plan process that many of these sites were unlikely to make early contributions to meeting housing supply requirements, unlike our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch that is straightforward to develop and in a single, willing ownership. The problem remains, and supports our contention that the Plan needs more easier to develop sites, with an ownership ready to start. Our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch is more straightforward and ready to start.

The latest Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement is for 31 March 2018, published in November 2018. It demonstrates a 4.1 year supply. Around half of the supply required (820 dwellings) during the period 2018 to 2023 is to come from allocations set out in the Pre-Submission Document. We believe there is considerable doubt over R11, R13 and R20's ability to deliver during this period. The general point we are making here is that a number of the Pre-Submission Document's brownfield allocations have been under consideration for ten years or more. Some of them, like the town centre car parks, will be complicated to redevelop. We have emphasised throughout the Local Plan process that many of these sites were unlikely to make early contributions to meeting housing supply requirements, unlike our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch that is straightforward to develop and in a single, willing ownership. The problem remains, and supports our contention that the Plan needs more easier to develop sites, with an ownership ready to start.

Change To Plan:

Removal of Allocation R20. This is a small site and should be categorised as a potential windfall site. At present, there appears to be no certainty about its availability.

R10 - We also think that, without any direct evidence of intent on behalf of the landowner, Allocation R10 should also be removed.

Policy R11 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.137 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
"The site will provide for around 45 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25"

Policy R13 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.146 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
"The site will provide for around 31 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25"

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference:

O - 26509 - 2788 - POLICY R14: WILLIAM HUNTER WAY CAR PARK - i, ii, iii

23223 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water. As this is a brown field site, we expect significant reduction in surface water runoff.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference:

S - 23223 - 1927 - POLICY R14: WILLIAM HUNTER WAY CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

23263 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference:

S - 23263 - 3791 - POLICY R14: WILLIAM HUNTER WAY CAR PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

22462 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22462 - 6776 - 9.153 - ii, iii, iv

22470 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Criterion A. b. of Policy R15 states 'provision for retail / commercial use'. As currently drafted this is open to interpretation. Policy PC03 which sets the employment land allocations for the Local Plan does not include this site as an allocation. The supporting text to Policy PC07 which sets out the Plans requirements for retail and commercial leisure growth, does not list this site as a location for such development.

It is recommended that this criterion be deleted, in line with paragraph 16 d) of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Delete criterion A. b. from Policy R15.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22470 - 6776 - POLICY R15: WATES WAY INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - iv

24122 Object**Respondent: Lidl UK GmbH [6726]****Agent: Avison Young (Mr Nick Hardy) [8367]**

Summary: Lidl is the owner of site RO15. Lidl is concerned that the proposed home number for this site is too high. The significance of this for the decision-making process will depend on (i) the final content of the application; (ii) the interpretation of the word "around" in Policy R15 and (iii) the extent to which the housing strategy might in due course incorporate greater flexibility than in the Pre-Submission draft. Lidl will be promoting a foodstore of a scale that will promote an important objective of the Local Plan, by virtue of the delivery of new convenience floorspace on a preferred site allocated for retail use, in addition to housing. Reference to the 2014 retail study and objectively assessed housing need highlights differing demand. This site presents the only option to meet the retail need. Para 9.2 explains how site specific allocations should be read. Lidl is keen to contribute to the delivery of housing and retail development targets, however Lidl is concerned that the statement of "around 80 dwellings" may be read by some as a minimum. Therefore this needs clarification and the text be changed to up to 80 dwellings.

Change To Plan: The plan would be positively prepared if it stated support for a foodstore on Site R15 of a scale and type that could address the need identified in the evidence base. Lidl proposes also that Policy R15 be revised to explain that the eventual number of dwellings on the site will be determined having regard to the expectation that it will also accommodate a foodstore to meet a proportion of the retail need set out in Policy PC07, but that it is expected to be able to accommodate up to 80 units within Use Classes C2 or C3.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24122 - 6726 - POLICY R15: WATES WAY INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - i

26510 Object**Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]****Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]**

Summary: Sites R 10-15, 20. The latest Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement is for 31 March 2018, published in November 2018. It demonstrates a 4.1 year supply. Around half of the supply required (820 dwellings) during the period 2018 to 2023 is to come from allocations set out in the Pre-Submission Document. We believe there is considerable doubt over R11, R13 and R20's ability to deliver during this period. The general point we are making here is that a number of the Pre-Submission Document's brownfield allocations have been under consideration for ten years or more. Some of them, like the town centre car parks, will be complicated to redevelop. We have emphasised throughout the Local Plan process that many of these sites were unlikely to make early contributions to meeting housing supply requirements, unlike our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch that is straightforward to develop and in a single, willing ownership. The problem remains, and supports our contention that the Plan needs more easier to develop sites, with an ownership ready to start.

Change To Plan: Removal of Allocation R20. This is a small site and should be categorised as a potential windfall site. At present, there appears to be no certainty about its availability.

R10 - We also think that, without any direct evidence of intent on behalf of the landowner, Allocation R10 should also be removed.

Policy R11 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.137 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
"The site will provide for around 45 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25"

Policy R13 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.146 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
"The site will provide for around 31 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25"

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26510 - 2788 - POLICY R15: WATES WAY INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - i, ii, iii

23224 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water. As this is a brown field site, we expect significant reduction in surface water runoff.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23224 - 1927 - POLICY R15: WATES WAY INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - i, ii, iii, iv

23264 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23264 - 3791 - POLICY R15: WATES WAY INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.159

22463 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraphs 9.125, 9.130, 9.141, 9.145, 9.149, 9.153 & 9.159 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22463 - 6776 - 9.159 - ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations Land off Doddington Road, Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood

22600 Object

Respondent: Cllr Philip Mynott [8283]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The two sites R16 and R17 should have been assessed separately in the council's Green Belt assessment. R17 in particular has a whole list of reasons not to have been a selected site.

Change To Plan: R17 should be removed from the list of Housing sites proposed. Both R16 and R17 should be reassessed from the ground up, especially as far as the NPPF goes.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22600 - 8283 - Land off Doddington Road, Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood - iii, iv

22572 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy wording lacks a commitment to deliver biodiversity net gain.

Change To Plan: Policy wording should be amended as follows:

b. provision for "multifunctional" public open space to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22572 - 2414 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - iv

22614 Object**Respondent: Gita Mackintosh [7214]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan appears unsound. It will still bring heavy traffic to the Doddinghurst Road on a network that is already under enormous pressure.

Change To Plan: Reduce number of homes planned for the site.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22614 - 7214 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - None

22615 Object**Respondent: Gita Mackintosh [7214]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Schools in the area are already oversubscribed and needs to be taken into account.

Change To Plan: Reduce number of homes planned for the site. Provide clear evidence around how education infrastructure will not be significantly impacted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22615 - 7214 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - None

22616 Object**Respondent: Gita Mackintosh [7214]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Developing homes near the A12 boundary is unlikely to be an attractive proposition and careful consideration needs to be done if this development will be successful.

Change To Plan: Reduce number of homes planned for the site to ensure enough boundary is in place between greenery and A12. Retain some of the countryside features so that the character of Brentwood and surrounding area is retained.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22616 - 7214 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - None

23440 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Williams [7267]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to planning 200 houses on bishops Hall back viking way. This is green belt has badgers and fox's on also rare birds sky larks which are protected since 1981 they nest on there they will have no where to nest.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23440 - 7267 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - None

26511 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary: R16 is weakly worded on the need for appropriate mitigating measures. It should state that any new development will provide effective measures along boundaries with the A12 and elsewhere. We note that the Policy also includes requirements for public open space and provision of pedestrian and cycling connections. Again, the Policy should insist on these provision and not simply ask potential developers to "consider" them.
R17 is a narrow strip of land on the southern side of the A12. R16 is currently a relatively wooded area at around the same level as the A12. Any landscaping here would be confined by the narrowness of the site and ineffective as a barrier against air and noise pollution. This should be removed from the allocation and designated instead as open space.
Effective noise and pollution barriers do not look aesthetically pleasing. Adequate space will be needed for landscaping to mitigate their visual impact. Better configured space and we agree that a degree of development here could be achieved in an acceptable environment, provided there are strong and effective measures to reduce air and noise pollution from the A12. Again, the land is on much the same level as the A12. Clearly, the further any development is located away from the A12 then the less the risk of pollution measures to mitigate.

Effective noise and pollution barriers do not look aesthetically pleasing. Adequate space will be needed for landscaping to mitigate their visual impact. R03, R16, R17, R21, R22 allocations are all bounded by the A12 to a greater or lesser extent. As noted in our representations on Policy NE05, the Pre-Submission Document's paragraph 8.50 states that transport generated emissions are the prime source of air pollution in the Borough. We have consistently questioned the wisdom of locating new housing next to the A12 on the grounds of public health. All these proposed allocations, in whole or part, have significant issues resulting from their proximity to principal sources of air and noise pollution. There is conflict with the Pre-Submission Document's own policies on these issues, including Policy NE05. Consequently we are suggesting a number of modifications to the relevant policies.

Change To Plan: We propose the following modifications for the reasons outlined in our response to the Local Plan consultation. Strengthen the wording of all policies to ensure that appropriate air and noise pollution measures form an integral part of any development proposals. Wherever there is reference to either the A12, or the mainline railway, the related criterion should read as follows:
"appropriate measures, including barriers, embankments and landscaping, to reduce air and noise must be provided along the site's boundary(ies) with the A12 and/or the mainline railway."
Removal of R17 from Policy R16 and R17.
Removal from proposed allocation R03 of the elliptical shaped piece of land between the A1023 Chelmsford Road and the A12 Marylands Interchange, and the area to the north of the site bounded by the Marylands Interchange to the north, the railway line to the south-east, a part of Arnold's Wood to the south-west and Chelmsford Road to the north-west.
Removal of Allocation R21 on grounds of poor physical environment, isolation from the main settlement of Ingatestone and coalescence with the village of Mountnessing.
Removal of Allocation R22 on grounds of poor physical environment.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26511 - 2788 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - ii, iii

23225 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23225 - 1927 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - i, ii, iii, iv

23267 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R16 & R17 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23267 - 3791 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - i, ii, iii, iv

24081 Support

Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: Support subject to amendments to policy wording. Site is achievable, deliverable, achievable within the first five years of the plan period. Housing number: A significant amount of feasibility work has been undertaken to confirm that the site can provide at least 250 homes. The 200-unit figure in Policy R16&17 has far less rationale and technical justification and may lessen the ability of this site. Access: the current wording allows for access from Dodinghurst Road only, this could have viability implications of housing delivery. We request that the policy retains flexibility for the use of the other accesses.

Change To Plan: Amend wording in Policy R16&17 with regards to(1) unit number (2) access, so that the policy retains flexibility for the use of the other accesses from Karen Close and Russell Close as a worst case scenario, in the interests of protecting the deliverability of the southern parcel of the site, particularly as these routes of access have been previously agreed with Essex County Council Highways.
Amend wordings in relation to the timing of the delivery in Appendix 1 and paragraph 9.160.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24081 - 250 - POLICY R16 & R17: LAND OFF DODDINGHURST ROAD - i, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.160

22617 Object

Respondent: Gita Mackintosh [7214]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Careful consideration needs to be done if this development will be successful.

Change To Plan: Reduce number of homes planned for the site to ensure enough boundary is in place between greenery and A12. Retain some of the countryside features so that the character of Brentwood and surrounding area is retained.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22617 - 7214 - 9.160 - None

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.164

22473 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.164 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.164 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Pilgrims Hatch CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22473 - 6776 - 9.164 - ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations Land off Crescent Drive, Shenfield

22344 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Owers [8114]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We support the creation of new homes on the site providing the ecology of the site is protected and that a site specific master plan is developed with engagement with the local community throughout the development process.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22344 - 8114 - Land off Crescent Drive, Shenfield - None

22343 Object**Respondent: Dr Norman Randall [8246]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The houses are needed, but the density is far too high and the design of the homes should be similar to existing Crescent Drive properties in size, quality, parking capability and existing greenery.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22343 - 8246 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - None

22574 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy wording lacks a commitment to deliver biodiversity net gain.

Change To Plan: Policy wording should be amended as follows:

b. provision for "multifunctional" public open space to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22574 - 2414 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - iv

24120 Object**Respondent: Fairview New Homes Ltd (Ms Faye Wilders) [8365]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Fairview supports the designation for housing, and having undertaken some design and massing work, considers that it can accommodate more than 55 units. However, for the basis of a policy designation, Fairview supports this policy and considers that this policy is sound. of a 1.5ha site, 1ha is developable.

Change To Plan: Removal of Policy R18: B Development Principles criterion b. provision for public open space.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24120 - 8365 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - None

24121 Object**Respondent: Fairview New Homes Ltd (Ms Faye Wilders) [8365]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Fairview does not consider Development Principle B: provision for public open space to be sound. Site Constraints - The key constraints to developing the site comprise the site levels and large number of existing trees. The site slopes from north to south by 3 metres and north-west to south-east by 4 metres. As such there is a storey height difference between the front and back of the site and from each side. Paragraph 5.181 in reference to Policy BE22: Open Space in New Development, useable open space is defined as 2000m2 in a single mass, giving people a space to be able to play. It is considered that given the substantial constraints relating to levels and tree coverage of the site, that creation of a public open space within the site is not a sound principle of development. Smaller pockets of amenity space that respond to the tree locations and ground levels would be a more appropriate development principle for this specific site.

Change To Plan: Remove criterion b. provision for public open space of Policy R18

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24121 - 8365 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - None

26112 Object

Respondent: Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. (i) The site of the North Thames Regional Transfusion Centre, (Draft Policy R18) proposed for residential redevelopment is now in an area of relative deficiency of open space. This was not always so however, but during the period of statutory control by the NHS, land management of access to open space was sadly neglected. The annexed historical and legal note with supporting documents show that the title to the land has appurtenant rights which should be exercised in conjunction with the Council in order to enforce rights over estate roads to the woodland open space and thereby to give proper and sustainable effect to NPPF policies.
(ii) Vehicular access should be taken only via private road section of Glanthsams Road, restored to the full width legally available under the easement and estate covenants appurtenant to the freehold title. The legacy of Percy Alfred Bayman who planted trees and shrubs in the hospital grounds as well as gifting land should be respected and restored by enforcing the estate covenants appurtenant to the land title.
(iii) The restrictive covenant referred to in paragraph 2 of this reply may be modified by the application to the Upper Tribunal Lands Chamber but it should be noted that while statutory powers have enabled covenants to be overridden, that protection will cease on sale. A more significant issue is the existence of a building scheme satisfying the criteria laid down by the Court of Appeal in Birdlip Limited -v- Hunter benefitting the site and also benefitting the Council owned open space. It seems the draft policy is predicated on a developer taking out indemnity insurance and packaging a residential development without reconnecting to the Glanthsams Park estate road or facilitating access to the woodland open space. This would be inimical to the policies and purposes of the NPPF.
(iv) The proposed policy R18 does not take an integrated approach to housing and open space facilities, does not protect or enhance rights of way or take into account the possibility of adding to high quality rights of way.
(v) The developable area of the R18 site together with the need for on site open space should be reappraised along with the restoration of Glanthsams Road, particularly as the site is within an area well served by public transport and could have a significant uplift in the average density beyond what is already proposed.

Change To Plan: 1. Development Principle Aa -Amount and type of development
Delete" around 55" and substitute "up to BO, depending on the amount of on-site private open space and onsite land take for vehicular movement via Glanthsams Road"
Reasons: (a) The site is well served by Public Transport, and adjoins the Community Hospital. Paragraphs 122-123 NPPF support a significant uplift in the average density.

(b) The draft policy proposes on-site open space and main vehicular access from Crescent Road. These are wasteful of the immediate infrastructure which should be restored, allowing more efficient and sustainable use of the site, the adjoining road infrastructure and the adjoining woodland open space of over nine acres.

2. Development principle Ba. and Paragraph 9.166 should be deleted. Principle Ba should read: The main vehicular access will be via the private road Glanthsams Road which will be restored to its condition and width on the Appointed Day {1 July 1948}. Paragraph 9.166 should read: The site abuts the Private Road Glanthsams Road.
Reason: It is not an effective use of land to abandon this right of way and estate road

3. Development principle b - provision of on-site public open space - should be deleted. This should be replaced by the following:
b. Prior to construction of residential units a scheme for restoration of the Woodland Open space to the South west shall be implemented by the clearance of dead wood and timber in conjunction with the local planning authority, with provision of direct access from the site to the woodland and footpaths.

The last 14 words in the first sentence of paragraph 9.169 should be deleted
Reasons for deletion: As set out in paragraph 21 of the attached historical and legal note, the opportunity should, and I suggest must, be grasped firmly in the redevelopment of Policy area R18 to restore the woodland open space as a local amenity to benefit the public as well all as future residents of the proposed redevelopment site. The last 14 words of paragraph 9.169 will be redundant if the modification to Development principle b is accepted, as the design of such a scheme will take an integrated approach and enhance access from the development to the open space. The existing wording implies sensitive boundary segregation rather than improved functional access to 2.54 hectares of woodland open space - a hugely valuable amenity if and when brought back into beneficial use.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 26112 - 1406 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - iii, iv

26113 Object

Respondent: Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Historical overview

2. By the National Health Service Act 1946 local voluntary hospitals were brought into public ownership - the Act transferred to the Minister all hospitals with their endowments. Percy Alfred Bayman had transferred to the Trustees of a charity known as the Brentwood District Hospital land shown and coloured pink blue yellow green mauve and brown on the plan annexed to a transfer dated the 15th day of June 1931. The Transfer included the benefit of covenants on the part of the Minister of Transport contained in a conveyance dated the 1st day of March 1929 and made between the Minister of Transport and Mr. Bayman. The Trustees of the Charity covenanted to protect the neighbouring land being developed as a building estate and will not permit any building or wall on the land transferred other than the Hospital or any extension thereof including Nurses Homes Entrance Lodges or any buildings used in connection with the hospital.

Change To Plan: 1. Development Principle Aa -Amount and type of development

Delete " around 55" and substitute "up to BO, depending on the amount of on-site private open space and onsite land take for vehicular movement via Glanthams Road"

Reasons: (a) The site is well served by Public Transport, and adjoins the Community Hospital. Paragraphs 122-123 NPPF support a significant uplift in the average density.

(b) The draft policy proposes on-site open space and main vehicular access from Crescent Road. These are wasteful of the immediate infrastructure which should be restored, allowing more efficient and sustainable use of the site, the adjoining road infrastructure and the adjoining woodland open space of over nine acres.

2. Development principle Ba. and Paragraph 9.166 should be deleted. Principle Ba should read: The main vehicular access will be via the private road Glanthams Road which will be restored to its condition and width on the Appointed Day {1 July 1948}. Paragraph 9.166 should read: The site abuts the Private Road Glanthams Road.

Reason: It is not an effective use of land to abandon this right of way and estate road

3. Development principle b - provision of on-site public open space - should be deleted. This should be replaced by the following:

b. Prior to construction of residential units a scheme for restoration of the Woodland Open space to the South west shall be implemented by the clearance of dead wood and timber in conjunction with the local planning authority, with provision of direct access from the site to the woodland and footpaths.

The last 14 words in the first sentence of paragraph 9.169 should be deleted

Reasons for deletion: As set out in paragraph 21 of the attached historical and legal note, the opportunity should, and I suggest must, be grasped firmly in the redevelopment of Policy area R18 to restore the woodland open space as a local amenity to benefit the public as well all as future residents of the proposed redevelopment site. The last 14 words of paragraph 9.169 will be redundant if the modification to Development principle b is accepted, as the design of such a scheme will take an integrated approach and enhance access from the development to the open space. The existing wording implies sensitive boundary segregation rather than improved functional access to 2.54 hectares of woodland open space - a hugely valuable amenity if and when brought back into beneficial use.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26113 - 1406 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - iii, iv

26114 Object

Respondent: Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. I have prepared a historical note with supporting documents, listed at the end of the note, and this note is an appendix to this reply to Question 5. It will be seen that there is a need to restore the private road which has been encroached upon, and paragraph 98 of the NPPF should be pursued to allow public use of Glanthams Road along its full width. This would allow a footpath and cycle path and vehicles to use it to enable the woodland open space to be brought into positive use as a local public amenity. Glanthams Road could remain a private Road connecting to Worrin Road with a footpath/cycle path created by order under the Highways Act 1980 Section 26. Generally, once an easement or right of way has arisen it will continue indefinitely unless it is extinguished or released. Failure to use a right of way is not of itself sufficient to allow abandonment to be inferred: in the case of *Benn-v-Harding* (1992) 60 P&CR 246 the Court of Appeal held that the failure to use the right for 175 years was not enough on its own to indicate an intention to abandon.

Change To Plan: 1. Development Principle Aa -Amount and type of development
Delete" around 55" and substitute "up to BO, depending on the amount of on-site private open space and onsite land take for vehicular movement via Glanthams Road"
Reasons: (a) The site is well served by Public Transport, and adjoins the Community Hospital. Paragraphs 122-123 NPPF support a significant uplift in the average density.

(b) The draft policy proposes on-site open space and main vehicular access from Crescent Road. These are wasteful of the immediate infrastructure which should be restored, allowing more efficient and sustainable use of the site, the adjoining road infrastructure and the adjoining woodland open space of over nine acres.

2. Development principle Ba. and Paragraph 9.166 should be deleted. Principle Ba should read: The main vehicular access will be via the private road Glanthams Road which will be restored to its condition and width on the Appointed Day {1 July 1948}. Paragraph 9.166 should read: The site abuts the Private Road Glanthams Road.
Reason: It is not an effective use of land to abandon this right of way and estate road

3. Development principle b - provision of on-site public open space - should be deleted. This should be replaced by the following:
b. Prior to construction of residential units a scheme for restoration of the Woodland Open space to the South west shall be implemented by the clearance of dead wood and timber in conjunction with the local planning authority, with provision of direct access from the site to the woodland and footpaths.

The last 14 words in the first sentence of paragraph 9.169 should be deleted
Reasons for deletion: As set out in paragraph 21 of the attached historical and legal note, the opportunity should, and I suggest must, be grasped firmly in the redevelopment of Policy area R18 to restore the woodland open space as a local amenity to benefit the public as well all as future residents of the proposed redevelopment site. The last 14 words of paragraph 9.169 will be redundant if the modification to Development principle b is accepted, as the design of such a scheme will take an integrated approach and enhance access from the development to the open space. The existing wording implies sensitive boundary segregation rather than improved functional access to 2.54

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26114 - 1406 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - iii, iv

26115 Object

Respondent: Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. The site within Policy R18 has a boundary with number 17 Crescent Road which derives from the right to purchase granted in the Transfer of 1931 to Francis John Bassett (the brown land in that Transfer) to connect Glanthams Road with Crescent Road. The site abuts Glanthams Road at its South East corner, where adverse possession has taken place extending the gardens over several plots at Worrin Close. The land transferred by Mr. Bayman had the benefit of covenants in a building scheme for Glanthams Park estate whereby plot owners covenanted not to obstruct the passage along any estate road and to contribute to the repair and maintenance of the footway and half the carriage way. Although neither Glanthams Road nor the open space woodland have been maintained since the 1920s, this has been due to the intervention of statutory authorities. So the private estate covenants were suspended.

Change To Plan: 1. Development Principle Aa -Amount and type of development
Delete" around 55" and substitute "up to BO, depending on the amount of on-site private open space and onsite land take for vehicular movement via Glanthams Road"
Reasons: (a) The site is well served by Public Transport, and adjoins the Community Hospital. Paragraphs 122-123 NPPF support a significant uplift in the average density.

(b) The draft policy proposes on-site open space and main vehicular access from Crescent Road. These are wasteful of the immediate infrastructure which should be restored, allowing more efficient and sustainable use of the site, the adjoining road infrastructure and the adjoining woodland open space of over nine acres.

2. Development principle Ba. and Paragraph 9.166 should be deleted. Principle Ba should read: The main vehicular access will be via the private road Glanthams Road which will be restored to its condition and width on the Appointed Day {1 July 1948}. Paragraph 9.166 should read: The site abuts the Private Road Glanthams Road.
Reason: It is not an effective use of land to abandon this right of way and estate road

3. Development principle b - provision of on-site public open space - should be deleted. This should be replaced by the following:
b. Prior to construction of residential units a scheme for restoration of the Woodland Open space to the South west shall be implemented by the clearance of dead wood and timber in conjunction with the local planning authority, with provision of direct access from the site to the woodland and footpaths.

The last 14 words in the first sentence of paragraph 9.169 should be deleted
Reasons for deletion: As set out in paragraph 21 of the attached historical and legal note, the opportunity should, and I suggest must, be grasped firmly in the redevelopment of Policy area R18 to restore the woodland open space as a local amenity to benefit the public as well all as future residents of the proposed redevelopment site. The last 14 words of paragraph 9.169 will be redundant if the modification to Development principle b is accepted, as the design of such a scheme will take an integrated approach and enhance access from the development to the open space. The existing wording implies sensitive boundary segregation rather than improved functional access to 2.54

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26115 - 1406 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - iii, iv

26116 Object

Respondent: Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 5. That position changes with the disposal of R18 policy site for residential development. The opportunity must now be taken to restore the private road and enforce the easements and covenants against obstructions to the passage along the unadopted part of Glanthams Road and also encroachments onto the open space at the rear of Glanthams Close, thereby enabling the woodland open space to be a public amenity in an area otherwise relatively deficient in open space. The developable area of the policy area R18 should be reviewed - there is little need for onsite public open space provision if the 9 and a half acres of woodland open space were restored and accessible.

Change To Plan: 1. Development Principle Aa -Amount and type of development
Delete" around 55" and substitute "up to BO, depending on the amount of on-site private open space and onsite land take for vehicular movement via Glanthams Road"
Reasons: (a) The site is well served by Public Transport, and adjoins the Community Hospital. Paragraphs 122-123 NPPF support a significant uplift in the average density.

(b) The draft policy proposes on-site open space and main vehicular access from Crescent Road. These are wasteful of the immediate infrastructure which should be restored, allowing more efficient and sustainable use of the site, the adjoining road infrastructure and the adjoining woodland open space of over nine acres.

2. Development principle Ba. and Paragraph 9.166 should be deleted. Principle Ba should read: The main vehicular access will be via the private road Glanthams Road which will be restored to its condition and width on the Appointed Day {1 July 1948}. Paragraph 9.166 should read: The site abuts the Private Road Glanthams Road. Reason: It is not an effective use of land to abandon this right of way and estate road

3. Development principle b - provision of on-site public open space - should be deleted. This should be replaced by the following:
b. Prior to construction of residential units a scheme for restoration of the Woodland Open space to the South west shall be implemented by the clearance of dead wood and timber in conjunction with the local planning authority, with provision of direct access from the site to the woodland and footpaths.

The last 14 words in the first sentence of paragraph 9.169 should be deleted

Reasons for deletion: As set out in paragraph 21 of the attached historical and legal note, the opportunity should, and I suggest must, be grasped firmly in the redevelopment of Policy area R18 to restore the woodland open space as a local amenity to benefit the public as well all as future residents of the proposed redevelopment site. The last 14 words of paragraph 9.169 will be redundant if the modification to Development principle b is accepted, as the design of such a scheme will take an integrated approach and enhance access from the development to the open space. The existing wording implies sensitive boundary segregation rather than improved functional access to 2.54

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26116 - 1406 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - iii, iv

26117 Object

Respondent: Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 6. Policies in the NPPF require the approach and modifications I put forward to the draft plan to achieve these planning policy objectives in the public interest. Paragraph 21 of the attached historical and legal note and the reply to question 6 refer.

Change To Plan: 1. Development Principle Aa -Amount and type of development
Delete" around 55" and substitute "up to BO, depending on the amount of on-site private open space and onsite land take for vehicular movement via Glanthams Road"
Reasons: (a) The site is well served by Public Transport, and adjoins the Community Hospital. Paragraphs 122-123 NPPF support a significant uplift in the average density.

(b) The draft policy proposes on-site open space and main vehicular access from Crescent Road. These are wasteful of the immediate infrastructure which should be restored, allowing more efficient and sustainable use of the site, the adjoining road infrastructure and the adjoining woodland open space of over nine acres.

2. Development principle Ba. and Paragraph 9.166 should be deleted. Principle Ba should read: The main vehicular access will be via the private road Glanthams Road which will be restored to its condition and width on the Appointed Day {1 July 1948}. Paragraph 9.166 should read: The site abuts the Private Road Glanthams Road.
Reason: It is not an effective use of land to abandon this right of way and estate road

3. Development principle b - provision of on-site public open space - should be deleted. This should be replaced by the following:
b. Prior to construction of residential units a scheme for restoration of the Woodland Open space to the South west shall be implemented by the clearance of dead wood and timber in conjunction with the local planning authority, with provision of direct access from the site to the woodland and footpaths.

The last 14 words in the first sentence of paragraph 9.169 should be deleted
Reasons for deletion: As set out in paragraph 21 of the attached historical and legal note, the opportunity should, and I suggest must, be grasped firmly in the redevelopment of Policy area R18 to restore the woodland open space as a local amenity to benefit the public as well all as future residents of the proposed redevelopment site. The last 14 words of paragraph 9.169 will be redundant if the modification to Development principle b is accepted, as the design of such a scheme will take an integrated approach and enhance access from the development to the open space. The existing wording implies sensitive boundary segregation rather than improved functional access to 2.54

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26117 - 1406 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - iii, iv

22231 Support

Respondent: Mr Ian Patterson [8223]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Very supportive of residential development but concerned at proposed density (55)

Elderly care/housing provision to be prioritised.

Bendy nature of road, heavy congestion at peak times plus a busy hospital means on-site parking provision must meet Brentwood Councils minimum standard (Policy BE17)

The land drops away significantly from the road. We suggest low-rise properties on the roadside that compliment the existing adjoining properties and character of the road, with taller properties further back consistent with the existent buildings on the site.

Protection for road-side Oak Trees plus trees on site is important. Public Open Space Policy to be complied with.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22231 - 8223 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - None

22338 Support

Respondent: Mr Richard Owers [8114]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We support the creation of new homes on the site.
New development must maintain the established landscape and continue the hedge screened residential character of the area.
Proposed density (55 homes) is a major concern as it is out of keeping and inappropriate. Clever design may create a suitable high density solution.
On site parking sufficient for all residents and visitors to the development essential. (Policy BE17)
The height of the development at the front to be kept to two stories + roof as now to maintain light levels for surrounding residents and the appearance of the road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22338 - 8114 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - None

23265 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23265 - 3791 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - i, ii, iii, iv

23812 Support

Respondent: Messers A, J and C Courage Owners of Eagle and Child Public House [8340]

Agent: Savills UK (Ms Catherine Williams) [3823]

Summary: Support for the proposed allocation of the site for residential development. It is located within the development boundary of Shenfield and comprises previously developed land. Site is sustainable having good public transport links, good connections with the local highway network, well supported by community facilities such as schools and healthcare providers, and local retail provision; site has a low probability of flooding; site is deliverable; new residential dwellings can be delivered within the first five years of the new Local Plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23812 - 8340 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - i, ii, iii, iv

25697 Support

Respondent: Mr G Burnham [8575]

Agent: N/A

Summary: In general support of this development but the following issues need to be considered: 1. scale of development in line with land available - matching existing homes to maintain character. 2. Front line properties kept inline with existing homes in Crescent Drive. 3. Keep parking restrictions in place to allow free flow traffic. Provide enough parking for development - 1 space for 1 bedroom and 2 for all units 2 or more bedrooms. 4. Access to development adjacent to Community Hospital. 5. Maintain the roadside current hedging to the boundary of the land, and replace any trees or shrubs that maybe affected with the development. 6) Include sufficient green spaces within development (25sqm per home).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 25697 - 8575 - POLICY R18: LAND OFF CRESCENT DRIVE - None

22339 Support **Respondent: Mr Richard Owers [8114]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: We support the creation of new homes on the site but are very concerned that the proposal for 55 dwellings may be inappropriate and out of character for the area where all residential properties are well screened, substantial detached houses.
A lower density development may be more appropriate.
Sympathetic screening and maintenance of the verdant and leafy nature of the area is essential.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22339 - 8114 - 9.165 - None

22340 Object **Respondent: Mr Richard Owers [8114]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: We support the creation of new homes but the proposal of 55 new dwelling will create too much additional traffic at peak times when traffic queues all the back from the junction with Shenfield Road passed the site.
The position of the exit from the site should avoid light pollution from turning vehicles for surrounding properties.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22340 - 8114 - 9.166 - None

22342 Support **Respondent: Mr Richard Owers [8114]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: This condition is crucial for the success of this project for the local community.
Hedges in front of the property are an important part of this condition as well as the existing trees and new planting.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22342 - 8114 - 9.169 - None

22450 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request amendment to second sentence of paragraph 9.105 and full paragraph of 9.170 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace second sentence of paragraph 9.105 and the full paragraph 9.170 with the following wording -

The site falls within the Shenfield CDA and is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding From Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early Engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22450 - 6776 - 9.170 - ii, iii, iv

22212 Object **Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The evidence base is flawed: The transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane, and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane, and does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor does it account for the impact of the Elizabeth Line; fails to address safety of residents : the technical submissions residents that new road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous have not been addressed, nor concerns that the road design is dangerous for increased traffic movements The Lane was never meant to be a main distributary road which it has now become. Residents have pointed out that as such it does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width. Where is the mitigation?

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22212 - 5538 - Land at Priests Lane, Shenfield - i, ii, iii, iv

22185 Object**Respondent: Mr Kaixuan Wang [5939]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The transport assessment is flawed.
The plan fails to address safety.
healthcare and education needs are not addressed by the plan

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the local development plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22185 - 5939 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22188 Object**Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Evidence base flawed/unsound:
i) Non-compliance with Essex Design Guide (road & pavement width.)

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22188 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22192 Object**Respondent: Mrs Julie Barnwell [8205]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The evidence does not take into account increased local traffic that uses the narrow road that is Priests Lane. The traffic fumes and congestion will affect the local area. Local services will be affected - schools, parking, doctors. The pavement width is either narrow or does not exist along the section where the proposed development is planned.

Change To Plan: Review road conditions and what changes can be made to make priests Lane a safe area to walk or drive along.

The area proposed should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22192 - 8205 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22193 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Perks [8206]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to site R19 being in the plan (Priests Lane) due to traffic concerns.

Change To Plan: Local plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs.
Traffic concerns: Priests Lane is not suitable for higher volumes of traffic and certainly unable to support a bus route which the plans appear to rely on to provide more public transport to avoid increased car usage. Priests Lane already does not comply with Essex design guide with respect to road and pavement width.
Please note in below questions I would have selected N/A for legally compliant and duty to co-operate as I do not feel I have enough information to comment

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22193 - 8206 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22194 Object**Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The evidence base is flawed.
The inclusion of the sites does not comply with NPPF on several counts. No account has been made for the increased traffic in the area as a result of the development of 1,000 new homes in Shenfield. The road is close to an AQMA and additional, standing traffic will only exacerbate this situation. Proposed access point is unsafe and does not potentially meet Essex Design Guidelines. Increased hazard for residents using the road

Change To Plan: Removal of the Priests Lane sites from the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22194 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22201 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Nash [5353]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Object to Land at Priests Lane being in the plan	
Change To Plan:	remove from Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22201 - 5353 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii	
Tests:	i, ii	Examination: No
22206 Object	Respondent: Mrs Concetta Hudson [7049]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Traffic considerations are unsound and dangerous. The negative impact of increased traffic movements and traffic flow on Priests Lane has been inadequately represented in the plan. Effects of increased pollution from traffic in an area where there are two schools has been ignored.	
Change To Plan:	Priests Lane site should be removed from The Local Development Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22206 - 7049 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii	
Tests:	i, ii, iii	Examination: No
22207 Object	Respondent: Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Inaccurate, flawed transport assessment. Dangerous increased traffic usage. Proposed access point on Priests Lane dangerously transgresses national guidelines. Council admits access is a problem. No official attention given to the Lane and pavements that do not comply with national criteria. Alternating narrow pavements.	
Change To Plan:	The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan and maintained as an open urban space.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22207 - 1215 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22210 Object	Respondent: D Westfall [5310]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Main objections to this new housing estate is the extra traffic it will create in an already congested area, together with the increase in traffic related pollution this will create for the local residents. Will Priests lane and Friars Ave be able to safely cope with this extra traffic, from this and the many other new houses being built in the local area? I also understand that the site was considered and rejected for development once before. Why does it keep coming back for consideration if its been rejected once already?	
Change To Plan:	The land at Priests lane should be removed from the LDP.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22210 - 5310 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22213 Object	Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The evidence base is flawed: The transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane, and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane, and does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor does it account for the impact of the Elizabeth Line; fails to address safety of residents : the technical submissions residents that new road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous have not been addressed, nor concerns that the road design is dangerous for increased traffic movements The Lane was never meant to be a main distributary road which it has now become. Residents have pointed out that as such it does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width. Where is the mitigation?	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22213 - 5538 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No

22222 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul Joyner [5486]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport Assessment was inaccurate, does not take account of the 1,000 new houses in Shenfield. The plan does not address pollution, safety, or health concerns. It is a valuable urban space. Priests Lane was never meant to be a major road for distribution of traffic from Shenfield and is not fit for purpose with too narrow road and pavements.

Change To Plan: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible. When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed to be justified and there is nowhere in the plan that allows for the enhancement of infrastructure as a result of development. There is no additional provision for increased educational and health needs, the expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands and there is already a low level of GP's per head. Schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22222 - 5486 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22225 Object**Respondent: Year Clare Bates [8208]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Priests Lane is a very narrow residential lane with only one pavement side at many places and increased houses and traffic will have a detrimental effect - it will be busier and more dangerous.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22225 - 8208 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22232 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Dohoo [5695]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: - Transport assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along priests lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic.

Change To Plan: Significantly reduce the number of proposed dwellings or remove site from Local Development Plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22232 - 5695 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22233 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Dohoo [5695]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: - Transport assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along priests lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic.

Change To Plan: land from local development plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22233 - 5695 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22250 Object**Respondent: Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local roads from this site cannot cope with the additional traffic.

Change To Plan: Exclude this site from development as exit road from the site will not support the extra traffic.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22250 - 4610 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i

22253 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern but no mitigation options have been identified.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22253 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22261 Object

Respondent: Ms Martina Fiddimore [1342]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The choice of further large scale building within this site/ area will cause inevitable horrendous traffic issues, pollution and will effect the charm and appeal of an old Brentwood Lane. Legally the plan it is not compliant as there has been no exercise to research safe egress from the proposed development so potential road safety issues.

Change To Plan: the land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22261 - 1342 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i

22281 Object

Respondent: Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Detailed technical evidence demonstrating the access from Priests Lane to the site doesn't meet road design guidelines and is unsafe, has been ignored.

Change To Plan: The Priests Lane sites should be removed from the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22281 - 6046 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22301 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The technical submissions of residents have shown that the present accesses to the sites are hazardous, in particular that at No. 61a which has an inadequate line of site in one direction and is almost opposite the junction with Glanthams road. The plan does not comply with the Essex design guide with respect to road and pavement width. The sites fail to meet relevant sustainability conditions, notably transport network, mitigation of impact on local services and an unacceptable impact on health due to increased pollution.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane (site Refs. 044 & 178) should be removed from the Local Development Plan. [Site new ref R19].

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22301 - 6584 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iv

22306 Object

Respondent: Mr & Mrs A Stewart [5781]

Agent: N/A

Summary: To conclude my thoughts clearly suggest that the land should be removed from the local development plan. I would welcome the chance to discuss and voice my opinions in greater detail.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22306 - 5781 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22341 Object

Respondent: Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Reasons are:

- o Detailed technical evidence demonstrating the access from Priests Lane to the site doesn't meet road design guidelines and is unsafe, has been ignored.
- o Traffic analysis is insufficient and based upon non-representative and flawed datasets.
- o The site has drainage and flooding issues, previous development was rejected on this basis.
- o Failure to preserve a Protected Open Urban Space, previously a school playing field.
- o Brentwood Council's consultation and decisions are inconsistent, and not evidence based.
- o No technical basis to support the housing number, proposals for a care home is flawed, and Amount/Type cannot be enforced.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

I support the request by the Priests Lane Residents Neighbours association to participate in the oral part of the EiP.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22341 - 7026 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22390 Object**Respondent: Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sport England objects to the allocation of Land at Priests Lane, Shenfield for residential development in the local plan.

The allocation would be contrary to the Council's evidence base in the new Playing Pitch Strategy specifically which confirmed that the loss of this site should be mitigated by investment in replacement facilities elsewhere in the Borough. The policy does not make reference to playing field mitigation. The allocation would also not accord with Government policy in the NPPF, especially paragraph 97, which specifically applies to proposals for developing playing fields

Change To Plan: While the protection of the site and the removal of the proposed allocation from the local plan would be an acceptable solution, as an alternative, potential would exist for this objection to be addressed in accordance with paragraph 97 of the NPPF and Sport England's playing fields policy if the playing fields were acceptably replaced as a requirement of the site allocation policy. As the Council's playing pitch strategy has recently considered the matter and specifically recommended that the loss of the playing fields be mitigated through replacement playing field provision, a solution that would be acceptable would be for an appropriate financial contribution to be secured towards the delivery of replacement playing field provision either on new playing field sites or in enhancing existing playing fields nearby. This could be addressed through modifying the policy's development principles to make provision for replacement playing field provision to be a pre-requisite of the development.

To take this matter forward with a view to reaching a mutually agreeable solution in advance of the matter being considered at the local plan examination, the Council are urged to engage with Sport England to explore a potential solution.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22390 - 4294 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iv

22474 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Policy R19 A. b. needs to be amended to be consistent with the wording provided in all other site allocation policies.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R19 A. b. as follows - provision of a residential care home (around 40 bed scheme as part of the overall allocation)

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22474 - 6776 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - iii

22481 Object**Respondent: Miss Katherine Webster [6005]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are significant traffic risks associated with new roads and the volume of traffic associated with this development. The Council has not addressed these. The size and density of the development are not in line with planning criteria.

Change To Plan: The site should be excluded or the number of houses reduced in line with planning criteria.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22481 - 6005 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iii, iv

22500 Object**Respondent: Mr Martin Skinner [8251]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council has consistently refused to discuss relevant evidence and representations from respected organisations that disagreed with their view. They have provided a tick box approach to consultation with respect to this site and ignored meaningful evidence that did not support their position.

Change To Plan: The site should be excluded or the house numbers significantly reduced.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22500 - 8251 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iv

22517 Object

Respondent: Miss Sophie Skinner [8252]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Protected Open Urban Space designation was valued by the community as there are very few greenfield areas in the town, and some open space should be retained.

Traffic congestion has been shown to be a significant problem here and new road junctions will cause increased risk to our safety, but this evidence has not been considered. If R19 was treated consistently with other sites, it should be removed from the Plan.

Change To Plan: The site should be excluded as inappropriate due to traffic problems and access risks, or the number of houses should be significantly reduced.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22517 - 8252 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iii, iv

22536 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lauren Thompson [8270]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport assessment was not representative or accurate - taken at times which excluded large proportion of typical school traffic.

Transport assessment didn't account for further development of 1000 houses elsewhere in Shenfield, travelling to / from A127 / Brentwood.

Road safety and design hasn't been addressed, with road design dangerous when under strain of increased traffic flow. Pedestrian safety with increased traffic flow has not been addressed.

Change To Plan: removal from LPD

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22536 - 8270 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii

22557 Object

Respondent: Gerald Downey [4671]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Test of Soundness.

Summary:

Delivery forecast of 1-5 years is not feasible given previous representation 15459 from Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews [6089]) who have "concerns over wastewater Services at this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. ...It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. ...local network upgrades can take between 18months - 3 years to design and deliver".

Has this and other turnaround times been taken into account?

I question if this site meets the NPPF definition of "deliverable".

Change To Plan: Remove the site from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22557 - 4671 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - iv

22559 Object

Respondent: Gerald Downey [4671]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Suggest that an updated Open Space Audit be conducted. I fully expect that this would result in retaining this Playing Field as a Protected Urban Open Space. This is pertinent given that 45.16% of the Green Belt Total (825/1827 net dwellings) is being met by Shenfield Village. This area will be in need of public open space/sports facility to meet identified need.

Also, brownfield land should be utilised first - see brownfield register link below. There are brownfields not included in the LDP. These should be prioritised as there's currently a failure to preserve "Protected Urban Open Spaces".

<http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=2838>

Change To Plan: This site should be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22559 - 4671 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iii

22560 Object**Respondent: Gerald Downey [4671]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This land has been originally used as playing fields, and is a protected urban open space.

Once lost, it's lost forever as use as a playing field, as previously represented by "Sport England".

Change To Plan: Update development principles from:

provision for public open space;

to

include provision of open space and Sports facilities for public use.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22560 - 4671 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - iv

22565 Object**Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The PRNLA has given the Council detailed technical evidence clearly showing that the access from Priests Lane to the site does not meet road design guidelines and is unsafe. This issue has not been addressed in the LDP, in fact it has been completely ignored.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22565 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iii, iv

22566 Object**Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to the inclusion of the Priests Lane site in the Local Development Plan for several reasons most significantly road safety, traffic congestion, air pollution, site access.

Change To Plan: The plan does not comply with road safety regulations. The Priests Lane site should be removed from the Local Development plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22566 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iii, iv

22577 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Detailed technical evidence demonstrating the access from Priests Lane and Bishop Walk to the site doesn't meet road design guidelines and is unsafe, has been ignored. Traffic analysis is insufficient and based upon cherry picked and flawed datasets.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane/Bishop Walk should be removed from the Local Development Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22577 - 6054 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22607 Object**Respondent: Miss Monica Eades [8288]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The site does not meet relevant sustainability conditions: access, transport network, mitigation of impact on local services, increased pollution and resulting effect on health. Proposed new road accesses from Priests Lane inappropriate and hazardous as Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex design guide with respect to road and pavement width. Junction of Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane already a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22607 - 8288 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22608 Object**Respondent: Miss Monica Eades [8288]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is a lack of healthcare infrastructure provision for the proposed developments.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22608 - 8288 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22609 Object**Respondent: Miss Monica Eades [8288]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is a lack of education infrastructure provision for the proposed developments.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22609 - 8288 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22618 Object**Respondent: Mr Toby Skinner [7179]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is too much traffic on Priests Lane which has only one pavement and is dangerous at times. The Council has not properly looked at this site or considered the residents' safety. There is no room for a bus here and a travel plan will not stop people from driving into town.

Change To Plan: I do not think that this site should be in the plan, definitely not for this many houses. The Council should also show how they will deal with the traffic risks, and show that the new roads will be safe, and if they cannot, then the site should be taken out.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22618 - 7179 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22656 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan fails to address safety of residents; new road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous, the road design is hazardous for increased traffic movements. The Lane was never designed to be a main distributary road which it has now become. Residents have pointed out that Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement use.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22656 - 5909 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22657 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times that excluded a large proportion of school traffic, it does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development and impact of Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22657 - 5909 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22658 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The site does not meet current sustainability conditions notably access, transport networks, mitigation of impact on local services, and unacceptable effect on health due to increased pollution.

Change To Plan: Removal of the sires in Priests Lane for the reasons stated above.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22658 - 5909 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22659 Object	Respondent: Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No account has been taken of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hot spot.	
Change To Plan:	Removal of site R19 Priests Lane.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 22659 - 5909 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	
22660 Object	Respondent: Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	NPPF Compliant Local Plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs. In this case, there is no traffic mitigation options have been identified, no provision for the increase of educational and health, the site cannot be deemed justified against reasonable alternatives.	
Change To Plan:	Removal of the sires in Priests Lane for the reasons stated above.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 22660 - 5909 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	
22661 Object	Respondent: Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The Priests Lane site has been rejected previously as the land was deemed a valuable open space.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 22661 - 5909 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	
22662 Object	Respondent: Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no provision for the increase of educational. The expansion of Hogarth School is op meet current demands and there is already a low level of GP's per head. Schools further afield which may have places will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.	
Change To Plan:	Removal of site R19.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 22662 - 5909 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	
22663 Object	Respondent: Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no provision for the increase of healthcare needs.	
Change To Plan:	Removal of the site.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 22663 - 5909 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	
22676 Object	Respondent: Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Traffic analysis is insufficient and based upon cherry-picked and flawed datasets.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:Yes Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 22676 - 6046 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	

22677 Object	Respondent: Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The site is a potential flooding hotspot, previous development was rejected on this basis.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 22677 - 6046 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22678 Object	Respondent: Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Failure to preserve a Protected Open Urban Space, previously a school playing field.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 22678 - 6046 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22679 Object	Respondent: Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Council's consultation and decisions are inconsistent, and not evidence based.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 22679 - 6046 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	
22680 Object	Respondent: Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No technical basis to support the housing number, and proposals for over 50s and a care home cannot be enforced.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 22680 - 6046 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22681 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Perks [8206]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local plans should address healthcare concerns.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 Priests Lane from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 22681 - 8206 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22682 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Perks [8206]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local plans should address education needs.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 Priests Lane from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 22682 - 8206 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	

22683 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hedy Lai [5774]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed construction of 1,000 housing will most certainly be detrimental to the area as it will exponentially increase the amount of traffic and pollution in an area that was not built to sustain such volumes.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22683 - 5774 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22684 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hedy Lai [5774]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Priests Lane has already been used as a main thoroughfare between Shenfield and Brentwood, something it was simply not designed for. Development would exacerbate traffic and safety issue.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22684 - 5774 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22685 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hedy Lai [5774]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sites in question have already been rejected previously as the spaces were deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22685 - 5774 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22686 Object**Respondent: Mr Francis Lai [5946]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed construction of 1,000 housing will most certainly be detrimental to the area as it will exponentially increase the amount of traffic and pollution in an area that was not built to sustain such volumes.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22686 - 5946 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22687 Object**Respondent: Mr Francis Lai [5946]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Priests Lane has already been used as a main thoroughfare between Shenfield and Brentwood, something it was simply not designed for. Development would exacerbate traffic and safety issue.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22687 - 5946 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22688 Object**Respondent: Mr Francis Lai [5946]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sites in question have already been rejected previously as the spaces were deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22688 - 5946 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22731 Object**Respondent: Miss Vena Clark [5879]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan as I do not consider the Local Plan to be sound or legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22731 - 5879 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22732 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The site is a potential flooding hotspot, previous development was rejected on this basis.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from the plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22732 - 6054 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22733 Object**Respondent: Miss Vena Clark [5879]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan as I do not consider the Local Plan to be sound or legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22733 - 5879 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22734 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Failure to preserve a Protected Open Urban Space, previously a school playing field.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22734 - 6054 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22735 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Council's consultation and decisions are inconsistent and not evidence based.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22735 - 6054 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22736 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No technical basis to support the housing number, and proposals for over 50's and a care home cannot be enforced.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22736 - 6054 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22737 Object**Respondent: Miss Vena Clark [5879]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan as I do not consider the Local Plan to be sound or legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22737 - 5879 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22738 Object**Respondent: Miss Vena Clark [5879]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan as I do not consider the Local Plan to be sound or legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22738 - 5879 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22739 Object**Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to the inclusion of the Priests Lane site in the Local Development Plan due to the loss of a Protected Urban Space.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22739 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22740 Object**Respondent: Miss Vena Clark [5879]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan as I do not consider the Local Plan to be sound or legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22740 - 5879 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22741 Object**Respondent: Miss Vena Clark [5879]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan as I do not consider the Local Plan to be sound or legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22741 - 5879 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22742 Object**Respondent: Miss Vena Clark [5879]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan as I do not consider the Local Plan to be sound or legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22742 - 5879 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22743 Object**Respondent: Miss Vena Clark [5879]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan as I do not consider the Local Plan to be sound or legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22743 - 5879 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22744 Object**Respondent: Ms Jan Sanders [6007]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22744 - 6007 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22745 Object

Respondent: Ms Jan Sanders [6007]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22745 - 6007 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22746 Object

Respondent: Ms Jan Sanders [6007]

Agent: N/A

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22746 - 6007 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22747 Object

Respondent: Ms Jan Sanders [6007]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22747 - 6007 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22748 Object

Respondent: Ms Jan Sanders [6007]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22748 - 6007 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22749 Object

Respondent: Ms Jan Sanders [6007]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22749 - 6007 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22750 Object

Respondent: Ms Jan Sanders [6007]

Agent: N/A

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22750 - 6007 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22751 Object**Respondent: Ms Jan Sanders [6007]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22751 - 6007 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22752 Object**Respondent: Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22752 - 1635 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22753 Object**Respondent: Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22753 - 1635 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22754 Object**Respondent: Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22754 - 1635 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22755 Object**Respondent: Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22755 - 1635 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22756 Object**Respondent: Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22756 - 1635 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22757 Object**Respondent: Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22757 - 1635 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22758 Object**Respondent: Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22758 - 1635 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22759 Object**Respondent: Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22759 - 1635 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22762 Object**Respondent: Julia Ebsworth [5462]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22762 - 5462 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22763 Object**Respondent: Julia Ebsworth [5462]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22763 - 5462 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22764 Object**Respondent: Julia Ebsworth [5462]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22764 - 5462 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22765 Object

Respondent: Julia Ebsworth [5462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22765 - 5462 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22766 Object

Respondent: Julia Ebsworth [5462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22766 - 5462 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22767 Object

Respondent: Julia Ebsworth [5462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22767 - 5462 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22768 Object

Respondent: Julia Ebsworth [5462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22768 - 5462 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22769 Object

Respondent: Julia Ebsworth [5462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22769 - 5462 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22770 Object

Respondent: Mr Robert Plumtree [1544]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22770 - 1544 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22771 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Plumtree [1544]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22771 - 1544 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22772 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Plumtree [1544]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22772 - 1544 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22773 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Plumtree [1544]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22773 - 1544 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22774 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Plumtree [1544]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22774 - 1544 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22775 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Plumtree [1544]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22775 - 1544 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22776 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Plumtree [1544]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22776 - 1544 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22777 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Plumtree [1544]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22777 - 1544 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22778 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Jackson [8296]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22778 - 8296 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22779 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Jackson [8296]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22779 - 8296 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22780 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Jackson [8296]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22780 - 8296 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22781 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Jackson [8296]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22781 - 8296 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22782 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Jackson [8296]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22782 - 8296 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22783 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Jackson [8296]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22783 - 8296 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22784 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Jackson [8296]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22784 - 8296 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22785 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Jackson [8296]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22785 - 8296 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22786 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Booth [5354]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22786 - 5354 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22787 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Booth [5354]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22787 - 5354 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22788 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Booth [5354]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22788 - 5354 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22789 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Booth [5354]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22789 - 5354 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22790 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Booth [5354]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22790 - 5354 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22791 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Booth [5354]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22791 - 5354 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22792 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Booth [5354]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22792 - 5354 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22793 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Booth [5354]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22793 - 5354 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22794 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22794 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22795 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22795 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22796 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22796 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22797 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22797 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22798 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22798 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22799 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22799 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22800 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22800 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22801 Object

Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22801 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22802 Object

Respondent: Ms Kiera Booth [8297]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22802 - 8297 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22803 Object

Respondent: Ms Kiera Booth [8297]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22803 - 8297 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22804 Object

Respondent: Ms Kiera Booth [8297]

Agent: N/A

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22804 - 8297 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22805 Object

Respondent: Ms Kiera Booth [8297]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22805 - 8297 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22806 Object

Respondent: Ms Kiera Booth [8297]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22806 - 8297 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22807 Object**Respondent: Ms Kiera Booth [8297]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22807 - 8297 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22808 Object**Respondent: Ms Kiera Booth [8297]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22808 - 8297 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22809 Object**Respondent: Ms Kiera Booth [8297]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22809 - 8297 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22810 Object**Respondent: Mr Vincent Burgess [5748]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22810 - 5748 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22811 Object**Respondent: Mr Vincent Burgess [5748]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22811 - 5748 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22812 Object**Respondent: Mr Vincent Burgess [5748]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22812 - 5748 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22813 Object

Respondent: Mr Vincent Burgess [5748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22813 - 5748 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22814 Object

Respondent: Mr Vincent Burgess [5748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22814 - 5748 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22815 Object

Respondent: Mr Vincent Burgess [5748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22815 - 5748 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22816 Object

Respondent: Mr Vincent Burgess [5748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22816 - 5748 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22817 Object

Respondent: Mr Vincent Burgess [5748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22817 - 5748 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22844 Object

Respondent: Mr David Gooderson [5871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no additional provision for increased health needs, there is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22844 - 5871 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22845 Object

Respondent: Mr David Gooderson [5871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of education infrastructure as a result of development. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands not further increased needs as a result of additional housing, schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22845 - 5871 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22846 Object

Respondent: Mr David Gooderson [5871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22846 - 5871 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22847 Object

Respondent: Mr David Gooderson [5871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified. Priests Lane does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width, and is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The Plan fails to address safety of residents.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22847 - 5871 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22848 Object

Respondent: Mr David Gooderson [5871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22848 - 5871 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22849 Object

Respondent: Mr David Gooderson [5871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22849 - 5871 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22850 Object

Respondent: Mr David Gooderson [5871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: New road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22850 - 5871 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22851 Object

Respondent: Mr David Gooderson [5871]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane and was taken at times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased usage of Priests Lane from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield travelling to the A127, nor the impact of the Elizabeth Line.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22851 - 5871 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22889 Object

Respondent: Miss. L.E. Mittins [1260]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Any development here would remove another small lung of green space, which is gradually being totally eroded in Shenfield.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22889 - 1260 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iii, iv

22890 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Pollution. In addition to the increase in the volume of traffic using Priests Lane, the development would also produce a very significant rise in the air pollution levels from car exhaust emissions in the vicinity. Such levels already exceed E.U.limits at the junction of Priests Lane and Middleton Hall Lane, due no doubt to the long traffic tail-backs which occur around this junction at peak times. The inevitable light pollution associated with such a housing development would illuminate what is at present a relatively dark area of night sky thus spoiling a facility regularly used by local amateur astronomers.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22890 - 6584 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iv

22891 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Local Services. Public Transport. At present there is no public transport such as a bus service in that part of Priests Lane at the proposed development site for very good reasons. That part of the lane can just allow two vehicles of the Range Rover type to pass in opposite directions in safety leaving no scope for anything wider such as a bus. The footpath which is only on one side of the lane is so narrow that pedestrians including mothers with babies in buggies are only inches away from the fast moving traffic.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan (Priests Lane).

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22891 - 6584 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iv

22892 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 4. Surface Flooding. At times of heavy rainfall which are not infrequent, Priests Lane, Middleton Hall Lane and St Andrews Place suffer surface flooding. At times of less heavy rainfall, parts of gardens adjoining the proposed development site can remain under water for several days due to the very poor surface drainage in the area. It is reported that some years ago when a previous development was under consideration the plan was abandoned as the site was deemed too wet for the purpose.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan Priests Lane

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22892 - 6584 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iv

22893 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 5. Environment. The proposed development will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and will occupy what is currently designated Protected Open Space.
For all the above reasons the development of Priests Lane sites 044 and 178 should be removed from the current Local Development Plan.

Change To Plan: Remove R19 Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22893 - 6584 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iv

22901 Object**Respondent: Mr Ian Hollocks [5334]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: PLNRA have supplied the council with detailed information to back up the arguments against developing this site but this information seems to have been ignored.

Change To Plan: I would ask the Council to review all of the information that has been compiled and submitted by the PLNRA, since much time and effort has gone into thoroughly investigating all the issues involved in this proposed development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22901 - 5334 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22902 Object**Respondent: Mr Ian Hollocks [5334]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Air pollution in the area is already an issue, particularly at the junction of Priests Lane and Middleton Hall Lane and the junction of Middleton Hall Lane and the A128 Ingrave Road, and will only be made worse by the proposed development.

Change To Plan: I would ask the Council to review all of the information that has been compiled and submitted by the PLNRA, since much time and effort has gone into thoroughly investigating all the issues involved in this proposed development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22902 - 5334 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22903 Object**Respondent: Mr Ian Hollocks [5334]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Road safety and traffic congestion: Priests Lane is far too narrow to allow pavement on both sides of the road in some places and there is no room for a cycle path. The traffic in Priests Lane is either backed up at rush hour or a dangerous rat run at other times, there have been numerous accidents along the road and there doesn't seem to be any provision in the plan to cope with an increase in traffic from various new housing in the area as well as the proposed development in Priests Lane.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22903 - 5334 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22904 Object**Respondent: Mr Ian Hollocks [5334]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan has suggested that some of the housing should be allocated for the over 50's. This is meant to be a strategy to help reduce the amount of traffic flowing onto Priests Lane at peak times but fails to consider that the retirement age is now 67. In the case of a nursing home, there will still be staff and visitors coming and going throughout the day. But even if this type of housing were to be approved, it is merely a suggested use of the site and it cannot be guaranteed.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22904 - 5334 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22905 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Hollocks [5334]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access from Priests Lane to the site does not meet road design guidelines and is unsafe. This issue has not been addressed in the LDP, in fact it has been completely ignored. Without a viable means of access, the site is not capable of being delivered and so should be removed from the DLP.

Change To Plan: The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22905 - 5334 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22906 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Hollocks [5334]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Using the site would be a failure to preserve a Protected Open Urban Space.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22906 - 5334 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22907 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Hollocks [5334]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are two schools backing onto the site and both will require land to expand onto in the future and once this site is developed it is lost forever. The area still requires room for other uses, not just housing. Building housing on every plot available does not allow for expansion of the schools, it doesn't allow for additional services to be added to the area.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22907 - 5334 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22908 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: PLNRA have supplied the council with detailed information to back up the arguments against developing this site but this information seems to have been ignored.

Change To Plan: I would ask the Council to review all of the information that has been compiled and submitted by the PLNRA, since much time and effort has gone into thoroughly investigating all the issues involved in this proposed development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22908 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22909 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Air pollution in the area is already an issue, particularly at the junction of Priests Lane and Middleton Hall Lane and the junction of Middleton Hall Lane and the A128 Ingrave Road, and will only be made worse by the proposed development.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22909 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22910 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Road safety and traffic congestion: Priests Lane is far too narrow to allow pavement on both sides of the road in some places and there is no room for a cycle path. The traffic in Priests Lane is either backed up at rush hour or a dangerous rat run at other times, there have been numerous accidents along the road and there doesn't seem to be any provision in the plan to cope with an increase in traffic from various new housing in the area as well as the proposed development in Priests Lane.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22910 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22912 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan has suggested that some of the housing should be allocated for the over 50's. This is meant to be a strategy to help reduce the amount of traffic flowing onto Priests Lane at peak times but fails to consider that the retirement age is now 67. In the case of a nursing home, there will still be staff and visitors coming and going throughout the day. But even if this type of housing were to be approved, it is merely a suggested use of the site and it cannot be guaranteed.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22912 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22913 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access from Priests Lane to the site does not meet road design guidelines and is unsafe. This issue has not been addressed in the LDP, in fact it has been completely ignored. Without a viable means of access, the site is not capable of being delivered and so should be removed from the DLP.

Change To Plan: The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22913 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22914 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Using the site would be a failure to preserve a Protected Open Urban Space.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22914 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22915 Object

Respondent: Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are two schools backing onto the site and both will require land to expand onto in the future and once this site is developed it is lost forever. The area still requires room for other uses, not just housing. Building housing on every plot available does not allow for expansion of the schools, it doesn't allow for additional services to be added to the area.

Change To Plan: The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22915 - 5332 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22933 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Craske [2712]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No surveys or work have been carried out prior to the issue of the LDP with reference to the flooding. West Horndon and Dunton are in a geographical dip between higher ground in all directions. In the past we have experienced several floods including my own property. It is not sensible to put all this additional housing in flood prone areas and to consider doing this without even basic land surveys is poor practise to say the very least.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22933 - 2712 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22938 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22938 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22940 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified and there is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of infrastructure as a result of development.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22940 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22941 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. There is no provision for increased educational need. The expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands. Schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend exacerbating the already dire traffic situation

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22941 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22942 Object**Respondent: Dr Paula Booth [5367]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no provision for increased health needs. There is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22942 - 5367 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22944 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Dohoo [5695]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: - Site does not meet sustainability conditions, notably access, transport network and mitigation of impact on local services.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22944 - 5695 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

22946 Object	Respondent: Mr Robert Dohoo [5695]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	- Site does not meet sustainability conditions, notably access, transport network and mitigation of impact on local services.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22946 - 5695 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22948 Object	Respondent: Year Clare Bates [8208]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The site doesn't meet relevant sustainability conditions such as access, transport network, impact on local services as well as increased pollution.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22948 - 8208 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22950 Object	Respondent: Year Clare Bates [8208]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	This plan [site proposal] has previously been rejected due to being valuable open urban space which is still the case.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22950 - 8208 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22956 Object	Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Evidence base flawed/unsound: ii) Transport Assessment inaccurate.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22956 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22957 Object	Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Evidence base flawed/unsound: iii) Missing Traffic Assessment.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22957 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22958 Object	Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Evidence base flawed/unsound: iv) Pollution Hot spot.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22958 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	

22959 Object	Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Evidence base flawed/unsound: v) Resident Safety from hazardous road accesses.		
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22959 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv		
22960 Object	Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Not NPPF Compliant: (Local Plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs.) i) Traffic concerns		
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22960 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv		
22961 Object	Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Not NPPF Compliant: (Local Plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs.) ii) Missing access point.		
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22961 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv		
22962 Object	Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Not NPPF Compliant: (Local Plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs.) iii) Missing Enhancement of infrastructure		
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22962 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv		
22963 Object	Respondent: mr Philip Davenport [8201]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Not NPPF Compliant: (Local Plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs.) iv) Missing healthcare and educational provision.		
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22963 - 8201 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv		
22964 Object	Respondent: Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Increased pollution in an over-polluted area.		
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 form plan and keep as open space		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22964 - 1215 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv		

22965 Object	Respondent: Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Omission of expansion plans for education infrastructure facilities.	
Change To Plan:	Remove R19 from plan and keep as open space	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22965 - 1215 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22966 Object	Respondent: Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Omission of expansion plans for education facilities.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 and maintain as an open space	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22966 - 1215 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22967 Object	Respondent: Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No mitigating plan to counter the flood zone.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 and maintain as an open space	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22967 - 1215 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22968 Object	Respondent: Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The Plan contradicts General Development Criteria laid down in Planning Policy 6.3. The sites have been rejected several times previously. Non-existent Council response to direct, technical resident objections. Inconsistent removal of other sites.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 and keep as open space	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22968 - 1215 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22996 Object	Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The site does not meet relevant sustainability conditions, notably access, transport network, mitigation of impact on local services, and unacceptable effect on health due to pollution, no account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 Priests Lane from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22996 - 5538 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22998 Object	Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The Priests Lane sites have been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from the plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22998 - 5538 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22999 Object	Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local Plan should address not only housing but health care, there is already a low level of GPs per head.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R19 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22999 - 5538 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv	
Tests:	i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No

23000 Object

Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan should address not only housing but education needs, expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current need. Schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23000 - 5538 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23001 Object

Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]

Agent: N/A

Summary: When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified and there is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of infrastructure as a result of development.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23001 - 5538 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23343 Object

Respondent: Ms Elaine Gale [8314]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I regard this proposal unsound based on reasons around the safety of pedestrians using the road to get about including school children. Traffic already regularly surpasses the 30 mph speed limit for the road - despite being a main thorough fair for pedestrians, including school children, walking to local schools in the area including Brentwood School. I understand the lane was never meant to be a main distributary road which it has now become. Pavement width is narrow and in some cases non-existent. An increase in road traffic will inevitably increase the probability of pedestrian accidents.

Change To Plan: For this reason any changes to the build in the area should take into account the implementation of new pedestrian road safety measures (ie pedestrian crossings, lower car speed limit, ie 20 mph) for Priests Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23343 - 8314 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23349 Object

Respondent: Mr. Andrew Rowland [1271]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport assessment does not account for the increased traffic or the safety issues in Priests Lane that will result from the c1000 additional properties in Shenfield. Many side roads around the Priests Lane, junction of Priest Lane and Middleton Hall Lane, area are already gridlocked by school traffic and there is no indication as to how this might be mitigated. Transport assessment does not account for the increased traffic and parking that will result from the success of the new Elizabeth Line. Priests Lane has width pinch points that present a significant safety issue. Road width and pavement availability do not comply with Essex design guides.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23349 - 1271 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23350 Object

Respondent: Mr. Andrew Rowland [1271]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. The Priests Lane site has previously been rejected on the basis the land was a valuable open green area. This land will become more valuable as a green open area once the Shenfield area is developed in general as proposed by the Plan.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23350 - 1271 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23351 Object

Respondent: Mr. Andrew Rowland [1271]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no indication how the needs of the additional residents will be met in terms of health and education.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23351 - 1271 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23415 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I do not believe that a full evaluation of the environmental impact and traffic congestion has been carried out and that the evidence base is flawed due to data not being collected at busy times such as rush hour and school opening and closing times, the Transport Assessment should have been made in Priests Lane at busy times as originally indicated by the Council.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23415 - 5765 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23416 Object

Respondent: Mark Fenton [7818]

Agent: N/A

Summary: With increasing traffic to unbearable levels, problems for emergency service, problems with traffic, noise, larger cars, damage to the highway, why develop more housing in an area that pays probably the highest taxes and rates in the borough? The site should have been bought up by residents when it was offered. There will be more problems with safety, it contradicts the ECC design guide and cause problems to cyclists. Should use other land owned by the Church or develop somewhere like Ongar by opening the rail line.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23416 - 7818 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23417 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Priests Lane already gets very congested in the mornings and evenings as it is used as an access road. Priests Lane was never intended as a main distributory road, which it has now become. It does not comply with the Essex design guide with respect to road and pavement width. There is only a pavement on one side for most of the road and in parts the road is very narrow causing difficulties to passing vehicles. Building 1,000 new dwellings in the area will add greatly to the congestion problem. No mitigation options being specified.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23417 - 5765 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23418 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The planned site does not meet relevant sustainability conditions for access, transport network, mitigation of impact on local services and unacceptable effect on health.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23418 - 5765 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23419 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Previously the site has been rejected as it was thought to be a valuable open urban space.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23419 - 5765 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23420 Object

Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No account seems to have been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, with the junction of the two being especially congested and a pollution hotspot resulting in unacceptable effect on health.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23420 - 5765 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23421 Object	Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The viability of an access point has not been fully evaluated or explained.	
Change To Plan:	The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23421 - 5765 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	Tests: None Examination: No
23422 Object	Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no additional provision for increased educational needs.	
Change To Plan:	The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23422 - 5765 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	Tests: None Examination: No
23423 Object	Respondent: Mr Ian Colclough [5765]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no additional provision for increased health needs.	
Change To Plan:	The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23423 - 5765 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	Tests: None Examination: No
23424 Object	Respondent: Mr Jonathan Lynch [8319]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The local roads are already too congested , with both the roadways and pavements being in unsatisfactory condition. This will only be made worse during and after building.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23424 - 8319 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	Tests: None Examination: No
23425 Object	Respondent: Mr Jonathan Lynch [8319]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The local doctors surgeries are bursting. If my children are ever ill , the waiting times are already far too long.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23425 - 8319 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	Tests: None Examination: No
23426 Object	Respondent: Mr Jonathan Lynch [8319]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The local schools are already increasing classroom sizes.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23426 - 8319 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	Tests: None Examination: No
23441 Object	Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	None of technical documents submitted by Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association, including questions over viability of access, have been reflected in the draft plan.	
Change To Plan:	Removal of the Priests Lane sites from the plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23441 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None	Tests: None Examination: No

23442 Object

Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Air Quality: At peak times there is heavy congestion at the junction of Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane. The air pollution at this junction is a 'hot spot' for Brentwood. The top of Priests Lane is close to an Air Quality Management Area, additional traffic resulting from this development and other allocations in the area will cause a further deterioration in the air quality.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane sites

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23442 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23443 Object

Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Biodiversity: The site has previously been designated as a protected open urban space and has been recognised as having value to the community. It is one of the few greenfield sites within the urban area separating Brentwood from Shenfield. It is important to retain it as such to maintain the quality of life within Brentwood. Essex Wildlife noted they provide a habitat to flora and fauna. Any development of this Greenfield site and the positive contribution the open space makes to Brentwood will be huge loss.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane allocation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23443 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23444 Object

Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The current medical facilities are at capacity. The introduction of a further 75 dwellings into the area will increase the requirement for both GP and dental surgeries neither of which are readily available.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane allocation

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23444 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23445 Object

Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Primary schools are at capacity (Hogarth Primary School has already been expanded to cope with existing need and while it may be feasible to further expand, this will only cause a depletion of the school's playing field, something which Sport England will surely contest.) If the population of Brentwood is expected to increase, then schools will likely need to increase with a corresponding need for playing fields. To remove this Greenfield asset does not appear to be a sensible decision.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane allocation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23445 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23446 Object

Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Increasing traffic volumes will worsen Priests Lane's traffic problems and have an adverse effect on residents and road users including (but not limited to):
* Heavy congestion.
* Speeding at off-peak times.
* Poor visibility when accessing the roadway from junctions or side roads.
* Safety issues due to absence of pavement.
* Health and safety issues for pedestrians crossing the road.
* Traffic accidents due to speeding and/or errors from poor visibility and the narrow road.
* Lorries and wagons having to mount the kerb in some places to pass each other due to the narrowness of the road.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane allocation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23446 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23447 Object**Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is away from local amenities: While the sites appear to be close to transport facilities, they are approximately a mile from the local amenities and about a mile from the local train stations. Priests Lane is not on any bus route and the Lane itself could not become a bus route due to its narrow nature in parts.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane allocation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23447 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23448 Object**Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Current information suggests that the drainage and sewerage network is running at full capacity. The open site currently absorbs water that would otherwise drain into the back gardens on Priests Lane or onto the railway. With the sewerage in the area operating at maximum capacity and may well already be exceeding capacity any development will put further strain on these facilities.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane allocation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23448 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23449 Object**Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sport England objected against development of the site on the grounds that it is the loss of a site which was previously used as a playing field and may well be again. With the open spaces report indicating that Shenfield is in short supply of such areas it does not seem logical in this day and age where we are attempting to fight child obesity that a potential playing field site is lost.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane allocation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23449 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23450 Object**Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is not yet clear where site access will be. The Priests Lane Residents Association have put together a very detailed road analysis outlining why the proposed access from the sites onto Priests Lane is unsafe, which is such a major health and safety issue.

Change To Plan: Removal of Priests Lane site.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23450 - 5999 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23871 Object**Respondent: Ian Hollocks [5606]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Most significant objection to Priests Lane are the transport issues: road safety., traffic congestion, site access, air pollution and the fiction that a cycle path is feasible along Priests Lane. Priests Lane is too narrow and has intermittent pavements, there are frequent accidents, air pollution is already an issue, particularly at junction with Middleton Hal Lane, Priests Lane Residents Association has given the Council technical evidence showing that the access does not meet road design guidelines and is unsafe. This has not been addressed.

Change To Plan: Remove Priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23871 - 5606 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23872 Object

Respondent: Ian Hollocks [5606]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The site is protected open urban space, it was a school playing field. Should not remove the designation as Protected Open Urban Space for the land at Priests Lane (R19) because of practical difficulties related to surface water. The land should not be released for residential development, as the Council has not provided evidence that the land is not surplus to needs for playing fields or open space, and/or educational expansion for the adjacent schools. The land should as far as possible be retained as open space (in line with previous planning decisions), and the Council should work with the landowner to obtain access for community use, in line with Council recommendations in 2005.

Change To Plan: Remove priests Lane from plan

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:** No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 23872 - 5606 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23875 Object

Respondent: Miss Amelia Skinner [5686]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object. All the traffic from this site has to turn onto Priests Lane causing safety and pollution issues. There is only one narrow pavement. The road is also narrow. There have been some car accidents along this road. The number of houses for the site is too large and does not seem to be based on what fits in with the surroundings. The Transport Assessment has ignored all the Priests Lane traffic; the traffic count used for the junction was done in the summer when study leave had started and therefore did not reflect school traffic in the area.

Change To Plan: I would prefer is this site excluded from the Plan, but if it continues to be in the Plan then think the Council should reduce the number of houses. They should also show how they will deal with the traffic risks, and show that the new roads will be safe. If they cannot, then the site should fail the tests and be excluded.

Legally Compliant?: Yes **Duty to Co-operate?:** Yes **Sound?:** No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 23875 - 5686 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23924 Object

Respondent: mr simon Fleming [7119]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to the merging of site 044 and 178 resulting in the large-site planning policies relevant to site 044 have been applied to the much smaller and entirely separate development of site 178. These include criteria A(a,b), B(a,b,c,d), C(a). Policy R19 is unnecessarily restrictive with regard to Site 178 as it would rely on successful negotiations with third parties in order to meet deadlines. Site 044 is expected to be developed over a longer time-frame than Site 178. It is important that housing development can take place at the earliest opportunity in order to meet the Council's target.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes **Duty to Co-operate?:** Yes **Sound?:** No **Tests:** None **Examination:** Yes

Full Reference: O - 23924 - 7119 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23925 Object

Respondent: mr simon Fleming [7119]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re criterion A(a): A mixture of house sizes, types and affordable housing may well be appropriate when spread across a large development such as site 44 but not for site 178 which should be a continuation of the existing housing in Bishop Walk, which are 4/5 bed high value houses in large plots.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes **Duty to Co-operate?:** Yes **Sound?:** No **Tests:** None **Examination:** Yes

Full Reference: O - 23925 - 7119 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23926 Object

Respondent: mr simon Fleming [7119]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re policy A (b): This policy relates solely to Site 044. Site 178 is too small for a care home.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes **Duty to Co-operate?:** Yes **Sound?:** No **Tests:** None **Examination:** Yes

Full Reference: O - 23926 - 7119 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23927 Object**Respondent:** mr simon Fleming [7119]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Re B (a): Site 178 already has direct access off Bishop Walk, a residential Type 4a Minor Access Road with an existing junction to Priest's Lane, all in accordance with Essex Highways Standards. With the limited number of houses proposed on Site 178, the traffic effect would be negligible; instead, the mitigation measures mooted at paragraph 9.172 relate solely to the new access road that will be required further down Priests' Lane for development on site 044. This should only be applicable to Site 044 and should not delay development on Site 178.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23927 - 7119 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23928 Object**Respondent:** mr simon Fleming [7119]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Re policy B (b): This policy also relates solely to Site 044. Site 178 has never had public access, and in any event the site is too small to make a meaningful contribution. Instead, significant public open space has been proposed for dog-walking and play on the playing fields Site 044.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23928 - 7119 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23929 Object**Respondent:** mr simon Fleming [7119]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Re policy B (c): This would require negotiation with third parties and so could result in a ransom situation.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23929 - 7119 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23930 Object**Respondent:** mr simon Fleming [7119]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Re policy B (d): The Endeavour School borders Site 044 as well as Site 178 (N.B. The R19 plan on page 335 of the Local Plan is incorrectly drawn). It is understood that the owners of site 044 are willing to provide land as necessary and so this should not be a restriction on Site 178.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23930 - 7119 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23931 Object**Respondent:** mr simon Fleming [7119]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Re policy C (a): This policy relates to Site 044. Site 178 lies within Flood Zone 1 (not subject to flooding and therefore a preferred location for development under the NPPF sequential test). Site 044 borders railway land, which is subject to flooding, and being larger than 1 Ha the development there could well have an impact.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23931 - 7119 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23932 Object

Respondent: Glenda Fleming [3779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to the merging of site 044 and 178 resulting in the large-site planning policies relevant to site 044 have been applied to the much smaller and entirely separate development of site 178. These include criteria A(a,b), B(a,b,c,d), C(a). Policy R19 is unnecessarily restrictive with regard to Site 178 as it would rely on successful negotiations with third parties in order to meet deadlines. Site 044 is expected to be developed over a longer time-frame than Site 178. It is important that housing development can take place at the earliest opportunity in order to meet the Council's target.

Change To Plan: Changes to Plan:
ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23932 - 3779 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23933 Object

Respondent: Glenda Fleming [3779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re criterion A(a): A mixture of house sizes, types and affordable housing may well be appropriate when spread across a large development such as site 44 but not for site 178 which should be a continuation of the existing housing in Bishop Walk, which are 4/5 bed high value houses in large plots.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23933 - 3779 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23934 Object

Respondent: Glenda Fleming [3779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re policy A (b): This policy relates solely to Site 044. Site 178 is too small for a care home.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23934 - 3779 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23935 Object

Respondent: Glenda Fleming [3779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re B (a): Site 178 already has direct access off Bishop Walk, a residential Type 4a Minor Access Road with an existing junction to Priest's Lane, all in accordance with Essex Highways Standards. With the limited number of houses proposed on Site 178, the traffic effect would be negligible; instead, the mitigation measures mooted at paragraph 9.172 relate solely to the new access road that will be required further down Priests' Lane for development on site 044. This should only be applicable to Site 044 and should not delay development on Site 178.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23935 - 3779 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23936 Object

Respondent: Glenda Fleming [3779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re policy B (b): This policy also relates solely to Site 044. Site 178 has never had public access, and in any event the site is too small to make a meaningful contribution. Instead, significant public open space has been proposed for dog-walking and play on the playing fields Site 044.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23936 - 3779 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23937 Object

Respondent: Glenda Fleming [3779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re policy B (c): This would require negotiation with third parties and so could result in a ransom situation.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23937 - 3779 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23938 Object

Respondent: Glenda Fleming [3779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re policy B (d): The Endeavour School borders Site 044 as well as Site 178 (N.B. The R19 plan on page 335 of the Local Plan is incorrectly drawn). It is understood that the owners of site 044 are willing to provide land as necessary and so this should not be a restriction on Site 178.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23938 - 3779 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23939 Object

Respondent: Glenda Fleming [3779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Re policy C (a): This policy relates to Site 044. Site 178 lies within Flood Zone 1 (not subject to flooding and therefore a preferred location for development under the NPPF sequential test). Site 044 borders railway land, which is subject to flooding, and being larger than 1 Ha the development there could well have an impact.

Change To Plan: ADD Paragraph 9.176A: "Policy R19 relates to two adjoining sites, HELAA refs 044 (Land off Priests' Lane - former Ursuline Playing Fields, 4.5 Ha) and 178 (Land off Bishop Walk, 0.6 Ha). The large-site planning policies outlined above are only applicable to Site 044 and should not delay a smaller scale housing development on Site 178."

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23939 - 3779 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

23940 Object

Respondent: Mr Steven Hearn [5492]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The evidence base is flawed. The lane was never meant to be a main distributary road which it has now become. As such it does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to road and pavement width. The secondary access roads to the site also do not comply with line of site rules. Notably St Andrews place junction with Priests Lane.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23940 - 5492 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - None

25627 Object

Respondent: Mrs Helen Pearson [5910]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site should not be included in the local plan due to sustainability and traffic concerns. The transport Assessment is inaccurate as it did not include traffic along Priest Lane. The Assessment was taken at times when a large portion of school traffic was excluded. It did not assess potential access points which are hazardous. The plan fails to address the safety of residents and all road users. At present the road is unsafe. Residents have provided details of many accidents along Priests Lane. The site does not meet relevant sustainability conditions, those of access, transport network, mitigation of the impact of local services and the detrimental effect on health due to the increase in pollution. Previously the site has been rejected for development as the open urban space was valued as an amenity, a green lung for the area. It does not comply with the Essex Design Guide with respect to both road and pavement width.

Change To Plan: The Land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25627 - 5910 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25643 Object

Respondent: Arthur Welham [8570]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site should be removed from the plan due to traffic and sustainability concerns. The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane, and was taken at a time which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. Transport Assessment does not take account of the additional traffic to the A127 nor the Elizabeth Line. The site does not meet relevant sustainability conditions, notably access, transport network, mitigation of impact on local services, and unacceptable effect on health due to increased pollution. The site has been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space. No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25643 - 8570 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25644 Object

Respondent: Mr R.V. Pearson [5758]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is not sound due to traffic and sustainability concerns. All transport assessments were taken at times devoid of school traffic. The plan does not consider congestion and does not take account of increased traffic that will occur due to this development and pollution on Priests Lane. The proposed plan for this site does not meet sustainability conditions. The Priests Lane site has been rejected a number of times in the past for users such as those described above and also because it is a valuable open urban space and should be protected as such to the benefit of current local residents. The development does not comply with the Essex design guide with respect to road and pavement width.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the local development plan. Doing this will make the local plan sound as it will negate all the issues that have been described in question 5.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25644 - 5758 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25645 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Kinnear [5759]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Pollution already above legal levels. Road not wide enough - only one side has pavement. Already too much traffic creating bumper to bumper queues. No extra schools to be included. No more surgeries - existing ones already too busy. We need green areas to improve air pollution. This is on flood plain. 8. Noise levels too high from traffic and rail lines.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25645 - 5759 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25646 Object

Respondent: Mr Brian Kinnear [5719]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Pollution even more!! Too much traffic now. Lane not wide enough nor pavements adequate to meet national standards. Flood risk. Insufficient schooling or GP practices. Need to keep green area as urban space.

Change To Plan: Scrap Priests Lane in Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25646 - 5719 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25647 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Ann Hennessy [5981]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site should be removed from the plan due traffic and sustainability concerns. The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane, and was taken at a times which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. Transport Assessment does not take account the additional traffic to the A127 nor the Elizabeth Line. The site does not meet relevant sustainability conditions, notably access, transport network, mitigation of impact on local services, and unacceptable effect on health due to increased pollution. The site sites been rejected previously because the land was deemed a valuable open urban space. No account has been made of the increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the local development plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25647 - 5981 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25661 Object

Respondent: Mr Gavin Hennessy [5984]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site needs to be removed from the plan due to traffic and safety concerns. The traffic assessment does not consider the current traffic levels during school times, nor does it consider the increase in traffic and pollution. No consideration has been given to the impact of 1,000 new homes in Shenfield and the impact of the Elizabeth Line. The site does not meet relevant sustainability requirements notably access, transport network, mitigation of local services and unacceptable effect on health due to increased pollution. Planning applications were previously refused due to the site being valuable open space. There is no additional provision for increased education and health services.

Change To Plan: The Land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25661 - 5984 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25662 Object

Respondent: Mrs Wendy Washington [8080]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Transport Assessment is flawed as it does not take account traffic along Priest Lane during school times. The Transport Assessment also does not take into consideration the changes to the area as a result of Crossrail or the additional housing. The technical submissions of residents have not been addressed. Submissions have been made regarding the safety issues surrounding the potential access routes and that they do not conform to Essex Highways requirements and they have not been addressed.

Change To Plan: My major concern is the impact such a site will have on Priest Lane. If this site could be accessed - over the railway to Orchard Avenue and so traffic accesses A128 at an already existing mini roundabout would have less impact. Or could some negotiations occur with the Endeavour school - to allow access via Higarth Avenue - again this would reduce heavy traffic mixing with Brentwood School Traffic and crossrail etc. It wouldn't be a 'cut through' and traffic could leave Brentwod A127 without increasing congestion at Middleton Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25662 - 8080 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25663 Object

Respondent: Mr Martin Ballard [8227]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The evidence base (Transport Assessment) is flawed. The assessment did not consider pre and post school runs; impact of the additional 1000 homes; impact of the Elizabeth Line. The plan does not take into consideration safe concerns. Does not meet sustainability conditions excess / transport / impact on local services / pollution. Access to site does not comply with the Essex Design Guide. Priest Lane is dangerous to pedestrians. The site is valuable open space and previous planning applications rejected for this reason.

Change To Plan: The land at Priest Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25663 - 8227 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25672 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jane Ballard [5532]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The evidence base (Transport Assessment) is flawed. The assessment did not consider pre and post school runs; impact of the additional 1000 homes; impact of the Elizabeth Line. The plan does not take into consideration safe concerns. Does not meet sustainability conditions excess / transport / impact on local services / pollution. Access to site does not comply with the Essex Design Guide. Priest Lane is dangerous to pedestrians. The site is valuable open space and previous planning applications rejected for this reason.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25672 - 5532 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25787 Object

Respondent: Mr Robert Payne [5511]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site should be removed from the LDP as the transport evidence is inaccurate - did not take into consideration school traffic along Priest Lane nor does it take into consideration the additional development proposed, and the impact of the Elizabeth Line. The Plan fails to address the safety of residents. The site does not meet relevant sustainability conditions. This site has previously been rejected for development as it is a valuable urban open space. No account for the pollution increase in the area (already a hotspot). There is a lack a services (schools and GPs).

Change To Plan: Remove site for the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25787 - 5511 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25793 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sylvia Allum [5419]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport assessment evidence is flawed: Middletown Hall Lane junction data was taken during exam period, therefore 1/3 fewer students. TA ignores transfer of pupils Brentwood Schools which causes most of congestion; doesn't account for increase in traffic from 1,000 Shenfield new homes; ignores impact of Elizabeth line; no specific assessment of supporting more traffic along Lane at peak times or access routes. No assessment of safety to motorists or pedestrians due to increased traffic. Priests Lane site is not sustainable - access, impact on transport network, no mitigation on local services and impact on health due to pollution. Duty to cooperate not addressed as comments from residents regarding access routes, impact on Priests Lane, loss of protected open space, increase in pollution, or suitability of road not considered. Plan is not NPPF compliant as ignores traffic concerns, need for educational facilities, or health provision.

Change To Plan: The needs of the current population need to be assessed regarding traffic flow, GP and school availability; Accurate traffic assessments should be carried out before any site is decided on for development and a sensible debate had regarding its viability and housing delivery; The health and safety of current resident should be considered before increasing traffic and therefore pollution in an already congested area; the plan must address the requirements for open space and special consideration must be given to requirements of the two schools bordering the sites as they will inevitably be requiring additional space, be it playing fields (due to loss of their current areas) or future expansion of the schools (in the light of extra demand from the rapid increase in population as a result of the proposed plan); the site is not justified given the amount of technical evidence against development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25793 - 5419 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25794 Object

Respondent: Mr Lawrence Allum [5420]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport assessment evidence is flawed: Middletown Hall Lane junction data was taken during exam period, therefore 1/3 fewer students. TA ignores transfer of pupils Brentwood Schools which causes most of congestion; doesn't account for increase in traffic from 1,000 Shenfield new homes; ignores impact of Elizabeth line; no specific assessment of supporting more traffic along Lane at peak times or access routes. No assessment of safety to motorists or pedestrians due to increased traffic. Priests Lane site is not sustainable - access, impact on transport network, no mitigation on local services and impact on health due to pollution. Duty to cooperate not addressed as comments from residents regarding access routes, impact on Priests Lane, loss of protected open space, increase in pollution, or suitability of road not considered. Plan is not NPPF compliant as ignores traffic concerns, need for educational facilities, or health provision.

Change To Plan: The needs of the current population need to be assessed regarding traffic flow, GP and school availability; Accurate traffic assessments should be carried out before any site is decided on for development and a sensible debate had regarding its viability and housing delivery; The health and safety of current resident should be considered before increasing traffic and therefore pollution in an already congested area; the plan must address the requirements for open space and special consideration must be given to requirements of the two schools bordering the sites as they will inevitably be requiring additional space, be it playing fields (due to loss of their current areas) or future expansion of the schools (in the light of extra demand from the rapid increase in population as a result of the proposed plan); the site is not justified given the amount of technical evidence against development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25794 - 5420 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25795 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Allum [6060]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport assessment evidence is flawed: Middletown Hall Lane junction data was taken during exam period, therefore 1/3 fewer students. TA ignores transfer of pupils Brentwood Schools which causes most of congestion; doesn't account for increase in traffic from 1,000 Shenfield new homes; ignores impact of Elizabeth line; no specific assessment of supporting more traffic along Lane at peak times or access routes. No assessment of safety to motorists or pedestrians due to increased traffic. Priests Lane site is not sustainable - access, impact on transport network, no mitigation on local services and impact on health due to pollution. Duty to cooperate not addressed as comments from residents regarding access routes, impact on Priests Lane, loss of protected open space, increase in pollution, or suitability of road not considered. Plan is not NPPF compliant as ignores traffic concerns, need for educational facilities, or health provision.

Change To Plan: The needs of the current population need to be assessed regarding traffic flow, GP and school availability; Accurate traffic assessments should be carried out before any site is decided on for development and a sensible debate had regarding its viability and housing delivery; The health and safety of current resident should be considered before increasing traffic and therefore pollution in an already congested area; the plan must address the requirements for open space and special consideration must be given to requirements of the two schools bordering the sites as they will inevitably be requiring additional space, be it playing fields (due to loss of their current areas) or future expansion of the schools (in the light of extra demand from the rapid increase in population as a result of the proposed plan); the site is not justified given the amount of technical evidence against development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25795 - 6060 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25802 Object

Respondent: Claire Hamer [5461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound as the evidence base is flawed, The transport Assessment is inaccurate. * Data for the junction at Middleton Hall Lane was taken during a period of exam study leave meaning a reduction of approximately 1 /3 of students and therefore a significant reduction in car journeys.
* The Transport Assessment does not account for the transfer of pupils to and from Brentwood School which accounts for a large proportion of the congestion along Priests Lane.
* The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased traffic usage of Priests Lane as a result of cars travelling from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield to the A127, nor the increase in other journeys as a result of this development.
* The Transport Assessment does not account for any impact of the Elizabeth Line.
* No specific assessment has been carried out to determine whether the Lane can support any additional vehicles at peak times.
* No assessment has been carried out of the potential access routes. These are either unsighted or not intended to withstand such volumes of traffic so pose a safety hazard to motorists and pedestrians alike.
* The site does not meet relevant sustainability conditions, notably access, transport network, mitigation of impact on local services, and unacceptable effect on health due to increased pollution.

Change To Plan: * The needs of the current population need to be assessed regarding traffic flow, GP and school availability.
* Accurate traffic assessments should be carried out BEFORE any site is decided on for development and a sensible debate had regarding its viability and housing delivery.
* The safety and health of current residents should be considered before increasing traffic and therefore pollution in an already congested area.
* The plan must address the requirement for open space in the area and special consideration must be given to the requirements of the two schools bordering the sites as they will inevitably be requiring additional space, be it playing fields (due to the loss of their current areas) or future expansion of the schools (in the light of the extra demand from the rapid increase in population as a result of the proposed plan).
* The site is not justified given the amount of technical evidence against development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25802 - 5461 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25803 Object

Respondent: Claire Hamer [5461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Duty to Cooperate; The technical submissions of residents have not been addressed.

* Submissions have been made regarding the safety issues surrounding the potential access routes and that they do not conform to Essex Highways requirements. These have not been addressed.

* No traffic assessment has been carried out along Priests Lane to support any additional houses despite requests from residents.

* The land is currently designated greenfield and was previously protected open urban space. There has been no proof that there is enough open space within the area, indeed it has been removed from previous plans for this reason.

* No account has been made of the increased pollution resulting from the increase in car journeys from this and the proposed Shenfield development at a junction which is already a pollution hotspot.

* The Lane was never meant to be a main distributary road which it has now become. Residents have pointed out that as such it does not comply with the Essex design guide with respect to road and pavement width.

NPPF Compliant: Local plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs.

* The plan does not include any planning for traffic concerns.

* The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern but is silent on plans to manage increased traffic flow through the town centre and Brentwood has historically had significant traffic problems with limited mitigation options.

* The failure to address these issues will result in poor future planning and is clearly the reason why the NPPF requires them to be included in local plans.

* There is no additional provision for increased educational needs, the expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands. Schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

* No thought has been given to health provision in a town where the population is of increasing old age. There is already a low level of GPs per head.

Change To Plan: * The needs of the current population need to be assessed regarding traffic flow, GP and school availability.

* Accurate traffic assessments should be carried out BEFORE any site is decided on for development and a sensible debate had regarding its viability and housing delivery.

* The safety and health of current residents should be considered before increasing traffic and therefore pollution in an already congested area.

* The plan must address the requirement for open space in the area and special consideration must be given to the requirements of the two schools bordering the sites as they will inevitably be requiring additional space, be it playing fields (due to the loss of their current areas) or future expansion of the schools (in the light of the extra demand from the rapid increase in population as a result of the proposed plan).

* The site is not justified given the amount of technical evidence against development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25803 - 5461 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

25846 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Andrews [7274]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound: The evidence base is flawed. The Transport Assessment is inaccurate as it has excluded traffic along Priests Lane, and was taken at a time which excluded a large proportion of school traffic, despite Council assurances that a traffic assessment would be done for Priests Lane. The Transport Assessment does not account for the increased traffic usage of Priests Lane as a result of cars travelling from the proposed development of 1,000 houses in Shenfield to the A127, nor does it account for the impact of the Elizabeth Line. The plan fails to address safety of residents: the technical submissions of residents that new road accesses along Priests Lane are hazardous and have not been addressed, nor concerns that the road design is dangerous for increased traffic movements. The site has been rejected previously because it was deemed valuable open urban space. No account has been made of increased pollution along Middleton Hall Lane and Priests Lane, the junction of which is a pollution hotspot. The lane was never meant to be a main distributor road which has now become. Residents have pointed out that as such it does not comply with the Essex design guide with respect to road and pavement width. Duty to Cooperate: Local plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs.

NPPF Compliant: Local plans should address not only housing but traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs.

* The sustainability review refers to traffic as a concern, but no mitigation options have been identified.

* No specific or robust argument has been made that a viable access point is possible.

* When considered against reasonable alternatives these sites cannot be deemed justified and there is nowhere in the plan which allows for the enhancement of infrastructure as a result of development.

* There is no additional provision for increased educational and health needs, the expansion of Hogarth School is to meet current demands and there is already a low level of GPs per head. Schools further afield which may have space will require a car journey to attend, exacerbating the already dire traffic situation.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the local development plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25846 - 7274 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

26111 Object

Respondent: Mr Russell Pearson [7499]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound as transport assessments were taken at wrong time, ignores the lane as a thoroughfare, of the Elizabeth line and the impact of more homes. The lane is congested and is unsuitable and hazardous for more traffic - narrow and few pavements. Doesn't comply with ECC design guide. The site is unsustainable. The lane has been rejected before for these reasons, it is valuable urban open space and should be preserved for current residents. Plan should address other issues such as traffic concerns, healthcare and education needs. No specific robust argument that a viable access point is viable. Use alternative sites they are better.

Change To Plan: Remove R19 from plan, this would make plan sound as it will negate all the issues I have describes .

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26111 - 7499 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

26465 Object

Respondent: Mr Brian Jones [5799]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - schools, doctors surgery, roads are congested, etc. Green spaces in town should be protected and find sites outside of town.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26465 - 5799 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - ii, iii, iv

26500 Object

Respondent: Mrs Judith Jeffery [5756]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport Assessment is flawed and does not accurately reflect the current traffic issues during school times and does not take account of increased traffic as a result of the development. Increased health risk due to pollution. The access to the site is not accurate as the proposed access is dangerous. Narrow roads and footpaths make it dangerous for pedestrians and cyclist. School and GP surgeries are at capacity.

Change To Plan: The land at Priests Lane should be removed from the Local Development Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26500 - 5756 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23226 Support

Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]

Agent: N/A

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this sites. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. It is recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23226 - 1927 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23266 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R18, R19 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23266 - 3791 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23870 Support

Respondent: Ursuline Sisters [28]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Pryor) [2581]

Summary: Support the allocation of site R19 ; however, the housing numbers being reduced to 95 in the light of unfounded local objection in relation to highway and traffic congestion is unsound. The policy should allow for around 100 new homes of mixed size and type. The evidence base had shown that the site was capable of accommodating some 130 homes. The Sustainability Appraisal supports the site as one of the most sustainable potential development sites within Brentwood. Its allocation is in line with the Plan's objectives and policies and aid short term housing delivery.

Change To Plan: It is recommended that criteria A- Amount and type of development be changed to increase numbers and wording to "provision for around 100 new homes of mixed size and type including affordable housing".

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23870 - 28 - POLICY R19: LAND AT PRIESTS LANE - i, iii, iv

22214 Object

Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]

Agent: N/A

Summary: With flawed evidence, in particular transport impact, more education and health infrastructure is needed, site location unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22214 - 5538 - 9.171 - i, ii, iii, iv

22302 Object

Respondent: Miss. L.E. Mittins [1260]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Further housing in this area is not sustainable as Priests Lane is a very narrow road. Along with Friars Avenue, it is already used as a rat run between Brentwood and Shenfield and is extremely dangerous with its current traffic - this development would worsen the situation. These roads cannot take any more traffic - indeed steps should be taken to reduce traffic. Any development here would remove another small lung of green space, which is gradually being totally eroded in Shenfield.

Change To Plan: Needs to remove this proposal completely to take account of increased traffic flow (which is unacceptable), safety of residents, lack of health provisions (doctors' surgeries are already overloaded) and detrimental effect on residents' health due to increased pollution, lack of transport facilities.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22302 - 1260 - 9.171 - ii, iii, iv

22519 Object

Respondent: Miss Sophie Skinner [8252]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The number of houses is inappropriate as it is much higher density than the neighbourhood, which is contrary to the councils policies. The site is wet and the surrounding areas have surface water problems which will be worsened by overdevelopment.

Change To Plan: The number of houses should be reduced significantly to bring it in line with planning policies..

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22519 - 8252 - 9.171 - ii, iii, iv

22195 Object**Respondent: Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site access at the proposed point would be hazardous to other road users and pedestrians alike. There is not sufficient visibility due to road furniture positioning and the hedges which are proposed to be pruned are not owned by the site and it is not guaranteed that these will be maintained regardless. There are 2 other potential accesses but even so, any access must exit onto Priests Lane which, at any point would be dangerous.

Change To Plan: Remove the Priests Lane sites from the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22195 - 5999 - 9.172 - i, ii, iii, iv

22460 Object**Respondent: Miss Katherine Webster [6005]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Evidence has been supplied to the Council that the proposed access from Priests Lane is narrow with insufficient visibility splayed based on Essex Design Guidelines. It will create an unsafe right-left staggered junction with a nearby road. This part of Priests Lane is narrow and winding with a pedestrian path on only one side, risk-mitigation opportunities are not available. It is often subject to heavy congestion during peak times which will be increased by this development in conjunction with other urban site developments.

Change To Plan: The proposed direct access from Priests Lane should not be considered as viable as the main access route. The Council should include proper plans to mitigate the risks and negative effects.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22460 - 6005 - 9.172 - ii, iii, iv

22505 Object**Respondent: Mr Martin Skinner [8251]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The road access is not safe for this size of development due to the poor visibility on Priests Lane. All traffic from the site must use Priests Lane which does not have any way to mitigate the traffic risks. Evidence produced by the residents association shows that the access to the site has poor visibility splayed that do not meet recommended metrics as set out in the Essex design guide. In addition the close proximity to a nearby junction would create further risk. This fails to meet the planning criteria set out by the Council.

Change To Plan: The access direct onto Priests Lane is unsuitable as the main access for the site

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22505 - 8251 - 9.172 - ii, iii, iv

22520 Object**Respondent: Miss Sophie Skinner [8252]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I live near this proposed access and have seen the traffic problems we have and know how difficult it is to see clearly along the road. This new access has bad sightlines and will be risky for such a large number of houses. The Council should be considering the safety risks when deciding if a site is viable, but the problem has been ignored by the Council.

Change To Plan: The Plan should recognise the safety risks and the problems with safety, and remove the site or reduce the housing number.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22520 - 8252 - 9.172 - ii, iii, iv

22215 Object**Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: With flawed and missing evidence, in particular transport impact, more education and health infrastructure is needed, site location unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22215 - 5538 - 9.173 - i, ii, iii, iv

22218 Object**Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: With evidence flawed or missing, in particular transport impact, more education and health infrastructure is needed, site location unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22218 - 5538 - 9.173 - i, ii, iii, iv

22465 Object**Respondent: Miss Katherine Webster [6005]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: All vehicular and pedestrian traffic from this site must use Priests Lane. This stretch of road into Brentwood is narrow and winding, it is insufficient for safe cycle ways. There is a single pedestrian path, as narrow as 1m in places, which switches sides along the roads with the crossings on blind bends. It is not conducive to pedestrians with reduced mobility. The Plan talks of enhanced connections, but has no concrete proposals to achieve it, probably because there aren't any, and so the Plan makes proposals which are unlikely to be viable.

Change To Plan: The proposed development is too large for this site and the Plan should say whether possibilities to improve connections exist.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22465 - 6005 - 9.173 - ii, iii, iv

22509 Object**Respondent: Mr Martin Skinner [8251]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sentiment may be good, but is not based on facts with regard to this site. Priests Lane is narrow, winding, has limited pedestrian paths with no possibility of creating enhanced pedestrian and cycle connections.

Change To Plan: This Plan should state that there may be limited or no ways to improve these connections.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22509 - 8251 - 9.173 - ii, iii, iv

22521 Object**Respondent: Miss Sophie Skinner [8252]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is only one pavement which is not very wide. Where the road becomes narrow the cars pass very close to pedestrians, which can be a bit worrying when they go fast. Also the crossings are on difficult bends and I have had to run to avoid being hit by cars. There are no real possibilities for providing enhanced pedestrian and cycle connections and so this statement isn't relevant. The Plan should not include general statements and aspirations when they cannot be met.

Change To Plan: This is irrelevant to this site and the Plan should recognise that it may not be possible.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22521 - 8252 - 9.173 - ii, iii, iv

22537 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lauren Thompson [8270]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 9.173 refers to improved connections to be maximised to create a development where alternative forms of transport to the private car (walking, cycling and public transport) are prioritised. Given the current width of the road, expected to accommodate wider traffic flow from further 1000 house development in Shenfield - since Priests Lane is a through road from Shenfield North to Beentwood / A127 - it is not clear how additional "connections" for pedestrian and cyclists can be provided without a detrimental impact on the increased traffic flow expected, thereby exacerbating an already stressed proposal from increased traffic flow alone.

Change To Plan: remove site from LPD; reduce egregious development size cited for Land North of Shenfield to reduce overall traffic impact to all connected areas within Shenfield

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22537 - 8270 - 9.173 - ii

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.174

22471 Object

Respondent: Miss Katherine Webster [6005]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Developing travel packs will not properly address the traffic and transport problems. In the case of this site, a travel pack will have no mitigating effect and is not a realistic solution. I do not think that this meets NPPF guidelines on mitigating traffic risks

Change To Plan: The travel pack is irrelevant.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22471 - 6005 - 9.174 - ii, iii, iv

22512 Object

Respondent: Mr Martin Skinner [8251]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Travel packs are not an effective way of mitigating the the travel problems associated with the development and should not be used in place addressing the problems with real solutions and is not in line with national guidelines in the development of local plans.

Change To Plan: Travel packs are irrelevant as a solution to mitigation of the risks

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22512 - 8251 - 9.174 - ii, iii, iv

22219 Object**Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: With flawed evidence, in particular transport impact, more education and health infrastructure is needed, site location unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22219 - 5538 - 9.175 - i, ii, iii, iv

22476 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.

Endeavour School is a special school for children aged 5 years to 16 years with moderate learning difficulties and complex needs and is the only special school in Brentwood. ECC welcomes the proposed creation of 6th form provision at Endeavour school and intends to commission some of the places for local children with an Education Health and Care Plan. The 6th form provision will enable local children to continue their education within their community and reduce travel time to specialist establishments elsewhere.

This should be reflected in paragraph 9.175.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 9.175 as follows -

The Endeavour School is a Special Educational Needs school which adjoins the site to the south is seeking to expand to accommodate a 6th form. ECC welcomes this proposal and intends to commission some of the places for local children with an Education Health and Care Plan. The 6th form provision will enable local children to continue their education within their community and reduce travel time to specialist establishments elsewhere. The school....'

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22476 - 6776 - 9.175 - ii

22220 Object**Respondent: Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: With flawed evidence, in particular transport impact, more education and health infrastructure is needed, site location unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Remove site R19 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22220 - 5538 - 9.176 - i, ii, iii, iv

22477 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.

3. Effective.

4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.176 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.176 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Shenfield CDA and Brentwood CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22477 - 6776 - 9.176 - ii, iii, iv

24150 Object**Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]****Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]**

Summary: Policies R10-R15 and R20 are all small urban sites. If these sites are suitable, available and achievable it must be surprising that at least some of them are not yet developed, Policy R20 concerns the Eagle and Child PH in Shenfield, with an estimated delivery of 20 new dwellings between 2021/22 and 2022/23. This site is surely best regarded as a windfall site, contributing to this stream of new housing supply as and when it is finally redeveloped. The fact that it first appeared in 2009's Call for Sites suggests that there is no urgency on behalf of the current site owners to take things forward. No application has been submitted over the past five years. The general point we are making here is that a number of the Pre-Submission Document's brownfield allocations have been under consideration for ten years or more. Some of them, like the town centre car parks, will be complicated to redevelop. We have emphasised throughout the Local Plan process that many of these sites were unlikely to make early contributions to meeting housing supply requirements, unlike our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch that is straightforward to develop and in a single, willing ownership. The problem remains, and supports our contention that the Plan needs more easier to develop sites, with an ownership ready to start.

Change To Plan: Removal of Allocation R20. This is a small site and should be categorised as a potential windfall site. At present, there appears to be no certainty about its availability. We also think that, without any direct evidence of intent on behalf of the landowner, Allocation R10 should also be removed.
 Policy R11 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.137 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
 "The site will provide for around 45 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25".
 Policy R13 - the third sentence of related paragraph 9.146 should be re-worded, for the reasons outlined in our answer to Question 5 above, as follows:
 "The site will provide for around 31 homes, anticipated to be delivered between 2023/24 and 2024/25".

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24150 - 2788 - POLICY R20: THE EAGLE AND CHILD PUBLIC HOUSE - i, ii, iii

23254 Support**Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on sites R03 and R20 should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration, possible relocation of an existing service/s or/and recruitment costs. Collaboration agreement, secure Wi-Fi and clinical system installation and maintenance will be required as part of mitigation within Care Homes.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23254 - 3791 - POLICY R20: THE EAGLE AND CHILD PUBLIC HOUSE - i, ii, iii, iv

22523 Object**Respondent: Miss Sophie Skinner [8252]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Travel Packs are not a realistic or practical way of mitigating the traffic problems. This does not replace the Council's responsibility to properly consider how to mitigate the risks and state what they plan to do. I do not think a travel plan will affect how people travel at all. The reality is people will drive into town from here.

Change To Plan: The Plan should recognise the limitations of the sites rather than adopt an ineffectual solution of providing travel packs. This is not a sound approach to dealing with the problems.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22523 - 8252 - 9.179 - ii, iii, iv

22478 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.180 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.180 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Shenfield CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22478 - 6776 - 9.180 - ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations Land South of Ingatestone

22179 Object **Respondent: mr James Kemble [8176]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Garden Centre site offered public access to green space enjoyment by virtue of its woods, gardens, walkways as well as garden produce business. Loss of this space has not been replaced. There is no other significant public access green space on south of the village.

Change To Plan: Restore Garden Centre site to public access nature resource. This site was designated green space with light business use. It was not designated brownfield so there has been a change of designation.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22179 - 8176 - Land South of Ingatestone - ii

22479 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Policy R21 B. d. covers 2 separate matters (landscape buffers and heritage) and should be split into two criteria.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R21 B. d. as follows to separate into two criteria -

d. provide for appropriate landscaping and buffers along sensitive boundary adjoining the A12 and railway line; and

e. provide a heritage assessment taking account of archaeological potential for the proximity to Roman Road

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22479 - 6776 - POLICY R21: LAND SOUTH OF INGATESTONE - iii

22573 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy wording lacks a commitment to deliver biodiversity net gain.

Change To Plan: Policy wording should be amended as follows:

b. provision for "multifunctional" public open space "to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity";

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22573 - 2414 - POLICY R21: LAND SOUTH OF INGATESTONE - iv

26110 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Dorothy Auduc [2542]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Ingatestone Garden Centre: The plan showing the garden centre is not correct.

a) There are two pieces of land between Burnt House Lane and the garden centre that should not be included i.e. the plot of Green Belt behind the gardens of 2 and 2A BHL and a further large plot of land which is owned by somebody else and has nothing to do with the garden centre.

b) Between the GC and the A12 works site is the recycling centre. Have you overlooked this?

c) The proposed development started with 60 homes which was far too many bearing in mind its position. Now this has been increased to 161 homes plus a further 57 homes a 1/4 of a mile down Roman Road. This will mean 218 homes with approx. 400 or more extra cars all using Roman Road? The slip road to the A12 which is needed for emergency services.

d) This site is just too big? In the wrong place.

Change To Plan: Remove site R21 from the plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26110 - 2542 - POLICY R21: LAND SOUTH OF INGATESTONE - i

26512 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary: R21 is a relatively narrow triangular site lying between the mainline railway and the A12. Previously described as land adjacent to the garden centre, we now note that the proposed allocation includes the garden centre. The site is at a level with the A12 and the railway, with consequent air and noise pollution issues. The allocation's extension northwards to the rear of homes in Burnthouse Lane means that it will form a long, southern extension to Ingatestone. It will consolidate coalescence with Mountnessing, which lies to the west of the site on the other side of the A12. Our comments made in 2018 regarding social isolation and pollution remain correct. R03, R16, R17, R21, R22 allocations are all bounded by the A12 to a greater or lesser extent. As noted in our representations on Policy NE05, the Pre-Submission Document's paragraph 8.50 states that transport generated emissions are the prime source of air pollution in the Borough. We have consistently questioned the wisdom of locating new housing next to the A12 on the grounds of public health. All these proposed allocations, in whole or part, have significant issues resulting from their proximity to principal sources of air and noise pollution. There is conflict with the Pre-Submission Document's own policies on these issues, including Policy NE05. Consequently we are suggesting a number of modifications to the relevant policies.

Change To Plan: We propose the following modifications for the reasons outlined in our response to the Local Plan consultation. Strengthen the wording of all policies to ensure that appropriate air and noise pollution measures form an integral part of any development proposals. Wherever there is reference to either the A12, or the mainline railway, the related criterion should read as follows:
"appropriate measures, including barriers, embankments and landscaping, to reduce air and noise must be provided along the site's boundary(ies) with the A12 and/or the mainline railway."
Removal of R17 from Policy R16 and R17.
Removal from proposed allocation R03 of the elliptical shaped piece of land between the A1023 Chelmsford Road and the A12 Marylands Interchange, and the area to the north of the site bounded by the Marylands Interchange to the north, the railway line to the south-east, a part of Arnold's Wood to the south-west and Chelmsford Road to the north-west.
Removal of Allocation R21 on grounds of poor physical environment, isolation from the main settlement of Ingatestone and coalescence with the village of Mountnessing.
Removal of Allocation R22 on grounds of poor physical environment

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26512 - 2788 - POLICY R21: LAND SOUTH OF INGATESTONE - ii, iii

23268 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on this site should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23268 - 3791 - POLICY R21: LAND SOUTH OF INGATESTONE - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.185

22480 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.185 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.185 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Mountnessing CDA and is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22480 - 6776 - 9.185 - ii, iii, iv

22180 Object**Respondent:** mr James Kemble [8176]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: This field is a "breathing space" between building development of Ingatestone village and Heybridge. Building houses here would destroy that discontinuity. It would also further erode the rural nature which has already been partly compromised by the recent Harebridge (Heybridge) housing development. There would be almost no gap between Ingatestone and Mountnessing on B1002.

Change To Plan: Retain the field as open land and develop it for public access leisure

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22180 - 8176 - POLICY R22: LAND ADJACENT TO THE A12, INGATESTONE - ii

26513 Object**Respondent:** Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]**Agent:** David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary: Still think it extraordinary to propose this allocation as a satisfactory environment for new homes. There are houses immediately to the south-west along Roman Road, but their presence should not be seen as a justification. The site is at a level with the A12, with the B1002 on the site's northern boundary elevated to cross the A12. We said in our response to 2018's Preferred Sites Consultation that no further consideration should be given to this site and nothing in the Pre-Submission Document has changed our views on this. R03, R16, R17, R21, R22 allocations are all bounded by the A12 to a greater or lesser extent. As noted in our representations on Policy NE05, the Pre-Submission Document's paragraph 8.50 states that transport generated emissions are the prime source of air pollution in the Borough. We have consistently questioned the wisdom of locating new housing next to the A12 on the grounds of public health. All these proposed allocations, in whole or part, have significant issues resulting from their proximity to principal sources of air and noise pollution. There is conflict with the Pre-Submission Document's own policies on these issues, including Policy NE05. Consequently we are suggesting a number of modifications to the relevant policies.

Change To Plan: We propose the following modifications for the reasons outlined in our response to the Local Plan consultation. Strengthen the wording of all policies to ensure that appropriate air and noise pollution measures form an integral part of any development proposals. Wherever there is reference to either the A12, or the mainline railway, the related criterion should read as follows:
 "appropriate measures, including barriers, embankments and landscaping, to reduce air and noise must be provided along the site's boundary(ies) with the A12 and/or the mainline railway."
 Removal of R17 from Policy R16 and R17.
 Removal from proposed allocation R03 of the elliptical shaped piece of land between the A1023 Chelmsford Road and the A12 Marylands Interchange, and the area to the north of the site bounded by the Marylands Interchange to the north, the railway line to the south-east, a part of Arnold's Wood to the south-west and Chelmsford Road to the north-west.
 Removal of Allocation R21 on grounds of poor physical environment, isolation from the main settlement of Ingatestone and coalescence with the village of Mountnessing.
 Removal of Allocation R22 on grounds of poor physical environment.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26513 - 2788 - POLICY R22: LAND ADJACENT TO THE A12, INGATESTONE - ii, iii

23269 Support**Respondent:** Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on this site should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23269 - 3791 - POLICY R22: LAND ADJACENT TO THE A12, INGATESTONE - i, ii, iii, iv

24007 Support**Respondent:** CALA Homes [5237]**Agent:** JB Planning Associates Ltd. (Mr. John Boyd) [469]

Summary: Strong support for the proposed allocation of land adjacent to the A12 Ingatestone site for around 57 homes (Policy R22) and we look forward to continuing discussions with the Council with respect to bringing the site forward for delivery at the earliest opportunity. A planning application is now being prepared and a pre-application meeting will take place in the near future.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24007 - 5237 - POLICY R22: LAND ADJACENT TO THE A12, INGATESTONE - None

22482 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

- Summary:
- 2. Justified.
 - 3. Effective.
 - 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request replacement of paragraph 9.190 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Replace paragraph 9.190 with the following wording:

The site falls within the Mountnessing CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?: No	Tests: ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 22482 - 6776 - 9.190 - ii, iii, iv				

22483 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request insertion of clarification in respect of Floods and SuDS after paragraphs 9.193, 9.196 and 9.200, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.193, 9.196 and 9.200 -

The proposed development area is not within areas identified at risk of flooding. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 22483 - 6776 - POLICY R23: BRIZES CORNER FIELD - ii, iii, iv

23227 Support **Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this sites. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. It is recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No
Full Reference: S - 23227 - 1927 - POLICY R23: BRIZES CORNER FIELD - i, ii, iii, iv

23270 Support **Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on this site should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No
Full Reference: S - 23270 - 3791 - POLICY R23: BRIZES CORNER FIELD - i, ii, iii, iv

24334 Support

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: The proposed allocation of Land off Blackmore Road as Policy R23 and its removal from the Green Belt is considered sound and is fully supported. It has been established through the evidence base supporting the PSLP that Kelvedon Hatch is a sustainable location to accommodate a modest amount of new houses to contribute to the Borough's housing needs. Indeed, as recognised by para 68 of the NPPF and as a medium sized site, such sites make an important contribution to "meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out quickly". We do however have some concerns with the amount of development set out at A of the Policy, the indicative yield at page 339 and the suggested trajectory for the site at Appendix 1. These representations provide for a modest increase in the developable area of the site with compensatory open space/structural landscaping. Supporting these representations is a Vision Document at Appendix A, a review of Green Belt and Landscape Sensitivity at Appendix B and a Summary Drainage and Utility Appraisal at Appendix C. These all confirm that the development at the site is both justified and fully deliverable within the terms of para 67a) of the NPPF. These representations suggest that the allocated area could increase to provide for a modest addition to the developable area in associate with compensatory open space and structural landscaping. It is considered that the proposals would be in accordance with para 138 of the NPPF. Part A of Policy R23 suggests that there be provision for around 23 new homes on the site. Part A Policy HP03 of the PSLP requires proposals to take a design led approach to density to ensure schemes are sympathetic to local character and make efficient use of land. Part B expects development to achieve a net density of at least 35dph unless the special character of the surrounding area suggests that such densities would be inappropriate. Based on page 339 of the PSLP, the suggested dwelling yield of 23 homes would result in a density of 29dph. The Vision Document confirms that within the allocated area it would be possible to provide around 28 homes at a density of 35dph. these representations sets out the need for greater flexibility and need for the provision of medium sized sites to aid the Council's housing needs and requirements. Against this background, these proposals to provide a modest increase to the allocated area for R23 are commended to the Council on the basis that the increased area provide for structural and accessible open space. It is therefore recommended that Policy R23 is amended to Policy R23A - substitute 23 new homes with 45 new homes; Policy R23B - additional bullet point b - development shall provide for not less than 0.7ha for accessible public open space and structural landscaping; Page 339 R23 - indicative dwelling yield substitute 23 with 45.

Change To Plan: representations sets out the need for greater flexibility and need for the provision of medium sized sites to aid the Council's housing needs and requirements. Against this background, these proposals to provide a modest increase to the allocated area for R23 are commended to the Council on the basis that the increased area provide for structural and accessible open space. It is therefore recommended that Policy R23 is amended as follows: a. Policy R23A - substitute 23 new homes with 45 new homes; b. Policy R23B - additional bullet point b - development shall provide for not less than 0.7ha for accessible public open space and structural landscaping; and c. Page 339 R23 - indicative dwelling yield substitute 23 with 45.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24334 - 2741 - POLICY R23: BRIZES CORNER FIELD - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations

Land off Stocks Lane, Kelvedon Hatch

22485 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request insertion of clarification in respect of Floods and SuDS after paragraphs 9.193, 9.196 and 9.200, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.193, 9.196 and 9.200 -

The proposed development area is not within areas identified at risk of flooding. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22485 - 6776 - Land off Stocks Lane, Kelvedon Hatch - ii, iii, iv

22575 Object Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414] Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy wording omits to mention the need to avoid impacts on Bre57 Furze Wood LoWS.

Policy wording lacks a commitment to deliver biodiversity net gain.

- Change To Plan: b. provision for "multifunctional" publicly accessible open space to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity;
- c. protect and enhance Bre57 Furze Wood LoWS

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22575 - 2414 - POLICY R24: LAND OFF STOCKS LANE - iv

26037 Object Respondent: Ms Elaine Harris [8667] Agent: N/A

Summary: I consider the proposal to build numerous houses within our small beautiful village appalling! We recently moved to the village and do not wish this wonderful place to change. I object to building on green belt land. The village is prone to flooding and thus development will increase the risk. Our small community does not have the infrastructure to cope with all the additional people these homes would contain. The local primary school is already full. The roads congested. The doctors surgery oversubscribed. Children play out, I feel additional traffic and access to the site would result in an accident.

Change To Plan: I do not consider any modification can be made. The proposal should be cancelled, there are more suitable sites where houses could be built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26037 - 8667 - POLICY R24: LAND OFF STOCKS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23228 Support Respondent: Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927] Agent: N/A

Summary: On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concern regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this sites. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. It is recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23228 - 1927 - POLICY R24: LAND OFF STOCKS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

23271 Support Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791] Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on this site should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23271 - 3791 - POLICY R24: LAND OFF STOCKS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

Summary: The proposed allocation of Land off Stocks Lane as Policy R24 and its removal from the Green Belt is considered sound and is fully supported. It has been established through the evidence base supporting the PSLP that Kelvedon Hatch is a sustainable location to accommodate a modest amount of new houses to contribute to the Borough's housing needs. Indeed, as recognised by para 68 of the NPPF and as a medium sized site, such sites make an important contribution to "meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built out quickly". We do however have some concerns with the amount of development set out at A of the Policy and the indicative yield at page 340 and the suggested trajectory for the site at Appendix 1. These matters are dealt with below. Supporting these representations is a Vision Document at Appendix A, a review of Green Belt and Landscape Sensitivity at Appendix B and a Summary Drainage and Utility Appraisal at Appendix C. These all confirm that the development at the site is both justified and fully deliverable within the terms of para 67a) of the NPPF. Part A of Policy R24 suggests that there be provision for around 30 new homes on the site. Part A Policy HP03 of the PSLP requires proposals to take a design led approach to density to ensure schemes are sympathetic to local character and make efficient use of land. Part B expects development to achieve a net density of at least 35dph unless the special character of the surrounding area suggests that such densities would be inappropriate. The suggested amount of 30 homes set out for Policy R24 does not currently reflect these requirements or provide an accurate representation of what is achievable on site. 30 homes represent 18.6dph which clearly does not represent an efficient or effective use of the land contrary to the objectives of HP03 and the supporting text set out at 6.18 to 6.20 and 6.22. The Vision Document confirms that around 45 homes can actually be provided on the site representing a far more efficient and effective dwelling yield. 45 homes would represent a density of approximately 28dph. Whilst this does not achieve 35dph, the Vision Document demonstrates that full account has been taken of the objectives of HP03 to ensure that a scheme would be sympathetic to local character. Critically, the illustrative scheme shows provision for open space within the site to meet the objectives of Policies HP13 and BE22. These policies provide for functional on-site open space. As such, achieving a greater density would be problematical.

Change To Plan: Policy R24A - substitute 30 new homes with 45 new homes; Page R24 - indicative dwelling yield substitute 30 with 45. At para 9.195 the PSLP suggests the development would take its access from Blackmore Road. This is an error. The paragraph should be amended to refer to Stocks Lane. The site is within the control of Stonebond Properties, a local house builder with considerable experience in the development of medium sized sites, quick delivery and achieving high design and layout standards. Upon removal from the Green Belt and grant of a planning permission, it would be expected that development at the site could commence 2020/21 and be completed within two years of the Plan. As a consequence, it is recommended that the Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory at Appendix 1 is amended to provide for the following based on an increased number of homes as set out in these representations: Year 5 - 2020/21 = 10; Year 6 - 2021/22 = 35.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24308 - 2741 - POLICY R24: LAND OFF STOCKS LANE - i, ii, iii, iv

22304 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Chapman [8245]

Agent: N/A

Summary: House building on the site is not reasonable.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22304 - 8245 - Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore - iii

22487 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request insertion of clarification in respect of Floods and SuDS after paragraphs 9.193, 9.196 and 9.200, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.193, 9.196 and 9.200 -

The proposed development area is not within areas identified at risk of flooding. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22487 - 6776 - Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore - ii, iii, iv

23127 Object

Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23127 - 6923 - Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore - i, ii, iii, iv

22178 Object**Respondent: Mr. Chris Hamilton [3835]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plot is frequently flooded and so are the houses adjacent to the field. Houses built on the field are very likely to flood themselves but it will have a knock on effect on the surrounding houses due to the reduced natural ground area.
The roads on Nine Ashes road near junction with Red Rose Lane are very busy around school time so development will only make this worse.
Since this LDP was published representatives of Stondon Massey have actively sought development on a site they have highlighted in order to sustain their village. This clearly seems like an obvious solution.

Change To Plan: Alternative sights should be found. Stondon Massey is the obvious one as their local representatives have said they actually want building their to keep their village sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22178 - 3835 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii

22189 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not stated what planning principle is being used to allocate the development of the Villages in the north of the borough. There are several rural communities and I am concerned that Blackmore is being allocated more than its fair share of new housing which will change the rural character of the village Section 2.10 of the Settlement Hierarchy chapter of the LDP states 'Development should be appropriate to the rural setting of the area.'

Change To Plan: A clear, fair and evidence based strategy to be stated for the allocation of new housing in Villages in the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22189 - 8199 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

22190 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The development of around 30 houses at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane is within Epping Forest District Council area but close to Blackmore and will impact services and infrastructure. Consultation between the two boroughs has not taken place.
Developing the greenbelt beyond the edge of Blackmore village is not appropriate to the rural setting of the area. It will change the rural nature of the village. This development will increase pressure on already stretched infrastructure and services; limited buses, one shop, drainage at capacity, Doctors with no non-emergency appointments, traffic and parking a problem, no places in local School.

Change To Plan: Take account of nearby development in Epping Forest District.
Consult with Epping Forest District Council on housing development.
Protect the rural nature of Blackmore village.
Avoid further impact on stretched village services and infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22190 - 8199 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

22202 Object**Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds:
failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed;
inadequate consultation with EppingForestDistrictCouncil and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore;
failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development;
adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic;
inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22202 - 4376 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iv

22244 Object**Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan unsound - no clear strategy. R25 & R26 previously deemed 'unsuitable for development'

Change To Plan: Remove the proposals R25 for development in Blackmore village

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22244 - 4388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

22254 Object**Respondent: mr Steve Whalley [4328]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The building of 40 houses on greenbelt land in the ancient village of Blackmore does not fit with planning policy requirements. This unneeded commercial development will change the nature of the environment and the quality of life that has acted as a pleasant relief to visitors from nearby urban environments. This relief is being eroded by constant development sprawl.

Specifically it is against item 2.10 in the LDP Settlement Hierarchy Chapter stating "Development should be appropriate to the rural setting of the area" - this clearly is not.

Change To Plan: This element of the plan should be abandoned and deleted.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22254 - 4328 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, iv

22262 Object**Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Plan unsound: no clear strategy. R25/R26 previously deemed 'unsuitable for development'

Change To Plan: Remove the proposals R25 & R26 for development in Blackmore village from the LDP

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22262 - 8240 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

22488 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. a. of Policy R25 states that vehicular access should be via Redrose Lane.

ECC as Highway Authority has previously advised that vehicular access from Redrose Lane may not be able to meet highway standards, and it could be more appropriate to take access from Nine Ashes Road.

The policy should therefore be amended to reflect this.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R25 B. a. as follows -

vehicular access via Nine Ashes Road;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22488 - 6776 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - iii

22576 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy wording lacks a commitment to deliver biodiversity net gain.

The hedgerows should be retained and enhanced, open space should be multifunctional and should include semi natural habitats for the benefit of wildlife. The scheme should deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity.

Change To Plan: Policy wording should be amended as follows

c. provision for "multifunctional" public open space "to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity"

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22576 - 2414 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - iv

22622 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22622 - 8290 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22624 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22624 - 8290 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22627 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22627 - 8290 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22636 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not been fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22636 - 8290 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22638 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities and has failed to account for the impact of developments in close proximity to the village. This contradicts key requirements of the LDP, as a nearby development of around 30 houses is under way on Fingrith Hall Lane, having been approved by Epping Forest District Council. The residents of these homes will undoubtedly use Blackmore infrastructure and the impact of these properties has not been taken into account.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22638 - 8290 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22640 Object**Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22640 - 8292 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22642 Object**Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22642 - 8292 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22648 Object**Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22648 - 8292 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22650 Object**Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not been fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22650 - 8292 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22652 Object**Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities and has failed to account for the impact of developments in close proximity to the village. This contradicts key requirements of the LDP, as a nearby development of around 30 houses is under way on Fingrith Hall Lane, having been approved by Epping Forest District Council. The residents of these homes will undoubtedly use Blackmore infrastructure and the impact of these properties has not been taken into account.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22652 - 8292 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22655 Object

Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council are required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22655 - 8292 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22664 Object

Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not chosen for good planning protocols, but convenient due to developers lined up.
At last LDP iteration - inappropriate to develop in the villages due to a lack of infrastructure. Nothing changed.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 entirely

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22664 - 4869 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

22665 Object

Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The scale of 70 new houses in a village of 350 houses is totally out of proportion - will change character.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22665 - 4869 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

22666 Object

Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Poor access. Lack of good transport links.

Change To Plan: Remove site from the plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22666 - 4869 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

22667 Object

Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Flooding risk to village increased.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22667 - 4869 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

22668 Object

Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore School at capacity - would force pupils out of the area.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22668 - 4869 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

22669 Object

Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No 'very special circumstances' to warrant building on greenbelt.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22669 - 4869 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

22693 Object

Respondent: D. Rawlings [1058]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is an isolated village with modest infrastructure and services and are at capacity. Therefore new development could not be supported. The area is currently prone to flooding. More suitable and sustainable site exist with Brentwood and brownfield sites. Development should not be permitted on greenfield / green belt

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22693 - 1058 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, iii

22711 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22711 - 7003 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

22712 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22712 - 7003 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22714 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22714 - 7003 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22716 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22716 - 7003 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22718 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council are required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22718 - 7003 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22722 Object**Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities and has failed to account for the impact of developments in close proximity to the village. This contradicts key requirements of the LDP, as a nearby development of around 30 houses is under way on Fingrith Hall Lane, having been approved by Epping Forest District Council. The residents of these homes will undoubtedly use Blackmore infrastructure and the impact of these properties has not been taken into account.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities and has failed to account for the impact of developments in close proximity to the village. This contradicts key requirements of the LDP, as a nearby development of around 30 houses is under way on Fingrith Hall Lane, having been approved by Epping Forest District Council. The residents of these homes will undoubtedly use Blackmore infrastructure and the impact of these properties has not been taken into account.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22722 - 7003 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22729 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22729 - 8290 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22818 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and as such has just enough amenities to support the number of people living here at present. One local store, two public houses, hairdressers and a garage. At the moment parking in the centre of our village at times can be a nightmare, extra cars in the village will just add to this.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22818 - 4841 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22820 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking outside the local shop at present is now dangerous. In the event of an emergency will emergency vehicles manage to get past the often double parked cars? The new development on the ex riding stables by Epping Forest council in Fingrith Hall Road can only add to the problem as traffic will use Blackmore as an access route and drive down to use the local shop.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22820 - 4841 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22822 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Has BBC consulted with Epping Forest District council on the impact their developments have on our village?

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22822 - 4841 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22824 Object

Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Can our doctors practice cope with more people? Try getting an appointment, you have to wait weeks now. This can only get worse.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22824 - 4841 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22826 Object

Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Can our local school cope with all the extra children any development would bring to the village?

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22826 - 4841 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22828 Object

Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We moved to Blackmore to be surrounded by green fields. What will it be like in the future? Instead of green belt open countryside, urban development and our narrow lane turned into a busy access road. It certainly is not suitable for the volume of traffic any new development would create.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22828 - 4841 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22830 Object

Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]

Agent: N/A

Summary: If this development does go ahead, how many years of disruption through our village. Large lorries hurtling through our country roads, breaking up the road surface. Noise, dust, road works when new sewers, pipes etc. for the essential services are required to be laid. This is a small village. Keep it that way.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22830 - 4841 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22852 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. For example Epping Forest District Council which is building about 30 new houses just 1 mile north of Blackmore at the top of Fingrith Hall lane. This will have a major impact on the village amenities, and will increase traffic flow through the village, especially when added to the over 70 new properties being proposed for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22852 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22853 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties as it is a single track lane which is unsuitable for heavy construction traffic, and the following traffic generated by the 70 properties.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22853 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22854 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village has historically been subject to serious flooding, most recently being 3 years ago. Red Rose lane is susceptible to flooding and this makes it impassable to vehicles. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems, even with the adoption of SUDS.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22854 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22855 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP, and why other areas have not.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22855 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22856 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong. The infrastructure simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22856 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22857 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding approximately 200 more cars (over 70 houses in Blackmore and 30 in Fingrith Hall lane) in the village of Blackmore (which already suffers from significant parking problems) will create a real danger to pedestrians in the village. The lives of small children and old people will be put in real danger with such a large increase in traffic volumes. There is not sufficient public transport links to the surrounding areas to make this environmentally sound, as the increase in private vehicles will add to the pollution already caused during the development phase.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22857 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22858 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22858 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22859 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road. This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of it's services by the addition of more permanent dwellings.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22859 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22860 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22860 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22861 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough: there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, but the Council have not shown that the required additional houses could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites; no evidence shows that available nearby Brownfield sites have been prioritised over greenfield; other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills) would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22861 - 4475 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22879 Object**Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 is inherently unsuitable developments because of flooding

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22879 - 8074 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

22880 Object**Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 as it will result in disproportionate increase in the housing stock

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22880 - 8074 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

22881 Object**Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 is inherently unsuitable developments because the development would not be sustainable.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22881 - 8074 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

22882 Object	Respondent: Mr Stephen Chapman [8245]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Redrose Lane is not fit for the traffic, being too narrow at places. Parking around the single shop is already a problem; there are no pavements in the area of Redrose Lane, making it potentially unsafe for local pedestrians if this and the adjacent development drive up local traffic.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: iii Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22882 - 8245 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - iii	
22883 Object	Respondent: Mr Stephen Chapman [8245]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The installation of utilities will be difficult, being at the edge of the village.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: iii Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22883 - 8245 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - iii	
22884 Object	Respondent: Mr Stephen Chapman [8245]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The installation of utilities will be difficult, being at the edge of the village.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: iii Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22884 - 8245 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - iii	
22916 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	2. No prior consultation with affected Blackmore residents	
Change To Plan:	Remove R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22916 - 8240 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
22918 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	3. Plots R25 & R26 Greenbelt. Unsuitable for development owing to flooding, poor access road, extra strain on services	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22918 - 8240 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
22919 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	4. Village services already overloaded (e.g. health, education, parking). Developments will exacerbate	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22919 - 8240 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
22920 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	5. Poor transport links will suffer further by additional dwellings	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22920 - 8240 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	

22921 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	6. No evidence of effect developments in adjacent areas will have on Blackmore services, or of Brentwood's consultation with those Councils	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22921 - 8240 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
22922 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	7. No evidence of proper examination of alternative sites (brownfield or in other parishes). LDP proposals appear developer-led	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22922 - 8240 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
22951 Object	Respondent: MR NEIL MILLER [8214]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	I do not believe that the area has adequate infrastructure to support new housing. There is only one doctors surgery. Waiting times for appointments are already considerable	
Change To Plan:	Improve public transport, Another doctors surgery in the locality	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22951 - 8214 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii	
22952 Object	Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Developing the greenbelt beyond the edge of Blackmore village is not appropriate to the rural setting of the area. It will change the rural nature of the village.	
Change To Plan:	Take account of nearby development in Epping Forest District. Consult with Epping Forest District Council on housing development. Protect the rural nature of Blackmore village. Avoid further impact on stretched village services and infrastructure.	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22952 - 8199 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii	
22953 Object	Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	This development will increase pressure on already stretched infrastructure and services; limited buses, one shop, drainage at capacity, Doctors with no non-emergency appointments, traffic and parking a problem, no places in local School.	
Change To Plan:	Take account of nearby development in Epping Forest District. Consult with Epping Forest District Council on housing development. Protect the rural nature of Blackmore village. Avoid further impact on stretched village services and infrastructure.	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22953 - 8199 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii	
22969 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No prior consultation with affected residents. No account of developments in adjacent boroughs, or evidence of consultation with those Councils	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22969 - 4388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	

22970 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No Housing Needs Survey to assess demand	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22970 - 4388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22971 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site unsuitable for residential development - flooding	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22971 - 4388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22972 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Village already congested in its centre (mainly parking), development will exacerbate problem, poor access road, already poor transport links strained further by extra dwellings	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22972 - 4388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22973 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site unsuitable for residential development - undue strain on services	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22973 - 4388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22974 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No evidence alternative sites (Brownfield/other parishes) has been properly examined. Development appears developer-led.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22974 - 4388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22982 Object	Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The proposed development is on Green Belt land which should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Amendments to boundaries around the village of Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as required by national policy.	
Change To Plan:	- Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development. As it stands the LDP is not justified in terms of overturning the Green Belt status of these sites. The LDP is unsound at present because the proposed development does not take account of reasonable alternatives.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22982 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No

22991 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development. As it stands the LDP is not justified in terms of overturning the Green Belt status of these sites. The LDP is unsound at present because the proposed development does not take account of reasonable alternatives.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22991 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22992 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development would cause the access off Red Rose Lane to be entirely unsuitable. The lane is narrow and does not have pavements for pedestrians. There are ditches on either side and two cars cannot pass each other without pulling to the side. The extra traffic would cause a major hazard because Redrose Lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development is sustainable.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22992 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22993 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken, as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22993 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22994 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development sites are liable to flood and this will also increase the flood risk in the village which has been subject to severe flooding in the past. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past. The proposed development is therefore not sustainable, and if ponds and extra drainage are required to alleviate the risk of flooding, then the development may not be deliverable.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken, as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22994 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22995 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore village has very basic services and infrastructure including minimal bus services to Brentwood and Chelmsford. The LDP does not demonstrate that the level of proposed development in Blackmore can be accommodated by existing infrastructure, and the plan is therefore not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22995 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

22997 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village primary school is already full. The LDP does not demonstrate that the level of proposed development in Blackmore can be accommodated by existing infrastructure, and the plan is therefore not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22997 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23002 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The nearest doctors' surgery is severely overstretched with increasingly long waiting times for appointments. Further housing development would cause a significant negative impact on all of these services and congestion. The LDP does not demonstrate that the level of proposed development in Blackmore can be accommodated by existing infrastructure, and the plan is therefore not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23002 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23003 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village centre is often very congested with parked cars near the local shop, making it difficult to park or turn at the junction or park. Further housing development would cause a significant negative impact on all of these services and congestion. The LDP does not demonstrate that the level of proposed development in Blackmore can be accommodated by existing infrastructure, and the plan is therefore not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23003 - 7055 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23020 Object

Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23020 - 4851 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23021 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23021 - 4851 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23022 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23022 - 4851 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23023 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23023 - 4851 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23024 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23024 - 4851 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23027 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Access is narrow, parking is already diabolical

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23027 - 8300 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23029 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green Belt Land should not be used as a building ground.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23029 - 8300 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23032 Object	Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding.	
Change To Plan:	The immediate withdrawal of site R25.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23032 - 8300 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
23035 Object	Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The parking in the village is diabolical already. Lack of parking already affects the economy you are destroying our lovely village and affecting our economy detrimentally.	
Change To Plan:	The immediate withdrawal of site R25.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23035 - 8300 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
23037 Object	Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Doctors surgery is not coping with the people it serves now. We have to wait a long time for an appointment now which will only get worse.	
Change To Plan:	The immediate withdrawal of site R25.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23037 - 8300 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
23040 Object	Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The school is already full with a long waiting list and will not cope with a large influx of children!	
	The ground has insufficient grounds to extend and this then affects all of the children who currently go to the school.	
Change To Plan:	The immediate withdrawal of site R25.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23040 - 8300 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
23042 Object	Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The services currently in Blackmore will not cope with the number of families coming if all the houses are built.	
Change To Plan:	The immediate withdrawal of site R25.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23042 - 8300 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
23044 Object	Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Brentwood Council has not consulted adequately with the neighbouring authorities and considered the impact of developments in the neighbouring vicinity such as Epping Forest District Council. There are additional planned housing developments in Red Rose Farm and on Spriggs Lane near Blackmore which have not been taken into account, these will rely on Blackmore infrastructure and result in increased use of services.	
Change To Plan:	Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23044 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No

23045 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are other more suitable and sustainable locations within Brentwood Borough Council with much better access to urban development, and locations such as Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified and no other brownfield sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23045 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23046 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is minimal bus services to Brentwood and Chelmsford. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. Further housing development would have a detrimental effect on these services and does not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23046 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23047 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The primary school is already full. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. Further housing development would have a detrimental effect on these services and does not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23047 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23048 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery nearby is severely overstretched with long waits for non-emergency GP appointments. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. Further housing development would have a detrimental effect on all of these services.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23048 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23049 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green belt land should be preserved and not used for building ground.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23049 - 8301 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23051 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Narrow local roads are already over-full and parking is congested near the local shops. Further housing development would have a detrimental effect on all of these services.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23051 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23052 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking in the village is already insufficient and is a struggle for residents. Blackmore has lots of visitors and the lack of parking already affects the economy hugely. More vehicles and need for parking would ruin the village and have a detrimental effect on the village, also making it less safe for local residents and children.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23052 - 8301 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23054 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed development sites are pristine Green Belt land. Brentwood Borough Council has not demonstrated that no suitable brownfield alternative sites are available.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23054 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23055 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The facilities and services in the village will not cope with the additional residents and families coming into the village, it will become far too overcrowded.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23055 - 8301 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23057 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local primary school is already full at maximum capacity with a long waiting list, and will not be able to cope with a large influx of additional children. The school has insufficient extra ground to be able to extend its facilities to be able to accommodate for extra children. Neighbouring villages schools are also at maximum capacity.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23057 - 8301 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23060 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence. Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other allocated sites within the LDP. There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of new houses proposed in the village.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23060 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23061 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery already struggles with the amount of local residents in the area as it is. It would not be able to cope with the needs and demands of a large number of additional residents. The waiting list is to be seen is already long, and this would only get worse and affect the service residents need.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23061 - 8301 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23063 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is far too narrow for it to provide access to a busy housing estate.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23063 - 8301 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23065 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23065 - 8301 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23067 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flood, and the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village which has been subject to severe flooding in the past. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and an adjacent field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the high risk of flooding. If ponds and extra drainage are required to alleviate the risk of flooding, then the development will not be deliverable as planned.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23067 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23068 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane, Blackmore is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements which would result from the proposed development. Indeed the lane is signed 'unsuitable for heavy vehicles'. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23068 - 7227 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23070 Object**Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The school is already full with a long waiting list and will not cope with a large influx of children. The ground has insufficient grounds for extending. You are having a detrimental effect on the children who are already settled if you make the school move!

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23070 - 8302 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23072 Object**Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Doctors surgery is not coping with the people already in the area. Waiting for an appointment is long which will only get worse!

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23072 - 8302 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23076 Object	Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The services currently in Blackmore will not cope with the number of families coming if all the houses are built.		
Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23076 - 8302 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
23078 Object	Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding.		
Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23078 - 8302 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
23080 Object	Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Red Rose Lane is far too narrow for the access to a housing estate!		
Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23080 - 8302 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
23082 Object	Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Green Belt Land should not be used as a building ground.		
Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23082 - 8302 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
23085 Object	Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The parking in the village is diabolical already. Blackmore is a lovely village which already has a lot of visitors. Lack of parking already affects the economy you are destroying our lovely village and affecting our economy detrimentally!		
Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R25.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23085 - 8302 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
23097 Object	Respondent: Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]	Agent: N/A
Summary: I don't feel there are adequate facilities in the village to support this development i.e. doctors.		
Change To Plan: Withdrawal of site R25.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23097 - 4876 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
23099 Object	Respondent: Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]	Agent: N/A
Summary: I don't feel there are adequate facilities in the village to support this development i.e. school places		
Change To Plan: Withdrawal of site R25.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 23099 - 4876 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No

23101 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I don't feel there are adequate facilities in the village to support this development i.e. parking

Change To Plan: Withdrawal of site R25.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23101 - 4876 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23128 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23128 - 6923 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23129 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23129 - 6923 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23131 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23131 - 6923 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23132 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23132 - 6923 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23145 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23145 - 6965 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23147 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23147 - 6965 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23149 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23149 - 6965 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23151 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23151 - 6965 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23314 Object

Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been insufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. Outside the parish boundary in Fingrith Hall Lane is a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities, and more than 5 miles from any other town / village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the adverse impact of the proposed new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23314 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23316 Object

Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Blackmore village centre of sits in a hollow and is prone to flooding. Flooding has occurred numerous times since with the most recent being 3 years ago when several houses on the Green were flooded and many of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is clearly against policy NE06.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23316 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23318 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The electricity, other utilities and in particular the sewerage system are unlikely to be able to cope an additional 70 properties without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road. The sewerage system is at maximum capacity already.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23318 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23320 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local primary school is already full - new arrivals in the village are not able to get their children into the school and have to travel to schools in other areas.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23320 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23322 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Bus services are limited, infrequent and do not run into the evenings.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23322 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23324 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is insufficient parking in the village centre causing people to regularly park on double yellow lines and there is no provision for disabled parking.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23324 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23326 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery is at capacity and waiting time for appointments are already unacceptable.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23326 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23328 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out to demonstrate why Blackmore has been specifically included in the LDP. There is no clear housing strategy for the villages and general area in the north of the Borough. There are many options that have been suggested through this process and should have been considered but have not been, including available brownfield sites nearby. The Borough Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23328 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23330 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23330 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23333 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is not highly accessible and not along a transit / growth corridor.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23333 - 4905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23335 Object**Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23335 - 8313 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23358 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is an isolated village with minimal services i.e.; doctors already covers four villages and cannot cope, we have to wait two to four weeks for an appointment.

Change To Plan: There is more suitable locations that have already good transport links without spoiling Blackmore by putting a minimum of 70 houses on greenbelt land.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23358 - 4861 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23359 Object**Respondent: Ms Janet Parris [8315]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In 2017/2018 Brentwood Council overturned there longstanding planning policy saying that our area was deemed unsuitable, I know things have changed where there is a lot of pressure to build new homes in all area's but surely Blackmore has not changed, the inter structure cannot deal with this sort of development.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23359 - 8315 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23362 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is an isolated village with minimal services i.e.; bus services is minimal and everyone will need their own transport, which the roads won't cope.

Change To Plan: There is more suitable locations that have already good transport links without spoiling Blackmore by putting a minimum of 70 houses on greenbelt land.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23362 - 4861 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23363 Object**Respondent: Ms Janet Parris [8315]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane itself is just a tiny country lane not suitable for a lot of traffic your also looking at plans to allow 9 property's Chelmsford Road, again more traffic surely this is not the right area for this sort of planning

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23363 - 8315 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23366 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore Primary School has less than 90 pupils - there would have to be an investment to enlarge the present premises.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23366 - 289 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

23368 Object**Respondent: Mr Stephen Allington [8316]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield land off Red Rose Lane. There has been no Housing Needs Survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23368 - 8316 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23370 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is hardly any local employment in the immediate area.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23370 - 289 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

23371 Object**Respondent: Mr Stephen Allington [8316]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements if development goes ahead.

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighbourhood plan".

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23371 - 8316 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23372 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The roads are too narrow and restricted to enable adequate flow of traffic. Once again further investment would be needed with road improvements (roundabouts etc.). There are no safety measures such as street lighting and paving - young people would be at an increased risk. Parking is a major problem in Blackmore - locals and visitors regularly use the local facilities and struggle to park.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23372 - 289 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

23376 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A major incursion onto green belt land which would significantly impact on the unique character of the parish.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23376 - 289 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23378 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The area is a natural flood plain where drainage and sewerage would be a major problem.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23378 - 289 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

23380 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The size of the proposed build is too large for a village of this size - nearly 30%!

Change To Plan: To have the opportunity to be able to listen to the Councils current views and be fully informed of their proposals - in addition to be able to challenge the proposals if justified.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23380 - 289 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

23387 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off Red Rose Lane is wrong because Blackmore is an isolated village with minimal services. There is more suitable locations that have already good transport links without spoiling the village. With putting minimum of 70 houses on greenbelt land.

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighbourhood plan " [Not supplied].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23387 - 4861 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23389 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. For example Epping Forest District Council which is building about 30 new houses just 1 mile north of Blackmore at the top of Fingrith Hall lane. This will have a major impact on the village amenities, and will increase traffic flow through the village, especially when added to the over 70 new properties being proposed for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23389 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23390 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties as it is a single track lane which is unsuitable for heavy construction traffic, and the following traffic generated by the 70 properties.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23390 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23391 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village has historically been subject to serious flooding, most recently being 3 years ago. Red Rose lane is susceptible to flooding and this makes it impassable to vehicles. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems, even with the adoption of SUDS.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23391 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23392 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP, and why other areas have not.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23392 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23393 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong. The infrastructure simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23393 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23394 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding approximately 200 more cars (over 70 houses in Blackmore and 30 in Fingrith Hall lane) in the village of Blackmore (which already suffers from significant parking problems) will create a real danger to pedestrians in the village. The lives of small children and old people will be put in real danger with such a large increase in traffic volumes. There is not sufficient public transport links to the surrounding areas to make this environmentally sound, as the increase in private vehicles will add to the pollution already caused during the development phase.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23394 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23395 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23395 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23396 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road. This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of it's services by the addition of more permanent dwellings.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23396 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23397 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23397 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23398 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough: there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, but the Council have not shown that the required additional houses could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites; no evidence shows that available nearby Brownfield sites have been prioritised over greenfield; other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills) would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23398 - 8318 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23399 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield land off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighborhood plan ". [Not supplied].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23399 - 4861 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23412 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements if development goes ahead.

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighborhood plan ". [Not supplied].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23412 - 4861 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23430 Object**Respondent: Mr Benjamin Rumary [8324]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23430 - 8324 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23452 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities, e.g. Epping Forest District Council (and the construction of c.30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane, and its impact on the Village).

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23452 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23454 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure it does not promote sustainable development. There are other more suitable (and / or sustainable) locations.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23454 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23456 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield (and Green Belt) land off of Red Rose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23456 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23458 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23458 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23460 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23460 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23462 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local services including Doctors surgery waiting times are already struggling to meet the demands of the existing Blackmore Population. Increasing this would be adding to this problem.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23462 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23464 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local services including limited parking are already struggling to meet the demands of the existing Blackmore Population. Increasing this would be adding to this problem.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23464 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23466 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local services including local schools are already struggling to meet the demands of the existing Blackmore Population. Increasing this would be adding to this problem.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23466 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23468 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The impact on local wildlife e.g. adders, slowworms, grass snakes, great crested newts, voles and a variety of birds.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23468 - 8117 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23470 Object

Respondent: Mr Marc Cohen [4268]

Agent: N/A

Summary: By allocating sites in Blackmore, the Plan is not compliant to:
* NPPF Sect 2 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services
* NPPF Sect 3 28 - local community
* NPPF Sect 5 77/78 - decisions should be 'responsive to local circumstances' and 'reflect local needs'
* NPPF Sect 9 103 - Development should be focused on locations, limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of travel modes.
* NPPF Sect 14 -the area floods
* NPPF Sect 15 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity.
* NPPF 16 - Conserving the historic environment.

Change To Plan: * Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no proven need that Blackmore need this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being hardly any local employment.
* Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.
* Detailed flood risk analysis required.
* Assess smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven.
* Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) rather than rural villages not near mainline rail

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23470 - 4268 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23476 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. Epping Forest District Council is building about 30 new houses just 1 mile north of Blackmore at the top of Fingrith Hall lane which will have a major impact on Blackmore local facilities, the utilities and the traffic in Blackmore, especially when added to the over 70 new properties being proposed for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23476 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23478 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties. This is a single track road, and is already dangerous for walkers and horse riders. Adding the extra volume of traffic on this road is completely unsuitable.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23478 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23480 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on The Green were flooded. Additionally several of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23480 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23482 Object**Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23482 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23484 Object**Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. Whilst there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, it is as if Blackmore has been chosen with virtually no other options being considered. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23484 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23486 Object**Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP, and why other areas have not.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23486 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23488 Object**Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Borough Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23488 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23490 Object**Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23490 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23492 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding 200 - 300 more cars (over 70 houses in Blackmore and 30 in Fingrith Hall lane) in the village of Blackmore (which already suffers from significant parking problems) will create a real danger to pedestrians in the village. The lives of small children and old people will be put in real danger with such a large increase in traffic volumes.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23492 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23494 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure (bus services, roads) simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23494 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23496 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village facilities simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23496 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23498 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The doctors simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23498 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23500 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure school simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23500 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23502 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road. This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of its services.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23502 - 8325 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23504 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. For example Epping Forest District Council which is building about 30 new houses just 1 mile north of Blackmore at the top of Fingrith Hall lane which will have a major impact on the local facilities, the utilities and the traffic in Blackmore, especially when added to the over 70 new properties being proposed for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23504 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23506 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties. This is a single track road, and is already dangerous for walkers and horse riders. Adding the extra volume of traffic on this road is completely unsuitable.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23506 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23508 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on the Green were flooded. Additionally several of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23508 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23510 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23510 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23512 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. Whilst there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, it is as if Blackmore has been chosen with virtually no other options being considered. Other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23512 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23514 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP, and why other areas have not.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23514 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23516 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Borough Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23516 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23518 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong. The infrastructure (bus services, roads) simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23518 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23520 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village facilities simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23520 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23521 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23521 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23522 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The school simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23522 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23526 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding 200 - 300 more cars (over 70 houses in Blackmore and 30 in Fingrith Hall lane) in the village of Blackmore (which already suffers from significant parking problems) will create a real danger to pedestrians in the village. The lives of small children and old people will be put in real danger with such a large increase in traffic volumes.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23526 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23528 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23528 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23530 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road. This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of it's services.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23530 - 6964 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23531 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy' for the Villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the Borough

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23531 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23534 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities, e.g. Epping Forest District Council (and the construction of c.30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane, and its impact on the Village)

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23534 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23535 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23535 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23536 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23536 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23538 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are other more suitable (and / or sustainable) locations - e.g. urban extension to Brentwood - and so the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield (and Green Belt) land off of Red Rose Lane

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23538 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23541 Object**Respondent: Mr David Barfoot [7177]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23541 - 7177 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23548 Object**Respondent: Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200]****Agent: N/A**Summary: What plans have been made for surrounding infrastructure?
Which other sites in Essex have been identified?
Asking residents door to door
Green Belt land is identified as green belt for a reason. There are other areas that can be built on which do not impact on small already strained village.Change To Plan: SCHOOL! This is a local village one form entry school, which is already oversubscribed. More houses equal more children.
TRAFFIC! Blackmore is already congested with cars and for parking, We do not want more traffic spoiling this beautiful village.
GP. Already overcrowded and will be put under more strain.
There is not a need for more houses here in such a small village

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23548 - 7200 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23550 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movement

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23550 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23552 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flood, and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in a village that can be prone to severe flooding.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23552 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23555 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local services including Doctors surgery waiting times, limited parking and local schools are already struggling to meet the demands of the existing Blackmore Population. Increasing this would be adding to this problem.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23555 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23556 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local services including Doctors surgery waiting times, limited parking and local schools are already struggling to meet the demands of the existing Blackmore Population. Increasing this would be adding to this problem.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23556 - 8326 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23561 Object**Respondent: Ms Eleanora Barfoot [8328]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23561 - 8328 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23565 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hayley Hammond [8329]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object (no reason given)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23565 - 8329 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23576 Object**Respondent: Sadie Barfoot [8330]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23576 - 8330 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23628 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Evans [8332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object (no reason supplied)

Change To Plan: Remove R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23628 - 8332 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23763 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane itself is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. This lane is regularly used currently by large agricultural vehicles which have to by-pass the village due to their size. They are large "Tracked" Tractors units towing large trailers which take up the full width of the lane and this closes the road to oncoming traffic. If they meet any vehicles coming the other way have to reverse to one of two temporary "Passing Places". Additionally large school buses use this lane again creating serious safety risks.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23763 - 7193 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23766 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* One village shop/Post Office with very restricted parking

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23766 - 7193 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23768 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* A Doctors surgery whereby I genuinely hope I do not need to request urgent care. If you want any form of response you have to continuously dial repeatedly to get assistance - comments on the website page highlights this

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23768 - 7193 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23771 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* The local village school has very limited places and resources which was put under further pressure due to a large unapproved travelling community site with some 20-30 caravans and families is also impacting on the village resources available

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23771 - 7193 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23773 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane regularly floods with the water coming down Nine Ashes Road like a river and into the lane. The ditches and limited drainage near to the junction simply cannot cope and a large area is regularly left under water during the winter months. Flooding has increasingly become an issue in recent years and has now started to erode the lane at the front of our house. This will also further impact the flooding risk in the village which has been an increasing problem.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23773 - 7193 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23775 Object

Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Council has simply not demonstrated that they have taken into account other Brownfield sites that are available which surely must take priority over the development of Green Belt Lane between Red Rose Lane and Blackmore Village.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23775 - 7193 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23941 Object

Respondent: Mrs Trina Chambers [8348]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Infrastructure insufficient: schools already full, long wait time for GP and not enough parking spaces available.

Change To Plan: The sites in Blackmore need to be removed now! You need to listen to and respond positively to the plan constructed by Blackmore Village Heritage association on behalf of our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23941 - 8348 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24097 Object

Respondent: Ms Julie Chandler [8352]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The entrance to the fields are not on a suitable road - liable to flooding the surrounding roads will not take the added traffic flow. It seems no-one has taken an overview or strategy view of development around the villages they have just been dictated by developers and money. Consultation with Epping Forest would be needed. There are too many properties to be built for people that will need busses, shops and schools. If they are to build affordable housing they need affordable infrastructure. There is no capacity for this. Elderly and young families need busses, shops and school and the ability to get in and out of the village. The village is a good 3 miles in the middle of no-where there needs to be adequate transport, roads for people that live in the village and any carers or visiting family. The parking outside the shop is already busy and dangerous utilised by not only people from Blackmore but all the surrounding villages. More suitable sites would be near to towns such as Brentwood or Ingatestone. These houses will not be far for the people that need housing because those people would be able to afford the cost of living in a small village such as this. A car is needed as cabs are £25+ per journey. Children need to be taken to and from school as the local school is full and this will limit the ability for the parents to work.

Change To Plan: Find other more suitable sites near to amenities

Use a site that isn't an area of natural beauty which contributes to green belt

Find an area where there are already adequate roads to service it

Provide housing for people where the cost of living isn't as high as Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24097 - 8352 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24195 Object

Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, its position is very isolated with narrow country roads. The bus service is very limited. Parking is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: Remote site 25 from the local plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24195 - 7195 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24201 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The only shop is a small Co-op which already can't cope. Not long ago our post office moved to the Co-op giving a very unsatisfactory service. There just isn't enough room to support such a service.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24201 - 7195 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24207 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The one school is already full.

Change To Plan: remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24207 - 7195 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24213 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The nearby doctors surgery is severely overstretched.

Change To Plan: remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24213 - 7195 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24219 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flooding is already a problem, I fear this would only get worse.

Change To Plan: remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24219 - 7195 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24225 Object**Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The accessibility including Red Rose Lane in particular is not sufficient and even farm vehicles struggle and have to bypass the village. It is already difficult to park/access the single village shop/Post Office along with the influx of the tea room which uses up all of the current parking resource available. Red Rose Lane is very narrow/winding road unsuitable for any increase in traffic. It is already dangerous with no pavements and is in constant use by dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24225 - 8370 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24231 Object**Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village school will not cope.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24231 - 8370 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24237 Object**Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery will not cope.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24237 - 8370 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24243 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose Lane regularly floods as do other areas of the village and this will be made worse by any further developments.	
Change To Plan:	remove site R25 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24243 - 8370 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
24342 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore is not part of any strategy in north of borough	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24342 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24344 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	BBC not consulted with neighbouring authorities	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24344 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24345 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24345 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24346 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing densities on other allocated sites.	
Change To Plan:	Remove R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24346 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24348 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Development off Red Rose Lane is wrong because Blackmore has modest services (school, parking, shops, doctors etc).	
Change To Plan:	Remove R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24348 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24349 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Other sustainable locations appear to be ignored, Blackmore proposal is not sustainable.	
Change To Plan:	Remove R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24349 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	

24350 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Access (road width/nature)off/on Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for volume of traffic. There are already too many vehicles in/going through Blackmore		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24350 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24351 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: There is no value in being a 'heritage/preserved village/green belt if it is to be ignored		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24351 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24352 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Additional development would destroy the 'character' of the village without providing any identifiable improvements		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24352 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24353 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: BBC has failed to identify other brownfield sites are available		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24353 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24354 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flooding: any development would require upgrading of brooks/culverts		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24354 - 8138 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24373 Object	Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]	Agent: N/A
Summary: No housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in LDP		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24373 - 8372 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii		Tests: i, ii, iii
		Examination: Yes
24375 Object	Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Blackmore is an isolated rural village with very modest services & infrastructure more suitable /sustainable locations eg urban extension to Brentwood. The locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24375 - 8372 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii		Tests: i, ii, iii
		Examination: Yes

24377 Object**Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other Brownfield sites that area available which should take priority over Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24377 - 8372 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

24379 Object**Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Access off/from Red Rose lane (single lane road) is completely unsuitable for large volume of traffic movement

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24379 - 8372 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

24381 Object**Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing density on other allocated sites

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24381 - 8372 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

24384 Object**Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate. yet again green belt is being developed on. Blackmore struggles to deal with the amount of traffic and parking and will not cope with the new development. Doctors surgeries, schools, public amenities are already at breaking point, how will they cope. Increased risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Withdraw the plan as it stands. Consider brownfield sites ,in fills and derelict properties.
Use parish council to communicate with the residents. Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24384 - 8373 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24389 Object**Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object: The plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate. Yet again green belt is being developed on. Blackmore struggles to deal with the amount of traffic and parking and will not cope with the new development.

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties,
Use parish council to communicate with the residents,
Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24389 - 8373 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24391 Object**Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Doctors surgeries, public amenities are already at breaking point, how will they cope.

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties,
Use parish council to communicate with the residents,
Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24391 - 8373 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24394 Object**Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increased risk of flooding

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties,
Use parish council to communicate with the residents,
Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24394 - 8373 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24399 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Historic village of Blackmore is a lively viable community slowly growing naturally.
Brentwood BC planning advice advocates only developing villages where there is a need to make them viable., the historic character will not be improved and road connections are easy. More of this is true for Blackmore. Moreover there has been no clear strategy for the villages north of Brentwood nor has there been any assessment of the needs of Blackmore.
At the open consultation meeting in early 2018 with BBC planners it was evident that they know little about Blackmores situation or about development of houses in Epping Forest DC which are really part of Blackmore although over the border. (Friary Hall Lane 32 +; Woolmanger Road 8). On about the 12 traveller sites off Chelmsford Road.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council.
Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24399 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24401 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Roads 5 lanes connect village to outside world, narrow and windy, subject to flooding in several places, badly congested at rush hours. Cut off by snow sometimes.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council.
Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24401 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24402 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Surface water drainage. Already poor, roads often flooded, with stalled cars, bad flood Aug 1987 when houses flooded around the Green, the south side of the Blackmore Road and the bottom half of Church Street including historic grade 1 St Lawrence Church. There has been no change to the water-ways since then, we has a "near miss" in June 2016.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council.
Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24402 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24403 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Roads 5 lanes connect village to outside world, narrow and windy, subject to flooding in several places, badly congested at rush hours. Cut off by snow sometimes.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24403 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24405 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Climate change predicted to increase extremes of weather! The run off of surface water from any further development will increase the risk of homes being flooded for existing residents.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24405 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24407 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sewage, pump off Ingatestone Road a the limit of coping quite often, overflows raw sewage into The Moat and thence into the River Wid fairly often. Back up in 2016 was the cause of one or two properties flooding.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable. Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24407 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24409 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Electricity supply prone to short power cuts specially in windy weather, throws timer/computer out frequently.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24409 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24411 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: School crowded, even now some village residents cannot get their children in!

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24411 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24413 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: GP services, local GP surgery cannot recruit enough doctors so waiting times long.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24413 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24415 Object	Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Parking in village centre and at village hall is dire. Road connections, windy narrow country lanes prone to flooding.	
Change To Plan:	Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable. Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: Not Specified Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24415 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv	
24417 Object	Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Epping Forest Developments will add strain on some of these infrastructure provision items	
Change To Plan:	Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable. Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24417 - 1497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv	
24419 Object	Respondent: Miss Nicky Joiner [8374]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No room in schools	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from lan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24419 - 8374 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii	
24422 Object	Respondent: Miss Nicky Joiner [8374]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No room in doctors, dentist	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24422 - 8374 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii	
24424 Object	Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200: Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore	
Change To Plan:	Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?: Not Specified Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24424 - 8375 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
24425 Object	Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200: Blackmore has been disproportionately targeted with a 30% increase in the current population proposed.	
Change To Plan:	The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the planes should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out the Blackmore local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?: Not Specified Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24425 - 8375 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	

24426 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200: There must be more suitable brownfield sites within the borough that having to build on Green Belt in Blackmore. The Blackmore sites of R25 and R26 are entirely unsuitable for large scale development

Change To Plan: The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the plan should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out the Blackmore local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24426 - 8375 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24443 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose lane is a single track and not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. It is used by walkers, joggers, cyclists; dog walkers and horseriders and has no pavement. The additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users along with the lack of street lights.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24443 - 8378 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24445 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure Requirements: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26, however all amenities and services are already stretched inc the local primary school, electricity, sewerage system, doctors surgery etc.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24445 - 8378 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24447 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear housing strategy for the villages and general area in the north of the borough. There are many other options that have been suggested through this process but have not been considered. A 'housing needs' survey should have been carried out which would have demonstrated why Blackmore has been specifically included on the LDP and why other more suitable areas have not been included.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24447 - 8378 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24449 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The borough Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24449 - 8378 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24451 Object**Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Other more suitable locations eg areas around Doddinghurst which have better transport links would have been a far better proposal that the development in Blackmore which is not a sustainable development proposal for the reasons given.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24451 - 8378 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24461 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. Red Rose Lane is single track and wont cope with more traffic.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24461 - 8379 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24463 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concern over flood risk on this site

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24463 - 8379 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24465 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. The local school is at capacity with no room for more children.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24465 - 8379 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24467 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. The doctors is at capacity, waiting times are bad already.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24467 - 8379 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24470 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. Electricity and services wont be able to cope with 70 extra houses.

Change To Plan: The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24470 - 8379 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24474 Object**Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore infrastructure and amenities would not be able to cope, doctor appointments already up to 1 month & this will get worse when the residents of old Norton Heath site descend on the village

Change To Plan: Refer to BHVA neighbourhood plan - remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24474 - 8380 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24476 Object	Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Blackmore infrastructure and amenities would not be able to cope, school is full,		
Change To Plan: Refer to BHVA Neighbourhood Plan - remove sites R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24476 - 8380 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
24478 Object	Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]	Agent: N/A
Summary: This is a small village which should never have been classed as category 3 it is category 4. There are various other planning applications going through for the village on Spriegs Lane & Chelmsford Road 20 properties are proposed on 4 applications.		
Change To Plan: Refer to BHVA neighbourhood plan. Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24478 - 8380 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
24482 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary: On green Belt		
Change To Plan: See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24482 - 8381 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
24484 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Developer led which is against national guidelines		
Change To Plan: See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24484 - 8381 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
24485 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Inadequate access, Red Rose Lane too narrow and floods frequently		
Change To Plan: See BVHA neighbourhood plan which I support (Remove R25 and R26 from plan).		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24485 - 8381 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
24489 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Local amenities unable to cope with existing residents		
Change To Plan: See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24489 - 8381 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
24490 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Would result in large increase in traffic which is already increased dramatically in last 12 months		
Change To Plan: See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove R25 and R26 from plan)		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24490 - 8381 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes

24494 Object**Respondent: Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The building of the proposed houses is totally unacceptable in this village. There doesn't seem to be any thought given to the local area. Especially with regard to providing local infrastructure and impacts on it.

Change To Plan: The use of brownfield sites to build a modest amount of houses would be much more acceptable to most people in the local areas. DO NOT build on Green Belt or Green Field sites for the good of the environment and wildlife. [Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24494 - 8002 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24498 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Reed [4708]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound. Infrastructure already fails local needs: flood risk, school and doctors surgery at over capacity & struggle to cope, poor (virtually non existent) bus service, roads not suitable, insufficient parking in village centre. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities (ie: Epping and Chelmsford). Sites mentioned not suitable, Alternative sites (that are better suited have been ignored. There has been no "housing needs" survey.

Change To Plan: The only practical solution is to remove sites R25 and R26. Take heed of the BVHA neighbourhood plan which identifies the actual requirement of local residents and proposes better suited alternative sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24498 - 4708 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24501 Object**Respondent: Dr Belinda Dunbar [8382]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local GP services and schools are already struggling to cope. There is no consideration of increasing the GP services to cope with additional houses. The access roads are not adequate to take the increased volume of traffic the extra homes will bring. Flooding occurs in the area during heavy rainfall, building more homes will add to these problems. Green Belt should be retained.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 & R26 from the Local Plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which sets out our local housing needs and that the Blackmore community is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24501 - 8382 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24506 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Robinson [4899]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No "housing needs survey" has been performed to show why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Blackmore is an established village and it would appear that an increase in demand on the infrastructure is not viable. I understand that the village school is full and the Deal Tree medical centre is reported to have one of the highest patient to practitioner ratios in certainly Essex. The access onto and off Red Rose Lane will not be suitable for the anticipated increase in traffic. The sites R25 and R26 have over the years suffered from persistent flooding. Around 30 houses are being or will be constructed at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 need to be removed from the plan. I suggest the planners need to read the BVHA neighbourhood plan which includes the Blackmore local housing requirements for what is clearly an existing sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24506 - 4899 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24507 Object**Respondent: Danielle Keys [8376]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose lane always floods due to bad weather. Building will increase flooding (I live in next to Red Rose lane). Also parking in and around the village. The village school, shop and doctors are at it's full capacity now.

Change To Plan: No modification will make the plan sound or legally compliant due to the size of the village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24507 - 8376 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24514 Object**Respondent: Mrs Terri Reed [4303]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sites are unsuitable for building, they are liable to flood and the road is not suitable as it is too narrow & also it regularly floods, cars get trapped. I am unaware if a housing need survey is being carried out. The infrastructure is already at bursting point. Children turned away from the local school as full; Drs surgery over stretched already; no parking in village centre. Because we are on the Brentwood borders, no account has been taken of the development being undertaken by Epping & Chelmsford RIGHT ON OUR DOORSTEP, impacting on local facilities. Alternative sites have been ignored, even when more suitable, inadequate public transport - you can't live here without a car. Most families have 2 or more.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26. Consider what Blackmore really needs not what ticks a few boxes, and what suits developers. The BHVA have worked hard to proposal alternative which are sustainable. They know the village better than the people behind the unsustainable proposal currently on the table.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24514 - 4303 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24516 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jean Drew [8383]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are more suitable and sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood. Development in Blackmore is not sustainable. The roads serving Blackmore are not designed to meet increase in traffic or HGV use for construction. Local school (1 form entry) are at capacity. Children may have to attend school elsewhere increasing traffic and pollution. There is only 1 doctors surgery covering 5 villages. Bus facilities are inadequate. It has not been demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing densities at other brownfield or allocated sites e.g. Dunton Hills. Existing flooding issues are likely to increase.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 & R26 from the Local Plan. Currently the infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering school, transport doctor and hospitals. This is a small village and plans to increase the size by 33% is just not making sense.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24516 - 8383 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24518 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Dawson [8385]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing needs survey carried out to justify development in Blackmore. There are more suitable and sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood. Development in Blackmore is not sustainable. The roads serving Blackmore are not designed to meet increase in traffic or HGV use for construction. Local school (1 form entry) are at capacity. Children may have to attend school elsewhere increasing traffic and pollution. There is only 1 doctors surgery covering 5 villages. Bus facilities are inadequate. It has not been demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing densities at other brownfield or allocated sites e.g. Dunton Hills. Existing flooding issues are likely to increase. BBC have failed to consider proposals for 30 dwellings across the border in Epping Forest DC.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the Village. School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area. The single Doctors surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for appointments already standing at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required. Current transport links for the villages would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24518 - 8385 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24520 Object**Respondent: Mrs Irene Saunders [8386]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound because Blackmore village is already bursting at the seams so will extremely overwhelming:- not enough school places, doctors, public transport, local shops will not be able to cope. There is already 30 dwellings in the process of being built on Fingrith Hall Lane (Epping Council). The village is already up to its maximum housing level so cannot cope with any more building development! Our village is already very busy and so Blackmore is definitely not the place to build any more dwellings.

Change To Plan: Consider local need [remove R25 and R26 form plan]

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24520 - 8386 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24522 Object**Respondent: Ms Pauline Davidson [6327]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore Village is a very small, isolated village with narrow country roads. One shop serves all and parking is very restricted. There is often flooding in the village. The plan is not sound because the resources cannot cope with the proposed developments and those already in progress around the village.

Change To Plan: Not to build on Green Belt sites. I support BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24522 - 6327 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24525 Object**Respondent: Mr Ross Davidson [8389]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I consider the plan to be unsound because the LDP has not demonstrated that the proposals off Red Rose Lane is sustainable. Red Rose Lane is a small winding road with footpaths and ditches either side. The access of the road is already dangerous. Making it totally unsustainable for any additional traffic that would be caused as a result of the proposed developments.

Change To Plan: Should not build on Green Belt sites when other brownfield sites are available nearby.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24525 - 8389 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24526 Object**Respondent: Mr Ross Davidson [8389]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I consider the plan to be unsound because the LDP has not demonstrated that the proposals off Red Rose Lane is sustainable. Red Rose Lane is a small winding road with footpaths and ditches either side. The access of the road is already dangerous. Making it totally unsustainable for any additional traffic that would be caused as a result of the proposed developments.

Change To Plan: Should not build on Green Belt sites when other brownfield sites are available nearby.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24526 - 8389 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24528 Object**Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the Green Belt, here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting, It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24528 - 8388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24530 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the lack of infrastructure here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do. Our sewerage is pumped nobody seems to care whether the station can cope.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting. It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24530 - 8388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24532 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the lack of infrastructure here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do. Blackmore is a Historical Village according to some Cllrs, one of the jewels in the crown of Brentwood. Sharing the title with South Weald. We are not within walking distance of any doctors, the only Hospital we have is Brentwood which has no casualty now, a blood test which is urgent the nearest hospital is a twenty mile round trip eg Basildon, Southend, Romford. We have one bus an hour.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting. It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24532 - 8388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24534 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the lack of infrastructure here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do. Blackmore is a Historical Village according to some Cllrs, one of the jewels in the crown of Brentwood. Sharing the title with South Weald. South Weald is close to Brentwood nearer to all senior schools and junior, easily walkable to the town and station, more buses and close to the M25 yet the land there has been withdrawn from the plan this does not make sense. We are not nimbyst it is just common sense to build closer to the town. All we are told is this will be sorted by the developers.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting. It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24534 - 8388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24536 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the lack of infrastructure here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do. Our school is at bursting point yet we are told maybe there will be some 106 agreement money come our way. This school has been under developed since the 80's my daughter was in the relocatables list and she is about to become a Granny. The extension was never built.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting. It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24536 - 8388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24538 Object**Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flooding is another hazard Brentwood chooses to ignore. This village has been Badly flooded several times. The current when this happened is very strong, damage serious and life threatening but BBC are not interested.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting, It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24538 - 8388 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24540 Object**Respondent: Mrs Tracey Dawson [8390]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for development north of the Borough.
No housing needs survey has been carried out for the village.
There are more suitable and sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood. Development in Blackmore is not sustainable.
The roads serving Blackmore are not designed to meet increase in traffic or HGV use for construction.
Local school (1 form entry) are at capacity. Children may have to attend school elsewhere increasing traffic and pollution.
There is only 1 doctors surgery covering 5 villages.
Bus facilities are inadequate.
The village is often cut off in bad weather e.g. snow.
It has not been demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing densities at other brownfield or allocated sites e.g. Dunton Hills.
Existing flooding issues are likely to increase.
BBC have failed to consider proposals for 30 dwellings across the border in Epping Forest DC.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5.
Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the village.
School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area.
The single doctors surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for appointments already standing at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required.
Current transport links for the villages would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24540 - 8390 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24542 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lorna Mitchell [8391]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No consideration to the infrastructure: doctor, dentist, school, amenities, current road access and effect that another 60-100 people in houses.

Change To Plan: I don't consider any modification will be 'considered necessary' to make the Local Plan sound. There are plenty of other, more logical sites that can be used locally.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24542 - 8391 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - iii

24547 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul De Rosa [8393]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24547 - 8393 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24549 Object**Respondent: Mr Philip Dow [8394]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Road works disruption while build work is carried out.
 Parking issues.
 Schools class room overcrowding and parking issues.
 Parking issues - Local residents.
 More houses - more strain on doctors surgery - no appointments available.
 Problems when roads are flooding causing pot holes - highway maintenance.
 Shops the lack of at this present time.
 Only 1 bus on the hour every hour.

Change To Plan: Frequent bus service.
 More doctors surgery for the area.
 Adequate drainage to land.
 Electricity and gas to land.
 Disruption to roads while work commencing.
 Extensive parking facilities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24549 - 8394 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24551 Object**Respondent: Mrs Anne Davies [8395]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inadequate infrastructure to support a large increase in population.
 There are narrow roads with no pavements increasing risks of accidents.
 Doctors surgery already oversubscribed with 3 week waiting times.
 School is full to capacity.
 Electricity supply is already struggling.
 Concerned regarding potential increase in surface water run-off, overloading of drainage and increased flood risk.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24551 - 8395 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24556 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. Local Plan, unsound, failure to consult with Epping Forest District Council. Re:- 30 houses being built on Fingrith Hall Lane which will already impact on the village

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24556 - 8392 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24558 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. The school is full and not able to cope with any additional houses / families. The preschool is full and not able to accommodate any further children at this stage, it is in the village hall with no possibility of being able to increase child number

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24558 - 8392 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24560 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. Doctors filled to capacity. Residents already have to wait 4 weeks for a routine appointment. If additional houses are built this would make this service reach breaking point

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24560 - 8392 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24562 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. Bus service is not sufficient enough

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24562 - 8392 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24564 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green belt land, unacceptable to build on

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24564 - 8392 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24566 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. Volume of traffic would ruin village, make it unsafe for school children

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24566 - 8392 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24568 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village prone to flooding

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24568 - 8392 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24570 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Wildlife destroyed

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24570 - 8392 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24573 Object**Respondent: Mrs Marion Woolaston [8397]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Basic services are already limited and at capacity: medical facilities, local school, sewerage and drainage facilities and when Meadow Rise was built the Council said the services meant they were incapable of further development. Access to the sites is narrow and inappropriate, more traffic would exacerbate the impacts.

Change To Plan: An adequate housing needs survey requires to be undertaken. This has not happened in Blackmore. To assess the impact on traffic flows through the village, a projected traffic survey requires to be undertaken.
To ensure that Blackmore does not become an urban suburb of Brentwood, a greater and wide consultation is required with those who are impacted by the development of the village

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24573 - 8397 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

24575 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Davies [8396]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Does not appear to be a strategy for maintaining local character (borough of villages);
Blackmore is isolated, surrounded by Green Belt with an historic core that needs protecting;
Increase in houses and population by 30% will change the village character and environment permanently;
Roads are minor, narrow country lanes and additional traffic movements, both private and commercial are likely to result in more accidents and injuries.
Lack of pavements and paths for pedestrians in the lanes surrounding the village. Additional traffic will affect their safety and be more dangerous.
Increased traffic levels will impact on cyclists and horse riders, which use the surrounding lanes for quiet on road cycling and riding.
Insufficient provision for education - school full, medical services e.g. doctors surgery already oversubscribed waiting times for appointments can be 3 weeks.
Insufficient parking provision in the village.
Flooding risk - building on the proposed sites can only increase surface water run-off to a drainage system that cannot cope now.
Electricity supplies - Power cuts are a fairly regular occurrence as the grid seems unable to cope with existing demands.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24575 - 8396 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24581 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24581 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24583 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council. Over houses being constructed and/or planned close to Blackmore village.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24583 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24585 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong, Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc).

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24585 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24587 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24587 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24589 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24589 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24591 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24591 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24593 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24593 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24595 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Redrose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24595 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24597 Object

Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24597 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24599 Object

Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Both fields (R25 and R26) are teeming with wildlife - hundreds of birds nest in the hedgerows within and around the fields. We have photographic evidence (stills and videos) of certain protected species (bats, Barn Owls, Great Crested Newts).

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24599 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24600 Object

Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Both fields (R25 and R26) are teeming with wildlife - hundreds of birds nest in the hedgerows within and around the fields. We have photographic evidence (stills and videos) of certain protected species (bats, Barn Owls, Great Crested Newts).

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24600 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24601 Object

Respondent: Mr Ronald Saunders [8384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound as it does not take into consideration the massive impact it will have on Blackmore village, housing density, footfall, local shops, amenities, doctors surgeries etc. The village is already up to its maximum housing level and will not sustain any further development. At the end of Flingrith Hall Road Epping Council have granted permission for 30 dwellings which will have a direct impact on Blackmore Village another 70 is inconceivable.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan. BBC should seriously appraise alternative sites (brownfield) nearer to Brentwood centre.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24601 - 8384 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24603 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Walker [8401]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear strategy, neighbouring authorities no consulted, lack of infrastructure, there are brownfield sites which should take priority over Green Field and Green Belt , Local plan is unsound. Sites are liable to flood, exacerbated by more homes. Difficult to get GP appointment, 2 weeks or more wait. School is full, one hall for key stages 1&2. Insufficient toilet facilities for staff and pupils, this would get worse. Not enough staff parking places, road outside school is narrow. Roads in village are narrow and couldn't cope with more traffic.

Change To Plan: I cannot set out any modifications which would make the local plan sound because the Blackmore Village hasn't room to make the facilities suitable to sustain a large housing estate. Brownfield sites around Brentwood should be used. [Remove sites R25 and R26].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24603 - 8401 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24605 Object

Respondent: Mr John Warner [5018]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to the plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24605 - 5018 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

24607 Object**Respondent: Mr David Wade [8402]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village is not suitable as infrastructure not suitable: roads, access, parking problems, flooding on Redrose Lane, Drainage, village school insufficiently funded PTA raises money for resources such as portacabin, library, pool projects.

Change To Plan: Smaller development on Orchard Piece and Woollard Way; better roads; consideration to the developments being proposed / happening in neighbouring boroughs. Eg 600 houses being proposed in Ongar (High Ongar/A414 area). Houses already being built at Fyfield Road, Ongar. High level of development proposed at Writtle Coff.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24607 - 8402 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24613 Object**Respondent: Mr Pete Vince [8123]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.
Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.
Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24613 - 8123 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24618 Object**Respondent: Mr Lyall Vince [8403]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy R25, 9.197-9.200

Policy R26, 9.201-204

Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.
Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.
Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24618 - 8403 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24623 Object**Respondent: Mrs Tina Wilding [8405]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound because: Doctors, School, Green Belt Land, Local transport - buses. Impact of development on area and infrastructure.

Change To Plan: remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24623 - 8405 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24625 Object**Respondent: Terence Dearlove [8404]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore village is a categorised as Cat 3 (large village) however this is outdated as the village now consists of just one small village shop (inclusive of a Post Office counter) and one small primary school. Parking to access these facilities is extremely limited thereby causing significant issues for existing residents, whilst Public transport to and from Blackmore village is already inadequate for existing residents of the village and surrounding communities. The nearby doctors surgery is currently struggling to cope. No housing needs survey has been conducted that demonstrate why Blackmore should be included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association 'Neighbourhood Plan', which clearly sets out the local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24625 - 8404 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24632 Object**Respondent: Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A residential development such as has been submitted for Blackmore will further stretch infrastructure (roads, parking, schooling, doctors, etc). There are more sustainable locations in the borough. There are "brown field" sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. This area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23 June 2016).

Change To Plan: Do not believe Green Belt land in Blackmore should be released for this development as part of BBC local plan due to all aforementioned reasons (and probably many others!)

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24632 - 8406 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24634 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan is unsound due to causing overcrowding of a small village - Blackmore. May people have cited a lack of school places and over full lists at the doctors surgery. We have no police over now and the fact is that the emergency services would be stretched further. Roads into Blackmore from A414 are little more than lanes this would cause further congestion due to extra traffic from 1 or more cars per home. Parking would be worse too. It should be remembered that Red Rose Lane fields were dedicated to Green Belt many years ago and therefore could not be built on. Earlier applications were rejected, so why should it be allowed now. If this is allowed to go ahead, how soon will it be before the development spreads further

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24634 - 7141 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24637 Object**Respondent: Giovanni De Domonocos [8407]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the village BBC have not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities. Blackmore is an isolated village with limited services. No space in the village school for our children. No adequate bus routes / parking / doctors. There is other suitable locations other than Blackmore Village. The access off / from redrose lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic. The sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24637 - 8407 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii

24641 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Wilding [8409]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services being overwhelmed: schools; doctors; transportation hubs; more crime ie: not enough police; more demand on firefighters. More cars on road leading to very dangerous conditions for young children on footpaths.

Change To Plan: Cancel the project. Blackmore and its environs are already in danger of forever being changed. There are plenty of other brownfield sites in Brentwood to consider, we have already had our fair share of new builds in Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24641 - 8409 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24644 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alexandre De Dominicis [6951]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the village BBC have not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities. Blackmore is an isolated village with limited services. No space in the village school for our children. No adequate bus routes / parking / doctors. There is other suitable locations other than Blackmore Village. The access off / from redrose lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic. The sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24644 - 6951 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii

24646 Object**Respondent: John Drain [8410]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26 have green belt status and there are no special circumstances for development in the green belt. Both sites are developers led and have only been included in the LDP figures since 2017. The Blackmore Village is a sustainable area that does not need further housing. No local housing survey was under taken by BBC to prone otherwise. There are no planned infrastructure improvements to alleviate the local school that is up to capacity, the sewage pumping system is overloaded, the doctors surgery has one of the highest doctor / patient ratios nationally and the transport system is poor with no service after 6:00pm. BBC has not demonstrated that the required housing needs cannot be met on previously existing sites or by increasing densities within urban areas. R25 and R26 are both unsuitable sites because of the poor access onto the very narrow lane of Red Rose Lane, surface water flooding it will result in a disproportionate increase in the housing (approx. 30%) and will not be sustainable with present services.

Change To Plan: To develop away from green belt land either by increasing densities on existing sites or more sustainable areas with good transport systems and built infrastructure to cope with the increase in population. At the 8th November meeting 260 properties from the Honeypot Lane development were shifted to Dunton Village. It was surprising that a mere to could not be removed from R25 and R26. The Government has just given £100,000 to BBC to help plans for Dunton Village. The press release indicated that the number of properties had increased at Dunton Village to 4,000 from the original figure of 2,600. 70 of this increase could surely come from R25 and R26.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24646 - 8410 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

24648 Object**Respondent: Jennifer Drain [8412]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26 have green belt status and there are no special circumstances for development in the green belt. Both sites are developers led and have only been included in the LDP figures since 2017. The Blackmore Village is a sustainable area that does not need further housing. No local housing survey was under taken by BBC to prone otherwise. There are no planned infrastructure improvements to alleviate the local school that is up to capacity, the sewage pumping system is overloaded, the doctors surgery has one of the highest doctor / patient ratios nationally and the transport system is poor with no service after 6:00pm. BBC has not demonstrated that the required housing needs cannot be met on previously existing sites or by increasing densities within urban areas. R25 and R26 are both unsuitable sites because of the poor access onto the very narrow lane of Red Rose Lane, surface water flooding it will result in a disproportionate increase in the housing (approx. 30%) and will not be sustainable with present services.

Change To Plan: To develop away from green belt land either by increasing densities on existing sites or more sustainable areas with good transport systems and built infrastructure to cope with the increase in population. At the 8th November meeting 260 properties from the Honeypot Lane development were shifted to Dunton Village. It was surprising that a mere to could not be removed from R25 and R26. The Government has just given £100,000 to BBC to help plans for Dunton Village. The press release indicated that the number of properties has increased at Dunton Village to 4,000 from the original figure 2,600. 70 of this increase could surely come from R25 and R26.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24648 - 8412 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

24654 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane Is a narrow lane most of which is not wide enough to allow two cars to pass one another, but given Blackmore's relatively poor public transport connections we can expect an average of at least two additional cars per household and assuming a minimum of two journeys each per day (one in and one out) that Is 280 extra cars per day along this narrow lane which has no pavements. It is unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles (see photos in attachment) with essential drainage ditches running down either side of widening the road is not a viable option without further increasing the flood risk for the rest of the village. There Is very limited parking In the centre of the village both outside the village shop and the two public houses and tea shops with visitors cars. It can be expected that this only will only spread further into the surrounding residential areas and along to the village green with the additional cars that the proposed developments will bring.

Change To Plan: Sites R2S and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that Just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan In cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24654 - 8411 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24657 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are not suitable for development due to the access road, impact on highways, impact on the school, impact on the GPs surgery, flooding issues and mitigation and benefits to the community are not in the plan.

Change To Plan: Sites R2S and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that Just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan In cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24657 - 8411 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24659 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ruth Wade [8413]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village roads are unsuitable for increased volume of traffic; Increased risk of flooding More maintenance of ditches and drains required; Village centre already congested by No. cars parked by residents and village visitors; No parking for busy shop/pub/tea rooms antique shops in centre of village insufficient parking at the sports and social club for the number of clubs/societies/organisations who are running; Underfunded local services - GPs, police, fore. For the No. of houses being proposed in the locality. Speeding cars through village passing school.

Change To Plan: Reconsideration of the size of this development. Increased investment in local school and services. Better policing. Lower speed limits. Traffic calming measures. Wider roads for accessing village from Shenfield. Better drainage

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24659 - 8413 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24665 Object**Respondent: Mrs Edna Williams [4728]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. The plan is unsound.
 a) There has been no evidence produced to show that there is a need for this size of development in Blackmore
 b) There has been no discussion or cooperation with any local bodies 30 houses have just been built just outside the village In EFDC area that will Impact on the village
 c) There are many aspects that do not comply with the NPPF Guidance.
 Protection of Green Belt
 Development located to minimize travel
 Local community not consulted
 No proven local need

Change To Plan: All of the points should be reassessed with local involvement.
 Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24665 - 4728 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24666 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Wisdom [8414]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Current infrastructure already stretched: roads, GPs, parking, Blackmore Village is a small rural location with limited services and facilities, and this needs to be considered and explored In-depth when this large proposed development is being considered. New development will exacerbate this. Site liable to flood, no housing need survey provided for locality, need to show what other brownfield sites are available and should take priority over Green Belt sites like this. Impacts should be looked at.

Change To Plan: None I can think of other than a new site being found which is more sustainable

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24666 - 8414 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24675 Object

Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A multiplicity of shortfalls are present In the proposals for R25 and R26 Including
a) lack of employment viability;
b) Lack of transport links;
c) lack of infrastructure;
d) lack of medical facilities;
e) lack of education facilities;
f) Severe flooding problems;
g) lack of roads to build the development and subsequently deal with the substantial increase In traffic movement;
h) loss of Green Belt and
I) damage to natural habitats.
When problems are this significant, solutions must be proposed before including in the Listed Sites. Failure to do this Is unsound, unjustified, Ineffective and flawed

Change To Plan: * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
* Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Forest District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
* Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
* Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
.* Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
* Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
.* Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there Is already a severe flooding problem which the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
* Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24675 - 1830 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24679 Object

Respondent: Ms Shirley Dearlove [8415]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 combined with developments in Epping Forest DC area will put extreme pressure on the infrastructure and facilities of Blackmore. There has been inadequate consultation between Brentwood BC and Epping Forest DC. Blackmore should be a category 4 (small village) not 3 (large village) due to it's low population (829), it only has one shop and one small primary school. The existing doctors surgery is already struggling and will be made worse by these proposals. Existing recorded flooding issues will be exacerbated. No housing needs survey has been carried out. Contradicts previous 2016 iteration of the Local Plan which sought to limit growth in rural areas to retain local character. Development should be located in more sustainable locations such as Brentwood or Dunton Hills.

Change To Plan: The above sites should be removed from the LDP and the planners should refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan. This clearly sets out the village's local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24679 - 8415 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24681 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helen Haynes [8416]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no value in Blackmore being a heritage/preserved village/Green Belt if it is being ignored.
 Brentwood BC has failed to identify other brownfield sites which are available.
 The development off Redrose Lane is wrong because Blackmore has modest services, i.e. school, shop (one) doctors surgery.
 The development site is liable to flooding. Brooks and culverts would need upgrading.

Change To Plan: R25 & R26 removed from the Plan. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24681 - 8416 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24685 Object**Respondent: Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound.
 It will put pressure on rural infrastructure.
 The character of the village will be impacted. It is currently enjoyed by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
 It will put pressure on local lanes.
 Bus services are infrequent.
 Medical centre, shop and school also impacted adversely.
 Other areas such as brownfield land should be developed first.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Heritage Village Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24685 - 8417 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24687 Object**Respondent: Mr Dennis Trumble [8418]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village school is full and the nearest surgery is overcrowded.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24687 - 8418 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24689 Object**Respondent: Mrs Elizabeth Thompson [5016]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object as I think the plan is unsound mainly due to the infrastructure, the school is oversubscribed, parking in the centre is a problem, difficult to get GP appointment, Red Rose land is single track and liable to flood.

Change To Plan: Developing on brown fields or as an extension to an urban development rather than green belt land.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24689 - 5016 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

24691 Object**Respondent: Mr Stuart Townsend [8419]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not enough facilities for current residents, new families would exacerbate this. Healthcare, roads, school, flooding are all issues.

Change To Plan: Road upgrades; drainage upgrades, healthcare improvements, education development; flood prevention, parking facilities.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24691 - 8419 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24696 Object**Respondent: Mr Desmond Temple [8420]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections: 04; 08; 09: see attached. Site allocations, disproportionate growth to Blackmore, flood risk, green belt. Blackmore infrastructure cannot cope now, without all the planned dwellings, We cant park in the village, our school is full, doctors waiting time is lengthy.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24696 - 8420 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24698 Object**Respondent: Miss Yasmin Tossun [8421]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy R25 and R26 section 09
Excess traffic , heavy demands on local amenities, more chance of local flooding and parking issues. More effort by BBC to locate and use brownfield sites and be more transparent and open about such sites that they have and could us first.

Change To Plan: More effort by BBC to locate and use brownfield sites and be more transparent and open about such sites that they have and could us first.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:Not Specified Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24698 - 8421 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24700 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susan Tossun [8422]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore cant cope with more traffic, parking and demand on schools and doctors surgery. Nine Ashes Road is already very busy especially in the mornings. The traffic emerging between Red Rose Lane and Nine Ashes Road near the school is already too busy and often dangerous. BBC must give more consideration to brownfield sites for new houses to be built on and consider the brownfield locations

Change To Plan: BBC must give more consideration to brownfield sites for new houses to be built on and include the brownfield locations

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24700 - 8422 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24702 Object**Respondent: Mr. Gurpal Singh Dhesi [7270]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There will be more cars which will affect our roads
Buildings on land will increase flood risk.
There is only one Primary school which would not be enough.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24702 - 7270 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24704 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Bhupinder Dhesi [7269]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of infrastructure.
The access off Redrose Lane is not fit for purpose for level of traffic.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24704 - 7269 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24706 Object**Respondent: Mr. Gurpreet Dhesi [7268]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Building on the land will increase flood risks.
The access off Redrose Lane is not wide enough.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24706 - 7268 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24708 Object

Respondent: Mr Stuart Lucas [4956]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan is not NPPF compliant, particularly with regards to meeting local needs, local community, limiting the need to travel, flood risk (no flood risk assessment was carried out), protecting and enhancing biodiversity, conserving the historic environment. Site R25 and R26 have 2 Grade II listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Red Rose Lane being the point of access has historical significance.

Change To Plan: Consultation with neighbouring authorities required. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no proven need that Blackmore needs this amount of houses being distant from transport links and there being little local employment. Detailed flood risk required. Assess possible smaller scale brownfield development within the area if any local need is proven. Re-assess the site allocation around the transport hub to accommodate Brentwood's housing needs. Develop a strategic approach to villages north of Brentwood by consultation

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24708 - 4956 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24710 Object

Respondent: Mr Frank Tabor [8424]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to R25 and R26: no clear strategy for the villages, BBC has not adequately consulted with Epping Forest DC, Development along Red Rose Lane is wrong, it is an isolated village, services are modest, there is a poor bus service, parking is a problem. Other more sustainable locations are available, particularly brownfield sites, which should be prioritised over green belt., other allocated sites should have higher densities. The BVHA housing need survey should be taken into account. Flooding is a problem already.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R15 and R26. Planners should refer t the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24710 - 8424 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24712 Object

Respondent: Mr Shefik Tossun [8425]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village cant sustain a large development of houses generating more traffic as well as more stress on the school with more demand for places etc. Also car parking will become a problem, More strain on doctors surgery. There are more suitable places to build new homes that will not impact the village. Hove the brownfield sites been considered. BBC have not indicated that these sites do exist and should be considered first.

Change To Plan: There are more suitable places to build new homes that will not impact the village. Hove the brownfield sites been considered. BBC have not indicated that these sites do exist and should be considered first.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24712 - 8425 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

24714 Object

Respondent: Anna Dunk [8426]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. The large scale development plan being proposed will, without a doubt, negatively effect the quality of life of its residents. The plan is being proposed by a developer who holds no knowledge of the village itself, which has resulted in a proposal that is completely inappropriate. The facilities in Blackmore are limited and an influx of new residents would be detrimental. The following reasons clarify why: 1. The proposed plan would produce overcrowding, resulting in an unacceptable increase in traffic and noise, destroying the very nature of our village. 2. There is no clear 'strategy' for the village and there are many other more suitable and sustainable locations for development. 3. Parts of the village are liable to flood. Building on the proposed land would increase the flood risk everywhere in the village. 4. There is just one shop in our village, an overcrowded primary school, and a local doctor surgery where it is extremely difficult to get an appointment. Such an increase in residents is simply unmanageable.

Change To Plan: A sound local plan would require: 1. The assessment must take into account the modest and limited services in the village, including the shop, doctor surgery, primary school and parking. 2. The character and nature of the village must be carefully considered, and the current residents quality of life must be protected. 3. BBC needs to look at the many other suitable locations in the area which can sustain this type of development. 4. The problems with flooding need to be taken into account and current problems with flooding addressed.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24714 - 8426 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24718 Object

Respondent: Mrs Christine Tabor [8427]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to R25 and R26: no clear strategy for the villages, BBC has not adequately consulted with Epping Forest DC, Development along Red Rose Lane is wrong, it is an isolated village, services are modest, there is a poor bus service, parking is a problem. Other more sustainable locations are available, particularly brownfield sites, which should be prioritised over green belt., other allocated sites should have higher densities. Flooding is a problem already.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. The BVHA housing need survey should be referred to. This clearly sets out the needs of our already sustainable community and should be adhered to.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24718 - 8427 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24720 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Tomey [8428]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy ' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council. Over houses being constructed and/or planned close to Blackmore village. The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong, Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school is full, the doctors surgery is Doddingtonhurst is already over subscribed inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc). There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP. The access off/from Redrose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Brownfield sites should be considered before developing conservation areas like Blackmore Village. There should be a housing needs survey and a clear strategy for Blackmore Village before any development can be considered, Redrose Lane has not been considered adequately in view of its history of regular flooding, limited access for traffic and pedestrian safety. Other sites need to be considered.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24720 - 8428 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24722 Object

Respondent: Mrs Elisabeth Taylor [2918]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 9: Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200
Policy R26 - 9.201-9.205

Blackmore is a small village and infrastructure is insufficient for more development.

The roads/lanes are busy and parking difficult. 30 new homes in Epping Forest DC will exacerbate problems along with R25 and R26. School is full. Need a housing need survey. Sites are liable to flooding, village floods. Impossible to get appointment at GPs. Our garden floods in heavy rain.

Change To Plan: BBC should be focusing on locations that already have the infrastructure in place that could cope with such a large development not a small village. There are villages in the area such as Stondon Massey that would welcome the development as it would bring amenities to the area that they so not currently have. Understand there are various brownfield sites that are far more suitable for development and should take priority over building on the Green Belt, sites with far wider roads which would cope with the influx of traffic better than Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24722 - 2918 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii

24724 Object

Respondent: Miss Chloe Taylor [8429]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and infrastructure is insufficient for more development. The roads/lanes are busy and parking difficult. School and GP oversubscribed. Sites are liable to flooding, construction work only increases this risk. No investigation to prove development is necessary in the village so why Blackmore? BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: I believe BBC should focus on more suitable locations that would be able to provide for the increase in population and be able to cope with such a large development. BBC has not taken into account other brownfield sites that are available that may be more suitable and should take priority over the greenfield land off of Redrose lane.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24724 - 8429 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii

24726 Object**Respondent: Mr James Taylor [8430]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and infrastructure is insufficient for more development. The roads/lanes are busy and parking difficult. Infrequent buses. Library has shut, moving to already busy Coop. Post office has shut. 30 new homes in Epping Forest DC will exacerbate problems along with R25 and R26. School is full. Need a housing need survey to show what is needed. BBC has not adequately consulted with Epping Forest DC with 30 new homes there too. Sites are liable to flooding, see this every winter. village floods. Impossible to get appointment at GPs. Our garden floods in heavy rain.

Change To Plan: Blackmore is at full capacity however there are places such as Stondon Massey which could do with a re-vamp and the freshness of a shop. Targeting a small village that is already struggling to cope with the limited resources we have. Stondon Massey would welcome and appreciate amenities and what they would bring. Brownfield sites are also a possibility and seem much more suitable than building on precious green belt land!

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24726 - 8430 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii

24728 Object**Respondent: Mr Steven Taylor [8431]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 9: Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200
Policy R26 - 9.201-9.205

30 new homes in Epping Forest DC will exacerbate problems along with R25 and R26. School is full. Need a housing need survey to show what is needed. BBC has not adequately consulted with Epping Forest DC with 30 new homes there too. Sites are liable to flooding, see this every winter. village floods. Impossible to get appointment at GPs. Our garden floods in heavy rain.

Change To Plan: BBC need to demonstrate that no brownfield sites are available. BBC also need to explain how the village infrastructure would be upgraded to deal with the increase in traffic.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24728 - 8431 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii

24734 Object**Respondent: Mr Stephen Downton [8432]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound because: - the detrimental effect that it would have on village from being one of the most prettiest and well visited in Essex to becoming one of the worst.

Change To Plan: Smaller and more dispersment (on preferably Brownfield sites) for any new builds in the surrounding area, rather than focusing such large development within an already stretched pretty village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24734 - 8432 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24735 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jasdeep Dhesi [7266]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There will be more traffic in the nearside area.
More suitable sites could have been identified.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24735 - 7266 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24737 Object**Respondent: Mrs Patricia Dean [8434]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I do not think the houses should be built on Green Belt land in Blackmore. It would put untold pressure on an already busy doctors surgery, on the small local school, public transport, parking etc.
There are more suitable sites sustainable locations. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services.

Change To Plan: I fully agree with the objectives of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24737 - 8434 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24740 Object**Respondent: Barry Robert Dean [8435]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In my opinion there is no clear 'strategy' for the village of Blackmore. There are more suitable sites and the green belt land does not have to be touched. Building the houses in Blackmore would put unwelcomed pressure on the already very busy doctors, schools, parking and bus services etc.

Change To Plan: I fully agree with the objectives of Blackmore village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24740 - 8435 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24743 Object**Respondent: Mr Joe Emmett [8436]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure issues - doctors, schools
Access issues Red Rose Lane - single lane
Volume of traffic
No housing needs survey completed.
Proposed sites have serious access issues.
School almost full already with no options to expand, detrimental effect on children already in attendance.
Doctors already a very over stretched service. Would be unable to meet increased demand.
No consultation with other Local Authorities. e.g. Epping Forest. A development of c. 30 houses already near completion. This will add to traffic and parking issues within village.
Proposed sites are liable to flood and building on land will also increase flood risk elsewhere. Village is already prone to severe flooding.
No clear strategy for villages in North of the Borough.

Change To Plan: None specified

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24743 - 8436 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

24745 Object**Respondent: Mrs Paula Tregent [8433]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound, there will be infrastructure issues for the village which will include limited places at the local primary school and pre-school. Parking in the village will eventually become an issue to Blackmore. Our doctors surgery is always fully booked up on a regular basis, sometimes you cant get an appointment for 3 weeks! This waiting time will increase massively.

Change To Plan: Flooding will be a major issue in the village with the proposed sites and will be the flooding elsewhere in the village something that we have experienced before. Traffic through the village will increase. This will include school buses and coached for the growing increase of children going to secondary schools. Redrose Lane is a narrow lane, the extra traffic will cause issues.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24745 - 8433 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24747 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul Tregent [8437]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to R25 and R26:
The plan is unsound, there will be infrastructure issues for my community. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure > I can never get a doctor appointment. The waiting time will increase. Parking within the village is on the increase and will get worse. Where I live is very worrying as major flooding would become a serious issue.

Change To Plan: The local council has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt (Redrose Lane).
Vehicular traffic in Redrose Lane will increase massively and the volume is unsuitable for such a narrow lane. As previously mentioned the proposed sites are liable to flooding.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24747 - 8437 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24750 Object

Respondent: Miss Harriet Davis [8440]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Current building plans that are being carried out at the moment around the village aren't on a scale that impeades and upsets a whole village. To build at this scale is only at the benefit of the developer.

Change To Plan: To make the Plan sound Blackmore should be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24750 - 8440 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24752 Object

Respondent: Samantha Dunk [8438]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is a lack of knowledge, interest or understanding of what the Village Needs to maintain its character and quality of life. There has been no honest assessment of the housing needs of the village and no planning strategy to protect and support the heritage and character of our village. BBC have not consulted with neighbouring authorities adequately. The increase in the number of people and traffic will produce overcrowding of our village streets and roads, noise and air pollution. The access off / from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure, the local school is full, doctors appointments are very difficult to get, parking in the narrow roads is limited. Parts of our village have severe problems with flooding and the proposed sites are liable to flood. Building on greenbelt will take away the open rural environment. BBC have not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield land off of Red Rose Lane. BBC have also not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other sites. There are other more suitable locations within the borough.

Change To Plan: There needs to be an honest and wise assessment of the housing needs of the village and a planning strategy to protect and support the heritage and character and quality of life in our village. The view of the Blackmore community need to be part of that assessment. The assessment must take into account the nature of the village, its modest services and infrastructure, local school, doctors surgery, narrow roads, limited parking. The problems with flooding must be taken into account and the current problems with flooding addressed. There needs to be a serious and honest look by the Brentwood Borough Council at other locations, outside of Blackmore, that are more suitable for development. There needs to be an understanding of the importance and value of protecting the quality of life in Blackmore village. The way of life in our village is unique, very precious and irreplaceable. We would urge you to honour and protect our village.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24752 - 8438 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24753 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to R25 and R26:
The local school is full. The local surgery is overcrowded.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24753 - 5029 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24754 Object

Respondent: Mr Edward Davis [8441]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are a lot of potential surrounding areas that could easily be used without upsetting the whole village.

Change To Plan: Blackmore to be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24754 - 8441 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24757 Object

Respondent: Mr Robert Davis [4789]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Increasing the size of Blackmore by a third will change the character of the village and should be drastically reduced. I understand the need for additional housing and agree with Blackmore Village Housing Association, in that a proper investigation into local needs and requirement should be undertaken.

Change To Plan: Blackmore to be removed from the Local Plan. Future Plan to be based on needs rather than goals.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24757 - 4789 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24759 Object**Respondent: Mr Raymond Thompson [4840]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increased flood risk to surrounding area, no space at doctors surgery, school is at full capacity, roads cannot cope with current traffic and any increase will be detrimental to safety due to lack of parking space etc.

Change To Plan: These fields are Green Belt and as such should be protected from development whilst there are other brownfield sites available along with urban extension (Brentwood) an increase of this many houses will be detrimental to an ancient village and will lose any heritage it has. Redrose Lane will not be capable of containing the construction traffic let alone the increase of vehicles from new residents.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24759 - 4840 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii

24761 Object**Respondent: Ms. Donna Toomey [8024]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan is unsound and not suitable for Blackmore : school is full, GP is full, impact on wildlife, traffic impact, Red Rose lane is not suitable for traffic and volume and the proposed sites are liable to flood.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan. No comment as I am totally against the building work.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24761 - 8024 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24763 Object**Respondent: Ann Davis [4404]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support the need for more housing, but to increase the village by 30% is not justified. Completely agree with Blackmore Village Housing Association in that more investigation is needed to ascertain local needs, and that development should be led by people who live in the community rather than developers.

Change To Plan: Blackmore to be removed from the LDP

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24763 - 4404 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24770 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8442]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council. Over houses being constructed and/or planned close to Blackmore village. The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong, Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school and preschool is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed, inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc). There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP. The access off/from Redrose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites, not Green Belt, ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24770 - 8442 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24773 Object**Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increase risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24773 - 8444 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24775 Object	Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	More suitable and sustainable locations (elsewhere).	
Change To Plan:	Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24775 - 8444 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24777 Object	Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore has not got the infrastructure.	
Change To Plan:	Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24777 - 8444 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24779 Object	Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No survey has been undertaken to demonstrate the needs.	
Change To Plan:	Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24779 - 8444 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24781 Object	Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	With the size of this proposal the roads are not designed/suitable.	
Change To Plan:	Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24781 - 8444 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24783 Object	Respondent: Mr Alan Dodd [4828]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No clear strategy for villages in north of the Borough. No consultation with Epping Forest in regards to 30 houses being built nearby to Blackmore. Local services and infrastructure including schools are already at their limit. Parking is already a concern. Local services have not been robustly examined in preparing the Local Plan. There are other more suitable brownfield sites and urban extensions in Brentwood. Not demonstrated that development could be accommodated elsewhere by increasing densities. No housing needs survey has been carried out. Roads are unsuitable. High flood risk which development would increase.	
Change To Plan:	The already existing situation explained above is not open to modification and should be excluded from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24783 - 4828 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	

24785 Object

Respondent: MR David Emmett [8445]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Major access issues on Red Rose Lane, local infrastructure is very limited and development of this size would cripple services such as doctors / school. Increased volume of traffic into and through village would have a detrimental effect on the area.

Change To Plan: Proposed sites liable to flooding which will add to serious flooding issues already regularly experience in Blackmore. Access in Red Rose Lane (single lane road) onto busy junction with Nine Ashes Road particularly at school time. Not suitable for volume proposed. No consultation with other LA's i.e. Epping Forest already large c. 30 development on Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24785 - 8445 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24792 Object

Respondent: Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 4
Policy SP01 - D(a), D(f)
Paragraphs 4.2 and 4.9
Policy SP02

Section 08
Policy NE06 8.5-8.64
Para 8.85 (iv)
Para 8.90
Para 8.101

Policy NE13

Section 09
Policy R25, 9.197-9.200
Policy R26, 9.201-204

No clear strategy for villages, why Blackmore and not others that have no special historic centre. Other locations must be more sustainable and suitable. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities, 30 homes on Fingrith Hall Lane. Blackmore Village is isolated, school is full, GP is 4 weeks for an appointment, parking in village in dangerous. Children and pensioners are at risk from this. Bus service is infrequent. More residents = more vehicles. More traffic will cause more air pollution bad for people and historic buildings. Sites are on Green Belt land, should use brownfield, not identified by BBC. Redrose Lane too narrow and floods severely, June 2016 floods across village. Sewers can't cope. Should increase densities on other proposed sites. Will increase village by 30%. Unauthorised travellers site will add to the impact on school, GP, local amenities. Has this been taken into account?

Change To Plan: I believe that R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the Blackmore village Heritage Association "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out our local housing needs to avoid further development locally.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24792 - 8175 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24794 Object

Respondent: Ms Jennifer Emmett [4896]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Major access issues on Red Rose Lane, local infrastructure is very limited and development of this size would cripple services such as doctors / school. Increased volume of traffic into and through village would have a detrimental effect on the area.

Change To Plan: Proposed sites liable to flooding which will add to serious flooding issues already regularly experience in Blackmore. Access in Red Rose Lane (single lane road) onto busy junction with Nine Ashes Road particularly at school time. Not suitable for volume proposed. No consultation with other LA's i.e. Epping Forest already large c. 30 development on Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24794 - 4896 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24796 Object**Respondent: Miss Donna Taylor [8446]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not consulted enough with other councils, especially in relation to other developments in the area and their impact. (Fingrith Hall Lane). Local infrastructure already stretched, school, GP long waiting time, lack of parking in village centre,. Increased risk of flooding in an area already susceptible. No housing need survey. There are many more suitable sites within BBC to be looked at before Blackmore Village is to be considered for any further development.

Change To Plan: There are many more suitable sites within BBC to be looked at before Blackmore Village is to be considered for any further development.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24796 - 8446 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24798 Object**Respondent: Catherine Elliott [8447]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increase traffic; schools; greenbelt land; keeping a village a village

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R 26 from LDP; Consult BVHA neighbourhood policy for sustainable village development.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24798 - 8447 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24800 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Tomey [8448]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is too narrow, pedestrian safety is an issue no pavements or street lights, sites are Green Belt and Conservation area, it is subject to frequent flooding. Village has limited infrastructure with regards to health and education,. Brownfield sites and urban extensions to Brentwood more suitable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood should develop on brownfield or urban areas, which are more suitable before Green Belt land, in a village with limited infrastructure. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: ii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24800 - 8448 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii

24801 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Tomey [8448]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is too narrow, pedestrian safety is an issue no pavements or street lights, sites are Green Belt and Conservation area, it is subject to frequent flooding. Village has limited infrastructure with regards to health and education,. Brownfield sites and urban extensions to Brentwood more suitable.

Changes to Plan:

Brentwood should develop on brownfield or urban areas, which are more suitable before Green Belt land, in a village with limited infrastructure. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Change To Plan: Brentwood should develop on brownfield or urban areas, which are more suitable before Green Belt land, in a village with limited infrastructure. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: ii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24801 - 8448 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii

24802 Object**Respondent: Heather Eltham [8449]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The BBC has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities (Epping Council) who are in process of building c. 30 houses at top of Fingrith Hall Lane - the impact this has on the village where the infrastructure is not sound to incorporate extra traffic. There are other brownfield sites that are available and they must take priority over our precious greenbelt. The school is at full capacity and the doctors surgery would not be able to accommodate the extra numbers

Change To Plan: I believe sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out our Housing Needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24802 - 8449 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24806 Object

Respondent: Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan has not been positively prepared

This plan does not meet the areas' objectively assessed needs and is not informed by agreements with other authorities. There is a development at the end of Thrifts Hall Road on the old Norton Heath Equestrian Centre which already has in excess of 30 houses under construction. I believe this land comes under Chelmsford Council's administration. There is another proposed development of 12 houses at the top of Nine Ashes Road - administered by EFDC, plus a development of 9 houses at the end of Spriggs Lane, Blackmore. The people occupying these homes will be using Blackmore facilities (small shop), roads (narrow, dangerous and badly maintained), school (already over- subscribed), doctor's surgery (over-burdened and extremely hard to get an appointment). Any development of the size proposed would put even extra pressure on the village and surrounding area. This is not sustainable development. The two proposed sites R25 and R26 are greenbelt and quality arable land. Red rose Lane appears to have been suddenly accepted as the village boundary. It is an ancient lane, is narrow and dangerous, and struggles to accommodate existing traffic. The turning on to Nine Ashes Road (opposite the school) is particularly dangerous with speeding traffic and poor visibility.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs to protect the heritage and character of Blackmore village and deliver the best housing solutions to meet local needs. There are already proposals put forward for development of Red Rose Farm for housing (this could be for locally required affordable housing- not high-end properties), plus other surrounding developments which need to be taken into consideration before allowing the two greenbelt sites to be used. Alternative brownfield sites on offer should be used instead of greenbelt/arable land. There needs to be a Housing Needs Survey which would address the local needs of the village before simply allowing more million pound homes to swamp the area just to make the numbers work. There needs to be a proper professionally-led investigation into the environmental effects of development to the village. Investigation into how our local services, school, doctors, transport, is supposed to cope with an influx of development. Previous information provided to the Council regarding the impact of such development should be thoroughly read and taken into account. The views of all residents of Blackmore and surrounding villages should be taken into account. The website for completion of this comment form and reference to associated documentation is extremely difficult to use, especially for those in the community who do not have access to the internet, are not PC literate, and cannot get their comments to the Council because they have no way of getting to the offices! The majority of people are simply put off giving their views because of the complex nature of communicating them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24806 - 6880 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24808 Object

Respondent: Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan is not justified

The Local Plan is not justified as an appropriate strategy, as all other reasonable alternatives have not been taken into account: The BBC have not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites available which should be taking priority over the greenfield and greenbelt land off Red rose Lane Blackmore. A large brownfield site capable of accommodating 70 houses has been proposed by the village of Stondon Massey-this has not even been considered. Why should two perfectly good pieces of arable land on the greenbelt be sacrificed when there is a brownfield site on offer? The two sites identified in Blackmore were excluded in 2016, but have been added to the LDP at a very late stage and were only briefly discussed at the end of the extraordinary meeting of the BBC in November 2017, and were the only sites put forward.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs to protect the heritage and character of Blackmore village and deliver the best housing solutions to meet local needs. There are already proposals put forward for development of Red Rose Farm for housing (this could be for locally required affordable housing- not high-end properties), plus other surrounding developments which need to be taken into consideration before allowing the two greenbelt sites to be used. Alternative brownfield sites on offer should be used instead of greenbelt/arable land. There needs to be a Housing Needs Survey which would address the local needs of the village before simply allowing more million pound homes to swamp the area just to make the numbers work. There needs to be a proper professionally-led investigation into the environmental effects of development to the village. Investigation into how our local services, school, doctors, transport, is supposed to cope with an influx of development. Previous information provided to the Council regarding the impact of such development should be thoroughly read and taken into account. The views of all residents of Blackmore and surrounding villages should be taken into account. The website for completion of this comment form and reference to associated documentation is extremely difficult to use, especially for those in the community who do not have access to the internet, are not PC literate, and cannot get their comments to the Council because they have no way of getting to the offices! The majority of people are simply put off giving their views because of the complex nature of communicating them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24808 - 6880 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24810 Object

Respondent: Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan is not effective

The local plan is not effective as it is not based on joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters - see comments under (a) above. It has not been demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other allocated sites. Other sites have been removed at a late stage which has put pressure on Blackmore to pick up the slack. The proposed site in Honeypot Lane Brentwood was withdrawn due to poor site access and the fact it is on greenbelt land. This reasoning also applies to the sites within Blackmore. It seems to be a numbers game- to fit in with government requirements to provide a certain amount of housing, and because this has not been given the correct amount of consideration in the past, the village of Blackmore is under threat of being overwhelmed. In addition, Blackmore has an illegal gypsy/travellers site on the Chelmsford Road which for years has been left unchallenged. This has now mysteriously become 'legal' and incorporated into the Local Plan. There is no clear strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, to the north of the Borough.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs to protect the heritage and character of Blackmore village and deliver the best housing solutions to meet local needs. There are already proposals put forward for development of Red Rose Farm for housing (this could be for locally required affordable housing- not high-end properties), plus other surrounding developments which need to be taken into consideration before allowing the two greenbelt sites to be used. Alternative brownfield sites on offer should be used instead of greenbelt/arable land. There needs to be a Housing Needs Survey which would address the local needs of the village before simply allowing more million pound homes to swamp the area just to make the numbers work. There needs to be a proper professionally-led investigation into the environmental effects of development to the village. Investigation into how our local services, school, doctors, transport, is supposed to cope with an influx of development. Previous information provided to the Council regarding the impact of such development should be thoroughly read and taken into account. The views of all residents of Blackmore and surrounding villages should be taken into account. The website for completion of this comment form and reference to associated documentation is extremely difficult to use, especially for those in the community who do not have access to the internet, are not PC literate, and cannot get their comments to the Council because they have no way of getting to the offices! The majority of people are simply put off giving their views because of the complex nature of communicating them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24810 - 6880 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24812 Object

Respondent: Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan is not consistent with National Planning Policy

This is not delivery of sustainable development. It is entirely developer-led. The infrastructure cannot support the amount of development proposed for Blackmore, which equates to twice the amount of development for other villages. There has been no housing needs survey undertaken to support the proposals. None of the evidence presented to BBC on the unsuitable nature of the proposed sites seems to have been taken into account, e.g. flooding, poor access, etc. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and already stretched infrastructure. The village had previously been excluded from the development plan, and back in 2016 we were told Blackmore would not be required to accept large scale additional housing numbers due to significant infrastructure issues and flood risks, plus the historic sensitivity of the village. We are now dealing purely with a numbers game - the village is being forced to take on the overflow of the perceived housing need, which has not been efficiently or effectively dealt with by the BBC.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs to protect the heritage and character of Blackmore village and deliver the best housing solutions to meet local needs. There are already proposals put forward for development of Red Rose Farm for housing (this could be for locally required affordable housing- not high-end properties), plus other surrounding developments which need to be taken into consideration before allowing the two greenbelt sites to be used. Alternative brownfield sites on offer should be used instead of greenbelt/arable land. There needs to be a Housing Needs Survey which would address the local needs of the village before simply allowing more million pound homes to swamp the area just to make the numbers work. There needs to be a proper professionally-led investigation into the environmental effects of development to the village. Investigation into how our local services, school, doctors, transport, is supposed to cope with an influx of development. Previous information provided to the Council regarding the impact of such development should be thoroughly read and taken into account. The views of all residents of Blackmore and surrounding villages should be taken into account. The website for completion of this comment form and reference to associated documentation is extremely difficult to use, especially for those in the community who do not have access to the internet, are not PC literate, and cannot get their comments to the Council because they have no way of getting to the offices! The majority of people are simply put off giving their views because of the complex nature of communicating them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24812 - 6880 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24814 Object

Respondent: Kirsty Edwards [8450]

Agent: N/A

Summary: [Remove R25 and R26]

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24814 - 8450 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24820 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Webb [4919]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties. This is a single track road, and is already dangerous for walkers and horse riders. Adding the extra volume of traffic on this road is completely unsuitable. The village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on the Green were flooded. The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road. No appropriate mitigation is highlighted in the plan. There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. Whilst there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, it is as if Blackmore has been chosen with virtually no other options being considered and others - such as Honey Pot Lane and Red Rose Farm - completely ignored or withdrawn. There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LOP, and why other areas have not. The survey carried out by local reps has been entirely ignored. The Borough Council has not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan or continuing to include Honey Pot Lane (now removed from the latest draft). There are Brownfield sites available nearby (Red Rose Farm as one example) but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. 11. Other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore which is not a sustainable development proposal.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community. Also remove the Site GT 16 - a II 8 previously unapproved pitches. Leave Blackmore IN Green Belt and restore the classification of "Rural Village in a sparse setting (which it is for roads, Buses, etc. etc. it really is) I am very unhappy that you have chosen to issue such a difficult form to complete with wholly unnecessary/inappropriate personal elements in Section A. It has taken me an unacceptable amount of time to understand and complete. I am very tempted to believe this is a deliberate attempt to stifle meaningful comment. A lot of people who hold views exactly like mine HAVE been put off from objecting because of this.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24820 - 4919 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24825 Object

Respondent: Mr Adrian Quick [8451]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Refer to attached form. The infrastructure is already stretched, and these additional developments would have a significant negative impact to the local community including provision for medical services and schooling. Bus services to larger employment locations (Brentwood Chelmsford, Epping) are totally inadequate. The designated sites have flooding issues, a problems across wider Blackmore footprint and development will cause further problems, increasing the flood rate. There are other Brownfield sites within existing urban boundaries (and local infrastructure and transport grids) better suited to development, negating the need to destroy Green Belt environments. There has been no evidence that Blackmore has a housing need requiring such scale of development. Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24825 - 8451 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24831 Object

Respondent: Mr Ronald Qusted [8452]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is not suitable location for large number of new homes. This village walk to the shops, hall, school, etc. Already a problem with speeding and parking. More traffic will exacerbate this. 30 new homes on Fingrith Hall Lane not taken into account. Other locations more sustainable and suitable. Use brownfield sites not Green Belt. Consider surrounding villages. Village is historic. Impact on school and GP surgery will be huge. Major risk of flooding in parts of village. "016 across the village, homes flooded and cars stuck. More housing will exacerbate this. Where is a Blackmore Housing Needs Survey.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP> The 'Neighbourhood Plan' from the BVHA should be looked at by the planners. This clearly sets out the local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24831 - 8452 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24833 Object**Respondent: Mrs Cynthia Kirby [8453]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are more suitable/sustainable locations than Blackmore. Services in Blackmore are already overstretched. 1) the school is already full. 2) there are so many people visiting the (one) shop and/or café or public houses that the parking in the village is chaotic and sometimes dangerous.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites (R25 and R26).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24833 - 8453 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24835 Object**Respondent: Mr David Kirby [8454]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: From what I understand, there are 30 new houses under construction in Fingrith Hall Lane (Epping Forest DC). These will have a huge effect on the village services and will increase the demand for Blackmore School, Deal Tre Health Centre and the Co-operative supermarket. This will contribute to chaotic parking in the centre of the village, Fingrith Hall Road and(more importantly) Red Rose Lane.
Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites. (R25 and R26).

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites. (R25 and R26).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24835 - 8454 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24838 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, adding a 100 houses and 200 vehicles would greatly affect an already dangerous road. Access to the site is via small lanes. Before adding more problem, decent thoughts should be taken to alleviate current problems.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24838 - 4847 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24840 Object**Respondent: Donna Eaton [8455]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A residential development such as has been 1. submitted for Blackmore will further stretch the infrastructure (roads, parking, schools, doctors surgeries). 2. There are other more suitable locations in the borough. 3. There are brown field sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. 4. The area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23rd June 2016). 5. Access to and from the development site entirely unsuitable for increased traffic problems.

Change To Plan: We / I do not believe green belt land in Blackmore should be released for this development as part of BBC Local Plan due to all of the aforementioned reasons. [Remove R25 and R26]

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24840 - 8455 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24843 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village school is already oversubscribed.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24843 - 4847 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24845 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Why build on Green Belt when there are plenty other suitable brownfield sites.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24845 - 4847 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24847 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Public transport is limited in the village.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24847 - 4847 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24849 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flooding issue.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24849 - 4847 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24851 Object**Respondent: Mr Scott Osborne [8456]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan is unsound because: GP surgery is already extremely busy with appointments difficult to get Additional housing will make this worse. Country lanes of Red Rose and surrounding area of the village are not suitable for an increase in traffic. Local village school does not have the facilities or plot to cope with an increase of children that additional housing would bring. Traffic and parking in Blackmore Village is already an issue without the additional cars and traffic that these houses would bring. Blackmore is surrounded by Green Belt land which includes the proposed sites and the impact that such a development would have on that land, the environment and wildlife would be so detrimental to the entire area.

The chice of Blackmore for this proposed development of houses is wrong, due to all the key infrastructure issues highlighted above. Other more suitable and sustainable locations must be considered.

The current development being built at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane that is within a mile of Red Rose Lane will already have an impact on the village, therefore this must be taken into consideration with neighbouring authorities.

Red Rose lane is a flood risk, therefore this by itself should be a red flag for development bit this coupled with the general unsuitability due to access and traffic issues and the lack of infrastructure must be a reason for modifications to the local plan to be made. I support the BVHA representation.

Change To Plan: The choice of Blackmore for this proposed development of houses is wrong, due to all the key infrastructure issues highlighted above. Other more suitable and sustainable locations must be considered.

The current development being built at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane that is within a mile of Red Rose Lane will already have an impact on the village, therefore this must be taken into consideration with neighbouring authorities.

Red Rose lane is a flood risk, therefore this by itself should be a red flag for development bit this coupled with the general unsuitability due to access and traffic issues and the lack of infrastructure must be a reason for modifications to the local plan to be made. I support the BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24851 - 8456 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24853 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Fox [8457]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing survey done for village.

Change To Plan: Consideration for local needs and infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24853 - 8457 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24855 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Fox [8457]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Impact on village and liable to flooding.

Change To Plan: Consideration for local needs and infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24855 - 8457 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24859 Object**Respondent: Mrs Faye Osborne [8458]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound due to the impact on the local school, the unsuitability of local roads for more traffic, the impact on the village, parking problems. The impact on wildlife and environment. Local services like GP hugely impacted, already difficult to get appointment.

Change To Plan: A small village like Blackmore is not suitable for sustainable development for all the reasons provided on the form.
A large development of around 30 houses are already being developed at the top of Fingrith Hal Lane which is less than 1 minute driving from Red Rose Lane and these houses will already impact Blackmore but this has obviously not been taken into consideration.
The flood risk and general unsuitability of Red Rose Lane due to access and traffic issues must be considered in favour of other more suitable locations

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24859 - 8458 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24861 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The two proposed development in Blackmore would completely destroy the nature of the village, given the consequent volume of traffic and cumulative impacts from 30 houses being proposed in Fingrith Hall Road, Epping.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
- complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
- consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24861 - 8459 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24863 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Children are being turned away from the local school due to lack of places.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
- complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
- consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24863 - 8459 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24865 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
- complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
- consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24865 - 8459 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24867 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It's already almost impossible to get doctor's appointment.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
- complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
- consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24867 - 8459 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24869 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There seems to have been no research into other more suitable brownfield sites which should take priority over Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
 - complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
 - consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24869 - 8459 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24870 Object**Respondent: Mr David Olley [8461]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Too many houses in small village. Must be more suitable [locations]. Infrastructure poor. Schools. Flood risk. Wildlife. Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan. [Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24870 - 8461 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24873 Object**Respondent: Mrs Gemma Olley [8462]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Need to take into account the infrastructure of the village it will not cope with extra houses. Not taking into account other developments in the area (EFDC & Chelmsford Council). Schooling will be a problem. I was unable to get my 2 sons into the village school. Flooding is a problem. We will lose vital flood plains, Red Rose Lane is too narrow as an access point, also will disrupt beautiful wildlife.
 Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan. [Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24873 - 8462 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24875 Object**Respondent: Mr Dane Fullick [8463]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Limited public transport in and out Blackmore to support additional population.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen to the Parishes and respond positively to the plan of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24875 - 8463 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24877 Object**Respondent: Mr Dane Fullick [8463]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Being in the Green Belt, it should not be used to create urban sprawl.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen to the Parishes and respond positively to the plan of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24877 - 8463 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24880 Object**Respondent: Mr Dane Fullick [8463]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Deal Tree surgery already suffers with long waiting list.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen to the Parishes and respond positively to the plan of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24880 - 8463 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24881 Object	Respondent: Mr Dane Fullick [8463]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose Lane and Nine Ashes already are prone to accidents, having witnessed a few. I do not want the increased risks of accidents due to extra road traffic especially at peak hours and school pick-up and drop-off.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen to the Parishes and respond positively to the plan of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24881 - 8463 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24883 Object	Respondent: Mr Marcus Forstner [8160]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local roads network are already heavily congested, already large traffic during school runs and rush hours, this is a danger to children health and lives.	
Change To Plan:	Increase the size of our roads, schools, infrastructure network etc.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24883 - 8160 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24885 Object	Respondent: Mr Marcus Forstner [8160]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We are already overcrowded in our schools.	
Change To Plan:	Increase the size of our roads, schools, infrastructure network etc.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24885 - 8160 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24887 Object	Respondent: Mr Marcus Forstner [8160]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site is not suitable for housing. It is within a high risk of flooding area. Building here would put local residents homes at risk and devalue all local and surrounding properties.	
Change To Plan:	Increase the size of our roads, schools, infrastructure network etc.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24887 - 8160 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24890 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Green Belt should not be built on.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24890 - 8464 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24892 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Redrose Lane is far too narrow for access to a housing estate.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24892 - 8464 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24894 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Redrose Lane is prone to flooding.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24894 - 8464 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	

24896 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	School is already full.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24896 - 8464 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24899 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Doctors area always fully booked, having to wait long time to get appointment.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24899 - 8464 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24901 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Services already struggled to accommodate families living in village.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24901 - 8464 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24903 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Redrose lane and Nine Ashes Rd are already a dangerous junction especially at school times, more traffic will be catastrophic. I live nearby and have witnessed collisions. There is real risk to life of pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24903 - 8464 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24905 Object	Respondent: Miss Autumn Fullick [8466]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Living near Redrose Lane junction I have near misses of collision of cars, adding extra volume of traffic will increase my risk of accident. Traffic increase around the primary school will lead to increase of accidents with cars in/out and young children around the village. Protection of pedestrians down Redrose Lane is not secure.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear strategy for people already living in the village to be defined to help understand the scale and impacts of the site - Justification as to why Blackmore is a suitable location over and above others in the surrounding Borough's - Demonstration of why other brownfield sites should take priority over the Green Belt land over the Green Belt near Redrose Lane. 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24905 - 8466 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
24909 Object	Respondent: Jacqueline Greagsby [8465]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	1. Red Rose Lane is not suitable for urban development, Blackmore has modest services and infrastructure which are failing with the existing population. 2. Access to/from Red Rose Lane is unsustainable for the volume of traffic. 3. Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding and any construction on this site could push the problem onto current residents property.	
Change To Plan:	Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out the local planning needs for our already sustainable community.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified
Full Reference:	O - 24909 - 8465 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	

24910 Object**Respondent: Miss Autumn Fullick [8466]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Doctors surgery already suffers with long waiting list.

Change To Plan: - Clear strategy for people already living in the village to be defined to help understand the scale and impacts of the site
 - Justification as to why Blackmore is a suitable location over and above others in the surrounding Borough's
 - Demonstration of why other brownfield sites should take priority over the Green Belt land over the Green Belt near Redrose Lane
 - Solution that protects the heritage and character of Blackmore village and local needs
 - Clear communication that member of the future of the village can understand.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24910 - 8466 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24914 Object**Respondent: Miss Autumn Fullick [8466]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Limited public transport to support additional population.

Change To Plan: - Clear strategy for people already living in the village to be defined to help understand the scale and impacts of the site
 - Justification as to why Blackmore is a suitable location over and above others in the surrounding Borough's
 - Demonstration of why other brownfield sites should take priority over the Green Belt land over the Green Belt near Redrose Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24914 - 8466 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24915 Object**Respondent: Miss Autumn Fullick [8466]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Long waiting list of children wanting to attend Blackmore primary school.

Change To Plan: - Clear strategy for people already living in the village to be defined to help understand the scale and impacts of the site
 - Justification as to why Blackmore is a suitable location over and above others in the surrounding Borough's
 - Demonstration of why other brownfield sites should take priority over the Green Belt land over the Green Belt near Redrose Lane
 - Solution that protects the heritage and character of Blackmore village and local needs
 - Clear communication that member of the future of the village can understand.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24915 - 8466 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24917 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The houses would be a blight on the local and surrounding area.

Change To Plan: See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24917 - 8467 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24919 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local amenities can't cope. You can't get a doctors appointment without waiting for at least 2 weeks.

Change To Plan: See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24919 - 8467 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24921 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local school is full.

Change To Plan: See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24921 - 8467 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24923 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose Lane and connecting junctions are already dangerous and could not cope with the extra traffic.

Change To Plan: See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24923 - 8467 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24925 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose Lane and Fingrith Hall Lane are susceptible to deep flooding after more than one day of heavy rain.

Change To Plan: See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24925 - 8467 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24928 Object**Respondent: Kay Ginivan [8468]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local plan is unsound because: 1. Blackmore is a small isolated rural village so it hasn't got the infrastructure and would affect school admissions, doctors wait times, parking, etc. 2. The Red Rose Lane is entirely unsustainable for this volume of traffic. 3. Brentwood Council hasn't looked at the used of brownfield sites that are available and take priority over the greenbelt lane off Red Rose Lane. 4. There has been no survey with regards to housing needs why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Please see BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24928 - 8468 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

24931 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council did not consult with Epping Council when deciding the impacts of additional housing on Blackmore.

Change To Plan:

- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24931 - 5892 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24933 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking in the village is dangerous, with motorists often park in dangerous positions, i.e. blocking views at junctions, blocking on double yellow lines.

Change To Plan:

- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24933 - 5892 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24935 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose lane is entirely unsuitable for additional volume of traffic being proposed. Children's poster pleading parents not to park on the double yellow line outside the school are being ignored because there is no space. How would additional housing and traffic improve this dangerous situation.

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24935 - 5892 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24937 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local doctor surgery is full. What will be the impacts of additional housing on local residents who already have to wait for weeks for an appointment?

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24937 - 5892 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24939 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council failed to demonstrate that there are other brownfield sites that are available and should take priority over the Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24939 - 5892 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24941 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council failed to demonstrate the required housing cannot be met by increasing density on other sites.

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24941 - 5892 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24944 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council did not consult with Epping Council when deciding the impacts of additional housing on Blackmore.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24944 - 8191 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24946 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking in the village is dangerous, with motorists often park in dangerous positions, i.e. blocking views at junctions, blocking on double yellow lines.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24946 - 8191 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24948 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose lane is entirely unsuitable for additional volume of traffic being proposed. Children's poster pleading parents not to park on the double yellow line outside the school are being ignored because there is no space. How would additional housing and traffic improve this dangerous situation.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24948 - 8191 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24950 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local doctor surgery is full. What will be the impacts of additional housing on local residents who already have to wait for weeks for an appointment?

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24950 - 8191 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24952 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council failed to demonstrate that there are other brownfield sites that are available and should take priority over the Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24952 - 8191 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24954 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council failed to demonstrate the required housing cannot be met by increasing density on other sites.

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24954 - 8191 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24956 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1- The Co-op is always in low stock most of the times. 2- The tearooms are always busy. 3- The hairdressers are always fully booked.

Change To Plan: The Council has not asked the local community what people want.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24956 - 8182 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24958 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: You have to wait for ages for a doctor's appointment.

Change To Plan: The Council has not asked the local community what people want.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24958 - 8182 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24960 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The school!!! (cannot cope with extra population)

Change To Plan: The Council has not asked the local community what people want.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24960 - 8182 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24962 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewage of the village is already full.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24962 - 8182 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24964 Object	Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We already get flooding in the area. More housing will make it worse.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24964 - 8182 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	Tests: None Examination: No
24965 Object	Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Some villagers have ideas about where fewer houses could go in the area but even then it will stretch the local facilities even more.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24965 - 8182 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	Tests: None Examination: No
24968 Object	Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Crossing the road outside Co-op area is already dangerous with cars driving through the village.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24968 - 8182 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	Tests: None Examination: No
24970 Object	Respondent: Mrs Lesley Fletcher [8469]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The number suggested is far too many and would affect our lives in a detrimental way. The number of cars would increase and Blackmore and the immediate surrounding areas do not have the facilities for cars to park near our few shops and to fill our narrow lanes.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24970 - 8469 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	Tests: None Examination: No
24973 Object	Respondent: Mrs Lesley Fletcher [8469]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	I understand there are other brownfield sites that could be built on without encroaching on our beautiful Green Belt.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24973 - 8469 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	Tests: None Examination: No
24974 Object	Respondent: Mrs Lesley Fletcher [8469]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	It is already difficult to see a doctor, with an additional 100 families of 3+, this is potentially another 300+ patients to be seen by what seems an already overstretched surgery	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24974 - 8469 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	Tests: None Examination: No
24976 Object	Respondent: Mrs Lesley Fletcher [8469]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Flooding in Red Rose Lane could become a greater problem with additional housing.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24976 - 8469 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	Tests: None Examination: No

24978 Object	Respondent: Mr Christoper Fletcher [8470]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	I do not oppose to a lower number of housing built on a brownfield site but object to building on the Green Belt.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24978 - 8470 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
24979 Object	Respondent: Mr Christoper Fletcher [8470]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	It is already difficult to see a doctor, with an additional 100 families of 3+, this is potentially another 300+ patients to be seen by what seems an already overstretched surgery.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24979 - 8470 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
24982 Object	Respondent: Mr Christoper Fletcher [8470]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The increased number of cars to park near our few shops and to fill our narrow lanes is not viable.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24982 - 8470 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
24984 Object	Respondent: Mr Christoper Fletcher [8470]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Flooding in Red Rose Lane could become a greater problem with additional housing.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24984 - 8470 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
24986 Object	Respondent: Edwin Fisher [1189]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Other residential developments continue to overload the local surgery (Deal Tree) causing GP waiting time of 4 weeks +.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 and 26 and refer to BVHA Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24986 - 1189 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
24988 Object	Respondent: Edwin Fisher [1189]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is insufficient car parking at the surgery to cope with this development.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 and 26 and refer to BVHA Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24988 - 1189 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
24989 Object	Respondent: Edwin Fisher [1189]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	This development appears to be site-based first without consideration about effects on the area. It should be the other way round. Plan fails to take account of available facilities to support additional housing.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 and 26 and refer to BVHA Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24989 - 1189 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No

24992 Object**Respondent: Edwin Fisher [1189]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed houses should be distributed around the Borough on a sound basis.

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 and 26 and refer to BVHA Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24992 - 1189 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24994 Object**Respondent: Mrs Aileen Fisher [8471]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The level of concentrated increased in population in one location of around 20% is unwarranted and flawed.

Change To Plan: - Site R25 and R26 removed. The dwellings proposed distributed around the borough.
 - All infill and brownfield sites take priority first no matter how small before considering Green Belt.
 - Provide infrastructure first before selecting site to build.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24994 - 8471 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24996 Object**Respondent: Mrs Aileen Fisher [8471]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is already a waiting period of 4 weeks for a doctor appointment. There are insufficient numbers of doctors to cope with increasing number of patients.

Change To Plan: - Site R25 and R26 removed. The dwellings proposed distributed around the borough.
 - All infill and brownfield sites take priority first no matter how small before considering Green Belt.
 - Provide infrastructure first before selecting site to build.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24996 - 8471 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

24998 Object**Respondent: Mrs Aileen Fisher [8471]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The current car parking facilities at the local surgery are barely able to meet current needs. There is no provision in the Plan to meet increased demands.

Change To Plan: - Site R25 and R26 removed. The dwellings proposed distributed around the borough.
 - All infill and brownfield sites take priority first no matter how small before considering Green Belt.
 - Provide infrastructure first before selecting site to build.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24998 - 8471 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25000 Object**Respondent: Mr Leslie Smith [8472]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The BBC has not demonstrated it has fully investigated more suitable and sustainable locations which should take priority over Greenfield and Green Belt land. The local plan is unsound. I fail to observe the plans soundness and that it has been positively prepared in line with the NPPF. Furthermore, how can the proposed site at Red Rose Lane and Fingrith Hall Lane be justified? Where is the strategy? What consideration has been given to a village with modest services and infrastructure incapable of accommodating such developments. Has BBC consulted with neighbouring authorities and the adverse impact such over development would have on the village?

Change To Plan: I strongly object to any development in Blackmore. To summarise, any or either of the proposed sites would adversely effect the residential amenity of neighbours. Access to / from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable and will be overbearing out of character in terms of its appearance compared with the existing development in the vicinity, not to mention that the character of the village will be lost.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25000 - 8472 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25003 Object

Respondent: Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Making infrastructure issues - other roads are flooded in this area and I suspect building on this scale would add to the problems - furthermore parking is often a problem in Blackmore, difficult to see appointment with the local GP service and no school places at present. 2. We have been told in the past that Blackmore village would not be required to access additional houses numbers. 3. We often have walkers and cycle and horse riders in those narrow roads so more traffic could be a danger.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA report - there are brownfield sites that should be considered first - there should be proper strategy for villages north of Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25003 - 8460 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25005 Object

Respondent: Mr John Ginivan [8476]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is rural and isolated with inadequate services and infrastructure to accommodate planned development. Brentwood BC have not look at the use of brownfield sites to take priority over greenfield (and Green Belt) land off Red Rose Lane. No survey has been carried out to justify why Blackmore needs to be developed. Access onto Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for the proposed volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25005 - 8476 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25008 Object

Respondent: Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I believe the plan in its current state is unsound, not illegally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate as it would result in an expansion of the village which current infrastructure could not support. The plan also will have a detrimental effect on the beauty of the village and the conservation area that it is. Furthermore, I do not believe we should build on land which is designated as greenbelt.

Change To Plan: The plan needs to move to a different piece of land, outside of Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25008 - 8477 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25010 Object

Respondent: Miss Claire Grant [8478]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Will increase existing flooding issues in and around village. Proposals should be reduced to 30 dwellings to allow community to cope. Facilities are already struggling. Should focus building in Brentwood. The recent development in Epping Forest DC is on the same road. Traffic will be a nightmare as Blackmore is already used as a cut through. No housing needs survey; Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy traffic.

Change To Plan: Road network to be improved, including road widening from A414 to the village. Suitable drainage, speed restrictions etc. Increased NHS facilities as it is impossible to get a doctors appointment at Deal Tree health centre. Development of local school facility to cope with an increase of 100 families in the area. The current local shop/post office is inadequate in size to cope and will need to increase. Increases in public transport. Flood improvements and preventative measures to be put in place. Increase parking facilities (nightmare as it is already!)

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25010 - 8478 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25016 Object	Respondent: Mr Christopher Sanders [8474]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Plan unsound because: needs a housing survey no consideration of infrastructure is given, school is full, 6-8 week wait for GP appointment, no local employment, limited public transport, local roads narrow and cant cope with more traffic, village becomes gridlocked due to parking.	
Change To Plan:	Housing needs survey to be undertaken, build on Brownfield sites first, build types of houses needed in Blackmore. I support the BVH mission.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25016 - 8474 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
25018 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Frost [8479]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Infrastructure does not support this: doctor surgery over full etc.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25018 - 8479 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25020 Object	Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no proper consideration to the location: Red Rose Lane is a narrow carriageway unsuitable for the proposed number of additional dwellings. Blackmore is an isolated village.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross. - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25020 - 8480 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25021 Object	Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No 'Housing Need Survey' was completed to look at what is right for Blackmore and its population.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross. - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25021 - 8480 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25022 Object	Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There has been no co-operation with Epping Forest Council who have authorised construction of 30 properties in Fingrith Hall Lane.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross. - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25022 - 8480 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25023 Object	Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no clear planning strategy for the villages including Blackmore.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross. - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25023 - 8480 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	

25024 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available, and which should have taken priority over the Green Belt land down Red Rose Lane. Brentwood Council has also not adequately considered other more suitable sites which are more sustainable e.g. urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place and the growth more sustainable.

Change To Plan: - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross.
- Complete a Housing Needs Assessment
- Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25024 - 8480 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25030 Object

Respondent: Ms Victoria Sanders [8482]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan unsound because: needs a housing survey no consideration or research of infrastructure is given, regarding lack of public transport, condition of roads, no parking in village, School oversubscribes and over 8 week wait for GP appointment. This will be made worse by increased population and not considered or tackled.

Change To Plan: Build on brownfield sites first and conduct a housing survey. Build the types of houses which are needed by the people of Blackmore. The reasons are self explanatory. I support the BHVA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25030 - 8482 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25034 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan has not considered other building outside the Plan with other Councils.

Change To Plan: Fully support the aims and objectives of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25034 - 8483 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25038 Object

Respondent: Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Building on greenbelt; 2. Infrastructure of school, surgery, parking, drainage; 3. Lack of consultation re local needs; 4. Local wildlife habitat leading to more flooding because of habitat removal; 5. Impact from top of Fingrith Hall Lane!!! Epping Borough. 6. More traffic pollution, risk of road accidents increases could lead to injury and deaths; 7. Local shop couldn't cope with the extra load; 8. Village will end up being part of London sprawl; 9. The profound historical nature and heritage will be deeply impacts; 10. Blackmore be a 'through' way / short cut from Red Rose at top of Fingrith Hall Road.

Change To Plan: 1. I would like the proposed sites R25 and R26 removed from local development plan. 2. Consult the BVHA neighbourhood plan for sustainable development. 3. Why doesn't Brentwood Council lead the way to protect green belt and historical heritage sites - Blackmore at the top of the list. 4. Green alternative use to those sites eg allotments, solar panels on both to serve the village.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25038 - 5024 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25040 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure has not been considered: Roads are not big enough. Red Rose Lane is too narrow for heavy good vehicles, states so on signage in the area.

Change To Plan: Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25040 - 8483 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25042 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Schools are at capacity.

Change To Plan: Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25042 - 8483 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25044 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Flooding.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25044 - 8483 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25046 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	GP surgery at capacity of intake of patients.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25046 - 8483 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25047 Object	Respondent: Mr Alan Snook [8484]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	This is Green Belt and should be kept that way. There at not enough community facilities in the area. IE: doctors surgeries, buses, rubbish clearance, sewerage, road infrastructure is not adequate for extra traffic, The plan is totally unsound in respect of Blackmore.	
Change To Plan:	I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission. I wish to be represented by BVHA.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25047 - 8484 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
25052 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The infrastructure has not been considered - parking.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25052 - 8483 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25054 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There are more suitable locations; areas in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25054 - 8483 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25056 Object	Respondent: Mrs Sandra Eaton [8486]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Section 09 (site allocation) policy R25 & R26. Unsound proposal, drainage flooding, doctors appointment, network inadequate infrastructure etc. There are other Brown Field sites in the area that could be developed. BBC should investigate other non-Green Belt sites for development.	
Change To Plan:	BBC should investigate other non-Green Belt sites for development.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25056 - 8486 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	

25059 Object

Respondent: Ruth Jones [8485]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. The village school is not large enough to accommodate a large increase in numbers and if was made 2 classes larger it would lose its village school feel. 2. It is difficult to get appointments at our GO surgery as it is. 3. Blackmore would lose its small village feel and identity. 4. More houses would mean more traffic and would make the roads less safe for pedestrians, particularly children. 5. Cheaper housing would change the demographic of the area. 6. Not all villages need to have affordable housing. I couldn't have afforded to live here when I got married but it was somewhere I aspired to and with hard work we could eventually afford to live here after a few years. 7. The village already has a problem with flooding without building on it further.

Change To Plan: I agree with the Blackmore Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25059 - 8485 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25063 Object

Respondent: Mr Steven Jacobs [4408]

Agent: N/A

Summary: N/A

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25063 - 4408 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25065 Object

Respondent: Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development is in a Green Belt area - which is not in line with national policy to develop. Also existing infrastructure needs updating and replacing for existing residents before any additional development is needed.

Change To Plan: Do not proceed with the development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25065 - 7953 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25069 Object

Respondent: Diane Jones [8488]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear strategy for Blackmore in north of BBC. Lack of consultation with nearby authorities (i.e. Epping FDC) - north part of Fingrith Hall Lane houses being built. Infrastructure - our modest services are already over stretched - school is full doctors appointments are hard to get. Traffic and parking - this will increase massively in the village will be dangerous. There are more suitable sites on and around Brentwood - i.e. old Toomey site on Ingrave Road has been empty for absolutely years as have many others in BBC Ongar Road former commercial park in town centre. No housing needs survey conducted to show why Blackmore is in the LDP. Access in/out Red Rose Lane unsuitable for volume of traffic the developments will produce accidents will happen. Proposed sites do flood - building on these will increase flood risk elsewhere in village

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 need to be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25069 - 8488 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25073 Object

Respondent: Mrs Josephine Snook [8489]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound relating to Blackmore because; Green Belt land should not be built on. Cant get a doctors appointment as it is. The village is liable to flooding. Red Rose Lane is way too narrow for an access point, The clues in the title (lane). There are other more suitable sites. I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission.

Change To Plan: I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25073 - 8489 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25075 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Goddard-King [8490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore cannot sustain more traffic and increased population. The school is already not able to cope with the numbers of pupils needing places.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and 26. The planners should refer to the BHVA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25075 - 8490 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25077 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Goddard-King [8490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local surgery is not able to cope with the number of registered patients.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and 26. The planners should refer to the BHVA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25077 - 8490 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25079 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Goddard-King [8490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The roads and speeding traffic is too much for a rural village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and 26. The planners should refer to the BHVA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25079 - 8490 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25081 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Goddard-King [8490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A loss of green sites damages the rural environment and countryside feel, reducing a sense of village living.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and 26. The planners should refer to the BHVA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25081 - 8490 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25083 Object

Respondent: Mr David Greagsby [8491]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are other parts of the Borough that is more suitable. Brentwood has not undertaken a full review of existing brownfield sites to establish whether they can be developed before using Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed; planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Pplan which sets out the local planning need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25083 - 8491 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25085 Object

Respondent: Mr David Greagsby [8491]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is not suitable for urban development, is prone to flooding. Any construction on this site could put the problem on residents' property within Blackmore

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed; planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Pplan which sets out the local planning need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25085 - 8491 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25088 Object

Respondent: Mr David Greagsby [8491]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Council has not undertaken a full review of existing brown sites to establish whether they can be developed before using Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed; planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Pplan which sets out the local planning need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25088 - 8491 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25089 Object

Respondent: Mr David Greagsby [8491]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Access to/from Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic such a development would generate!

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed; planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Pplan which sets out the local planning need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25089 - 8491 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25091 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Gill [8492]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Other locations and housing developments by neighbouring Councils have not been taken into account when proposing the site for sites R25 and R26. Housing development from neighbouring Councils are close to Blackmore village and will have a major impact to the village infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25091 - 8492 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25093 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Gill [8492]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A housing need survey was not conducted with this (impacts on the village's infrastructure) in mind.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25093 - 8492 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25095 Object

Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Neighbouring authorities (Epping and Chelmsford) have not been consulted and no consideration has taken place around the additional impacts of their proposed development; there is already work started for 30 houses and further planned.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25095 - 4758 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25097 Object

Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A housing needs survey was not conducted. There is no proof that the required housing needs cannot be met elsewhere, for example, brownfield sites, urban extension in Brentwood, increase density at other allocated sites.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25097 - 4758 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25099 Object	Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	School cannot cope with this increase in population.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25099 - 4758 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25101 Object	Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Buses and roads cannot cope with this increase in population.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25101 - 4758 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25103 Object	Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Doctors and dentists cannot cope with this increase in population.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25103 - 4758 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25105 Object	Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The site and the village are liable to flooding. Building will increase this flood risk.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25105 - 4758 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25107 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore is a small village with limited facilities. It has one shop transport links are very poor with the bus service very limited indeed cancelled at one time and has traffic problems. The imposition of 70 houses is grossly excessive and also totally disproportional to the total required.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25107 - 4942 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25110 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no strategy for villages and no housing needs survey has been done by the council.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25110 - 4942 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25112 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The area is liable to flood and further building would only worsen this.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25112 - 4942 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	

25114 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Some natural habitat for the local wildlife would be lost.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25114 - 4942 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25116 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The health centre is already at full capacity.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25116 - 4942 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25119 Object	Respondent: Mr Bruno Giordan [8104]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Inadequate account has been taken of the infrastructure limitations of the location.	
Change To Plan:	A more central location in the Borough would have better transport links, access to schools and surgeries	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25119 - 8104 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25121 Object	Respondent: Mr Bruno Giordan [8104]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The intrusion into Green Belt is unnecessary and damages village's character.	
Change To Plan:	A more central location in the Borough would have better transport links, access to schools and surgeries.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25121 - 8104 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25123 Object	Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore has been allocated 70 which represents 60% of land released in villages in what is described in the LDP as a 'borough of villages'. This is totally disproportionate.	
Change To Plan:	A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25123 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25126 Object	Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The LDP has not shown that the 70 houses could not be built by increasing density on the more urban sites. Denton Village could easily absorb this amount for example.	
Change To Plan:	A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25126 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25128 Object	Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No Housing Needs Survey has been made, except by Blackmore Village Heritage Association, to ascertain local needs and to show why Blackmore has been included.	
Change To Plan:	A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25128 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	

25130 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There already are other sites within the Blackmore boundaries that have been submitted to Brentwood Planning for development as well as building by Epping Council on our borders. All of which will be using our services and infrastructure adding to further congestion in an already busy village. There is a large, illegal, travellers site in Chelmsford road that additionally impacts all the roads, parking, infrastructure, school, doctor's surgery, services etc.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25130 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25132 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: More sustainable locations with better infrastructure, more schools, & surgeries, etc etc such as the urban areas of Brentwood are available.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25132 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25133 Object

Respondent: Brenda Juniper [8493]

Agent: N/A

Summary: School already full; Village congestion already dangerous too many cars, limited parking, especially weekends and summer when there are many visitors to village. At the present time Blackmore is a pretty 'village' why spoil it, there are plenty of brown field site in Brentwood use those. Doctors already struggling to give appointments. Red Roe Lane is an historic road having been used to avoid the village when the plague was rife. There is an estate being built in Fingrith Hall Road which comes under Epping Council all those folk will use village amenities as we are closest.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25133 - 8493 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25136 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The doctors' surgery is overwhelmed. It is not possible to get an appointment for weeks. At time of writing this was until at least the end of April.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25136 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25138 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local primary school, that is listed as an asset in the plan, is oversubscribed with a waiting list.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25138 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25140 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brownfield sites have not been properly considered before the green belt and green field sites.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25140 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25142 Object**Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The infrastructure cannot support this additional build which could mean upwards of 200 people, 140 cars, 250 car journeys. Traffic and parking is already a problem and will only get worse as planning departments in Brentwood and Epping continue to approve building plans

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25142 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25144 Object**Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There doesn't appear to have been much, if any, consultation with Epping & Chelmsford Borough Councils. 30 properties have been built in Fingrith Hall Lane which will impact the village and the inhabitants.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25144 - 4943 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25146 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul David Jackson [7387]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access road, Red Rose Lane is a single track and not suitable for the volume of traffic. Other brown field sites should take priority over green field sites. Greenfield sites were established to protect the countryside and this ideal should be followed. The development proposed is out of proportion to the size of the village. BBC does not appear to have taken into consideration the plot at the top of Fringrith Hall Lane (part of Epping Forest District Council) within 1 mile of the development of about 40 units. There has been no housing needs survey carried out.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan should follow the guidelines and be legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25146 - 7387 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25148 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council has not considered other buildings outside the Plan with other Councils.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25148 - 8494 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25151 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are suitable locations; Blackmore village does not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25151 - 8494 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25153 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The infrastructure has not been considered - eg. schools.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25153 - 8494 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25155 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure has not been considered - eg. GPs, hospitals.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25155 - 8494 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25156 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure has not been considered - eg. flooding.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25156 - 8494 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25157 Object

Respondent: Iris Jones [8495]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is narrow and winding, cars have to slow down to pass. There are ditches on either side and no footpaths. The exit onto Nine Ashes Road often floods and is a particularly junction, right by the school. An increase in traffic would be a great risk. Blackmore is a very small village and despite being very isolated has a minimal bus service. There is one shop a full school that is already over stretched and a doctor surgery that isn't cope now. The narrow roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and already car parking problems. Blackmore village cannot possibly cope with the strem of the proposed developments on its infrastructure. I therefore consider the plan to be unsound. Why choose Blackmore greenbelt when there are other locations within Brentwood Borough Council more sustainable.

Change To Plan: Greenbelt should not be built on. I agree with the Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25157 - 8495 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25162 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose lane will not be able to cope with heavy good vehicles.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25162 - 8494 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25164 Object

Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Green Belt must be protected for future generations.

Change To Plan: "Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25164 - 5703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25166 Object

Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Lack of highway.

Change To Plan: "Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25166 - 5703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25168 Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Lack of utilities (sewage).		
Change To Plan:	"Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25168 - 5703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		
25170 Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Lack of doctors.		
Change To Plan:	"Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25170 - 5703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		
25172 Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Red Rose Lane is far too narrow as an access point.		
Change To Plan:	"Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25172 - 5703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		
25174 Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Village is liable to flooding - from river Wid.		
Change To Plan:	"Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25174 - 5703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		
25176 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Inadequate consultation with Epping Council as 30 houses are already being built on Fingrith Hall Lane which will have impacts on Blackmore.		
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25176 - 8496 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		
25178 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Local school is full.		
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25178 - 8496 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		
25180 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Deal Tree health centre already struggles with population of surrounding villages.		
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25180 - 8496 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		

25182 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local transport system is not available hence more cars on the road creating yet more pollution and people driving to work, taking children to school.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25182 - 8496 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No
25184 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Brentwood Council have demonstrated whether there are brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25184 - 8496 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No
25185 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Brentwood Council have demonstrated whether there are brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25185 - 8496 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No
25186 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Brentwood Council have demonstrated whether there are brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25186 - 8496 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No
25188 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose Lane is a flood area and any building will increase flood risk.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25188 - 8496 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No
25190 Object	Respondent: Mr Thomas Lennon [747]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	To add approximately 70 homes will add approximately 25% to increase the village population. The village has a history that reaches back to the era of Henry XVIII and the Plague.	
Change To Plan:	Only brownfield lands are appropriate. SP02 states that growth is prioritised in highly accessible areas.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25190 - 747 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No
25192 Object	Respondent: Mr Thomas Lennon [747]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Both R25 and R26 have ecological values, with sightings of bats, owls, all are protected species.	
Change To Plan:	Only brownfield lands are appropriate. SP02 states that growth is prioritised in highly accessible areas.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25192 - 747 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No

25195 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Lennon [747]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore has a history of flooding.

Change To Plan: Only brownfield lands are appropriate. SP02 states that growth is prioritised in highly accessible areas.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25195 - 747 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25196 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Lennon [747]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is in Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Only brownfield lands are appropriate. SP02 states that growth is prioritised in highly accessible areas.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25196 - 747 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25198 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Pressure on school.

Change To Plan:

- Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25198 - 8497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25200 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Pressure on doctors - already difficult to get an appointment.

Change To Plan:

- Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25200 - 8497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25202 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Mander [4562]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development should not occur on the greenbelt. Councillors should visit the surveys take by L.A. when it asked land holders to give details of potential sites, large and small, for dwellings. The survey findings could provide some answers. It covers all Brentwood area. As it now appears green belt is no longer an issue in Blackmore await the support of our Brentwood Councillors in our bid to protect the very ancient village of Blackmore.

Change To Plan: [Remove R25 and R26]

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25202 - 4562 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25204 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Excess traffic on local roads causing pressure on already pot-holed roads.

Change To Plan:

- Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25204 - 8497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25206 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking in local areas in centre of Blackmore village.

Change To Plan:

- Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25206 - 8497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25208 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Insufficient amenities for the excessive amount of houses/ people.

Change To Plan:

- Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25208 - 8497 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25210 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is liable to flooding; building on this will increase flood risk with impacts on current residents.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore.
Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25210 - 8498 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25212 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are more suitable and sustainable locations - e.g. the Urban extension to Brentwood. The locations stated in Blackmore do not promote Sustainable development considering the limited facilities currently available.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25212 - 8498 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25214 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore especially is an isolated village and access is via roads that have not been designed to meet the number of cars let alone the amount of heavy vehicles that would be required to build the number of houses in the current LDP.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25214 - 8498 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25216 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local schools are running at full capacity and are a single entry form. Therefore the children might have to be schooled outside of the village therefore increasing the traffic and pollution in the area

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25216 - 8498 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25218 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Access to Doctors appointments. In fact there is only 1 Doctors surgery covering all 5 Villages which are all being impacted by the LDP.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25218 - 8498 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25220 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport/ Bus facilities are hardly adequate.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25220 - 8498 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25222 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC have not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing the housing density on other (Allocated or Brownfield) sites such as Dunton.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25222 - 8498 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25224 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan is not compliant with NPPF on many points:
* NPPF Sect 2 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services
* NPPF Sect 3 28- local community have been ignored in production of the plan.
* NPPF Sect 5 77 /78 - decisions should be 'responsive to local circumstances' and 'reflect local needs'. There is no proven need for these houses.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25224 - 4711 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25226 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]

Agent: N/A

Summary: NPPF Sect 9 103 - development should be focused ... on locations ... limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of travel modes. This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest stations accessed via local rural lanes.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25226 - 4711 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25228 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25228 - 4711 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25230 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not compliant with NPPF Sect 15 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25230 - 4711 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25232 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not compliant with NPPF 16- Conserving the historic environment. R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Red Rose Lane being the point of access for both developments having historical significance as a local plague road from the time of the Black Death.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25232 - 4711 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25234 Object

Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. Fingrith Hall Lane is the entrance to a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities and more than 5 miles from any other town/village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 (40 + 30) new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25234 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25236 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Also, Red Rose Lane, along with many other roads in and around the Blackmore area, is used regularly by walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog-walkers and horse riders. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users. There are also very few street lights in Blackmore and none in Red Rose Lane which adds more risk.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25236 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25238 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore sits in a dip and is prone to flooding. Since the major development of the village in the 1970s there have been a number of occurrences of flooding. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is clearly against policy NE06.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25238 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25240 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. The electricity, other utilities are unlikely to be able to cope an additional 70 properties without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road. Power cuts are a regular feature, especially in adverse weather.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25240 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25242 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewerage system is at maximum capacity already.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25242 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25244 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local primary school is already full - new arrivals in the village are not able to get their children into the school and have to travel to schools in other areas

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25244 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25245 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Bus services are limited, infrequent and do not run into the evenings.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25245 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25247 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is insufficient parking in the village centre causing people to regularly park on double yellow lines and double park along the residential part of Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25247 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25249 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery is at capacity and waiting time for appointments are already unacceptable.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25249 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25251 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear housing strategy for the villages and general area in the north of the Borough. There are many options that have been suggested through this process and should have been considered but have not been.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25251 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25254 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out which would have demonstrated why Blackmore has been specifically included in the LDP, and why other more suitable areas have not been included.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25254 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25256 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25256 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25259 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25259 - 7046 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25261 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. Fingrith Hall Lane is the entrance to a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities and more than 5 miles from any other town/village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 (40 + 30) new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25261 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25262 Object

Respondent: Mrs Michelle Morgan [4505]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Neighbouring authorities not been adequately consulted. Blackmore does not have the infrastructure to meet the needs of 30% more residents. Doctors already very full, school at capacity. Health and safety impact of additional traffic in volume. Other more suitable sites such as extension to Brentwood. Brownfield sites should take priority over greenbelt. No housing needs survey undertaken. Likelihood of flooding - village is already prone to flooding. The Plan does not have a fair distribution access to

Change To Plan: significant reduction in planned houses - on brownfield land.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25262 - 4505 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

25265 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Also, Red Rose Lane, along with many other roads in and around the Blackmore area, is used regularly by walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog-walkers and horse riders. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users. There are also very few street lights in Blackmore and none in Red Rose Lane which adds more risk.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25265 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25267 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore sits in a dip and is prone to flooding. Since the major development of the village in the 1970s there have been a number of occurrences of flooding. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is clearly against policy NE06.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25267 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25269 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. The electricity, other utilities are unlikely to be able to cope an additional 70 properties without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road. Power cuts are a regular feature, especially in adverse weather.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25269 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25271 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewerage system is at maximum capacity already.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25271 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25273 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local primary school is already full - new arrivals in the village are not able to get their children into the school and have to travel to schools in other areas.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25273 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25275 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Bus services are limited, infrequent and do not run into the evenings.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25275 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25277 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is insufficient parking in the village centre causing people to regularly park on double yellow lines and double park along the residential part of Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25277 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25279 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery is at capacity and waiting time for appointments are already unacceptable.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25279 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25281 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear housing strategy for the villages and general area in the north of the Borough. There are many options that have been suggested through this process and should have been considered but have not been.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25281 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25283 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out which would have demonstrated why Blackmore has been specifically included in the LDP, and why other more suitable areas have not been included.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25283 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25285 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25285 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25287 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25287 - 8501 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25290 Object

Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A proper survey hasn't been done.

Change To Plan: There must be plenty of brown field sites available. Keep Blackmore a village instead of turning it into a town.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25290 - 8502 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25292 Object

Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Should not build on Green Belt.

Change To Plan: There must be plenty of brown field sites available. Keep Blackmore a village instead of turning it into a town.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25292 - 8502 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25294 Object

Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The school cannot take any more people.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25294 - 8502 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25297 Object	Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The doctors cannot take any more people.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 25297 - 8502 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: No
25298 Object	Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The risk of flooding is great.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 25298 - 8502 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: No
25300 Object	Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The amount of car will snap up the village which already has far too many cars.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 25300 - 8502 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: No
25302 Object	Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Limited bus services running hourly and finishes at 7pm and only for 6 days a week.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 25302 - 8502 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: No
25304 Object	Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]	Agent: N/A
Summary: A proper survey has not been done.		
Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 25304 - 4990 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: No
25306 Object	Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The schools cannot take any more.		
Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 25306 - 4990 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: No
25308 Object	Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The doctors cannot take any more.		
Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 25308 - 4990 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None		Tests: None
		Examination: No

25310 Object**Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewer will not take extra water and will flood.

Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25310 - 4990 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25312 Object**Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village has many powercuts already so the extra load will cause many problems.

Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25312 - 4990 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25314 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore has a history of flooding recently due to water run-off, due to amount of hard-standing and nowhere for the water to go. Building on this site will just compound this.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25314 - 8503 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25316 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Difficult to get doctors' appointment.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25316 - 8503 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25318 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Transport links are poor.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25318 - 8503 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25320 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose Lane is a narrow lane where 2 cars cant pass in places.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25320 - 8503 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25323 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development would spoil the enjoyment of walkers and cyclists who use Redrose Lane as a circulation road around the village in promoting good health.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25323 - 8503 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25324 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The town in Brentwood is suitable for further development as there are already facilities and services in place.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25324 - 8503 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25326 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore borders Epping Forest and Chelmsford Council areas who have both approved numerous property extensions, new build and housing development near Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Make public the 'Duty to Cooperate' result. Go and visit the area to see the extent of development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25326 - 8503 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25328 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore has a history of flooding recently due to water run-off, due to amount of hard-standing and nowhere for the water to go. Building on this site will just compound this.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25328 - 8504 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25330 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Difficult to get doctors' appointment.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25330 - 8504 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25332 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Transport links are poor.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25332 - 8504 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25334 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose Lane is a narrow lane where 2 cars cant pass in places.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25334 - 8504 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25336 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development would spoil the enjoyment of walkers and cyclists who use Redrose Lane as a circulation road around the village in promoting good health.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25336 - 8504 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25338 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The town in Brentwood is suitable for further development as there are already facilities and services in place.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25338 - 8504 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25340 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore borders Epping Forest and Chelmsford Council areas who have both approved numerous property extensions, new build and housing development near Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Make public the 'Duty to Cooperate' result. Go and visit the area to see the extent of development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25340 - 8504 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25342 Object**Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inadequate consultation with Epping Forest Council which has, or will soon, impact Blackmore village with 30 houses built on Fingrith Hall Lane.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25342 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25344 Object**Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Deal Tree Centre GP Surgery already struggles with existing population and could not cope

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25344 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25347 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The proposed development in Blackmore does not promote sustainable development. There are more obvious opportunities to develop in and around Brentwood Town Centre.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25347 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25349 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The school is full and cannot cope. More pollution on our roads from school buses or parents vehicles travelling elsewhere.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25349 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25350 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The sites are liable to flood and the existing homes will be adversely affected.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25350 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25352 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No clear strategy for the villages in the north of the village.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25352 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25355 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The Council has not demonstrate whether there are available brownfield sites which should take precedence over Green Belt green field in Blackmore.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25355 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25356 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Access to/from Redrose Lane is totally unsuitable for the volume of traffic that would ensue as a result of the proposed development.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25356 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25358 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There has been no housing needs survey to explain why Blackmore has been included in the Plan.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25358 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	

25360 Object**Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Public transport is relatively scarce in Blackmore making it unsuitable for development. Nearest train stations are Brentwood (7.5 miles) and Ingatestone (4.4 miles).

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25360 - 6958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25362 Object**Respondent: - Neil Stainer [2334]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not Nimbyism but BBC have been lazy and not thought through Blackmore option. Red Rose lane is too small for access and there are safety issues. Access an issue, localised flooding, impacting on existing homes, services and infrastructure limited, need a housing survey, not sustainable and negative impact on Village.

Change To Plan: BBC have not identified suitable brownfield sites before submitting Green Belt suggestions - renew and resubmit, There are many other suitable sites identified in part 2 of the LDP.

BBC has not identified and demonstrated that the housing requirement could not be met by increasing housing density on other allocated sites.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25362 - 2334 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25363 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound. No village plan has procured.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25363 - 8505 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25366 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not enough thoughts have been given to the flooding issue.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25366 - 8505 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25368 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewage pumping station is at capacity.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25368 - 8505 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25370 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: At the moment it takes three weeks to see a doctor. With 2,600 patients per doctor, this is one of the highest in the country. With more inhabitants this will increase.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25370 - 8505 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25372 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: School is at capacity.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25372 - 8505 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25376 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking is already a problem. Development will increase the problem in the village centre and at the school.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25376 - 8505 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25378 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village is sustaining its grocery shops, tea room, public house. No further properties required.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25378 - 8505 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25380 Object**Respondent: Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inadequate and unsuitable access from Redrose Lane.

Change To Plan: If the Council can demonstrate the need for extra housing, then there are more suitable and sustainable sites than Blackmore, eg. Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25380 - 8506 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25381 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Sanders [4923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound, needs housing need survey, infrastructure not sufficient, school, GP appointment delay, no employment in village, non existent public transport, lanes narrow and unsuitable, grid locked village centre already, parking problems.

Change To Plan: Plan is unsound, needs housing need survey, infrastructure not sufficient, school, GP appointment delay, no employment in village, non existent public transport, lanes narrow and unsuitable, grid locked village centre already, parking problems.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25381 - 4923 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25384 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul Sullivan [8507]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure of area taking into consideration of GPs available. schools, use of roads, lack of paths, street lighting and wildlife in area.

Change To Plan: Fully support Blackmore Plans for village and their objectives (BVHA)

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25384 - 8507 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25386 Object**Respondent: Mrs Debbie Spencer [6959]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound plan: infrastructure issues. Red Rose lane is unsuitable. Sites liable to flood, increase flood elsewhere, school full, GP at capacity, inadequate bus service, traffic bad in village centre, with development on Woolmongers/Norton Heath, making it worse, danger to residents on roads.

Change To Plan: Need a clearer strategy for villages. The volume of traffic will be chaotic from & to Red Rose Lane access. Why has Blackmore been included in the local plan delivery as NO housing needs survey has been carried out. We have modest services in our village and so increase traffic will be severe. Our beautiful church has no parking so when there is a wedding, christening or any type of service the visitors park in the centre of the village & surrounding roads, Adding to congestion, There are other suitable locations so why our green field sites? The borough council has not shown there are other brownfield sites available which would take priority over greenfield sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25386 - 6959 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i

25388 Object	Respondent: Mrs Anne Stockman [8508]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Infrastructure does not support this	
Change To Plan:	Dr Surgery already full	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25388 - 8508 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
25390 Object	Respondent: Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Unnecessary expansion of Green Belt instead of using available brownfield sites.	
Change To Plan:	If the Council can demonstrate the need for extra housing, then there are more suitable and sustainable sites than Blackmore, eg. Brentwood.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25390 - 8506 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
	Tests: None	Examination: No
25392 Object	Respondent: Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Destruction of local habitat and protected species.	
Change To Plan:	If the Council can demonstrate the need for extra housing, then there are more suitable and sustainable sites than Blackmore, eg. Brentwood.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25392 - 8506 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25394 Object	Respondent: Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Lack of infrastructure eg. doctor's surgery, currently a 4-week wait for appointments.	
Change To Plan:	If the Council can demonstrate the need for extra housing, then there are more suitable and sustainable sites than Blackmore, eg. Brentwood.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25394 - 8506 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None	
25397 Object	Respondent: Mrs Debbie Stevens [8509]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. No consultation with adjoining boroughs, Huge effect on Blackmore primary school almost full, health centre almost full. As a parent we are able to walk to primary school. In 13 years I am more worried of number of illegally parked vehicles outside the school, Woollard Way is near school, the increase in the number of speeding vehicles. More residents would make traffic worse. More traffic exiting Woollard Way 100 yards from already busy school. This is a risk that should not be taken, This whole project is a business deal with not consideration at all to the residents - the people!	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25397 - 8509 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No

25403 Object

Respondent: Mr Craig Stevens [4958]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. No consultation with adjoining boroughs, new homes will drain resources, impact on local school, already at capacity, as is GP. Will increase local traffic by at least 300 vehicles, Increase local traffic, road risks, road damage, and local roads not suitable for this r plant machinery. BBC failed to demonstrate that there aren't more suitable locations, already more suitable brownfield sites before green belt. Level 3 flood risk in village, new development will increase this risk downstream, roads and homes. No strategy on this impact on Blackmore. Blackmore is of historical heritage and importance new homes will heavily impact on this. These changes will be damaging and irrevocable and seemed to have been totally ignored by the planners to date.

Conduct a meaningful local housing survey with residents and listen to and respond to the concerns and needs of local residents before any planning decisions are made, It is my opinion that after meaningful consultation with local residents and a large and appropriate reduction in proposed development, small scale sympathetic development would be welcomed and supported.

Change To Plan: Conduct a meaningful local housing survey with residents and listen to and respond to the concerns and needs of local residents before any planning decisions are made, It is my opinion that after meaningful consultation with local residents and a large and appropriate reduction in proposed development, small scale sympathetic development would be welcomed and supported.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25403 - 4958 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25407 Object

Respondent: Mrs Malanie Sanders [8511]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. Unsound plan: no housing need survey, not sustainable as no infrastructure consideration, particularly as school full, 6-8 week wait for GP, no jobs available in village, no public transport, roads narrow and unsuitable, in area by shop it gets gridlocked due to parked cars. Housing needs survey should be undertaken, build on brownfield sites first, build the types of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey should be undertaken, build on brownfield sites first, build the types of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25407 - 8511 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25409 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is all green field land comprising of wildlife habitat and numerous trees.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or for it to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25409 - 6846 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25411 Object

Respondent: Mr William A Smith [8512]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections HRA, R25 and R26 This plan is no dealing with a problem, it is making one, We do not have the infrastructure in this village or town. I need myself a good hospital, a GP appointment, these are both overstretched and difficult to obtain, they do their best but we have far too many people per doctor. Our village now is not properly maintained. No street cleaning, no road repairs, no police, long waiting times nationally for ambulances. These things are important for young and old alike. There is nothing in this local plan that deals with this. Developers build, take the money and leave us with the mess these plans solve nothing to alleviate anything, I also have lived in this town 80 years.

Change To Plan: We need the investment to go with the plan not just houses we need massive improvement too infrastructure sewers, schools, Drs hospitals transport, better roads, we need a consultation to the whole of Brentwood, this is a devastating plan to our village and a disaster to Brentwood. We need government money to carry this out. I too question the site at South Weald. Be withdrawn. I lived there all my young life. It is within easy reach of the M25 amenities, easy access to the city, town within walking distance, the site is available. Give me one good reason why you turned it down.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25411 - 8512 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

25414 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are many available brownfield sites in Brentwood which would be more suitable.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25414 - 6846 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25416 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Housing development would be dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians and young children because of the lack of parking facilities and development would increase the volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25416 - 6846 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25418 Object

Respondent: Mr David Smith [4872]

Agent: N/A

Summary: See 09 Policy R25 and R26
Blackmore as a contained village already suffers from small access roads, more traffic and building is going to ruin the roads. Any new housing needs to consider local needs, affordable housing, pressure on public transport, school, doctors etc. There are better locations around Brentwood and have other authorities been consulted? Epping forest etc.

Change To Plan: None. No new housing in any quantity can be sustained in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25418 - 4872 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

25420 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Development will increase flooding.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25420 - 6846 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25422 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no place available: schools, doctors.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25422 - 6846 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25424 Object

Respondent: Mr Bryan Moreton [8513]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Very poor infrastructure, no or very poor public transport, long waiting line for doctors appointment. The additional population which will bring their families with them would mean additional vehicles, traffic, pollution, parking issues. We don't need more vehicles in our village.

Change To Plan: I don't see that any modification could make the Plan sound because building on Green Belt is immoral.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25424 - 8513 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25429 Object**Respondent: Mrs Anne Sands [8514]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 4, 8, 9 - R25 and R26. Unsound because: too much traffic in the village, Blackmore school is bursting plus morning traffic is increasing and dangerous, Flood risk, not enough parking in the village, doctors appointments already like gold dust, narrow lanes, risk for the cyclists and horse riders.
Take R25 and R26 OUT of the LDP and please consider BVHA consultation plan.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 OUT of the LDP and please consider BVHA consultation plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25429 - 8514 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25431 Object**Respondent: Mrs Gloria Moreton [8515]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound because all things have not been considered. No more room for school. No early or late bus to get to work or to the station. Fingrith Hall Lane is congested. We're a compact village, any expansion or building will affect the unique atmosphere. Where are they going to put the roads? Redrose lane is too narrow. No thank you.

Change To Plan: Start again. This Plan is useless and fit for failure. Everyone needs a house to live in but not at the expense of others. More interaction with other Councils. Epping Forest building at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane will have too much impact on Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25431 - 8515 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25433 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Sullivan [8516]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Relates to section 09: R25 and R26. Local plans unsound infrastructure schools, GPs, other sites close by being built on by EFDC & Chelmsford, heavy use of roads, no paths, no street lights, wildlife, Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: Blackmore village plans aim to need the needs & objection of the village I fully support their plans

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25433 - 8516 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25435 Object**Respondent: Mr Stephen Murrell [8517]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: [blank]

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25435 - 8517 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25437 Object**Respondent: Miss Wendy Schweitzer [8518]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 9 Negative impact on village, unnecessary Green Belt site. Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA development plan

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA development plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25437 - 8518 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25439 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lorraine Murrell [8519]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: [blank]

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25439 - 8519 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25441 Object

Respondent: Mr Sean Moore [8520]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Major impacts on a village that's at stretching point without all the funding and infrastructure to meet its needs. Also impacts on wildlife, flooding issues in the area, infrastructure. There are more suitable brownfield sites elsewhere. Three local boroughs wanting to build within 5-10 miles of Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Create new communities in areas where you can build all the correct infrastructure, local amenities in keeping with the local areas and generate new housing that don't have an impact on others.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25441 - 8520 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25443 Object

Respondent: Mr Sean Moore [8520]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Honeypot Lane was taken off at last minute due to poor access and being on Green Belt which R25 and R26 have the same issues if not far worse.

Change To Plan: Create new communities in areas where you can build all the correct infrastructure, local amenities in keeping with the local areas and generate new housing that don't have an impact on others.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25443 - 8520 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25446 Object

Respondent: Mrs Shui-Lin Moore [8521]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are more suitable sites. The village is just about coping with the capacity of the village as it is; there are already lots of traffic to cope with. Putting more dwellings in these plots will only impact on the roads and access and will completely change the ambience of what is currently a beautiful surrounding countryside and turn it into a circus. Doctors services are already stretched to stretching point. Development on this site does not offer sustainable development, nor does it offer good ratio of children to school or patient to doctor.

Change To Plan: There is much more land in Stondon Massey where additional housing would not cause as much stress to an already stretched village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25446 - 8521 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25447 Object

Respondent: Mr Graham Martin [8522]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and is of historical interest with many ancient buildings. The village is prone to flooding should Green Belt be covered with hard standing. There is insufficient road width and parking to cope with additional housing. There is insufficient school places and doctors.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25447 - 8522 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25451 Object

Respondent: Hazel Mills [8523]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Epping Forest District Council was not consulted about the 30 homes being built at the top of Fringrith Hall Lane, hence no consideration was given to the impact this will have on our village. No clear strategy has been outlined for Blackmore in the north of the borough. Our doctors surgery is oversubscribed - no more patients please!! The school is full, don't ruin it by overfilling the classrooms. Where would the excess water go? There's nowhere to park as it is! We love the wildlife here - please don't destroy their homes.

Change To Plan: Remove plans for sites R25 and R26. Suggest the Planners refer to the BVH Neighbourhood Plan which illustrates the villages housing needs relevant to maintaining a sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25451 - 8523 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25455 Object

Respondent: Edward Mills [8524]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village infrastructure is insufficient to deal with a significant increase in population in terms of oversubscribed school and doctor surgery. I totally disapprove of building on greenfield sites.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 need to be removed from the Local Development Plan. We need housing that fulfils a sustainable community as outlined in BVH Neighbouring Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25455 - 8524 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25458 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities (Epping Forest and their development of 30 dwellings at the top of Fringith Hall Lane and the effect on Blackmore facilities. There has been no consultation on actual requirements for Blackmore and what services will be required) to service additional housing. It is currently almost impossible to get a doctors appoint, transport to and from Brentwood is a bar adware. The village is already congested without 70 more houses as the cars that will bring. The lone school is already full and no space to extend it.

Change To Plan: To sustain 70+ houses the road system with need to the upgrades and facilities (medical, schools and transport) will need to be in place before building commences.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25458 - 4709 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii, iv

25461 Object

Respondent: Doddinghurst Infant School (Ms. Ingrid Nicholson) [4339]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no consultation on the actual requirements for the village of Blackmore for example the services that will be required to meet the demand that the additional housing will bring. There has also been no consultation with neighbouring authorities, ie, Epping Forest and their allowed development of 30+ houses at the top of Fringith Hall Lane and the effect these additional houses will have. The current social amenities, health education and transport one already over subscribed and therefore any additional housing will need these facilities upgraded prior to any building commence. This has not been identified in the proposed plan.

Change To Plan: In order to accommodate the 70 additional houses the current road system will need to be upgraded and in place. The current school provision is operating close to maximum and there is no room to expand the school. The local health centre is also under pressure and it can take up to 3 weeks to get a doctors appointment unless classed as an emergency.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25461 - 4339 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25465 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Sands [8525]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 4,8, 9_ policies R25 and R26. Unsound. Protect Green Belt, my house id built on a building envelope and for this I paid a premium, flood rick, unsuitable roads, health risk form more traffic, parking issues, GP over run, village attracts and encourages cyclists, impact to existing village wildlife increase on local services - rubbish collection, recycling.

Change To Plan: Sections 4,8, 9_ policies R25 and R26. Blackmore is an historic village renowned for its village feel and qualities. The reason it has remained jewel in Essex is because of the protected Green Belt land. The government encourage "brownfield" site to be built on and there are many more suitable site, which would not impact on this traditional English village, Access in these medieval country lanes is not suitable for the increase volume of cars, The school & doctors would be unable to cope with this large growth in the population, and this would have an impact of the villagers wellbeing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25465 - 8525 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25467 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Staples [8526]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Flood risk - the allocated amount of properties is disproportionate to the size of the village, this is Green Belt land and is a designated area for agriculture and to provide habitat for wildlife.

Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets our local housing need for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets our local housing need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25467 - 8526 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25469 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jane Staples [8527]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policies R25 and R26. This is Greenbelt land which is set aside as a safe haven for wildlife. There is a very real risk of flooding as it has in the past, the building of these properties will increase the risk of flooding further into the village. We have approx. 300 properties in the village at present the infrastructure cant cope wit another 70, when will this end?!

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25469 - 8527 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25471 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Saxton [4882]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. Unsound because increased risk of flooding, local amenities, i.e. schools, doctors, parking areas will not be able to cope. The proposed development will greatly increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village, No development should be allowed that requires access via Red Rose Lane, There has not been adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities as an example to development in Fingrith Hall Lane.

Change To Plan: The proposed development will greatly increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village, No development should be allowed that requires access via Red Rose Lane, There has not been adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities as an example to development in Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25471 - 4882 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25473 Object**Respondent: Mr David Saxton [4286]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. Unsound. Increased risk of flooding local school will not be able to cope, Insufficient capacity at doctors. In adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities as an example to development in Fingrith Hall Lane. There should not be any development that accesses Red Rose Lane. The proposed development will increase the flood risk in the village.

Change To Plan: In adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities as an example to development in Fingrith Hall Lane. There should not be any development that accesses Red Rose Lane. The proposed development will increase the flood risk in the village.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25473 - 4286 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25475 Object**Respondent: Mr M. Skidmore [1160]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 & R26. The infrastructure of Blackmore is not suitable for housing on this scale, Green Belt should be protected, Blackmore is prone to flooding. I endorse and support the neighbourhood plan written by BVHA

Change To Plan: I endorse and support the neighbourhood plan written by BVHA

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25475 - 1160 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25477 Object

Respondent: Mrs Elaine Stares [8528]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 R26. Unsound. More houses - already being built on outskirts of Blackmore, covered by other Councils, why are they able to build too near Blackmore, using the infrastructure/facilities of that village and nearby Doddinghurst, which are already under pressure, roads, doctors, shop, school, etc. Use of Brownfield sites not fully investigates as alternative. Loss of Green Belt, being pushed out towards Red Rose lane just because land owners have offered plots for sale and BBC have shortage of house numbers. Not for the good of Blackmore or the village is beautiful and historical and at the moment fairly peaceful, with an abundance of wildlife, Puts pressure on surrounding facilities / villages. At least 2 cars per household, pollution & road damage. People use car as very limited public transport.

Need a full housing needs survey to fit the needs of the village not the needs of BBC or developers/landowners. If this development is allowed to progress, infrastructure is an issue. The village also suffers from flooding, Roads, school, doctors, traffic, parking, litter, damage to countryside is a real issue. Needs thorough independent investigation.

Change To Plan: Need a full housing needs survey to fit the needs of the village not the needs of BBC or developers/landowners. If this development is allowed to progress, infrastructure is an issue. The village also suffers from flooding, Roads, school, doctors, traffic, parking, litter, damage to countryside is a real issue. Needs thorough independent investigation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25477 - 8528 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25479 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lesley Stone [8529]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 R26. Use brownfield. Protect special, unique country village of Blackmore, with a great community spirit. Not got infrastructure to support more homes, doctors full, busy with cars already.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out housing needs for a sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25479 - 8529 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25481 Object

Respondent: Mrs Debbie Martin [8530]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Very busy road, not enough parking, which would increase to a dangerous amount. Local school already at max capacity. Doctors impossible to get an appointment which will get worse.

Change To Plan: I am in total support of the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25481 - 8530 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25483 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Mills [8533]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Misuse of Green Belt - Overcrowding of local services e.g. GP - Generation of local traffic - Negative impact on local infrastructure - Destruction of wildlife habitat.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26. Consult BVHA for local development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25483 - 8533 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25485 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Mills [6982]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Overload of sewage system. Inappropriate use of Green Belt. Overloading of local school

Change To Plan: Development removed from the Plan. Any development to consider local needs.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25485 - 6982 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25487 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lorraine Mitchell [8534]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This would alter the character of a lovely countryside that was enjoyed by local residents, clog up streets with traffic, prolong the waiting time to see a doctor. How would the local school cope. Public transport is poor with no bus running at nights and on Sundays. There are plenty other Brown field lands so no need to erode the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Support the mission of the BVHA. Not necessary to erode Green Belt for the sake of fulfilling housing need.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25487 - 8534 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25489 Object

Respondent: Mr Steve Mitchell [8535]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The existing doctor's surgery is already running over full capacity and almost impossible to get an appointment. School struggles to meet local needs. Flooding is an issue, building on these sites will increase the risk of flooding for existing homes. Housing density could be increased on identified sites. Blackmore does not have the infrastructure compared to urban area. Use Brown field sites instead of encroaching the Green Belt which would open the floodgate for future development and destroy the character of a beautiful Essex village.

Change To Plan: Support the BVHA. Why not use brown fields instead?

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25489 - 8535 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25491 Object

Respondent: Stuart Moulder [4713]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear strategy for the village. More suitable brownfield sites elsewhere. There is no housing need demonstrated in Blackmore that cannot be met elsewhere in Brentwood. Redrose Lane is not suitable for expected traffic. Site is liable to flooding. Current infrastructure cannot cope with additional population.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25491 - 4713 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25493 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Moulder [4719]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a quite historic village in the Green Belt, its character will be eradicated by further urbanisation, road use and population growth. With development earmarked at site R23 the nature of the village will be lost as Hook End/Doddinghurst spreads towards Blackmore. Local infrastructure and service cannot support growth, e.g. healthcare, school, roads, parking, public transport. Site is liable to flooding. Brownfield sites elsewhere would be a better residential site.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25493 - 4719 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25495 Object

Respondent: Mrs Hilery Morse [8536]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site is not sustainable. Dangerous country lane. Site is in Green Belt. Blackmore should remain a small village with natural habitat. Flood was experienced from time to time. GP and local school and other facilities e.g. sewage, water, public transport do not have capacity. We don't want to end up as "outer London. Keep the village as it is intended.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26. Refer to BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25495 - 8536 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25497 Object

Respondent: Mr Frank Stone [8538]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are brownfield sites available in Brentwood, it currently takes 4 weeks to get a GP appointment so this area hasn't for adequate medical facilities, There is a shortage of fresh water in this area. The road infrastructure cannot support further development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out housing needs for a sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified **Duty to Co-operate?:** Not Specified **Sound?:**No **Tests:** i, ii, iii **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25497 - 8538 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25501 Object

Respondent: Mrs Melanie Simpson [8539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26
Section 04 - Policy SP01 ad SP02
Section 08. Policy Ne06 paras 8.85; 8.90; 8.101
BBC not considered lack of infrastructure in area, schools, doctors, buses, roads, bin collection, etc. Sites are Green Belt green field, us brownfield. There was no housing need survey. Village prone to flood, more houses will exacerbate this.
I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.
Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.
Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Change To Plan: I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.
Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.
Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25501 - 8539 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25508 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gladys Skinner [8540]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections R04, R08 (flood and Green Belt) and R09. Blackmore Village doesn't have the infrastructure for houses in Red Rose Lane, The volume of traffic at present has already reached its limit. Also I understand that flooding could be a real possibility.
Sites R25 and R26 should be remove from the plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be remove from the plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25508 - 8540 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25510 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Snelling [6960]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Chair of Blackmore Primary School Governors, not enough space and facilities for existing pupils let alone new comers. Never is infrastructure provided first before a population increase, Access to healthcare and GP limited, Until all facilities (education, roads, healthcare etc) are available there should be no development. No additional burden on already stretched resources.
Types of housing not checked ad balanced to prevent speculators and private investors making money at the expense of affordable for young/old members of the community.
Identify alternative brown sites; preserve Green Belt in perpetuity, undertake a housing needs survey to identify relevant data, invest in infrastructure, particularly to reduce constant flooding in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Identify alternative brown sites; preserve Green Belt in perpetuity, undertake a housing needs survey to identify relevant data, invest in infrastructure, particularly to reduce constant flooding in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25510 - 6960 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii, iv

25512 Object

Respondent: Miss Carole Scott [8541]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26
Infrastructure issues.
I would have thought more suitable sites could have been and should have been identified, The locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development, I have lived here since 1993 and cannot believe the impact this will cause on our village particularly with regard to flooding.

Change To Plan: I would have thought more suitable sites could have been and should have been identified, The locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development, I have lived here since 1993 and cannot believe the impact this will cause on our village particularly with regard to flooding.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25512 - 8541 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25514 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Sexton [4860]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Lived in the village for 50 years when it was a vibrant well serviced village. This has changed. The proposed development would not regenerate the village but have the opposite effect - GP, school, sewage, flood, parking, etc 30+ new homes in Epping on Fingrith Road plus this proposal will overburden existing infrastructure, Impact on roads and parking. Day visitors make this worse. I commuted to Poplar for 25 years, using every option, ended up parking at Shenfield which was expensive. Crossrail will make this worse and add to road congestion.

Scrap the existing plans, go back to the drawing board for a re-think. Blackmore cannot cope with over development. You will make peoples lives miserable and frustrating. "Do we have human rights over this matter" to comply with Government's demands are causing rash and unworkable plans to be implemented. THINK AGAIN.

Change To Plan: Scrap the existing plans, go back to the drawing board for a re-think. Blackmore cannot cope with over development. You will make peoples lives miserable and frustrating. "Do we have human rights over this matter" to comply with Government's demands are causing rash and unworkable plans to be implemented. THINK AGAIN.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25514 - 4860 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25516 Object**Respondent: Mrs June Sexton [8542]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Fingrith Hall Road is congested, parking problems, dangerous for prams and mobile scooters, pedestrians. Pressure on local shop, long queues, more homes will make this worse. School is full,

Need common sense. Village used to have better services, more shops, a police house. Village can't cope with more homes, people and cars.

This small village is not able to cope with all the people. Vehicles parking. Our doctors surgery is unable to cope at the moment. People having to wait 4-6 weeks to make an appointment with a GP. This is a small village and will not cope with the numbers that are due to live here.

Change To Plan: This small village is not able to cope with all the people. Vehicles parking. Our doctors surgery is unable to cope at the moment. People having to wait 4-6 weeks to make an appointment with a GP. This is a small village and will not cope with the numbers that are due to live here.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25516 - 8542 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25518 Object**Respondent: Miss Faye McCarthy [8543]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is too narrow. No room for it. Coop cannot take it. Public bus runs once an hour cannot take it.

Change To Plan: This Plan should not go through as Blackmore is not big enough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25518 - 8543 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25520 Object**Respondent: Mr Terence Stenning [8544]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Lived here for 18 months but am aware of existing issues which would be exacerbated by new homes. School is full so new ones would travel elsewhere. Older children could not attend after school activities as school transport has left. Public transport is poor. More parents driving to jobs elsewhere. Pedestrians are unsafe due to busy roads and poor pavements, there is no health centre or chemist in village which is problematic for non-drivers.

Whilst a small organic growth of the housing stock in Blackmore should be possible, large scale development should be located around Brentwood itself. Here are found more convenient facilities and better transport.

Change To Plan: Whilst a small organic growth of the housing stock in Blackmore should be possible, large scale development should be located around Brentwood itself. Here are found more convenient facilities and better transport.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25520 - 8544 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

25522 Object**Respondent: Mr Chris McGovern [8545]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Roads wont be able to cope. Also will raise issues relating to rights to unobtrusive views from my Grade II Listed Homestead; it will have a detrimental effect on that view. The village infrastructure will be severely tested by development at Fingrith Hall Lane, let alone the LDP if it went ahead. Services are already at breaking point, any increase will be severely detrimental to existing and new residents.

Change To Plan: LDP to be significantly shrunk or move away from Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25522 - 8545 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25523 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ann Stenning [8546]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26
Although I have no objections for building of a few more houses in Blackmore I feel that 70+ is excessive.
My main worry is the increase in traffic. We live in the busy Chelmsford Road and there are no footpaths along a lot of it so it is dangerous at the best of times to walk into the village for the shop etc.
If we take the car into the village we are adding to the parking problem, especially around the coop. Other reasons are the lack of school places and a health centre which would make it unsuitable for young families or older people.

Change To Plan: No change provided

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25523 - 8546 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

25526 Object**Respondent: Mrs Melanie Snelling [8547]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26 - a and c
My house is already prone to flooding and the proposed houses will increase this risk - the field off Red Rose lane is often like a pond at the moment.
Red Rose Lane is far too small for extra traffic, This area is Green Belt land and should not be built on, Services such as our school (already full) and our doctors surgery are all stretched - appointments are difficult and would be worse if there are more families due to the proposed housing. We have not been surveyed as to whether houses are needed in this area. BBC should look for other brownfield sites or extend the Brentwood urban area.
Do not build on greenfield or Green Belt land. Invest in infrastructure first, Have a clear strategy for the villages including Blackmore. Improve state of the roads and car parking facilities, Have a housing needs survey.

Change To Plan: Do not build on greenfield or Green Belt land. Invest in infrastructure first, Have a clear strategy for the villages including Blackmore. Improve state of the roads and car parking facilities, Have a housing needs survey.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25526 - 8547 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25528 Object**Respondent: Mrs Francesca McCarthy [8548]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose lane is too narrow. My house, as a Grade II Listed homestead, has rights to view of open land. If the LDP goes ahead my view will be affected. There is a nearby development of 30 houses from Epping Council and I already noticed more traffic. Schools, doctors and all services are at breaking point.

Change To Plan: Under no circumstance should this plan go ahead as it would alter the character of Blackmore Village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25528 - 8548 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25534 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Simpson [4462]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09 Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200; Policy R26, 9.201-9.205:
Section 4 Policy SP01-D(a) D (f) Para 4.9,4.2; Policy SP02
Section 8: Policy NE 06, 8.5-8.64 - para 8.85 (iv), 8.90, 8.101; Policy NE13
As a local teacher I worry about the impact on local infrastructure that is already struggling. Schools, doctors, buses, roads. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services that cannot cope with further pressure on the services. There needs to be a housing needs survey. Brownfield sites should be used. Access from/to red Rose lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic; the village is prone to flooding and when it does Red Rose land is the only way through the village - if there are homes built will this increase the flooding? There is no clear strategy for BBC on this proposal.
Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Change To Plan: Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25534 - 4462 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25536 Object

Respondent: Mr Tony Severn [8550]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore village currently has one school which is over subscribed, one doctors surgery with ridiculously long waiting times. Another problems is parking in the village. The access from Red Rose Lane would be totally unsuitable for the volume of traffic caused by this development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25536 - 8550 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25541 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04, 08 09 - R25 R26
Limited consultation on this with neighbouring authorities, no housing needs survey, stretched infrastructure - school, GO, congestion, parking, bus services. Need evidence of other sites being considered, brownfield or urban extensions, which would regenerate the High Street,. Fields in village prone to flooding, new homes would increase this. Red Rose Lane is bounded by ancient hedgerows, providing a green boundary to Blackmore. This development would destroy that.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25541 - 8107 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25543 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pauline Roberts [8551]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound as GP is full, roads for access too narrow, liable to flood. I moved here to live in the countryside and this will gradually be taken away. I pay very high council tax for the privilege of living here. I already live on a cut through for traffic to the A12, more traffic from the development will make it worse.

Change To Plan: Support aims and objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25543 - 8551 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25548 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Ratcliffe [5040]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 04,
08 - Green Belt and Flooding
09 - R25 R26

There is no clear strategy for villages (Inc. Blackmore) in north of borough.

Principle of development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. There are modest services and infrastructure in Blackmore (an isolated village). School is full, GP waiting times are over 4 weeks, parking in the centre of the village is already a nightmare.

BBC not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met on other (allocated) sites.

There has been no housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Access on/off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic. Equally access via Woollard Way 'hammer heads' would be problematical.

Flooding in the village - proposed sites are liable to flood and therefore building on this land will also increase flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: I fully support the plan put forward by Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25548 - 5040 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25553 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Romang [6974]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for rural communities in borough. Blackmore has been stripped of public services.

No consideration of development already occurring around Blackmore, recent planning decisions in Blackmore to reduce the housing stock whilst 30 new homes on Fingrith Hall Lane with their impact on village. Neighbouring Councils not consulted.

Development is ill considered as village has reduced public services, poor infrastructure, inadequate transport links, oversubscribed school and GP, parking problems, all cant cope with existing community. Parking controls not enforced, roads often unpassable

Development will push village envelop out into surrounding agricultural land and set an endless precedent for developers.

This development, not mentioned in previous LDP drafts, does not demonstrate an example of sustainable development and more suitable sites appear to the available in Shenfield and Brentwood.

Brownfields sites do not appear to have ben investigated fully and should take precedent over green belt. The ancient hedgerow boundary to Red Rose Lane also appears not to have been considered. It has been cut back hard for the first time in decades.

Document doesn't demonstrate required housing density? For Brentwood cannot be included as part of the provision identified in other allocated sites in the borough.

Housing needs survey not been done, so why was Blackmore selected for development and how would housing type be decided?

Existing road infrastructure inadequate - congestion, parking, road sizes.

Proposed sites and access roads are liable to flood and more homes increase this risk. Red Rose Lane floods regularly as does access to the village around the pond.

Changes have been set out in the BVHA neighbourhood plan and I refer to this document.

Happy to be represented by the BVHA and Roger Keeble

Change To Plan: Changes have been set out in the BVHA neighbourhood plan and I refer to this document. Happy to be represented by the BVHA and Roger Keeble

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25553 - 6974 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25555 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Rothery [8552]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Retain Green belt; more homes will decimate the area, use the brownfield sites - have they been considered? Local infrastructure is insufficient - GP, police, schools, pre-school. 70 properties = 300+ people. More building = loss of land = more flooding. Roadways unsuitable. No reasonable proof to support tenability of proposal. Where will wildlife go?

Change To Plan: Accept that the continued building on Green Belt land is unsustainable and will have dire short term and long term consequences for existing local community. Stop building on Green Belt and concentrate on re-developing existing brown field sites should the need for voracious new builds be required in semi and rural locations. AS such sites R25 and R26 should be removed.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25555 - 8552 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25560 Object**Respondent: Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 04, 08, 09 - policy R25 and R26 Blackmore village cannot cope with any further demand on its infrastructure. Presently school is at its capacity and medical centre is also struggling with patients having to wait unacceptable time to get an appointment.

Change To Plan: I agree with BVHA neighbourhood plan and planners need to heed th Blackmore local housing requirements.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25560 - 4897 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25562 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susan Rayner [8553]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policies R25 and R26. Local schools, doctors surgery parking in Blackmore for shop/pubs - all at capacity - especially doctor where we have to wait weeks for an appointment! Congestion at cross road in centre of village especially with through traffic breaking speed limit, delivery lorries for coop shop and buses and cyclists. Green Belt land being used for housing and increased risk of flooding to properties in Church Street.

Change To Plan: Blackmore is a small village with an historic character and building may more homes on Green Belt land will destroy the character of this lovely old village. In my view no modification would be suitable! The housing development underway at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane (although under Epping Council) will also put a strain on the Blackmore centre.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25562 - 8553 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

25564 Object**Respondent: Mr Hugh Rayner [8011]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Too much strain on local infrastructure - schools, medical, doctors waiting times for appointment and could result in increased flooding to village. Parking already impossible in village.

Change To Plan: More suitable sites should have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25564 - 8011 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

25566 Object**Respondent: Mr Lyn Robbins [8554]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Do we need more housing in Blackmore. Not enough consideration for those living here. Local issues need to be addressed before any new development. Local serviced are already oversubscribed i.e. schools, doctors surgery, already a month is required for Drs appointment waiting at hospitals is obscene!! Transport for elderly is always being threatened. Flooding should be addressed first.

Change To Plan: Object to building on Green Belt in principle.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25566 - 8554 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, iii

25568 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lisa Rawlings [8555]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26. Should do a housing need survey; consult neighbouring boroughs impact on traffic, schools, doctors; Village is isolates and hasn't the infrastructure for new homes including GP, schools; Village susceptible to flooding, new homes will make this work; use alternative brownfield sites; use alternative more sustainable sites near to Brentwood; roads are small and unsuitable for more traffic, especially Red Rose Lane; Visitors exacerbate parking problems, new homes will make this worse.

Change To Plan: Country lanes in and out of the village will need to be repaired and maintained, maybe even widened to allow for the extra volume of traffic. Car parking around the sports and social / village hall will need to be increased to allow for the extra people using the facilities.
The flooding that leads to major disruption in the village at certain times would have to be investigated and plans to deal with this need to be put in place before any buildings work should take place.
The village school would have to be extended to allow for the extra children, including extra teachers and support staff. I hope the council have put the extra money aside for this.
More people would mean more demands on the transport links into Brentwood and Chelmsford which are poor now - without the volume of more people. Better links have to be considered and put in place by the council.
An extra doctors surgery should be built to take some of the existing load away from the Deal Tree Health Centre and to cope with the extra footfall. Or more doctors need to be employed to work in the existing centre.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25568 - 8555 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, iii

25570 Object

Respondent: Mr Geoffrey Rose [8556]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26. If 30 or more houses are built at the Red Rose site this will have an adverse impact on the village. There are already issues with flooding and main drainage. We are not able to get appointments at the doctors surgery in good time and the school is already overloaded. It is supposed to be Green Belt and some rogue dwellings have been allowed without planning.

Change To Plan: It will be too much for a wonderful village to cope with. maintain the Green Belt.
We need R25 and R26 removed and review the BVHA plan. We have enough housing already for the existing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25570 - 8556 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25572 Object

Respondent: Mrs Rosalind Rose [8557]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26.
30 new dwellings on Fingrith Hall Lane will impact on village, school, GPs and drainage as above the village. Red Rose site in area already prone to flooding, more homes will increase this. We have limited bus service which needs improvement is more residents. Blackmore has very limited facilities for large population and school already full and GP has long wait time for appointments as already absorbing people from large Mountnessing development. Green Belt was designed to maintain some of the countryside of Britain and should be upheld.

Change To Plan: We need R25 and R26 to be removed and it is necessary for the BVHA should be looked at as it states that the neighbourhood plan shows quite plainly that our local housing needs are suitable for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25572 - 8557 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25574 Object

Respondent: Mrs Patricia Mountstevens [8559]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC did not consult or consider neighbouring authorities, Epping Forest is constructing 30 dwellings at Fingrith Hall Lane and other sites being planned are also not taken into consideration. BBC not shown that the housing required could be met by using other allocated sites. Brownfield lands should be considered before Greenfield Green Belt. Blackmore does not have infrastructure to cope with additional housing, its lanes are too narrow for increasing traffic, flooding issue will be increased if more buildings are built.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list and consider other sites.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25574 - 8559 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25576 Object**Respondent: Mr Gerald Mountstevens [4911]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No consideration when taking into account the development at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane. No strategy for north of the Borough. The illegal caravan site beyond Sprigg Lane appears to get bigger. All of this will put traffic flow within and through the village unsustainable. Blackmore's limited service cannot cope. Area is prone to flooding. Unclear if available brownfield sites in Blackmore has been considered first. No Housing Need Survey has been conducted.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list and consider other sites.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25576 - 4911 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25578 Object**Respondent: Mr John Richardson [4858]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC have pasted houses onto a Green Belt area around Blackmore to achieve that LDP targets and failed to consider the effects on the community and infrastructure. Additional housing around Blackmore not considered (32 new homes). Has BBC discussed local development with neighbouring councils? The effect on local Highways by additional housing.

Blackmore village has a vibrant centre that has congestion due visitors to this with parking on pavements, parking on double yellow lines. Also no designated disabled parking spaces. No enforcement. This will be exacerbated by new homes. BBC say the developers have undertaken a flood survey for their land, what about adjacent land with the history of flooding. The school and GP are full, with long GP waiting list which will be exacerbated. Monies collected for infrastructure will be spent elsewhere. Parish Cllrs were not allowed to debate this in the full council meeting on 08 Nov 2018, this is undemocratic. Travellers site in Chelmsford Road was deemed illegal but now LDP making it legal but on what grounds? Previous development proposals there failed due to insufficient sewerage capacity, how will this be addressed. It is apparent that the Blackmore area is the "dumping ground" to make up the numbers and imposing a housing mix without carrying out a housing need survey.

Change To Plan: Please refer to 'BVHA neighbourhood plan'.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25578 - 4858 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25580 Object**Respondent: Mr Neil Ratcliff [8561]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. Infrastructure does not support this. Doctors surgery all ready over booked.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26. Doctors surgery all ready over booked.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25580 - 8561 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25582 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Ryan [4937]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. Flooding is an issue and areas of proposed sites are prone to flooding, will increase with new homes; Infrastructure not sufficient parking, schools, doctors how will be combatted? BBC not considered other sites being developed; Access via Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for that volume of traffic; no clear and cohesive strategy for north villages in borough; Need to justify why ignored alternatives. Each element of the decision seems flawed with no firm and valid justification, Opposing arguments and not countered with just responses.

Please refer to 'BVHA neighbourhood plan'. I support BVHA representation.

Change To Plan: Please refer to 'BVHA neighbourhood plan'. I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25582 - 4937 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25587 Object

Respondent: Mr Simon Richardson [8562]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound.

- a) There is no proof that Blackmore needs this number of houses
- b) There has been no discussion with the villagers.
- c) No cooperation with any local neighbouring authorities. 30 houses have just been built outside the village in EFDC area that will impact on the village. 8 houses recently built at what was Nine Ashes Farm again in EFDC area.
- d) The LDP does not comply with NPPF Guidance:
 - No protection of Green Belt
 - Development is not located to minimize travel
 - Local community not consulted
 - There is no proven local need
 - There has been no Flood Risk Assessment
 - The location does not 'minimize travel' as required

Change To Plan: All of the above points should be reassessed with local involvement.
Local housing need to be assessed.
The size of the local school needs to be considered
The Doctors surgery is already oversubscribed and consideration needs to be given on to how address this.
Flooding is an issue and needs greater consideration. The Woollard Way field (R25) is often flooded.
Not an issue as a field but this surface water will need to go somewhere if the field is concreted over. (as a local villager my Father used this field and its ponds to water his horses).
Any development of this size needs to be located nearer to good transport links.
Small brownfield developments need to be considered.
Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25587 - 8562 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25593 Object

Respondent: Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policies: R25; R26; SP02; SP02; NE06; NE13

This will put intolerable pressure on GP services the local surgery fails to me demand. Blackmore is a small community based around a small number of roads that are not designed to meet the inevitable increase in traffic due to a wholly inadequate public transport service. It is the level and scale of this development that is excessive and inappropriate.

Change To Plan: A significant reduction in the scale and number of houses to be built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25593 - 8563 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25595 Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Rogers [8564]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 09 R25 and R26. Blackmore village is far too small for another 70 plus houses, the infrastructure of the roads with more traffic, coming to and fro. The local primary school could possibly not cope with the amount of families coming in. Deal Tree Health Centre is busy as it is, let alone with more houses.

Change To Plan: Refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan. I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25595 - 8564 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25600 Object

Respondent: Mr Matthew Romang [8565]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 04; 08 - green belt flooding; 09 - R25 and R26

The strategy for rural villages like Blackmore isn't clear in the document, . Red Rose lane is unsuitable for an increase in traffic flow, due to the access onto/off of the road; the proposed sites are areas known for flooding and development will also increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore; the principle of the red rose lane development is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with limited infrastructure and poor public transport, which would struggle more.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25600 - 8565 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25606 Object

Respondent: Mr David Rolfs [8566]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC have pasted houses onto a Green Belt area around Blackmore to achieve that LDP targets and failed to consider the effects on the community and infrastructure.

Additional housing around Blackmore not considered (32 new homes). Has BBC discussed local development with neighbouring councils?

The effect on local Highways by additional housing.

Blackmore village has a vibrant centre that has congestion due visitors to this with parking on pavements, parking on double yellow lines. Also no designated disabled parking spaces. No enforcement. This will be exacerbated by new homes. BBC say the developers have undertaken a flood survey for their land, what about adjacent land with the history of flooding. The school and GP are full, with long GP waiting list which will be exacerbated. Monies collected for infrastructure will be spent elsewhere.

Parish Cllrs were not allowed to debate this in the full council meeting on 08 Nov 2018, this is undemocratic. Travellers site in Chelmsford Road was deemed illegal but now LDP making it legal but on what grounds? Previous development proposals there failed due to insufficient sewerage capacity, how will this be addressed. It is apparent that the Blackmore area is the "dumping ground" to make up the numbers and imposing a housing mix without carrying out a housing need survey.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25606 - 8566 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25612 Object

Respondent: Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Insufficient consultation with neighbouring boroughs; red Rose Lane is not suitable for access; Severe flooding in village will get worse and sewage pumping station cant cope; No housing need survey; Already problems with cars - congestion, parking, poor bus service,; destroy wildlife and habitat; green belt should be protected; primary school is full; no clear housing strategy to consider other sites than R25 and R26.

Change To Plan: As there seems to be considerable doubt that all aspects of the planning process have been adhered to R26 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Leave Blackmore in the Green Belt and restore its classification as a Rural Village in a setting with non f the amenities enjoyed by areas such as Mountnessing and Ingrave i.e. a through road., regular buses over an extended time frame, a doctors surgery that can be reached on foot. BBC should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out local housing need for our already sustainable community.

Please note that this was a very difficult form to fill in as many on us have limited knowledge of the planning process!

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25612 - 8567 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25614 Object

Respondent: Mrs Maureen Murrell [8560]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Other brown field sites around Brentwood are more suitable. Green Belt in Blackmore should not be built on. Too much traffic making it difficult to walk in the village. Doctors cannot take any more patients.

Change To Plan: Roads have to be widened, drainage updated, school enlarged.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25614 - 8560 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25617 Object**Respondent: Mr Brian Marchant [8569]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Other brownfield sites suitable and available not fully investigated, village life not considered, school not considered, access road not considered, no cooperation from the Council. Blackmore is being picked on, let's have more sensible options from Council's leader.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25617 - 8569 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25624 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is deficient in respect of Blackmore Village and unsound on all 4 tests. In particular:

1. There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough.
2. BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council, over the houses being constructed and/or planes, close to Blackmore Village.
3. The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. (The school is full, the doctors surgery in Doddingtonhurst is already over-subscribed, inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc).
4. There are more suitable and/or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions or Brentwood, (Eg Honeypot Lane) and the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.
5. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Green Field/Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane.
6. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.
7. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore Village is included in the LDP.
8. The access off/from Red Rode Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements.
9. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.
10. Both fields (R25 and R26) are teaming with wildlife - hundreds of birds nest in the hedgerows within and around the fields. We have photographic evidence (stills and videos) of certain protected species (bats, barn owls, great crested newts).

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26 Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached Blackmore Village Survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25624 - 4874 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25631 Object**Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are greenfield sites available (for example adjoining existing urban areas) in preferable and more sustainable locations.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25631 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25633 Object**Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsustainable developments because of inadequate access and narrowness of Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25633 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25635 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsustainable developments because loss of "very good" agricultural land, of loss of biodiversity.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25635 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25638 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsupported by relevant and up to date evidence base. Evidence regarding flooding shows the sites to be unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25638 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25639 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsustainable developments because they don't fulfil the three sustainability objectives: economic, social or environmental. There is only limed employment in Blackmore so benefits would be limited and short term. Service are limited in the Village and children are being sent elsewhere for education. There is a reliance on the car, the sites are at risk of flooding, require the release of high grade agricultural land in the Green Belt. The access road is narrow and infrastructure works would harm the character of the area and loss of historic hedges and habitat. Other more sustainable locations should be allocated in preference - refer to SA. Nos: 038A,253, 277B, 297, 218B 053B, 189, 318, 288B, 153, 280, 024A and 130.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25639 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25641 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsustainable developments because it will result in disproportionate increase in the housing stock

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25641 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25648 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Infrastructure and facilities within the village are already at capacity. (Shop, primary school, two village halls, a sports and social club, tennis courts, football and cricket pitches, a flood-lit Multi-Use Games Arena. Three pubs, Anglian Church, Baptist Church). There is a very limited bus service and s thus remote. It is over 6 miles to Brentwood and so residents are reliant on the car. There is social harm from some children being shipped out to other schools. There is only limited employment.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25648 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25651 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: The Parish Council and BVHA also take issue with the proposed allocation of Blackmore as a Category 3 settlement within the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (see pages 21-25 of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan). Therefore the Local Plan, with proposed allocations R25 and R26 and the allocation of Blackmore as a "larger village", is unsound in that it has not been positively prepared, is not justified, is not effective nor consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019 edition)(the NPPF).

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25651 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25653 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are in the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances justifying their removal from the Green Belt. There is no evidence to demonstrate that all other reasonable alternatives have been explored - those alternatives including increasing densities or brownfield land and land in more urban/sustainable locations. The removal of sites R25 and R26 from the Green Belt is contrary to both local and national planning policies.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Represent many residents in Blackmore and surrounding area against inclusion of R25 and R26 in the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25653 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25654 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are in the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances justifying their removal from the Green Belt. There is no evidence to demonstrate that all other reasonable alternatives have been explored - those alternatives including increasing densities or brownfield land and land in more urban/sustainable locations. The removal of sites R25 and R26 from the Green Belt is contrary to both local and national planning policies.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25654 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25655 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Development on R25 and R26 has historically been discounted, most recently as 2016. There is no change in local circumstances justifying development on sites R25 and R26 now.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25655 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25657 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: The restricted access that Redrose Lane affords is inconsistent with Brentwood Borough Council's removal of Honey Pot Lane from the LDP on grounds of restricted access. At the Extraordinary Brentwood Council Meeting of 8th November a site known as Honeypot Lane, included in the Plan since inception, was withdrawn. This allocation, designed to include social and low-cost housing within 500m of the Town Centre, was removed due the narrowness of a small section of the road access that created a 'pinch-point', despite being bordered by open land providing opportunity for road widening. Unlike the continuously narrow and unpaved Redrose Lane, Honeypot Lane enjoys a double-width carriageway for all but a short section and is split between 20mph and 30mphs limits. Redrose Lane, where the national speed limit applies, is posted with weight restriction warning; whereas Honeypot Lane is not.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified **Duty to Co-operate?:** Not Specified **Sound?:**No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** Yes

Full Reference: O - 25657 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25659 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: There is no evidence of a need for housing in the village of Blackmore. If there is a need then it has not been quantified by reference to number of type/size of property. The proposed allocation accounts for a disproportionately large amount of development in "larger villages" within the Borough (i.e. >50% of the proposed Green Belt release in larger villages comes from Blackmore alone).

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified **Duty to Co-operate?:** Not Specified **Sound?:**No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** Yes

Full Reference: O - 25659 - 1921 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25664 Object

Respondent: Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: 70 homes could end up with 280 people (4 people per household) plus at least 200 cars (or more). Infrastructure will not be able to cope with this amount. Schools, hospitals, doctors, traffic and litter and at the end of the day we have lost our Green Belt. Blackmore will end up the same as Billericay, a sprawl of estates.

Change To Plan: Please refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25664 - 8597 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25668 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Newcombe [8598] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The history of Blackmore many years ago was known as the black swamp and was a very wet area. This is why it is not a large village due to flood risk. Most of the land is given over to Green Belt because of this reason. There are many brown sites which could be used without flood risk.

Change To Plan: Please refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** i, ii, iii, iv **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25668 - 8598 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25673 Object

Respondent: Miss Charlotte Newton [8599]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no discussions with the village regarding proposed development.
Should find out what needs improving before adding houses to the village.
Plenty of places elsewhere that need new housing.
Property in the village is not affordable but that's what makes it a lovely place to live.
Adding more houses has a negative effect on local/government services (e.g. schools, doctors, hospitals, teachers etc).
Would more building work be needed at the school to accommodate growth.
The village has small narrow roads not equipped for builders/machinery.
There is an issue with parking around the village especially during school term.

Change To Plan: Sites that need removing from the LDP as follows: R26 and R25.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25673 - 8599 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25677 Object

Respondent: Mrs Tina Newton [8600]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There was no consultation with the village on selecting these sites.
Councillors had not read the document outlining the villagers concerns.
Would put pressure on the flood plain, sewage, schools, doctors, traffic and environment.
Parking is already an issue, the Coop, tea rooms, two public houses and day trippers.
It's hard to get a doctors appointment now, you have to go to a walk in centre in Harold Wood.
Local school will not be able to cope.
The roads around the village are not made to carry so much traffic, the cyclist that visit daily hold the traffic up now.

Change To Plan: Stondon Massey want more housing so what was their plan rejected?

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25677 - 8600 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25679 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Newton [8601]

Agent: N/A

Summary: How and where in the said plan are the numbers to back up the facts on school numbers, doctors appointments delayed times.
No proof of need for planned houses.
No consultation with the residents of Blackmore of the needs of the villagers.
Proposals in addition to new houses being built up Fingrith Hall Road will add to parking issues at teamrooms and Co-Op.
The drain/sewer system is at breaking point and struggles when we get heavy rain adding another load of houses onto this is a plan that is doomed to fail.

Change To Plan: If the need for more housing is proven then why has Stondon Massey not been looked at? This it would appear is a village that will be happy to have new houses built.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25679 - 8601 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25681 Object

Respondent: Mrs Joan Marchant [8602]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Land is liable to flooding and increases severe flooding to Blackmore. More suitable locations in Brentwood and elsewhere. There is too much traffic in this area, roads are not suitable, doctors and schools are full, parking is awful. Village life and character not considered.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 to be removed from the Plan. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25681 - 8602 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25683 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lesley Moss [7053]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure in the village will be threatened. Flooding problem will be a real threat when the field at Woollard way is cemented over. Schools and doctors are full. Parking problems make it dangerous to cross the roads. We are threatened with buses discontinuing. There are other suitable sites, why pick on us?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25683 - 7053 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25686 Object**Respondent: Mr and Mrs Brian and Lesley Moss [2905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Plan is unfair and unsound. Infrastructure is unable to cope, doctors and schools are full. Library was closed. No guarantee that the bus service will still be in place next year. Wifi cannot cope. 30 houses are being built on our border. Village regularly floods.

Change To Plan: Keep Blackmore a village, not a new town.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25686 - 2905 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25687 Object**Respondent: Mr Barry Monery [8004]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: When I bought my property the searches showed that the land could not be built on, that's why I bought my property. This site is in Green Belt which must not be built on.

Change To Plan: The Council have a duty of care for our village for future generations.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25687 - 8004 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25689 Object**Respondent: Miss Jean Monery [8007]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to local authority overturning Green Belt regulation. Blackmore is in Green Belt and legally should not be built on.

Change To Plan: Move the planning of houses to areas that needs more people/families.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25689 - 8007 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25691 Object**Respondent: Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council have not consulted adequately with the neighbouring authorities. The Plan did not consider the impact of development on the village, which has small roads, inadequate parking, limited services; the school is full, doctors surgery is full, buses do not run regularly. There is just no infrastructure. Flooding is an issue. No strategy outlined for the village. We have no police in the area to make sure the increased population abide the law. Emergency service will find it hard to reach rural areas. Site is in Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Look for more suitable, available sites in Brentwood instead of using Green Belt. Refer to BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25691 - 4848 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25698 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Morgan [4987]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with Duty to Cooperate. Blackmore does not have infrastructure and resource to accommodate the additional population. Parking is a massive problem, too many people park and turn at Jericho Place. Schools are full, parents have to pay for bus service or drive children to out of town schools. Doctors are full. No police or youth organisation. The nearest supermarket is far away. Development will change village character and way of life.

Change To Plan: Look for other sites in Brentwood that are suitable and have infrastructure. Refer to Blackmore BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25698 - 4987 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25700 Object

Respondent: Mr & Mrs John & Linda Hornett [8604]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The additional 400 people and 200 cars is like a brand new village/community. The surrounding roads are dark country lanes, lighting them and installing mini roundabouts will ruin this ancient village. There are houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane. There is no plans for medical or school facilities for an already packed village.

Change To Plan: You cant make a road bigger to accommodate extra houses unless you demolish existing homes so the Local Plan would never won.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25700 - 8604 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25702 Object

Respondent: Mr Alan Moody [1825]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The detrimental effect of extra 70 houses in Blackmore has not been adequately evaluated. Local roads are too narrow and congested. Schools and doctors are full. The effect of houses being built on Fingrith Hall Lane in Epping Forest has not been taken into account. Plan is non NPPF compliant in regards to Green Belt and preserving historic towns.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26 from the Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25702 - 1825 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25704 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Miers [3959]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the Villages. No account has been taken of the c.30 dwellings at Fingrith Hall Lane nor severe impact on the endangered species seen on site. Blackmore is an isolated village within the Green Belt, with very poor local services: no library, very poor bus service, congested lanes, severe parking problems, schools and doctors are at capacity, inadequate provision for waste water removal. BBC has not shown that housing needs can be accommodated by other brownfield sites or by increasing housing density on other sites. No Housing needs survey has been undertaken.

Change To Plan: Brownfield sites must be explored within BBC, to preserve our Greenfield/Green Belt areas. This will take pressure from small village lanes, ensuring any developments should be adjacent to main transport artery.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25704 - 3959 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25706 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Mass [8605]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Coucil shows no clear strategy for the villages, fails to consult with neighbouring authorities. No housing need survey has been undertaken. There are more suitable sustainable sites. Blackmore does not have adequate infrastructure. Site is on Redrose Lane which has inadequate access and is unable to accommodate additional traffic. Parking is at capacity. The village has a flood risk.

Change To Plan: Increase density on other sites.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25706 - 8605 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25708 Object

Respondent: Mass and Co (Mr John Mass) [3669]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Coucil shows no clear strategy for the villages, fails to consult with neighbouring authorities. No housing need survey has been undertaken. There are more suitable sustainable sites. Blackmore does not have adequate infrastructure. Site is on Redrose Lane which has inadequate access and is unable to accommodate additional traffic. Parking is at capacity. The village has a flood risk.

Change To Plan: Increase density on other sites.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25708 - 3669 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25714 Object**Respondent: Mrs Caroline Parkin [8606]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local school is full, and this goes for other local services. Have Epping Forest Council been consulted? The impact of development on the village way of life will be huge and will change what we love about the area.

Change To Plan: Infrastructure of the village needs better consideration. Consult with neighbouring Councils.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25714 - 8606 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25716 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jill Pritchard [4269]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1-Other development from neighbouring Council have not been considered. 2-Existing infrastructure cannot cope with additional people and cars, i.e. the doctors surgery, school, parking. 3-The areas in the Plan, i.e. Redrose Lane is susceptible to flooding. 4-Redrose Lane is very narrow and unsuitable for heavy goods vehicle. 5-Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available which should take priority over Green Belt greenfield land off Redrose lane.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA aims and objectives and their Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25716 - 4269 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25718 Object**Respondent: Miss Lisa Philips [8607]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Overburden of existing services e.g. GP. Local bus services insufficient to support larger community. Building on Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25718 - 8607 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25720 Object**Respondent: Mr Hylton Palmer [8154]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound due to: a. Green Belt/ Brownfield consideration b. wildlife c. infrastructure d. local school at capacity e. GP at capacity f. Doddinghurst shopping centre car park at capacity g. inadequate public transport h. inadequate room to access from Redrose Lane i. flooding issues j. water and sewage at capacity

Change To Plan: More investigation required into Brownfields. Remove R25 & R26 from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25720 - 8154 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25722 Object**Respondent: Mrs. June Palmer [3739]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound due to: a. Green Belt/ Brownfield consideration b. wildlife c. infrastructure d. local school at capacity e. GP at capacity f. Doddinghurst shopping centre car park at capacity g. inadequate public transport h. inadequate room to access from Redrose Lane i. flooding issues j. water and sewage at capacity.

Change To Plan: More investigation required into Brownfields. Remove R25 & R26 from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25722 - 3739 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25724 Object**Respondent: Mrs Julie Pounds [8608]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Little consideration was given to rural villages. The effect on infrastructure and the capacity to serve new houses has not been properly considered. If infrastructure is enlarged it will completely change the characteristic of the village and way of life for residents and Blackmore will lose its heritage. There has not been sufficient consultation with residents, and there must be more suitable locations available.

Change To Plan: Confine all new housing development to the edge of Brentwood town as it has better infrastructure, facilities and it would not be adversely affected by changing the whole characteristics and way of life for its residents.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25724 - 8608 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25726 Object

Respondent: Mr Darryl Pounds [8609]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Little consideration was given to rural villages. The effect on infrastructure and the capacity to serve new houses has not been properly considered. If infrastructure is enlarged it will completely change the characteristic of the village and way of life for residents and Blackmore will lose its heritage. There has not been sufficient consultation with residents, and there must be more suitable locations available.

Change To Plan: Confine all new housing development to the edge of Brentwood town as it has better infrastructure, facilities and it would not be adversely affected by changing the whole characteristics and way of life for its residents.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25726 - 8609 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25728 Object

Respondent: Mrs Irene Power [8610]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Doctors surgery already full. Narrow country lane, unsuitable for more cars. Redrose Lane too narrow to access, also flooding.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA Village Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25728 - 8610 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25731 Object

Respondent: Mr Terence Power [8611]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Doctors surgery already full. Narrow country lane, unsuitable for more cars. Redrose Lane too narrow to access, also flooding.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA Village Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25731 - 8611 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25732 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beth Pardoe [8613]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound. No mention of extending the local school and GP which are both at capacity. Parking is becoming increasingly difficult with many people resorting to parking on pavement. Cumulative impacts from development at Fingrith Hall Lane. Redrose Lane is wholly unsuitable: it's liable to flood, too narrow for vehicular access, it's popular to walkers but it has no pavement. There are more suitable sites but Brenwood Council seems to have ignored completely. Development would have far reaching negative and harmful impacts on the village overall.

Change To Plan: R25& R26 to be removed. Refer to BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25732 - 8613 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25734 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janet Pincombe [8614]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is liable to flood, access to Red Rose Lane is not suitable per the volume of traffic which will be using it daily. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that required housing could not be built on Brown field site. The infrastructure of the village is not suitable for a large scale development such as this i.e. school, doctor, car parking, shop.

Change To Plan: Brownfield sites should be investigated before building on greenfield sites.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25734 - 8614 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25736 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Poulton [8119]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site is liable to flooding and impact on flood risk areas in the village. Brownfield site available in the borough has not been utilised. Nearby development in other local authorities not considered, which would have an impact on already stretched services and infrastructure. Red Rose Lane is narrow and unsafe for increased access caused by development. No local consultation to consider local needs.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local needs as submitted in the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25736 - 8119 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25738 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Poulton [8149]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Greenfield Green Belt being prioritised whilst brownfield site available in the borough has not been utilised. Site is liable to flooding and impact on flood risk areas in the village. Nearby development in other local authorities not considered, which would have an impact on already stretched services and infrastructure. Red Rose Lane is narrow and unsafe for increased access caused by development. No local consultation to consider local needs. Lack of consultation with neighbouring authorities to consider developments nearby.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local needs as submitted in the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25738 - 8149 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25740 Object

Respondent: Ms Judith Phillips [8615]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound. Green Belt land. Narrow lanes unsuitable for traffic levels. Red Rose Lane is mainly used by villagers for pleasant country walks or bike rides. Village only small cannot take this level of housing without materially changing the character of village. Traffic already too much, parking difficult, doctor cannot cope now.

Change To Plan: BVHA Village Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25740 - 8615 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25742 Object

Respondent: Mr Douglas Piper [603]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound. This is Green Belt land. Local amenities already overstretched, doctors and schools are at capacity. This is too large an increase for a village this size.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25742 - 603 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25745 Object

Respondent: Lloyd Piper [8616]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound. Local amenities cannot cope with such increase in number, it will change the dynamics and atmosphere of the village life for the worse. Red Rose Lane is too narrow for access and floods every year. These are 2 green field sites, there are other alternatives. Stondon Massey has a brownfield site it wishes to develop. This is just Brentwood Council taking easy option as they have been approached by 2 developers.

Change To Plan: Support BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25745 - 8616 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25747 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kay Parkinson [4599]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Lack of consultation with Epping Council regarding 30 new houses on Fingrith Hall lane which will have major impacts on Blackmore's local facilities, utilities and traffic. Red Rose Lane is narrow and unsuitable to be a main access to new properties. This will exacerbate flooding. An increase of 70 properties (30% of the village's size) without counting the 30+ properties in Fingrith Hall Lane would put pressure on sewage, water and electricity. There are many alternatives options but no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. No 'Housing Needs' survey has been carried out.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25747 - 4599 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25749 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kay Parkinson [4599]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The required houses could be delivered by increasing the density on other sites. However, the Council didn't demonstrated so. No evidence that the brownfield sites were prioritised before Green Belt. This 30% increase in Blackmore would severely affect this historic village, its facilities and utilities. The retail, medical, school, road and transport facilities barely meet the village's requirements. Its roads and lanes are narrow and don't have footpaths, additional traffic would create danger to pedestrians, and aggravate parking problems. A far better proposal would be locations that have transport infrastructure and links, e.g. Doddinghurst, Brentwood, Dunton Hills. Wildlife wasn't considered.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25749 - 4599 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25753 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Parkinson [8617]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The required houses could be delivered by increasing the density on other sites. However, the Council didn't demonstrated so. No evidence that the brownfield sites were prioritised before Green Belt. This 30% increase in Blackmore would severely affect this historic village, its facilities and utilities. The retail, medical, school, road and transport facilities barely meet the village's requirements. Its roads and lanes are narrow and don't have footpaths, additional traffic would create danger to pedestrians, and aggravate parking problems. A far better proposal would be locations that have transport infrastructure and links, e.g. Doddinghurst, Brentwood, Dunton Hills. Wildlife wasn't considered.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25753 - 8617 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25756 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Parkinson [8617]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of consultation with Epping Council regarding 30 new houses on Fingrith Hall lane which will have major impacts on Blackmore's local facilities, utilities and traffic. Red Rose Lane is narrow and unsuitable to be a main access to new properties. This will exacerbate flooding. An increase of 70 properties (30% of the village's size) without counting the 30+ properties in Fingrith Hall Lane would put pressure on sewage, water and electricity. There are many alternatives options but no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. No 'Housing Needs' survey has been carried out.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25756 - 8617 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25757 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Pegram [8618]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We have had development neighbouring our village which has caused more traffic, Red Rose Lane cannot safely take any increase in traffic. Doctors is full, school oversubscribed and parking restricted on country lanes. Brownfield should take priority over Green Belt. Red Rose Lane and other roads are already high flood risk area. The Borough should consider brownfield sites more suitable for development.

Change To Plan: Blackmore village should be removed from the list of proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25757 - 8618 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25759 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Parkin [8619]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound for the following reasons: - Local school already oversubscribed. - Not consulting other authorities on their plan, huge effect on village life.

Change To Plan: Consultation of other Councils. Other considerations of land - brownfield.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25759 - 8619 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25761 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Pritchard [8620]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Other buildings not considered. 2. Extra traffic, making roads more dangerous, also adding to roads parking, and making cycling more dangerous. 3. Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding and not suitable for lorries. 4. I believe that more suitable sites in Brentwood.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25761 - 8620 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25763 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Pallet [1313]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound. No positive infrastructure. Additional housing to levels suggested (which will probably be exceeded) will cause adverse strain on: doctors, schools, the only shop-parking, roads, drainage, wildlife.

Change To Plan: Need to have clearer strategy for the North of the Borough. Epping Forest should be liaised with. the Council should demonstrate why more suitable brownfield sites which could have been used were ignored, and why they are considering Green Belt whilst originally they said they would not. Liaise with local groups to build moderate number of homes.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25763 - 1313 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25765 Object**Respondent: Mr Vessenin Paounov [8621]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a beautiful village, it is sustainable as it is with a sense of community and Green Belt land should not be built on.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA's objectives.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25765 - 8621 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25767 Object**Respondent: Mr David Pegram [8622]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not taken into account the 30 houses being built on Fingrith Hall Lane. There are many sites more suitable for development and would not affect day to day living of their neighbour. 70 houses would affect parking, traffic and flood risk issues in the village. Why cant BBC spread the number to Doddinghurst, Kelvedon Hatch, Blackmore, Hutton, Shenfield, Ingrave, South Weald. BBC has taken the easy option. See flooding photo attached.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from proposal list.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25767 - 8622 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25769 Object**Respondent: Ms Paula Pegram [8625]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Risk of flooding, recent mitigation work at the Green only pushed the problem to the bank of Blackmore Mead to burst causing flood at Red Rose Lane. See enclosed photo. Development will make it worse. The nearby development on Nine Ashes, Highwood, Fingrith Hall Lane caused more traffic. Doctor surgery is full, local school oversubscribe and will need extension into Green Belt. Brownfield should be prioritised over Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from proposal list.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25769 - 8625 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25771 Object**Respondent: Mr James Pegram [8626]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is inadequate for the level of traffic new development would bring, other nearby development already increased traffic. There are many suitable brownfield sites. We are a small village with restricted parking. Doctors surgery full, school oversubscribed. Green Belt should be protected and village preserve. Development will put many homes at risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from proposed development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25771 - 8626 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25773 Object

Respondent: Mrs Tracy Goddard-King [8627]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No housing strategy for Blackmore, no clear housing needs analysis of the area. No proper infrastructure analysis to suggest that the proposed development would not have adverse impacts on the local areas in terms of flooding, traffic, flood, school, doctor, crime, police arrangement. No evidence of exploring other options.

Change To Plan: R25 & 26 to be removed from the Plan. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25773 - 8627 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25775 Object

Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Development on Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan. Green Belt sites should only be developed when all other brownfield sites are considered and rejected or considered and developed.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25775 - 4779 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25777 Object

Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan fails to take into account of development impacts on village in terms of amenities including roads.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25777 - 4779 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25779 Object

Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan fails to take into account of development impacts on village in terms of amenities including schools.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs for our community which is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25779 - 4779 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25781 Object

Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan fails to take into account of development impacts on village in terms of amenities including medical facilities.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs for our community which is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25781 - 4779 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25783 Object

Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan fails to take account of the already busy roads running through the village and the impacts on wildlife and inhabitants.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs for our community which is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25783 - 4779 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25785 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Harris [8628]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not good use of Green Belt. Strain on electric supply, water supply, doctors, drainage. Wild life. Flooding. Road access. More cars on the roads. School too small.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult BVHA local policy.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25785 - 8628 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25791 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Agree with points raised by BVHA - lack of school places, lack of parking, poor bus service, GP full, Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy vehicles and is narrow, dangerous for children to walk to school.

The form is complicated and full of legal jargon. Not clear even after visit to council offices. BVHA helping to portray view of myself and others. The borough set the building limits for Blackmore in the 1960s, considered infrastructure and Green Belt. Since then gas has been supplied and water pressure improved. We still have power cuts. The council set the village boundary and infrastructure right in the 1960s and has helped to preserve this wonderful village. There is no justification for the need to build on Green Belt land adjoining Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25791 - 8010 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25805 Object

Respondent: Mr Neil O'Riordan [8630]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No infrastructure ie: schools, doctors, dentists, transport

Change To Plan: "?"

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25805 - 8630 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25806 Object

Respondent: Mrs Mandy Hamilton [8633]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plots are frequently flooded and the houses adjacent to the field. The roads on Nine Ashes road near junction with Red Rose Lane are very busy around school time so development will only make this worse. There are rarely sufficient parking spaces which will only be made worse with the new development. The local primary school has already been refusing children who live in the parish and appears to be at full capacity. BBC does not appear to have taken into account the building within the Epping district which borders Blackmore which will have a further detrimental effect.

Change To Plan: Since this LOP was published representatives of Stondon Massey have actively sought development on a site they have highlighted in order to sustain their village. This clearly seems like an obvious solution. Just because this news has come to light after the latest LOP has been published, it should be urgently considered. BBC has not sufficiently demonstrated that other brown field sites are not available. These should have been the primary focus of any building.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25806 - 8633 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25808 Object

Respondent: Miss Lois Hamilton [8632]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plots are frequently flooded and the houses adjacent to the field. The roads on Nine Ashes road near junction with Red Rose Lane are very busy around school time so development will only make this worse. There are rarely sufficient parking spaces which will only be made worse with the new development. The local primary school has already been refusing children who live in the parish and appears to be at full capacity. BBC does not appear to have taken into account the building within the Epping district which borders Blackmore which will have a further detrimental effect.

Change To Plan: Since this LOP was published representatives of Stondon Massey have actively sought development on a site they have highlighted in order to sustain their village. This clearly seems like an obvious solution. Just because this news has come to light after the latest LOP has been published, it should be urgently considered. BBC has not sufficiently demonstrated that other brown field sites are not available. These should have been the primary focus of any building.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25808 - 8632 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25810 Object

Respondent: Mr Max Hamilton [8631]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plots are frequently flooded and the houses adjacent to the field. The roads on Nine Ashes road near junction with Red Rose Lane are very busy around school time so development will only make this worse. There are rarely sufficient parking spaces which will only be made worse with the new development. The local primary school has already been refusing children who live in the parish and appears to be at full capacity. BBC does not appear to have taken into account the building within the Epping district which borders Blackmore which will have a further detrimental effect.

Change To Plan: Since this LOP was published representatives of Stondon Massey have actively sought development on a site they have highlighted in order to sustain their village. This clearly seems like an obvious solution. Just because this news has come to light after the latest LOP has been published, it should be urgently considered. BBC has not sufficiently demonstrated that other brown field sites are not available. These should have been the primary focus of any building.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25810 - 8631 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25812 Object

Respondent: Fairview New Homes Ltd (Ms Faye Wilders) [8365]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Parking is a nightmare, school is full, GP is at capacity, post office has closed. Should show there are other suitable areas for these building works can take place. I believe it will drop house prices on all property in Blackmore which is unfair to residents already having property. I give my full support for BVHA to voice my views

Change To Plan: Should show there are other suitable areas for these building works can take place. I believe it will drop house prices on all property in Blackmore which is unfair to residents already having property. I give my full support for BVHA to voice my views

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25812 - 8365 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25814 Object

Respondent: Mr Graham Hesketh [8634]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This plan does not meet areas objectively assessed. It is not informed by agreements with other authorities - Chelmsford and Epping - residents from these developments will utilize facilities in Blackmore which when added to the proposed 70 new dwellings will cause congestion, environmental concerns as well as sustainability to the surroundings. There will be a possibility of a near 100% doubling of capacity within the area. The sites proposed at Orchard Piece and Redrose Lane are greenbelt sites with quality arable land. The local plan is not justified as an appropriate strategy as all other reasonable alternatives have not been taken into account. There are other Brownfield sites available which should be taking priority over the Greenfield and Greenbelt land in Blackmore. There is no clear strategy for the villages especially those in the north of the borough. No housing survey has been undertaken to support the proposals. It would appear that none of the evidence presented to the BBC on the unsuitable nature of the proposed sites has been taken into consideration such as the flooding and poor access to the sites from Redrose Lane. This development would appear to be a direct contradiction of the LDP - specifically policies related to climate change and sustainable transport.

Change To Plan: More needs to be addressed as to how the heritage and character of the village of Blackmore can be protected in order to meet the housing solutions for local needs. Proposals already put forward and referred to in this document such as Red Rose Farm and Spicers Lane must be investigated thoroughly as these are already Brownfield sites and so development should take place on them before Greenbelt ones considered. Reference has been made to good arable land that will be built on. This should be investigated further. Houses that are likely to be built by developers will no doubt be extremely expensive as they play the numbers game in order to make us much profit as possible before going on to their next project leaving the community to pick up the pieces. This means it is imperative for a Housing Needs Survey to be done so as to address the local needs of the village. This development of 70 or more houses will have a significant environment impact on a village and not enough has been done to investigate these effects on this village, especially flooding. Not only is there a problem with the environment but the impact on local services such as doctors (already overstretched), school (oversubscribed) and roads (narrow and dangerous with greater traffic) needs to be investigated in a thorough context. Information sent to the council previously regarding the impact of such developments should be revisited. What has changed? One has to feel from reading reports and getting version of events at what happened at the EGM to pass the LDP that the discussion on this developmental area had already been decided with only 15 minutes discussion allocated to such a monumental decision about Blackmore. As the area concerned has one independent councillor who is not a member of the ruling party were his views discarded? Yet the site at Honeypot Lane which is a more accessible site and can accommodate 200 houses was at the last moment decided to be inadequate by the ruling party so necessitating the need for the inclusion of the Greenbelt fields in Blackmore. This needs to be investigated fully. Brentwood Borough Council have made it reasonable difficult for residents in this area to reply to the LDP as they only take responses on line or you have to download the forms in order to respond. This makes it difficult in a village where internet access is not great, many are elderly and not PC literate. Thus many residents will not have a chance to air their views. It could be a majority of the people are put off giving their views because of the complex nature in which BBC have made this process of review.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25814 - 8634 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25816 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25816 - 4693 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25825 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.)and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25825 - 8136 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25836 Object

Respondent: Lisa Houston [8636]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear "strategy" for the Villages in the North of the Borough. More suitable and sustainable locations. The locations in Blackmore do not promote Sustainable development considering the limited facilities available. BBC fails to demonstrate there are other brownfield sites available. Inadequate services available: school places, GP surgeries, lack of public transport. Proposed sites in Blackmore are all liable to flooding. There has been no "Housing Needs Survey". BBC have failed to consider the impact on Blackmore of the 30 dwellings proposed off Fingrith Hall Lane, with the BBC failing to consult EFDC.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the Village. School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood this increasing pollution in the area. The single Doctors surgery which supports 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for an appointment at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required. Current transport links for the village would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the aging population.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25836 - 8636 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25845 Object

Respondent: Mr John Hughes [4500]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. However, all amenities and services are already stretched - utilities, the local primary school is already full, Bus services are limited, insufficient parking in the village, the doctors surgery is at capacity. A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore. The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed. Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25845 - 4500 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25852 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. However, all amenities and services are already stretched - utilities, the local primary school is already full, Bus services are limited, insufficient parking in the village, the doctors surgery is at capacity. A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore. The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed. Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25852 - 8637 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25859 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. However, all amenities and services are already stretched - utilities, the local primary school is already full, Bus services are limited, insufficient parking in the village, the doctors surgery is at capacity. A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore. The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed. Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25859 - 8638 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25866 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Hughes [8639]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. However, all amenities and services are already stretched - utilities, the local primary school is already full, Bus services are limited, insufficient parking in the village, the doctors surgery is at capacity. A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore. The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed. Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25866 - 8639 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25871 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sara Harris [8122]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village not a town, cannot cope with extra traffic. School is too small, doctors' appointment is hard to get. Green Belt land must not be built on. Wildlife on site will be disturbed

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25871 - 8122 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25873 Object

Respondent: Mr Patrick Hinchin [6750]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is narrow, not suitable for traffic. It is on marshy ground, flooded after heavy rain. If site is built on it will remove the ability to absorb water and lead to flooding on other area. Doctors' surgery and school are at capacity. Bus service, shops, sewage and water not able to cope. Other Brownfield sites are available, why go after Green Belt. No housing survey.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25873 - 6750 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25875 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Helliard [8640]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Roads unsuitable for extra traffic and lorries. Not enough doctors to cope with extra population. The area is heavily congested. School is full, children have to travel to other areas, most of the time by car, this will be worsen.

Change To Plan: Further consultation with residents. Remove R25 & R26. Look at a proper plan for infrastructure needs.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25875 - 8640 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25877 Object

Respondent: MR ALAN BOWLAND [8121]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26 % increase in housing will change the nature of the village and ignores the impact on services and infrastructure - GP, school, car parking, traffic. Concerned the sites will exacerbate current surface water flooding problems. The plan needs to consider the other new development in Epping Forest district. Infrastructure should be provided before development taking place.

Change To Plan: The housing needs should be distributed fairly across all rural areas not centred on one apparently convenient village. Brownfield sites should be identified before utilising green field (Green Belt) land. The need of the village should be considered first and not the requirement of developers to make profits.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25877 - 8121 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25879 Object

Respondent: Mrs Judith Bowland [8642]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We were consulted on what Blackmore needs, this does not. Parking, is bad and will get worse, especially on Fingrith Hall Lane. Access lanes are too narrow. Area already flood, more homes will exacerbate this. No plans for sewerage provision. School is full and more cars on the road to use other schools. GP is full. % increase is colossal and will damage village. A small increase would be appropriate or in towns like Brnnetwood. Why have no brownfield sites been put forward before using the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: We need housing for first time buyers and properties for the older population to downsize to. I see no evidence that the developers will prioritise these needs. The lanes need widening BEFORE any extra houses are built. Other infrastructure need increasing before building eg extra capacity in sewage disposal. Extra classrooms and teacher in the primary school. An extra doctors surgery is needed to service all the villagers in the locality. There are brownfield sites available but developers make a higher profit if they can use green belt land: location, location, location.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25879 - 8642 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25881 Object

Respondent: Mr Allan Hilliard [8641]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to building on Green Belt sites as it will set precedents to other sites. There are already new developments around Blackmore, flooding in Blackmore will get worsened by more building. Brownfield sites in Brentwood should be used first. Bus services may get suspended, local school is at capacity.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25881 - 8641 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25883 Object**Respondent: Mr Ray Brooks [8643]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. The infrastructure in the village will not take more houses in the area, for example the doctors cant cope now I already find it hard to get appointments. Only 1 bus ever hour the school is already full to its capacity. Also the access in Red Rose Lane if entirely unsuitable being a narrow lane.

Change To Plan: You would need a bigger school, more frequent bus service, also a new doctors surgery. The roads in the area will need to be wider. The small shop and post office is already very busy and often runs out of things.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25883 - 8643 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25885 Object**Respondent: Ms Kay Hewitt [8644]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: School and doctors oversubscribed. Parking issues. Flooding and sewage system. Building on Green Belt not acceptable when Brownfield sites are available.

Change To Plan: Remove Plan as it stand. Discuss with Parish Council. Build on Brownfield sites and infills.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25885 - 8644 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25887 Object**Respondent: Miss Alison Bell [8646]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09, R25 and R26. Infrastructure does not support this.

Change To Plan: Doctors surgery almost full, difficult to get an appointment. Do not believe schools have capacity.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25887 - 8646 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25888 Object**Respondent: Mrs Barbara Head [8645]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Children have to travel on full buses to surrounding areas for school. How will more children get to school? There are other sites in Brentwood with better links. Road traffic will treble. Doctors are full, elderly people or those with disability struggle to have appointments.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local people.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25888 - 8645 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25891 Object**Respondent: Mr Dennis Holla [8647]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Too much traffic on the roads already, buses are infrequent. Doctors oversubscribed. Buses taking children to school are often full. People will rely on cars to travel, each family will have 2-4 cars.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local residents.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25891 - 8647 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25893 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Borton [8648]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is contradictory. Borough of villages is considered where it enhances the vitality of rural communities. Blackmore does not fit with this as it already has vitality and doesn't need any more.
Blackmore is assigned a Cat 3 status therefore the proposed development does not align with 'limited urban extensions appropriate to its rural settings'.
Policy SP01 notes development supported where it enhances character and settlement setting ... and traffic generation has no adverse effects. The proposed development is the polar opposite of both these statements.
Blackmore has a vibrant community but suffers from inadequate parking at local shops and amenities. More housing of any number will impact on the safe use of these by increasing traffic congestion. Blackmore is also a 'mecca' for the cycling community and increased vehicle use would pose risks to the safety of other cyclists and the general community.
Flooding is a well known risk to Blackmore and whilst no doubt the proposed housing scheme will require a demonstrable SUDS design, in practice these are not always reliable. The increased risk to flooding and cost of repairs is of real concern.
The road systems in and out of Blackmore are at certain points suitable only for single car traffic, especially the bridge leading into the village green. Further traffic flow would worsen the existing conditions.
The heritage of Blackmore is well documented and the development pays little respect to that and the local plan.
Whilst it is accepted that additional housing is required Blackmore does not fit with the local plan and there are far better, more suitable areas in the Borough.

Change To Plan: 1 There seems to have been little coordination with other neighbouring authorities who may welcome additional housing.
2 Villages should be encouraged to remain as such and their legacy maintained, The local plan will extract from this.
3 The local plan is hugely limited in the identification of other sites that would be more suitable for development.
4 There is a lack of a survey demonstrating why Blackmore has been selected.
5 Infrastructure concerns seem entirely lacking.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25893 - 8648 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii

25895 Object

Respondent: Mr David Bennett [8649]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09 R25 and R26
The village has a poor bus service and the local school cannot sustain more children moving into the village. The doctors is unable to accommodate Blackmore and surrounding villages.
The village drainage system is insufficient now and would not cope with additional houses over the past five years there has been a number of occasions when our drainage has been blocked.

Change To Plan: Local roads would need to be improved and more parking facilities. Additional schools would be required. the local area would require a better bus service to both Brentwood and Chelmsford. Local drainage system would need to be improve to cope with additional housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25895 - 8649 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

25899 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Birch [8158]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There doesn't appear to be any coherent idea for the villages including Blackmore, no cohesion with neighbouring authorities. Should be considering other new development in other boroughs. The Blackmore community will be jeopardised by the proposed plan.
Traffic is a problem, congestion on the Ongar Road, parking in Blackmore near shops is difficult, GP is overrun.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan. Please refer to the BHVA neighbourhood plan. Remove Blackmore from the proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25899 - 8158 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25903 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Bartrop [8650]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 08 Flood Risk and Green Belt
Section 09 R25 and R26

There doesn't appear to be any coherent strategy for the villages including Blackmore, strain on amenities, 4 weeks for GP appointment, limited bus service would mean more traffic. Brentwood Borough Council has not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increased housing density on other allocated sites, There is no housing need survey, sites are liable to flood and new homes will increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: A detailed housing needs survey needs to be undertaken for Blackmore Village and I endorse the objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25903 - 8650 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25907 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 08 Flood Risk and Green Belt
Section 09 R25 and R26

There doesn't appear to be any clear strategy for the villages including Blackmore, strain on facilities, such as school places and doctors. Very limited bus service and roads and lanes would be stretched and struggle to cope with more traffic. There is no housing need survey to say these sites are most suitable. Sites are liable to flood and new homes will increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: A detailed housing needs survey needs to be undertaken for Blackmore Village and I endorse the objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25907 - 8651 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25909 Object**Respondent: Mr Luke Holmes [8652]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25909 - 8652 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25917 Object**Respondent: Miss Ami Holmes [8653]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25917 - 8653 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25930 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25930 - 8574 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25936 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Foreman [4394]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools, Green Belt. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25936 - 4394 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25938 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support BVHA and their submission. Reading the Local Plan at the Council Offices was daunting as is filling in this form. In the early 1960s the LPA set the limits to the village taking into consideration public utilities, sewage and drainage capacity whilst maintaining the Green Belt around the village. Little has changed since then except getting mains gas and water pressure has improved. The planners got it right then but now there is no justification for building on the Green Belt and there are many brownfield sites in the borough which would allow the housing target to be met. Object to sites R25 and R26 being in the plan.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25938 - 5045 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25940 Object**Respondent: Mrs Pauline Farthing [7120]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Refer to attached scan.

Summary

Blackmore is a small village, no buses at weekend, full up school, long GP waiting lists. Must be brownfield sites more suitable than Blackmore. We have already had Gypsies adding to impact on services, a new development on Fingrith Hall Road, 5 more on Spriggs Lane. Village prone to flooding which would be exacerbated with more homes.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan. This is a complicated form , the wording is terrible, it is purposely made complicated to stop ordinary people having a say in things.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25940 - 7120 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25946 Object**Respondent: Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to the inclusion of Blackmore sites as strategy for site choice is not justified, impacts not detailed or mitigated and no account of other recent development in the area.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore Sites should be removed from the Local Plan until there has been:

(1) A full housing need survey for Blackmore

(2) A proper consultation, including the BBC taking into account alternative sites

(3) A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25946 - 4547 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25948 Object**Respondent: Mr Ben Holmes [8654]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25948 - 8654 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25956 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Holmes [8655]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25956 - 8655 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25964 Object**Respondent: Mr Barry Coldham [8656]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound due to infrastructure - lanes too narrow, school at capacity, GP appointments difficult to get, parking at shop will become dangerous, flood risk will increase. Not positively planned as not in original LDP, plans on green belt when non green belt available.

Other options available including area not on green belt in Stondon Massey, a village that would welcome more dwellings.

To make current proposal more sound you would need to increase school capacity and doctors surgery. Also make roads more accessible and decrease flood risk.

Change To Plan: Other options available including area not on green belt in Stondon Massey, a village that would welcome more dwellings.

To make current proposal more sound you would need to increase school capacity and doctors surgery. Also make roads more accessible and decrease flood risk.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25964 - 8656 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

25969 Object**Respondent: Mr John Caton [4881]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, there is no clear strategy for villages and has not considered brownfield sites which should be prioritised over Green Belt sites, this is developer led and not thought through by BBC, ignored adjacent authority development, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, the number of homes will overwhelm village - school and GP. Parking already a problem and shops, cafes, pubs already insufficient. Extend the urban development to Brentwood town instead.

Change To Plan: Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan, which was properly composed and states what the village and villagers need. Far too many of what might have been thought of as affordable, have been extended, modified to the maximum and are no longer affordable. There are very few properties left in Blackmore of a smaller, single storey bungalow type. The sites R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP for the reasons given.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25969 - 4881 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25972 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8657]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, there is no clear strategy for villages and has not considered brownfield sites which should be prioritised over Green Belt sites, this is developer led and not thought through by BBC, ignored adjacent authority development, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, the number of homes will overwhelm village - school and GP. Parking already a problem and shops, cafes, pubs already insufficient. Extend the urban development to Brentwood town instead.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. In accordance with local needs smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the chance to down size releasing their larger homes.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25972 - 8657 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25975 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The LDP has changed from original plan to that considered at Reg 18, with no explanation of why some sites have been included after initially being promised they will be excluded eg Blackmore vs Honeypot Lane. The late changes to the plan curtailed the amount of time available to appropriately consider and challenge it. There has been insufficient, if any, coordination with neighboring Councils and this leads to developments agreed by one council adversely affecting communities in another councils area. Eg Epping Forest & Brentwood. There is no evidence that any C.I.L. required from developers would be sufficient to do an adequate job of protecting the local community. Nor is there any requirement for such levy to be exclusively used for the benefit of the community impacted by the development. There is no evidence of a Housing Needs Survey being completed for Blackmore. There is no evidence of appropriate investigation into other brownfield sites that are available and should take precedence over the Green Belt Sites.) It is unsound to arbitrarily place disproportionate growth on one existing community which will cause it harm, leaving others with nothing at all when they would actually like some development to improve their sustainability. Eg Blackmore v Stondon Massey.) No consideration has been given to Counties "Protected Lanes" & "Quiet Lanes" policies. Blackmore plans refer to type of development and require allocations for local & affordable housing which is unachievable. There is a lack of employment viability; transport links; infrastructure; medical facilities; education facilities; Severe flooding problems; roads to build the development and subsequently deal with the astronomical increase in traffic movement; loss of Green Belt and damage to natural habitats

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25975 - 4759 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25976 Object

Respondent: Mr Eugene Cullen [8658]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, not demonstrated that housing could not be reached by increasing housing elsewhere, there must be more suitable sites/locations like urban extension to Brentwood, there is no clear strategy for villages in north of borough, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, area prone to flooding and more homes will make this worse.

Change To Plan: Support BVHA in its mission

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25976 - 8658 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25985 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The LDP has changed from original plan to that considered at Reg 18, with no explanation of why some sites have been included after initially being promised they will be excluded eg Blackmore vs Honeypot Lane. The late changes to the plan curtailed the amount of time available to appropriately consider and challenge it. There has been insufficient, if any, coordination with neighboring Councils and this leads to developments agreed by one council adversely affecting communities in another councils area. Eg Epping Forest & Brentwood. There is no evidence that any C.I.L. required from developers would be sufficient to do an adequate job of protecting the local community. Nor is there any requirement for such levy to be exclusively used for the benefit of the community impacted by the development. There is no evidence of a Housing Needs Survey being completed for Blackmore. There is no evidence of appropriate investigation into other brownfield sites that are available and should take precedence over the Green Belt Sites.) It is unsound to arbitrarily place disproportionate growth on one existing community which will cause it harm, leaving others with nothing at all when they would actually like some development to improve their sustainability. Eg Blackmore v Stondon Massey. No consideration has been given to Counties "Protected Lanes" & "Quiet Lanes" policies. Blackmore plans refer to type of development and require allocations for local & affordable housing which is unachievable. There is a lack of employment viability; transport links; infrastructure; medical facilities; education facilities; Severe flooding problems; roads to build the development and subsequently deal with the astronomical increase in traffic movement; loss of Green Belt and damage to natural habitats

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25985 - 4700 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

25992 Object**Respondent: Hannah Cook [8659]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for traffic, it floods. Infrastructure not sufficient: school at capacity, bus service inadequate, GP service appointments unavailable, minimal amenities all problems exacerbated with new homes. More suitable locations closer to built up areas like Brentwood

Change To Plan: Refer to BHVA neighbourhood plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25992 - 8659 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i

25995 Object**Respondent: Mr David Coates [8133]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not enough infrastructure, village too crowded already, lack of space at local school, not enough 'village' parkin facilities (Blackmore village).

Change To Plan: Access off Red Rose Lane is total unsuitable for volume of traffic, the whole principal of building 50+ homes in the village (approx. 30 in Red Rose Lane) is just wrong. The village is already full. There are modest services (GP, school, shops, parking, bus services). There has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. The proposed sites are liable to flooding, flood risk will increase if build on land.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25995 - 8133 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25997 Object**Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25997 - 8660 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

25998 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Corby [8186]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. The access roads are extremely unsuitable for this volume of traffic,

Change To Plan: Blackmore is a modest village with low and ineffective services and infrastructure. Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan. This clearly sets out our local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25998 - 8186 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26009 Object**Respondent: Mr James Corby [8661]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. Blackmore is an isolated village with very modest and ineffective services and infrastructure. there are more suitable locations nearer to Brentwood. The locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26009 - 8661 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26012 Object**Respondent: Mr Alex Corby [8663]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the villages in the north of the borough including Blackmore. Brentwood/Basildon council have not consulted with neighbouring authorities and the impact of housing already being built. The access off from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26012 - 8663 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26014 Object**Respondent: Hazel Cowing [2817]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Need to demonstrate why Blackmore is in the LDP, amenities not sufficient, will impact transport, destroy picturesque village, more properties could make Blackmore be classed as a small town.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan for local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26014 - 2817 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

26016 Object**Respondent: Miss Lucy Corby [8664]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for northern villages, Brentwood/Basildon have not consulted with neighbouring authorities about houses already being built. access off Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for volume of traffic increase.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan, refer to =BVHA neighbourhood plan regarding local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26016 - 8664 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26018 Object**Respondent: Ms Julie Currey [8665]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to sections 4, 8, 9 - policies R25 and R26.
Insufficient infrastructure, already at capacity - schools, roads, GP, parking. Not considered other new development, increases size of village by 1/3.
Remove R25 and R26 from plan and consider alternatives.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan and consider alternatives.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26018 - 8665 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26020 Object**Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26020 - 8662 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26030 Object**Respondent: Ms Linda Cearn [5013]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan unsound - need a housing need survey to justify sites, use brownfield sites first. Need to consider flood and sewerage problems. utilities, transport, schools, medical facilities, roads, access, need to consult more with Epping Forrest DC.
Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan as sites not justified.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan as sites not justified.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26030 - 5013 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26033 Object**Respondent: Mrs Louise Coldham [8666]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound - development to be built on quality arable land and in Green Belt. Infrastructure issues - flood, narrow lanes, parking, sewerage, school places, GP, safety of walker / cyclists / horse riders.

Change To Plan: Unsound - development to be built on quality arable land and in Green Belt. Infrastructure issues - flood, narrow lanes, parking, sewerage, school places, GP, safety of walker / cyclists / horse riders.

An historic village with visitors who come to enjoy the quaintness and scenery. There would be more suitable locations that would not impact on the unique nature of the popular village. Other non-Green Belt sites should be priority, access not appropriate, school and GP are full.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26033 - 8666 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii

26039 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: The flooding of a few years ago has just been alleviated this would cause more problems in that area. Blackmore would be unable to cope with this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26039 - 8668 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26047 Object**Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26047 - 7304 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26058 Object**Respondent: Mrs Joann Cook [8669]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not enough infrastructure, village too crowded already, lack of space at local school, not enough 'village' parking facilities (Blackmore village). Access off Red Rose Lane is total unsuitable for volume of traffic, the whole principal of building 50+ homes in the village (approx. 30 in Red Rose Lane) is just wrong. The village is already full. There are modest services (GP, school, shops, parking, bus services, sewerage). There has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. The proposed sites are liable to flooding, flood risk will increase if build on land.

There are more suitable sites - brownfield, not Green Belt, remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Change To Plan: There are more suitable sites - brownfield, not Green Belt, remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26058 - 8669 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26060 Object

Respondent: Mr Tony Cook [8670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not enough infrastructure, village too crowded already, lack of space at local school, not enough 'village' parking facilities (Blackmore village). Access off Red Rose Lane is total unsuitable for volume of traffic, the whole principal of building 50+ homes in the village (approx. 30 in Red Rose Lane) is just wrong. The village is already full. There are modest services (GP, school, shops, parking, bus services, sewerage). There has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. The proposed sites are liable to flooding, flood risk will increase if build on land.

Change To Plan: There are more suitable sites - brownfield, not Green Belt, remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26060 - 8670 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26062 Object

Respondent: Mr David Chalkley [8671]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Limited amenities - shop, GP, school, lanes congested and unsafe, sewerage overloaded, need significant investment in the village and infrastructure.

Change To Plan:

There are more suitable locations, Red Rose Lane access is limited and ridiculous to suggest it could cope with this volume of traffic. Greenfield and Green Belt land should not be touched, use other brownfield sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26062 - 8671 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26064 Object

Respondent: Mr D. Cormack [1447]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policies R25 and R26, paras 9.197-205
Services and infrastructure already has strain, GP, traffic already a problem, would get worse, environmental repercussions, should not use Green Belt land, use brownfield elsewhere.
Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association neighbourhood plan regarding local housing need. remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association neighbourhood plan regarding local housing need. remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26064 - 1447 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26066 Object

Respondent: Mr. Keith Creffield [8001]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local plan is unsound and totally unsuitable for the village of Blackmore: the facilities of Blackmore is not sustainable for more dwellings, the impact on local wildlife, the proposed sites are liable to flood, traffic around the village, impact on the GP and school. Totally against building work in Blackmore

Change To Plan: . Totally against building work in Blackmore

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26066 - 8001 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26068 Object

Respondent: Mr John Bell [8672]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local plan is unsound and totally unsuitable for the village of Blackmore: the facilities and infrastructure of Blackmore is not sustainable for more dwellings

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 have to be removed from the plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan for local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26068 - 8672 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26070 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Bedford [8673]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Already pressure on infrastructure. Schools, congested roads, parking, and road safety, GP appointments. Not an ideal area to build new homes, will ruin the village and cause overcrowding.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26070 - 8673 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

26072 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christine Bedford [8674]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is already straining to fulfil its needs in providing schooling and doctors, a possible extra 200 people with possibly as many cars would be a great strain on the already busy roads.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26072 - 8674 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

26074 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I object to the inclusion of the sites on Green Belt land. The two Blackmore sites fail to give an objective assessment of the development and infrastructure requirement; address the impact on the village with a 27% increase in size has been underestimated in respect of impact on the lives of the occupants of the village and of other residents in close proximity to the development; mitigate the effects of traffic emissions and manage climate and/or ensuring the area is well served by public transport; fully examine the redevelopment of the brownfield sites; in their obligation to preserve Green Belt as laid out in the Sustainability Appraisal; by the local planning authority to provide evidence of any assessment of local housing needs in Blackmore. No consideration given to the two Grade 11 listed properties on the boundary of the development, Redrose Lane which is proposed as the access point to both development is not suitable as it is a country lane not designed to take large volumes of traffic and is unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26074 - 4275 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26088 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carole Cole [8675]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Concerns over schools in the area, ie more traffic in and round Blackmore, Doddinghurst and nearby villages. Also Dr's surgery seems difficult to get appointments now, without new housing in the area.
Take R25 and R26 out of the plan and consider the alternatives.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 out of the plan and consider the alternatives.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26088 - 8675 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

26091 Object**Respondent: Mr David Holland [8676]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local schools are struggling to cope already. More houses will increase demand. The local GP services are also struggling to cope and more homes will place even more pressure on them. The current road infrastructure will not be sufficient for more traffic. Flooding is a risk factor in the area and building more houses will aggravate this.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs as the Blackmore community is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26091 - 8676 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26108 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The 30 huge houses by Epping District council very close to the boundary of Blackmore Parish means that the village amenities are already under pressure- and this has not been accounted for within any of the plans. The single track is not suitable for extra traffic without marked improvements to the road - including fixing pot holes and filling ditches on either side. It is also continually used by the public - on foot and on horseback - and is part of at least one major cycle route. There are no walkways so the extra traffic will increase the danger to road users. The local school and doctor's surgery are already at capacity. The internet connection is appalling, the sewage system is at tipping point, there are frequent power-cuts in the area already, Public Transport is almost non-existent in the village and parking anywhere is a nightmare. A survey should have been carried out to demonstrate the need for housing - and in particular the need for 'type of housing'. There are more suitable locations with better access to larger towns in the area: extensions to Brentwood or possibly increasing the size of the proposal for Dunton Hills would all have better transport links for commuters, on better kept roads

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore if not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26108 - 8677 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, iii, iv

26118 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Harris [8678]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and development of this size on green belt land is inappropriate. There is no consideration re: 30 houses built in Fingrith Hall Lane under EFDC, which will use services of Blackmore- doctor, shop, school- none which can cope now. There are plenty of other urban sites that could take this development without ruining the local infrastructure. In addition to the proposed development there are plans for additional homes on Chelmsford Road and Spriggs Lane for 20 additional homes. Red Rose Lane is an unsuitable lane for this traffic as it floods.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26118 - 8678 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26123 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Harris [8679]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is an unsuitable lane for this traffic. It floods and is unpassable every time we have rain. Development of this size on green belt land is inappropriate. No consideration re: 30 houses built in Fingrith Hall Lane under EFDC, which will use Blackmore services- doctor, shop, school - none which can cope now. There are plenty of other urban sites that could take this development without ruining the local infrastructure. No consideration of the 20 additional homes planned for Chelmsford road and Spriggs Lane.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26123 - 8679 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26128 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beverley Holla [8680]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. No trains, bus one an hour everyone must drive. In my col de sack each household has 3, 4, 5 cars. 2. The roads are very narrow and dangerous every month at least one car (a Tesco delivery lorry last week) turned upside down in ditch. 3. Cannot get appointment with doctor surgery. 4. Roads too dangerous for children to cycle. 5. Plenty of space nearer to Brentwood.

Change To Plan: Remove the proposed sites field 25 and 26 from local development plan. Consult local people they know how congested and dangerous the roads are winding and very narrow.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26128 - 8680 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26130 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hazel Town [4993]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound as representation was not allowed at the public meeting as the meeting ran over planned time so Blackmore was not allowed to speak. The village infrastructure cannot cope with 70 more houses - consideration has not been made regards:

The school is at capacity; GP is full and wait for appointments more than 2 weeks, sewerage is at capacity; village is a conservation area with listed buildings; problems with car parking on the pavements; access lane is narrow; danger of accidents particularly from school with more cars; more new development is happening on Spriggs Lane; sites are liable to flooding, already experienced in village; sites are in Green Belt and a conservation area of great natural beauty.

Change To Plan: The only way you can make the plan acceptable is to find ground which is not Green Belt and not within a conservation area. We are already losing too many of our beautiful places in England and especially Essex.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26130 - 4993 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26136 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jane House [8681]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Extra traffic - roads already very busy. Extra population. Lack of supporting infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA Neighbourhood Plan for local development plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26136 - 8681 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26139 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher House [8682]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of infrastructure - school / doctor places. Roads not fit for traffic.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA Neighbourhood Plan for local change.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26139 - 8682 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26141 Object**Respondent: Miss Helen Sheard [8487]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan is unsound as it doesn't consider other new development, impact on infrastructure such as schools, GP, parking, congestion. Access road is too narrow. Will damage quality of life of current residents. No brownfield sites have been taken into account, other sites should be used. Proposal is not sustainable, no plan to prove what the influx of extra tenants will do to the village. Sites flood, there is a lack of services in the area. It is a cover up for the lack of action taken by the BBC to deal with the perceived housing need.

Change To Plan: The plan needs to provide the best housing solution without destroying the heritage, charm and character of Blackmore Village. Other developments in the surrounding area need to be taken into consideration before using the greenbelt land. The other more suitable sites should be used for example brownfield sites rather than the arable green belt land. A housing needs survey which would address local needs and not just houses to make up numbers needs to be undertaken. The environmental effects of the village development need to be assessed and taken into consideration. An investigation of how the Village is able to be sustainable with the influx of development and new tenants.

Information that has already been provided needs to be read and taken into account along with the views of the current residents of the village. There should also be an opportunity for all residents to take part and express their views and have them taken into account. Even if they are unable to understand lengthy forms or are unable to communicate their views due to the complexity of the information or the way it is being presented to them

It is clear the infrastructure of the village would need updating for the size of development and the additional usage. Some of this would be needed in the conservation area to address the issues of flood risk, This would need to be considered before the planning was granted, I am unable to say whether these modifications would make the plan sound or cost effective as no such evaluations have been made.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26141 - 8487 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26143 Object

Respondent: Ms Charlotte Hall [7147]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Infrastructure and services - roads, parking, schools, doctor surgery - are completely unsuitable and insufficient for the amount of houses proposed. Area is liable to flood which will only get worse with additional development. No clear strategy for villages in the north of the borough. The plan has failed to demonstrate that the 70 proposed houses could not be absorbed into other allocated sites. Proposed access route on Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable. 9. There are other more suitable and sustainable options i.e. urban extension to Brentwood. There hadn't been a housing needs survey to justify why Blackmore has been included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: As previously stated no attempt has been made to survey plots by Brentwood Borough Council. This should be done before proposing a green belt site. The 70 houses planned for plots R25 and R26 should be re-allocated to an area that has suitable infrastructure capacity to accommodate the additional people and traffic. The 70 houses should be re-allocated to an area that had an identified housing need. This isn't that area in Blackmore. The argument against development of R25 and R26 were not heard because the extraordinary council meeting in November has gone on for too long. These arguments should have been heard and not just voted through with no discussion.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26143 - 7147 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26145 Object

Respondent: Mrs Margaret Brooks [8683]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Village can't cope with more traffic, parking a problem, schools full, GP is full.

Change To Plan: You would need to widen roads, increase the school size, would need another shop, more parking, another GP surgery, Red Rose Lane or Orchard Piece would not be able to cope with any more traffic.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26145 - 8683 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26147 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Hall [6734]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Infrastructure and services - roads, parking, schools, doctor surgery - are completely unsuitable and insufficient for the amount of houses proposed. Area is liable to flood which will only get worse with additional development. No clear strategy for villages in the north of the borough. The plan has failed to demonstrate that the 70 proposed houses could not be absorbed into other allocated sites. Proposed access route on Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable. 9. There are other more suitable and sustainable options i.e. urban extension to Brentwood. There hadn't been a housing needs survey to justify why Blackmore has been included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: As previously stated no attempt has been made to survey plots by Brentwood Borough Council. This should be done before proposing a green belt site. The 70 houses planned for plots R25 and R26 should be re-allocated to an area that has suitable infrastructure capacity to accommodate the additional people and traffic. The 70 houses should be re-allocated to an area that had an identified housing need. This isn't that area in Blackmore. The argument against development of R25 and R26 were not heard because the extraordinary council meeting in November has gone on for too long. These arguments should have been heard and not just voted through with no discussion.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26147 - 6734 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26150 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Hall [8684]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I do not feel BBC has properly investigated other sites for development which would be suitable and not GREEN BELT. Access from Red Rose Lane is unsuitable as it is a narrow country lane. The proposed sites are liable to flooding and will exacerbate the flooding problem already exists. The existing infrastructure and services - roads, parking, schools, doctor surgery is at capacity.

Change To Plan: No development

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26150 - 8684 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26153 Object

Respondent: Mr David Hall [4867]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are no brownfield sites that are available which should take priority over green belt land. There are other more suitable locations e.g. urban extension to Brentwood. The proposed sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk. The school will not be able to accommodate more children. The doctor's surgery can barely cope with the existing population.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26153 - 4867 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26158 Object

Respondent: Laura Harris [8685]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no consideration re: 30 houses built in Firgrith Hall Lane in EFDC, which will use services of Blackmore - doctor, shop, school - none which can cope now. There are plenty of other urban sites that could take this development. The infrastructure is not sufficient. In addition to the plan there are 20 homes on Chelmsford Road, Spriggs Lane. Red Rose Lane is an unsuitable lane for this traffic, it floods.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26158 - 8685 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26163 Object

Respondent: Susan Harris [8686]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no consideration by BBC re: 30 houses in Fingrith Hall Lane in EFDC, which will use Blackmore services - doctors, shop, school. These cannot cope now. The infrastructure, namely Red Rose Lane is not sufficient for the amount of additional traffic. No consultations with EFDC which border village. There are other urban sites which could be developed. There is also other sites planned for development on Chelmsford Road, Spriggs Lane which amounts to 20 additional homes.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26163 - 8686 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26165 Object

Respondent: Mr Reginald Dawson [8687]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

- * There has been no "Housing Needs Survey" to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP
- * There are more suitable and sustainable locations - e.g. the Urban extension to Brentwood . The locations stated in Blackmore do not promote Sustainable development considering the limited facilities currently available
- * Blackmore especially is an isolated village and access is via roads that have not been designed to meet the number of cars let alone the amount of heavy vehicles that would be required to build the number of houses in the current LDP.
- * The local schools are running at full capacity therefore the children would have to be schooled outside of the village therefore increasing the traffic and pollution in the area
- * Inadequate services available: to provide adequate School places in the Village. Access to Doctors appointments. In fact there is only 1 Doctors surgery covering all 5 Villages which are all being impacted by the LDP. Transport I Bus facilities are hardly adequate
- * BBC fails to demonstrate there are other brownfield sites available
- * These other Brownfield sites which are available which should take priority over the Greenfield (and Green Belt) land.
- * BBC have failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing the housing density on other (Allocated or Brownfield) sites
- * Proposed sites in Blackmore are all liable to flooding, therefore building on this land will no doubt increase the probability of flooding in the village with the impact on current residents
- * The BBC have failed to consider the impact on Blackmore of the 30 dwellings proposed off Fingrith Hall Lane, with the BBC failing to consult Epping Forest District Council

Change To Plan:

Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5 Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the Village School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area The single Doctors surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for appointments already standing at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required Current transport links for the villages would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the aging population

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26165 - 8687 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26167 Object

Respondent: Mr John Eaton [8124]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound. Inadequate infrastructure to support development i.e. doctors surgery, road network, drainage etc. There are other brown field sites in the area that could be developed, e.g. Stondon Massey.

Change To Plan: BBC should investigate other none Green Belt sites for development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26167 - 8124 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26169 Object **Respondent: Mr Stephen Holland [8689]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of infrastructure. Increase flood risk. Use of Green Belt inappropriate. Increase of traffic flow.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26169 - 8689 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26172 Object **Respondent: Mr Michael Jones [8690]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26, Green Belt policy in section 08.
the green Belt was set up to stop villages being changed for ever by over-building. I feel 70 houses is far too many but also feel a smaller number say 20 would be reasonable. The local schools and doctors will be overstretched. There is not enough public transport to sustain this number of houses proposed.

Change To Plan: I agree with the Blackmore Village heritage Association plans.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26172 - 8690 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26178 Object **Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8691]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound because: 1. Access at Redrose Lane unsuitable for traffic. 2. Available brownfield sites should take priority over greenbelt. 3. Blackmore is not equipped to deal with more population on this scale. The school and doctors surgery are already stretched to capacity. 4. There are more suitable / sustainable locations than Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26178 - 8691 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26181 Object **Respondent: Mrs Janet Jacobs [8692]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to 09 [R25 and R26], 04, 08

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26181 - 8692 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26184 Object **Respondent: Mrs Catherine Jennings [8693]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to R25 and R26. Proper procedures have not been followed resulting in Blackmore suddenly having 96 houses pushed on it after years of being assured that this gem of the Brentwood villages was safe. Regard to other nearby developments has only just been recognised - Top of Fingrith Hall Road, Woolmongers Lane and Spriggs Lane flats; also travellers in Chelmsford Road and Ingatestone Road. Also large mobile home site at Elm Farm.

Change To Plan: Extensive infrastructure improvement needed for flood prevention, sewage clearance, road and parking improvements, school crowded, poor road connections along windy narrow country lanes prone to flooding.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26184 - 8693 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv

26186 Object **Respondent: Mrs Louise Woodford [8398]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I consider the plan to be unsound as it will ruin the character of a beautiful village. The traffic, noise and disturbance, the visual impact, the strain on schools, doctor surgeries and loss of privacy will have a negative impact on everyone living in and around the village. I feel there are more suitable areas of Essex to build more houses. A sleepy village surrounded by greenbelt / an abundance of wildlife is not the place to cause such a disturbance.

Change To Plan: Modify the location. There are areas of Essex where houses can be built without causing such disturbance to people or wildlife.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26186 - 8398 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26188 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Susan Miers [8695]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No account has been taken of the c.30 dwellings at the top end of Fingrith Hall Lane. Blackmore and the impact these will have locally. Blackmore is an isolated village within the Green Belt, with very poor local services. No Library, very poor bus service, congested village lanes, severe parking problems at peak times, long delays 5/4 weeks for the local health center. Current primary school in need of development for any additional pupil intake. BBC has not shown that other brownfield sites are available. BBC has not shown that increased housing developments could be achieved by increasing housing density on other allocated sites. No Housing needs survey has been undertaken to show why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Local lanes are at capacity during peak travel times and the additional vehicle use of access to and from the site from Red Rose Lane opposite the Village Primary School will present significant traffic problems. There is inadequate provision for waste water removal in Blackmore. No report on these two sites in Blackmore have taken into account the biodiversity of impact on the local wildlife using these two greenfield sites which have not been in productive arable use for the last 20 years at least, and therefore are vital corridors for wildlife. Any development on these two greenfield sites will seriously affect the following bird species on the Birds of Conservation and Concern 4 (BOCC4) endangered listings. Red List . Starling, Song Thrush, House Sparrow, Tree Sparrow, Linnet, Twite, Yellowhammer. And on the BOCC4 Amber List. Dunnock, Bullfinch.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26188 - 8695 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26192 Object**Respondent: Mr Conrad Dixon [8688]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound as it is not based n evidence relating to Blackmore, it ignores impact of village of greater surface water flooding risk; ignores capacity of local infrastructure - sewers, roads, public services. Plan is not legally compliant
Plan is not drawn up in cooperation with other local authorities.

Change To Plan: It is clear that significant remediation of infrastructure would be needed for a sustainable development. Some of these would need to be in the conservation area to address flood risks, and that would have to be considered before work could be committed. I am unable to say whether these modifications would make the plan sound, sustainable , to even financially viable, as no such evaluation has been made.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26192 - 8688 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26194 Object**Respondent: Mr John Eaton [8124]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound proposal, inadequate infrastructure to support development ie GP, roads, drainage etc. there are other brownfield sites in the area that could be developed eg Stondon Massey.

Change To Plan: BBC should investigate other none Green Belt sites for development.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26194 - 8124 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26196 Object**Respondent: Cariss Tsui [8694]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Need to consider other development impact and infrastructure as well as this site, access is too narrow, school, GP both full. Build in better locations - Stondon Massey, brownfield sites, Don't build on Green Belt. Sites not justified , flooding, poor access, services.

Change To Plan: The plan needs to provide the best housing solution without destroying the heritage, charm and character of Blackmore Village. Other developments in the surrounding area need to be taken into consideration before using the greenbelt land. The other, more suitable, proposed sites should be used for example brownfield sites rather than the arable, greenbelt land. A housing needs survey which would address local needs and not houses just to make up the numbers needs to be undertaken. The environmental effects of the village development need to be assessed and taken into consideration. An investigation of how the Village is able to be sustainable with the influx of development and new tenants. Information that has already been provided needs to be read and taken into account along with the views of the current residents of the village. There should also be an opportunity for all residents to take part and express their views and have them taken into account. Even if they are unable to understand lengthy forms or are unable to communicate their views due to the complexity of the information or the way it is being presented to them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26196 - 8694 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26200 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Owen [4760]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

Section 04

Section 08

Section 09 - policies R25 and R26.

Local plan is unsound due to failure to consult with Epping Forest District Council RE: 30 houses being built at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and impact on village.

There is not clear strategy for the village including Blackmore in the north of the borough.

Red Rose Lane is a narrow dangerous lane not road with a band which is blind for pedestrians and traffic with no pavement facilities. School parking is congested in this area impeding traffic into the village, at entry to Redrose Lane in Nine Ashes Road.

Doctors waiting lists for appointment is 4 weeks at times. The village is an unsafe area for pedestrians due to narrow uneven pavements and parking. Blackmore school is full to capacity. Buses for commuters without cars (teenagers etc) is unsatisfactory - no later than 7PL. Counted 8 Skylarks in fields adjacent to Nine Ashes Road last year, will they remain with heavier traffic on Rod? Blackmore Road floods (above waist high).

Change To Plan:

Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community. Such plans will merge Blackmore into an urban sprawl, something counter to Brentwood's statement to preserve our environment, heritage and character.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?:

Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference:

O - 26200 - 4760 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26202 Object**Respondent: Ms Pauline Barry [8699]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

Adverse impact on local amenities. Already too many cars on road.

Change To Plan:

Use brownfield sites instead.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?:

Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference:

O - 26202 - 8699 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii

26204 Object**Respondent: Mr Ron Beazley [4831]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

This plan is ill thought out and will cause many problems with traffic in the centre of Blackmore. There are far too many vehicles at present and these additions will only add to the danger for particularly older residents and school children.

Change To Plan:

We should not have more major infrastructure in Blackmore but should allow development of brownfield sites. With so many additional people local services which are already at breaking point will be over burdened and unable to operate satisfactory.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?:

Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference:

O - 26204 - 4831 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26206 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

1. Brentwood Borough Council failed to consult with neighbouring authorities i.e. Epping Forest District Council regarding 30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and its impact on our village. The people use our facilities in the village.

Change To Plan:

Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?:

No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

O - 26206 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26207 Object**Respondent: Mrs Eileen Beazley [8700]****Agent: N/A**

Summary:

Please listen to Blackmore villages. Visitors know Blackmore as a beauty spot in the middle of chaos. If further development is approved all its charm and uniqueness will disappear.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?:

Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference:

O - 26207 - 8700 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26210 Object**Respondent: Mr Neil Beney [8701]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increase local traffic. The land that it is being built on is known to flood. The doctors is at its full capacity. Size of the school in the village.

Change To Plan: I believe that there is no modification that can be made.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26210 - 8701 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - iii

26212 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. No clear strategy for the village including Blackmore in the north of the Borough.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26212 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26214 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. To have a residential development off Red Rose Lane is totally wrong - Blackmore is an isolated unique village with modest services and infrastructure. Also, this is a lane and not a road.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26214 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26216 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. There must be other more suitable and/or sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood to the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26216 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26218 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 5. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available which take priority over Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane before grabbing Green Belt land as an easy option which would benefit the developer.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26218 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26220 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 6. No housing need survey has been conducted for our village to demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26220 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26224 Object**Respondent: Mr John Caton [4881]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The development is developer led. No consideration for the adjacent authorities Plans - EFDC, who have permitted 30-40 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall, and have permission pending in Woolmongers lane. The proposed access is unsuitable. The construction of so many dwellings will overwhelm the Blackmore infrastructure - school is already full, the doctor surgery is difficult to get appointments now, parking is already insufficient. The urban extension to Brentwood which is already planned could be extended.

Change To Plan: BBC planners should refer to the Blackmore Village neighbourhood plan, which was properly composed and states what the village and villagers need. Far too many of what might have been thought of as affordable, have been extended, modified to the maximum and are no longer affordable. There are very few properties left in Blackmore of smaller, single storey bungalow type. The sites R25 and R26 should be taken out of the local development plan for the reasons given.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26224 - 4881 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26225 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 7. Blackmore has a history of flooding so would be concerned that more housing would further increase the flood risk elsewhere.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26225 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26228 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 8. Our school is full. My grandchildren who live in the village are driven to another school everyday 2 miles away. Also parents driving children to school cause chaos each day with inconsiderable parking and annoying local residents when using their roads to park.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26228 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26232 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 9. Our doctor practice is full, have trouble now getting appointment.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26232 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26235 Object**Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The number of houses proposed is far too many for the small village. The infrastructure cannot cope - lack of parking, schools and doctor surgery are at capacity. New development will affect the wildlife. The new developments will change the whole feel of the village. In the past the village has been flooded. The site proposed are liable to flooding. More houses means more cars means more pollution

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26235 - 7016 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26237 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 10. The traffic using our village has increased in the last 10 years and is now horrendous. The residents cannot park in the centre of the village to shop because there is no parking available. We have visitors to the village which are welcomed and they use the businesses, but others are racing through our village to get to the A12 and M11 etc when there are accidents breakdown on the A12 and exit at the Mountnessing roundabout.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26237 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26239 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 11. At a recent meeting at our village hall where BBC planners attended, they referred that Lanes were Roads; this is not the case. They are lanes with ditches either side and difficult to drive down hoping that no-one meets you coming the other way. These lanes are used by horse riders, cyclists and cyclists who race and belong to clubs and Blackmore is a favoured venue for these cyclists.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26239 - 8118 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26244 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susan Capes [8702]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local infrastructure is already at capacity - GP services, schools, narrow roads, limited parking. Blackmore is already prone to flooding. Transport links from the village to town are poor. There is no proven need for more housing in Blackmore. The proposed development is on Green Belt land when there are Brown Belt areas more usefully located closer to Brentwood and Shenfield. The proposal does not take into account the increased housing from areas of private development within Blackmore. Blackmore is a small village of historical importance and character. Further development, will damage it irreversibly.

Change To Plan: I do not think that any modification will be able to make the plan sustainable for Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26244 - 8702 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26246 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Brentwood Borough Council failed to consult with neighbouring authorities i.e. Epping Forest District Council regarding 30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and its impact on our village. The people use our facilities in the village.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26246 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26248 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. No clear strategy for the village including Blackmore in the north of the Borough.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26248 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26252 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. To have a residential development off Red Rose Lane is totally wrong - Blackmore is an isolated unique village with modest services and infrastructure. Also, this is a lane and not a road.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26252 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26255 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8704]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development of the proposed site has not been proven to be what is required in the village. Development by neighbouring authorities (e.g. Epping DC) have not been considered. Brownfield sites within BBC's authority have not been considered over Green field sites. The proposed development of 90 plus houses is far too many for the existing infrastructure, particularly Red Rose Lane for traffic 'and often local roads, doctors surgery and the local primary school.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. In accordance with 'local needs' some smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the choice to "downsize", redeeming their (?) home.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26255 - 8704 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26256 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. There must be other more suitable and/or sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood to the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26256 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26259 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 5. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available which take priority over Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane before grabbing Green Belt land as an easy option which would benefit the developer.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26259 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26261 Object**Respondent: Mr Steven Corby [8705]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in a village that is prone to severe flooding. Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the provided housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other allocated sites. They have also not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available which should have priority over the greenfield site off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BCHA Neighbourhood Plan which (?) sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26261 - 8705 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26264 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 6. No housing need survey has been conducted for our village to demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26264 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26265 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 7. Blackmore has a history of flooding so would be concerned that more housing would further increase the flood risk elsewhere.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26265 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26267 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 8. Our school is full. My grandchildren who live in the village are driven to another school everyday 2 miles away. Also parents driving children to school cause chaos each day with inconsiderable parking and annoying local residents when using their roads to park.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26267 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26270 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 9. Our doctor practice is full, have trouble now getting appointment.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26270 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26271 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 10. The traffic using our village has increased in the last 10 years and is now horrendous. The residents cannot park in the centre of the village to shop because there is no parking available. We have visitors to the village which are welcomed and they use the businesses, but other are racing through our village to get to the A14 and M11 etc when there are accidents breakdown on the A12 and exit at the Mountnessing roundabout.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26271 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26273 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 11. In my opinion, Blackmore is a unique village and should remain so, it is its openness that gives it its identity and quaintness.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26273 - 8703 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26278 Object

Respondent: Mr Michael Williams [8706]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Major concerns about flooding in village due to additional strain on the drainage / sewage systems. Overload on already strained infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors surgery, parking facilities. Additional traffic and parking problems on already overused country lanes which were not designed for heavy traffic. Building on green belt is not acceptable when brown fill sites are available.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26278 - 8706 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26283 Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Ann Williams [8707]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Major concerns about flooding in village due to additional strain on the drainage / sewage systems. Overload on already strained infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors surgery, parking facilities. Additional traffic and parking problems on already overused country lanes which were not designed for heavy traffic. Building on green belt is not acceptable when brown fill sites are available.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26283 - 8707 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26285 Object

Respondent: Mr Jon Watson [7112]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sites propose in Blackmore are within the greenbelt. There is an exceptional need for housing in Blackmore and in the absence of any special circumstances it would appear that the proposal is entirely inappropriate. There is already severe pressure on vital services such as schooling and health care. Blackmore is a small village which will lose its character completely if this huge development goes ahead.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26285 - 7112 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26288 Object

Respondent: Mr John Wollaston [8183]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been insufficient consultation with either the village or neighbouring councils to show clearly what impact these developments will have on the village and its environment. Access to basic services and infrastructure is limited - schools, doctors, roads, parking sewage and drainage. The choice of Red Rose Lane, a narrow country lane, as a site for major urban expansion is wholly inappropriate and could only operate safely with major expansion of it and the surrounding roads. Transport links for commuters are currently inadequate and would inevitably increase the demand for use of private transport.

Change To Plan: There has been no adequate housing need survey. There has been no projected traffic survey to assess the impact of the proposed development. The needs to be greater consultation with those impacted by the development of the village and ensure that it does simply become a urban suburb of Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26288 - 8183 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26292 Object

Respondent: Mr Neil Warner [8709]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I understand that there has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. There should be clear evidence that all brownfield sites in the Borough have been fully utilised in an development plan. There is insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the planned housing expansion.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26292 - 8709 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26296 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Gillian Warner [8710]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brownfield sites in the Borough as a whole should be developed before ever considering green field and green belt sites. I understand there has been no "housing needs survey" to demonstrate that Blackmore should be in the LDP. The infrastructure in and around the village is already exhausted. Blackmore cannot take more housing without extensive changes to the infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26296 - 8710 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26298 Object**Respondent: Ms Nicolte Unwin [8711]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Schools over populated. Doctors over populated. 3 week waits. (Removal of main Port Office to ingatestone) a year which makes queries in shop very busy all the time.

Change To Plan: Cannot believe you are even thinking about building houses here as there seems to be houses going up everywhere example Ford Motor Company. Brentwood 350 house within the next 5 years. 100s of houses at bughleigh Park Chelmsford as a massive estate being build in Witham. Is this really needed.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26298 - 8711 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26300 Object**Respondent: Mr Alex Atkins [8126]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Brentwood Council has not consulted with Epping FOrrest Council. 2. No Housing Need Survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. 3. Blackmore has a history of flooding, concerned with future flood risks in the village. 4. The village will not be able to cope with the increased volume of traffic. 5. Worried that Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that all brownfield sites are being used over Green Belt land. 6. The infrastructure of the village is already full. The doctors, primary school and local shop already have parking issues.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26300 - 8126 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26302 Object**Respondent: Ms Hayley Atkins [8712]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Brentwood Council has not consulted with Epping FOrrest Council. 2. No Housing Need Survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. 3. Blackmore has a history of flooding, concerned with future flood risks in the village. 4. The village will not be able to cope with the increased volume of traffic. 5. Worried that Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that all brownfield sites are being used over Green Belt land. 6. The infrastructure of the village is already full. The doctors, primary school and local shop already have parking issues.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26302 - 8712 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26304 Object**Respondent: Ms Margaret Allan [8713]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a village with no infrastructure to cope with the proposed dwellings, i.e. parking, bus service, schools, doctors full to capacity at the moment. There must be more suitable sites available in the Borough before using Green Belt sites. The road access from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the volume of traffic planned for this site. The proposed sites are liable to flood, and will increase the risk of flooding to the rest of the village.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26304 - 8713 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26306 Object

Respondent: Mr John Allan [8714]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Has the impact of c.30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane been considered what effect will it have on the village.
2. If you built in this area how is the infrastructure going to cope i.e. traffic, schools, doctors full
3. There must be brownfield sites that should be looked at before using Green Belt sites.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26306 - 8714 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26308 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher J Atkins [8715]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Council not consulted with Epping Forest District Council regarding 30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and its impact on village.
2. No clear strategy for the village.
3. Development off Red Rose Lane is totally wrong. Blackmore is an unique village and should remain so.
4. Use brownfield sites before Green Belt.
5. Traffic in village is bad.
6. Doctors full to capacity.
7. Flooding a huge problem.
8. No housing need survey has been conducted for our village
9. Do not kill off the habitats of the wildlife and wild flowers to replace with houses.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26308 - 8715 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26310 Object

Respondent: Mr Paul Anthony [6823]

Agent: N/A

Summary: - Major concerns over local infrastructure. Havent seen any plans to ensure issues around roads, flooding, safety will be addressed.
- How are other housing development e.g. Fingrith Hall Lane being considered- haven't seen nothing on this?
- Dealing with parking by Co-op and outside schools
- How will flood risk be mitigated?
- School is full
- Explain why brownfields sites are not more suitable
- Traffic is already dangerous, there has been no planning for how this would be dealt with to make it safe for pedestrians.

Change To Plan: - Full and transparent review of flood risk mitigation strategy.
- Show plans for infrastructure improvements around traffic and parking
Consider other sites, brownfield sites where there will be better infrastructure, schools, shops and show the result of this review. Demonstrate what other sites were considered and why not suitable.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26310 - 6823 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26313 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lorraine Wisdom [8718]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The residential development of off Red Rose Lane will worsen the already stretched local services due to the increased number of residents i.e. doctors surgery, schools (primary and senior). Parking in the village is limited. Volume of traffic is detrimental and unsuitable for the location on/from Red Rose Lane. Proposed sites are liable to flooding and development on this land will increase the flood risk in the village has suffered from flooding previously. No housing need survey conducted. Brownfield sites should be developed first before building on greenbelt. Additional housing development in a 3-4 mile radius (Roman Road, Mountnessing 91; Toby Lane 90+) will want to use the facilities in surrounding area including Blackmore village. Has this been looked into my BBC and any effect it has or will have on our services locally?

Change To Plan: None I can think of other than a new site being found which is more suitable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26313 - 8718 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26315 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Bury [8717]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Although there is need for new affordable housing, this is vast over-egging of the cake, given the ongoing construction of 30+ new dwellings at the top of our lane.
2. The infrastructure and services in the village are totally inadequate to deal with such a housing population "explosion". The primary school would have to be rebuilt, the surgery is already overburdened.
3. There has been no consultation or housing need survey.
4. Red Rose Lane floods regularly.
5. Access to Red Rose Lane via/from any direction is simply not designed to cope with the volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: Plan's objectives should be:
1. more pragmatic approach with thorough consultation
2. a staged evolution to how many houses are built as opposed to this planned "revolution"
3. detailed, budgeted, thought through plans for the village's road and transport system, enlargement of school, the implication for the surgery, post office.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26315 - 8717 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26317 Object

Respondent: Ms Lynn Baggott [8721]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound as other building projects are under consideration and are not included in the BBC Plans. Doctors surgery full, school full. Traffic will cause many problems as most households have at least 2 cars and living in Blackmore, a car is essential. Epping Council are building on the boundary of Blackmore and this will have serious impacts on what at the moment is still a village of historic interest to many visitors.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. The BVHA Plan clearly sets out our local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26317 - 8721 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26319 Object

Respondent: Mr Alan Bird [8722]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Endorsed the fears expressed by all regarding grossly overload already stretched amenities. It is very difficult to get a doctor appointment, parking is a problem. I believe the local school is already full. Traffic has become quite dangerous on our narrow roads with many large lorries.

Change To Plan: Site R25 & R26 removed from the LDP. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26319 - 8722 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26326 Object

Respondent: Ms Maria J Bennett [8723]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development positioned on a road subject to flooding (where it meets Nine Ashes Road and Red Rose Farm). Red Rose Lane far too narrow to accommodate increased volume of traffic. Blackmore already had a new development at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane; another substantially larger development will greatly impact on waiting times at GP surgery, volume of parked vehicles, congestion in the centre of the village, local school capacity, as well as further generated traffic from parents/buses taking children to neighbouring village school.

Change To Plan: Changes to Plan:
Consideration should be given to the potential flood risks and impacts on the rest of the village. Is the road going to be widened? School and GP should be consulted, how will they cope with the increased number of residents?

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26326 - 8723 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26331 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village with narrow street and limited services. The existing infrastructure - schools, doctor surgery, roads, parking, sewage and drainage - are already overstretched and unable to support additional development. The area is prone to flooding which will only be worsen by development.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26331 - 8720 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26333 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert J Brittleton [8724]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated or shown other suitable sites (brown belt) for consideration. The primary + preschool are full. The Plan will not only have a detrimental effect on schools but also the doctors which are vastly oversubscribed. There will be an increase in traffic to local shop where there is very little parking causing unsafe condition on the village roads. No housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore was chosen. There are more suitable sites not considered. Red Rose Lane is too congested, liable to flood. The infrastructure in the village cannot sustain the amount of proposed houses.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 & R26 should be removed from LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26333 - 8724 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26335 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kelly BRITTLETON [8097]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated other suitable Brown Belt sites considered. Blackmore infrastructure i.e. school, pre-school, doctors, shops, parking and traffic will be threatened, unsafe and unmanageable with the increase in houses. There are more suitable locations but BBC has not demonstrated why Blackmore or why Green Belt. or why not increasing density on other allocations. Red Rose Lane is a lane and unsuitable as it is opposite an already congested part of the village by schools and clubs. Proposed sites are liable to flood. Our heritage village should be protected, not stressed.

Change To Plan: Re-allocate suitably elsewhere: Dunton, Stondon Massey, Brentwood
Sites R25 & R26 removed from Plan
Planners should read and refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Planl.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26335 - 8097 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26337 Object**Respondent: Mr & Mrs Melvin & Joy Wright [8725]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No comments made on form. Modifications read: We feel both sites R25 & R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan shows what housing needs require. We have no infrastructure to accommodate the people you wish to place in the house you wish to build.

Change To Plan: We feel both sites R25 & R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan shows what housing needs require. We have no infrastructure to accommodate the people you wish to place in the house you wish to build.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26337 - 8725 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26339 Object**Respondent: Mrs. P. Bakdwin [8726]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Housing shouldn't be built to accommodate the overspill of London. Brentwood is currently considered outer London but it won't be long before it becomes part of Greater London. More schools are needed with smaller class sizes. The existing infrastructure is insufficient. Concerned about the transformation of the area is the development goes ahead.

Change To Plan: Is this the best site are there not enough small infill plots around Brentwood or are they not economically viable for builders (Take look at the Manafly(?) Directors actual income of building companies).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26339 - 8726 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26341 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jeannette Butcher [8727]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Increased traffic and flooding. Doctor surgery is full.		
Change To Plan: Remove development from LDP		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26341 - 8727 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified
26343 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Black [1291]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The infrastructure, eg car parking, doctors surgery, schools, will struggle to cope with the increase in number of families coming into the village, Blackmore.		
Change To Plan: There are a number of other sites that should be considered before Blackmore.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26343 - 1291 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii		Tests: ii
		Examination: Not Specified
26345 Object	Respondent: Mrs Ruth Black [8728]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Other developments are not being taken into consideration. Impact on village school, doctors surgery, parking and road etc.		
Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26345 - 8728 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii		Tests: i, ii, iii
		Examination: Not Specified
26347 Object	Respondent: Mr Cliff Black [8729]	Agent: N/A
Summary: I do not feel that other developments by councils such as Chelmsford and Epping Forest are being taken into consideration and the strain they will add to Blackmore pubic services. The access roads to the proposed sites in Red Rose Lane do not appear to support this level of development		
Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26347 - 8729 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified
26349 Object	Respondent: Mrs Janet Birch [8730]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Infrastructure and services unable cope now - parking, doctors surgery - only one shop.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26349 - 8730 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified
26353 Object	Respondent: Mr Arthur Birch [4769]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Blackmore has only modest facilities and would struggle to accommodate these developments. Locally traffic seems to be mushroomed. Parking in the village centre is difficult. I think there are other allocated sites which could accommodate these developments more easily.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26353 - 4769 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified
26357 Object	Respondent: Mrs Maureen Butler [5017]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The infrastructure of the village is no capable of with standing the amount of housing being proposed.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26357 - 5017 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified

26359 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Burgess [5030]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local infrastructure and services - parking, doctors surgery, bus service - are not sufficient and cannot support the proposed development. Area prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26359 - 5030 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26376 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kim Barber [8731]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound as no clear strategy for villages, inc. Blackmore, in the north of the borough. Sever impact on Blackmore of construction of dwelling as village cannot support services, i.e. school, doctors, bus service, etc. No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26376 - 8731 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26384 Object**Respondent: Mr. Colin Barber [919]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound as no clear strategy for villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. Sever impact on Blackmore of construction of dwelling as village cannot support services, i.e. school, doctors, bus service, etc. No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26384 - 919 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26386 Object**Respondent: Mr Martin Clark [2456]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Local Plan is not NPPF compliant on many points: e.g. to meet local need, to include local community, responsive to local circumstances, to limit the need to travel, to carry out flood risk assessment, to protect and enhance biodiversity, to conserve the historic environment.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs.

* Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no proven need that Blackmore need this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little local employment.

* Detailed flood risk analysis required.

* Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need If any is proven.

* Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood.

* Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26386 - 2456 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26391 Object

Respondent: Mrs Anita Clark [8168]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Very little local infrastructure. Local roads are rural and not designed for large traffic flow, 70 houses will add 100+ cars to the village. R25 and R26 are far from employment opportunities. There is no proven need for houses in this area. The local community's opinions and local survey results have been ignored. Sites R25 and R26 were discounted under previous plans why is it now deemed to be acceptable to develop on these Green Belt sites? There is no 'joined up' strategy for the villages in the north of the borough or discussion with adjacent authorities.

Change To Plan: To be legally compliant the plan needs to comply with the NPPF guidance. This calls for:
* Local community Involvement. There has been none to meet local needs. There is no proven need. * Green Belt to be protected. R25 and R26 are on Green Belt land. Locations need to be selected to minimize the need to travel. Blackmore is a small village with few local employment opportunities. * All of these Issues need to be assessed for the LDP to comply.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26391 - 8168 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26393 Object

Respondent: Mr John Adkins [8734]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding 70 houses to the village is excessive - to share the existing shop, schools etc it does not take into account the 30+ houses being built by Epping Forest Council outside our village but will all expect to be 'serviced' by the existing village. Not possible unless we can ban them from using our facilities

Change To Plan: Offset the number of houses by 30 (the number being built by Epping Forest Council next to our village) so 70-30=40 absolutely maximum.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26393 - 8734 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26397 Object

Respondent: Ms Anne Adkins [8735]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not legally compliant. No consultation.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult local needs.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26397 - 8735 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26400 Object

Respondent: Ms Elizabeth Arthur [8736]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is completely unsound. Site is in Green Belt, only brownfield sites should ever be considered. Traffic access via Blackmore is already compromised with poor parking, narrow lane and busy. A huge increase of local traffic will make the village a car park. Infrastructure is suited to a small village, not such an increase in population. Flooding: our roads are already compromised by flood run off, more houses will cause considerable damage to property.

Change To Plan: A far more in depth study of other suitable options to provide housing.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26400 - 8736 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26402 Object

Respondent: Ms Mandy Anthony [8737]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound. No demonstration of how flooding or general infrastructure will be dealt with. Blackmore cannot cope with this number of houses: schools are busy and I haven't seen anything that proves new problems will be managed.

Change To Plan: Would like to see what plans have been prepared to consider: - flood risk - safety issue relating to increased traffic - how this plan has been drafted in line with other regions, e.g. Epping houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane - show the housing needs survey - sustainable plan for Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26402 - 8737 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

26409 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ella Bradley [4875]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure - schools, doctors surgery, parking, drainage, roads - unable to cope.

Change To Plan: I really can't see what modifications could be considered in view of the infrastructure of the village. In view of my previous comments - the potential flooding - the narrow lanes - the parking - schools, doctors at full capacity.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26409 - 4875 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26411 Object**Respondent: Mr. Gordon John Beman [8739]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: All local services and infrastructure is at capacity - roads, drainage, schools, doctor surgery, parking, shop. Area is prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: Plots R25 and R26 should both be removed from the LDP on two points. 1. We already have several plots under consideration for development by property developers both in and surrounding areas. 2. BBC have chosen to ignore several suitable sites for development including neglected "brownfield options".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26411 - 8739 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, iii, iv

26413 Object**Respondent: Mr. Robert Beeching [3839]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No consideration of developments in other neighbouring authorities. Local schools and medical facilities are at capacity. Flooding issues.

Change To Plan: Green belt land should be developed as a last resort - there are plenty of other sites in around Brentwood where better facilities exist.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26413 - 3839 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26415 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Burgess [4863]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - school, doctors surgery, parking. Area prone to flooding. No housing needs survey done.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26415 - 4863 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26418 Object**Respondent: Ms Margaret Boreham [8033]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - school, doctors surgery, parking. Area prone to flooding. No housing needs survey done.

Change To Plan: scrap it

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26418 - 8033 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii

26421 Object**Respondent: Mr David Baines [8740]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - school, doctors surgery, parking. Area prone to flooding. No housing needs survey done. More suitable locations elsewhere. Lack of consideration of village needs.

Change To Plan: Consider the local needs as outlined by the BVHA plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26421 - 8740 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26430 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore services and infrastructure - roads, drainage, parking, schools, doctor surgery - are already at capacity and cannot accommodate any additional people / dwellings.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26430 - 8742 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26433 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore services and infrastructure - roads, drainage, parking, schools, doctor surgery - are already at capacity and cannot accommodate any additional people / dwellings.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26433 - 8741 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26441 Object**Respondent: Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Blackmore seems to have been chosen by developers rather than BBC as other non-greenbelt sites are available in Stondon Massey and surrounds. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP and consult BVHA local neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26441 - 7309 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26446 Object**Respondent: Mrs Wendy Dunbar [8743]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 to be removed from the LDP and Planners to refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which details the local housing needs, etc.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26446 - 8743 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26448 Object**Respondent: Mr Reginald Dawson [8744]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the Village. School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area. The single doctor surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for an appointment already standing at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required. Current transport links for the villages would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the aging population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26448 - 8744 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26450 Object

Respondent: Mr Lewis Pincombe [8745]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited.

Change To Plan: use local other brownfield site in the area before using green belt land. Simple.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26450 - 8745 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - ii, iii, iv

26452 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lindsey Pavitt [8746]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs modifying to consider other local areas suitable for development in the Brentwood locality. The Local Plan also has to be reviewed to consider other development in progress of 30 or more houses within 2 miles of Blackmore which will put more pressure on the village roads and amenities. Where will children from the existing new development and the proposed development go to school ? Can roads within and around Blackmore cope with considerably more traffic? The existing roads are narrow, in a poor condition and with pot holes at the sides already. Areas in the village which already, or in the past, have flooded quite seriously must surely be considered before more houses are built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26452 - 8746 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26454 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Pavitt [8747]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs modifying to consider other local areas suitable for development in the Brentwood locality. The Local Plan also has to be reviewed to consider other development in progress of 30 or more houses within 2 miles of Blackmore which will put more pressure on the village roads and amenities. Where will children from the existing new development and the proposed development go to school ? Can roads within and around Blackmore cope with considerably more traffic? The existing roads are narrow, in a poor condition and with pot holes at the sides already. Areas in the village which already, or in the past, have flooded quite seriously must surely be considered before more houses are built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26454 - 8747 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26459 Object

Respondent: Mr John Orbell [4805]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP Plan. You need to refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association for our Local Housing Needs for our sustainable community. We do not want unwanted and unjustified large scale development. There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Was it not the Brentwood Borough Council who said "we will continue to protect our key assets including the environment, heritage and character of the borough".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26459 - 4805 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

26463 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen York [8748]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited.	
Change To Plan:	Please refer to the plan put together by BVHA	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26463 - 8748 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
26466 Object	Respondent: Cllr Roger Keeble [1990]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. Limited employment opportunities in the village. No consideration of the developments in neighbouring authorities. The original draft Plan discounted Blackmore as it did not align with the councils strategy, and this has not changed.	
Change To Plan:	The moving of 25 and R26 sites out of the LDP could be mitigated by increasing the numbers of properties built at Dunton Garden Village. This occurred with the transfer of 260 properties to DGV in amendment I of the extraordinary council on 8th November 2018. This was done because the access to the properties down Honeypot Lane which is bounded by historical hedges, deep ditches and no change of a pavement for pedestrians. 70 houses could be included into the urban area by increasing density of development in areas where both transport and employment lines are far superior to R25 and R26.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26466 - 1990 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
26492 Object	Respondent: Mr Surinder Panesar [8749]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Impact on natural environment including increased flooding risk and going against the purpose of the Green Belt.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out the local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26492 - 8749 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
26495 Object	Respondent: Mrs Annabelle Panesar [8750]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	site allocations are inappropriate.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 to be removed. BVHA neighbourhood Plan sets out the local housing needs, that are sustainable.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26495 - 8750 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv	
26498 Object	Respondent: Mrs Linda Watkinson [4984]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site is in the green belt. Development should be focused in more sustainable areas, and not in areas like Blackmore which is in the greenbelt. Local services and infrastructure are at full capacity - school, GP surgery, roads, drainages, sewage utilities. Limited public transport.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26498 - 4984 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iv	
26501 Object	Respondent: Ms Lesley Whan [8751]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local services and infrastructure are already at capacity - school, GP surgery, limited parking. Area is prone to flooding. Site is green belt.	
Change To Plan:	The road system is inadequate - major changes would have to be made. Realising the pressure that local councils are facing with direct figures in new builds. Surely, less greenbelt area can be found. The area regularly suffers power cuts therefore a major upgrade would be necessary. Similarly, water pressure is extremely low therefore there would be a major impact on the local population. An extension, or new build, would have to be made at Blackmore Primary School. In conclusion therefore what would be the best for the above, and some of the others that haven't been mentioned. Who would fit the bill?	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 26501 - 8751 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii	

26572 Object

Respondent: Mr & Mrs Gunthardt [8790]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Our objections to the proposed development reflected the general views expressed by our Parish Council and those of a large proportion of the Village population. We feel strongly that the proposed development including the latest revised LDP would negatively impact on the unique character of the Blackmore Village and put undue strain on its already strained infrastructure and services including traffic and parking facilities, access to the local school, lack of adequate medical facilities, flooding etc. We also understand that there are now plans to build a further 70 properties just outside our borough which will cause further strain on the resources and infrastructure of our village. We fully support the efforts and views expressed by our local Parish Council. We trust that you will fully take into account of the views expressed by the residents of our village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26572 - 8790 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - None

23272 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on this site should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23272 - 3791 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, ii, iii, iv

23634 Support

Respondent: Constable Homes Limited [7333]

Agent: Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]

Summary: Although we object to the indicative yield and suggest amendments are needed to make the policy sound but site R25 is fully supported. It is an appropriate site for the northern villages and would contribute towards a sustainable development. Site is suitable: it is not subject to any ecological designations, raise no concern regarding surface water flooding, capable of being laid out in a way that effects on the two listed buildings can be minimised. Site can contribute towards the 5-year housing land supply. The selected house builder has track record of delivery. The masterplan complies to the policy.

Change To Plan: To make the policy sound:

*The policy text needs to be amended to allow provision for around 50 new homes of mixed size and type;

* Policy Part A.b of the policy needs to clarify that the 25% requirement would comprise of all affordable housing and would contribute to the borough-wide Policy HP05 requirement to provide 35% affordable housing onsite; it should also contains a mechanism for these units to be made available for people outside the local area in the event that they are unfulfilled by people with a 'local connection'. Addition text are recommended as followed: [A S106...of age.] These dwellings should comprise affordable housing as defined by the NPPF and, for the avoidance of doubt, should contribute towards the requirements of Policy HP05 (Affordable Housing). [A person with ...parishes or wards.] The nomination agreement will include provision for the release of such dwellings to persons on a prescribed waiting list who do not meet the above criteria, following a 3- month period of seeking to secure a letting to a local person(s) in the event the local connection remains unfulfilled.

*Policy Part B.d should add the following text: [heritage ... Blackmore] and taking account of the potential effect on the settings of listed buildings in accordance with the NPPF.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23634 - 7333 - POLICY R25: LAND NORTH OF WOOLLARD WAY - i, iv

22198 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The development of houses at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane is within Epping Forest District Council area but will impact services and infrastructure in Blackmore. Consultation between the two boroughs has not taken place. Developing the greenbelt beyond the edge of Blackmore village is not appropriate to the rural setting of the area. It will change the rural nature of the village and have an impact on already stretched infrastructure and services. This site is unsuitable as floods regularly. More housing will put pressure on sewers and increase flood risk elsewhere from surface water, particularly in historic village centre.

Change To Plan: Take into account housing development nearby in Epping Forest District. Consult with Epping Forest District Council on housing development. Protect the rural setting of Blackmore Village. Avoid further impact on stretched local services and infrastructure. Avoid building on area prone to flooding. Avoid exceeding sewer capacity. Avoid increasing the flood risk to other sites in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22198 - 8199 - 9.197 - i, ii

22223 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Drew [8212]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I do not agree with building on green belt land. The infrastructure currently will not support the increase in housing planned. The doctors surgery can not cope now with the population locally

Change To Plan: Confirmation that the infrastructure, particularly the doctors, can cope with this increase in population. One of the local buses has recently been threatened with being cut but was relieved. I am not convinced that local transport is sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22223 - 8212 - 9.197 - iv

22258 Object**Respondent: mr Steve Whalley [4328]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A development of this size will greatly affect the historic conservation area of Blackmore. The infrastructure does not exist to cope with an increase in foul and surface drainage and WILL lead to more flooding in the area. Experience of living here for 30 years bears this out.

Change To Plan: remove from LDP

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22258 - 4328 - 9.197 - i

22191 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A housing needs survey has not been done. The Council has not shown that there is a housing need locally or the quantity and type of housing needed.

Change To Plan: Undertake a local housing needs survey for the Villages in the north of the Borough and use the evidence from that to plan for local housing development.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22191 - 8199 - 9.198 - i, ii

22196 Object **Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: This proposed main vehicular access from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for this volume of traffic due to its narrow and rural nature. To alter this old rural road would not be appropriate to the rural setting of the area. Section 2.10 of the Settlement Hierarchy chapter of the LDP states 'Development should be appropriate to the rural setting of the area.'

Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for this volume of traffic because it floods regularly.
The three junctions with faster main roads are not suitable for this volume of traffic. I am concerned that there would be accidents.

Change To Plan: Avoid changes to the rural nature of Red Rose Lane.
Avoid an increase in the volume of traffic on/off Red Rose Lane.
Avoid an increase in the volume of traffic at the junctions of Red Rose Lane and the main roads.
Avoid an increase in the volume of traffic on Red Rose Lane which floods regularly.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22196 - 8199 - 9.199 - ii

22255 Object **Respondent: mr Steve Whalley [4328]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The ancient plague road of Redrose Lane is not suitable for the amount of traffic associated with this development. It is not suitable for this purpose.

Change To Plan: Remove item from plan

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22255 - 4328 - 9.199 - i

22489 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Paragraph 9.199 makes reference to the main vehicular access for the site to be via Redrose Lane.

ECC as Highway Authority has previously advised that vehicular access from Redrose Lane may not be able to meet highway standards, and it could be more appropriate to take access from Nine Ashes Road.

The paragraph should therefore be amended to reflect this.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 9.199 as follows -

The development will take its main vehicular access from Nine Ashes Road.....'

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22489 - 6776 - 9.199 - iii

22491 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] **Agent:** N/A

- Summary:
- 2. Justified.
 - 3. Effective.
 - 4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request additional paragraph after paragraph 9.204 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after 9.204 -

The proposed development area is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?:No	Tests: ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 22491 - 6776 - Land north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore - ii, iii, iv				

22197 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not stated what planning principle is being used to allocate the development of the Villages in the north of the borough. There are several rural communities and I am concerned that Blackmore is being allocated more than its fair share of new housing which will change the rural character of the village. Section 2.10 of the Settlement Hierarchy chapter of the LDP states 'Development should be appropriate to the rural setting of the area.'

Change To Plan: A clear, fair and evidence based strategy to be stated for the allocation of housing in the villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22197 - 8199 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

22203 Object**Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inclusion of site allocations R25 and R26 in the LDP are inappropriate, unsound and not compliant with legal requirements on the following grounds: failure to prove that more suitable (brownfield) sites do not exist in the borough, or that other site allocations couldn't absorb the 70 dwellings proposed; inadequate consultation with EppingForestDistrictCouncil and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore; failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development; adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; inadequate local amenities/services; other considerations per full representation.

Change To Plan: Removal of proposed developments R25 and R26 from the plan and reallocation of the 70 dwellings to more suitable brownfield sites in the borough.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22203 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv

22256 Object**Respondent: mr Steve Whalley [4328]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Item 2.10 in the LDP Settlement Hierarchy Chapter states "Development should be appropriate to the rural setting of the area" - this clearly is not appropriate.

The building of 30 houses on greenbelt land is not in line with planning policy and will forever alter the rural nature of the area whilst encouraging more infill development.

Change To Plan: Remove this item from the LDP

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22256 - 4328 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i

22492 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. a. of Policy R26 states that vehicular access should be via Redrose Lane

ECC have previously advised that vehicular access from Redrose Lane may not be able to meet highway standards. It would be more appropriate to take access from Orchard Piece, or after further consideration Fingrith Hall Road.

The policy should therefore be amended to reflect this.

Change To Plan: Amend Policy R26 B. a. as follows -

vehicular access via Orchard Piece or Fingrith Hall Road;

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22492 - 6776 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - iii

22578 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy wording lacks a commitment to deliver biodiversity net gain.

The hedgerows should be retained and enhanced, open space should be multifunctional and should include semi natural habitats for the benefit of wildlife. The scheme should deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity.

Change To Plan: Policy wording should be amended as follows:

c. provision for "multifunctional" public open space to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22578 - 2414 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - iv

22623 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22623 - 8290 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22630 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22630 - 8290 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22631 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R26 is home to a number of protected species including turtle doves, skylarks, various species of bat, and barn owls. The turtle dove is a Section 41 species which is of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. They are vulnerable to global extinction and identified in the Red List of Endangered Species. The loss of this site to housing would inevitably mean the loss of this important breeding site and contrary to national policy. As it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22631 - 8290 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22637 Object**Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not been fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22637 - 8290 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22641 Object

Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22641 - 8292 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22643 Object

Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22643 - 8292 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22649 Object

Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed sites in Blackmore (R25, R26) are liable to flood, and the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village which has been subject to severe flooding in the past.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22649 - 8292 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22651 Object

Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22651 - 8292 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22670 Object

Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not chosen for good planning protocols, but convenient due to developers lined up.
At last LDP iteration - inappropriate to develop in the villages due to a lack of infrastructure. Nothing changed.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22670 - 4869 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

22671 Object

Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The scale of 70 new houses in a village of 350 houses is totally out of proportion - will change character.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22671 - 4869 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

22672 Object**Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Poor access. Lack of good transport links.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22672 - 4869 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22673 Object**Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flooding risk to village increased.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22673 - 4869 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

22674 Object**Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore School at capacity - would force pupils out of the area.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22674 - 4869 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

22675 Object**Respondent: Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No 'very special circumstances' to warrant building on greenbelt.

Change To Plan: Remove site from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22675 - 4869 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

22692 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Swift [1747]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The amended policy of 30 houses is not in line with national policy for a plot of this size. This site (1.52 hectares) would provide housing for at least 40, two-three bedroomed homes.

Change To Plan: The allocation of 40 units should be reinstated instead of 30 units.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No

Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22692 - 1747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i

22696 Object**Respondent: Ms Virginia Stiff [1748]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The units allocated to the site have been reduced to 30 units, however, given that there is an acute need at the local level for more housing, there is no rationale given for this reduction. I believe the allocation of 40 units should, therefore, be reinstated.

Change To Plan: The allocation of 40 units should be reinstated.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22696 - 1748 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, iv

22697 Object**Respondent: D. Rawlings [1058]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is an isolated village with modest infrastructure and services and are at capacity. Therefore new development could not be supported. The area is currently prone to flooding. More suitable and sustainable site exist with Brentwood and brownfield sites. Development should not be permitted on greenfield / green belt

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 22697 - 1058 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, iii

22707 Object

Respondent: Mrs Christine Blythe [4718]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I do not agree that the allocation of Policy R26 has been reduced from 40 to 30 units as there is an acute need at a local level for both private and affordable housing, and there is no technical justification for this change. According to Policy HP03 "Residential development proposals will generally be expected to achieve a net density of at least 35 dwellings per hectare net or higher.." Accordingly the net area of this site (1.52 hectares) this would equate to around 53 units.

Change To Plan: Given the need to provide sufficient housing supply for the coming 15 years an allocation of approximately 40 units should be reinstated.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: i, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22707 - 4718 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, iv

22709 Object

Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council are required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22709 - 8292 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22710 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22710 - 7003 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22713 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22713 - 7003 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22715 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22715 - 7003 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22717 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not been fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22717 - 7003 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22719 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Borough Council are required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22719 - 7003 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22723 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities and has failed to account for the impact of developments in close proximity to the village. This contradicts key requirements of the LDP, as a nearby development of around 30 houses is under way on Fingrith Hall Lane, having been approved by Epping Forest District Council. The residents of these homes will undoubtedly use Blackmore infrastructure and the impact of these properties has not been taken into account.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22723 - 7003 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22724 Object

Respondent: Ms Gabriella Fickling [8292]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities and has failed to account for the impact of developments in close proximity to the village. This contradicts key requirements of the LDP, as a nearby development of around 30 houses is under way on Fingrith Hall Lane, having been approved by Epping Forest District Council. The residents of these homes will undoubtedly use Blackmore infrastructure and the impact of these properties has not been taken into account.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22724 - 8292 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22725 Object

Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities and has failed to account for the impact of developments in close proximity to the village. This contradicts key requirements of the LDP, as a nearby development of around 30 houses is under way on Fingrith Hall Lane, having been approved by Epping Forest District Council. The residents of these homes will undoubtedly use Blackmore infrastructure and the impact of these properties has not been taken into account.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22725 - 8290 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22726 Object

Respondent: Dr Murray Wood [7003]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R26 is home to a number of protected species including turtle doves, skylarks, various species of bat, and barn owls. The turtle dove is a Section 41 species which is of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. They are vulnerable to global extinction and identified in the Red List of Endangered Species. The loss of this site to housing would inevitably mean the loss of this important breeding site and contrary to national policy. As it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22726 - 7003 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22727 Object

Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22727 - 8290 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22728 Object

Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22728 - 8290 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22730 Object

Respondent: Ms Pierina Norman [8290]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22730 - 8290 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22819 Object

Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and as such has just enough amenities to support the number of people living here at present. One local store, two public houses, hairdressers and a garage. At the moment parking in the centre of our village at times can be a nightmare, extra cars in the village will just add to this.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22819 - 4841 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22821 Object

Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Parking outside the local shop at present is now dangerous. In the event of an emergency will emergency vehicles manage to get past the often double parked cars? The new development on the ex riding stables by Epping Forest council in Fingrith Hall Road can only add to the problem as traffic will use Blackmore as an access route and drive down to use the local shop.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22821 - 4841 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22823 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Has BBC consulted with Epping Forest District council on the impact their developments have on our village?

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22823 - 4841 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22825 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Can our doctors practice cope with more people? Try getting an appointment, you have to wait weeks now. This can only get worse.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22825 - 4841 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22827 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Can our local school cope with all the extra children any development would bring to the village?

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22827 - 4841 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22829 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We moved to Blackmore to be surrounded by green fields. What will it be like in the future? Instead of green belt open countryside, urban development and our narrow lane turned into a busy access road. It certainly is not suitable for the volume of traffic any new development would create.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22829 - 4841 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22831 Object**Respondent: Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: If this development does go ahead, how many years of disruption through our village. Large lorries hurtling through our country roads, breaking up the road surface. Noise, dust, road works when new sewers, pipes etc. for the essential services are required to be laid. This is a small village. Keep it that way.

Change To Plan: Leave Blackmore alone, let the residents continue to enjoy their way of life. If building needs to be done look for brown belt sites in more suitable areas first before greenbelt areas are considered. Many of which I understand have been identified but rejected.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22831 - 4841 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22862 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. For example Epping Forest District Council which is building about 30 new houses just 1 mile north of Blackmore at the top of Fingrith Hall lane. This will have a major impact on the village amenities, and will increase traffic flow through the village, especially when added to the over 70 new properties being proposed for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22862 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22863 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties as it is a single track lane which is unsuitable for heavy construction traffic, and the following traffic generated by the 70 properties.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22863 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22864 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village has historically been subject to serious flooding, most recently being 3 years ago. Red Rose lane is susceptible to flooding and this makes it impassable to vehicles. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems, even with the adoption of SUDS.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22864 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22865 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP, and why other areas have not.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22865 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22866 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong. The infrastructure simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22866 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22867 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding approximately 200 more cars (over 70 houses in Blackmore and 30 in Fingrith Hall lane) in the village of Blackmore (which already suffers from significant parking problems) will create a real danger to pedestrians in the village. The lives of small children and old people will be put in real danger with such a large increase in traffic volumes. There is not sufficient public transport links to the surrounding areas to make this environmentally sound, as the increase in private vehicles will add to the pollution already caused during the development phase.

Changes to Plan:

My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22867 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22868 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22868 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22869 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road. This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of it's services by the addition of more permanent dwellings.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22869 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22870 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22870 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22871 Object**Respondent: Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough: there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, but the Council have not shown that the required additional houses could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites; no evidence shows that available nearby Brownfield sites have been prioritised over greenfield; other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills) would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22871 - 4475 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22876 Object**Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R26 is inherently unsuitable developments because of flooding

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22876 - 8074 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22877 Object**Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R26 is inherently unsuitable developments because it will result in disproportionate increase in the housing stock

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22877 - 8074 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22878 Object	Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	R26 is inherently unsuitable developments because the development would not be sustainable.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22878 - 8074 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
22885 Object	Respondent: Mr Stephen Chapman [8245]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	House building on the site is not reasonable.	
Change To Plan:	Remove R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22885 - 8245 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - iii	
	Tests: iii	Examination: No
22886 Object	Respondent: Mr Stephen Chapman [8245]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Redrose Lane is not fit for the traffic, being too narrow at places. Parking around the single shop is already a problem; there are no pavements in the area of Redrose Lane, making it potentially unsafe for local pedestrians if this and the adjacent development drive up local traffic.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22886 - 8245 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - iii	
	Tests: iii	Examination: No
22887 Object	Respondent: Mr Stephen Chapman [8245]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The installation of utilities will be difficult, being at the edge of the village.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22887 - 8245 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - iii	
	Tests: iii	Examination: No
22888 Object	Respondent: Mr Stephen Chapman [8245]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The area is a natural relief floodplain for Blackmore, which already sees almost being cut off by deep water after periods of heavy rain and this development would make the situation worse.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22888 - 8245 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - iii	
	Tests: iii	Examination: No
22924 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	1. Plan unsound: no clear strategy. R25/R26 previously deemed 'unsuitable for development'	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22924 - 8240 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
22925 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	2. No prior consultation with affected Blackmore residents	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22925 - 8240 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No

22926 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	4. Village services already overloaded (e.g. health, education, parking). Developments will exacerbate	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22926 - 8240 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22928 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	3. Plots R25 & R26 Greenbelt. Unsuitable for development owing to flooding, poor access road, extra strain on services	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22928 - 8240 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22929 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	5. Poor transport links will suffer further by additional dwellings	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22929 - 8240 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22934 Object	Respondent: Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	7. No evidence of proper examination of alternative sites (brownfield or in other parishes). LDP proposals appear developer-led	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22934 - 8240 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22975 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Plan unsound - no clear strategy. R25 & R26 previously deemed 'unsuitable for development'	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22975 - 4388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22976 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No prior consultation with affected residents. No account of developments in adjacent boroughs, or evidence of consultation with those Councils	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22976 - 4388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
22977 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No Housing Needs Survey to assess demand	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 22977 - 4388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	

22978 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site unsuitable for residential development - flooding	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22978 - 4388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
22979 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site unsuitable for residential development - undue strain on services	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22979 - 4388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
22980 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Village already congested in its centre (mainly parking), development will exacerbate problem, poor access road, already poor transport links strained further by extra dwellings	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22980 - 4388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
22981 Object	Respondent: Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No evidence alternative sites (Brownfield/other parishes) has been properly examined. Development appears developer-led.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22981 - 4388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: No
22983 Object	Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	inadequate consultation with Epping Forest District Council and failure to properly consider the impact of other nearby developments on Blackmore;	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22983 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv	Tests: ii, iv
		Examination: No
22984 Object	Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Failure to recognise the increased flood risk resulting from the proposed development;	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22984 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv	Tests: ii, iv
		Examination: No
22985 Object	Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	adverse impact on roads, noise levels and safety of existing road users from increased traffic; not located within the identified transit corridors	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22985 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv	Tests: ii, iv
		Examination: No

22986 Object	Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Impact on Green Belt, does not represent an acceptable exception;	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22986 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv	Tests: ii, iv
		Examination: No
22987 Object	Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	loss of agricultural land and intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22987 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv	Tests: ii, iv
		Examination: No
22988 Object	Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Should be for affordable housing for local community needs	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22988 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv	Tests: ii, iv
		Examination: No
22989 Object	Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	the council have inappropriately passed a motion that would allow up to 75% of the properties built on the proposed sites to be sold to those other than local people (indeed the other 25% are reserved for "local people or those over 50 years of age", so there is no guarantee that any would be allocated to local community needs).	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22989 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv	Tests: ii, iv
		Examination: No
22990 Object	Respondent: Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore should be Settlement Category 4, rather than Category 3, as it is remote and it having poor public transport, limited shops, jobs and community facilities and it being reliant on nearby settlements for some of its services (doctors, vets, supermarkets etc.).	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 22990 - 4376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iv	Tests: ii, iv
		Examination: No
23004 Object	Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The proposed development is on Green Belt land which should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Amendments to boundaries around the village of Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as required by national policy.	
Change To Plan:	- Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development. - Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken, as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 23004 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	Tests: None
		Examination: No

23005 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development, in particular that there are no other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt land development such as the sites off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23005 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23006 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development would cause the access off Red Rose Lane to be entirely unsuitable. The lane is narrow and does not have pavements for pedestrians. There are ditches on either side and two cars cannot pass each other without pulling to the side. The extra traffic would cause a major hazard because Redrose Lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development is sustainable.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23006 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23007 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken, as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23007 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23008 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development sites are liable to flood and this will also increase the flood risk in the village which has been subject to severe flooding in the past. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past. The proposed development is therefore not sustainable, and if ponds and extra drainage are required to alleviate the risk of flooding, then the development may not be deliverable.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken, as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23008 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23009 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore village has very basic services and infrastructure including minimal bus services to Brentwood and Chelmsford. The LDP does not demonstrate that the level of proposed development in Blackmore can be accommodated by existing infrastructure, and the plan is therefore not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23009 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23010 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village primary school is already full. The LDP does not demonstrate that the level of proposed development in Blackmore can be accommodated by existing infrastructure, and the plan is therefore not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23010 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23011 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The nearest doctors' surgery is severely overstretched with increasingly long waiting times for appointments. Further housing development would cause a significant negative impact on all of these services and congestion. The LDP does not demonstrate that the level of proposed development in Blackmore can be accommodated by existing infrastructure, and the plan is therefore not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23011 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23012 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village centre is often very congested with parked cars near the local shop, making it difficult to park or turn at the junction or park. Further housing development would cause a significant negative impact on all of these services and congestion. The LDP does not demonstrate that the level of proposed development in Blackmore can be accommodated by existing infrastructure, and the plan is therefore not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23012 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23013 Object

Respondent: Mr Gary Dimond [7055]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R26 is home to a number of protected species including turtle doves, skylarks and barn owls. The turtle dove is a Section 41 species which is of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. They are vulnerable to global extinction and identified in the Red List of Endangered Species. The loss of this site to housing would inevitably mean the loss of this important breeding site and thus further loss of appropriate habitat. Loss of this habitat and impact on protected species is also contrary to national policy.

Change To Plan: - Brentwood Borough Council is required to demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available which should take priority over Green Belt development.
- Highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment, detailed ecological surveys and 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village should be undertaken as it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23013 - 7055 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23014 Object

Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R26 is home to a number of protected species including turtle doves, skylarks, various species of bat, and barn owls. The turtle dove is a Section 41 species which is of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. They are vulnerable to global extinction and identified in the Red List of Endangered Species. The loss of this site to housing would inevitably mean the loss of this important breeding site and contrary to national policy. As it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23014 - 4851 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23015 Object

Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23015 - 4851 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23016 Object

Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23016 - 4851 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23017 Object

Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23017 - 4851 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23018 Object

Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23018 - 4851 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23019 Object

Respondent: Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23019 - 4851 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23028 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]

Agent: N/A

Summary: School full

Change To Plan: Remove site 26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23028 - 8300 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23030 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Green Belt Land should not be used as a building ground.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23030 - 8300 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23031 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is far too narrow for the access to a housing estate.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23031 - 8300 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23034 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23034 - 8300 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23036 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The parking in the village is diabolical already. Lack of parking already affects the economy you are destroying our lovely village and affecting our economy detrimentally.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23036 - 8300 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23039 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Doctors surgery is not coping with the people it serves now. We have to wait a long time for an appointment now which will only get worse.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23039 - 8300 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23041 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The school is already full with a long waiting list and will not cope with a large influx of children!

The ground has insufficient grounds to extend and this then affects all of the children who currently go to the school.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23041 - 8300 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23043 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The services currently in Blackmore will not cope with the number of families coming if all the houses are built.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23043 - 8300 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23050 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green belt land should be preserved and not used for building ground.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23050 - 8301 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23053 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking in the village is already insufficient and is a struggle for residents. Blackmore has lots of visitors and the lack of parking already affects the economy hugely. More vehicles and need for parking would ruin the village and have a detrimental effect on the village, also making it less safe for local residents and children.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23053 - 8301 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23056 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The facilities and services in the village will not cope with the additional residents and families coming into the village, it will become far too overcrowded.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23056 - 8301 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23058 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local primary school is already full at maximum capacity with a long waiting list, and will not be able to cope with a large influx of additional children. The school has insufficient extra ground to be able to extend its facilities to be able to accommodate for extra children. Neighbouring villages schools are also at maximum capacity.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23058 - 8301 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23059 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery already struggles with the amount of local residents in the area as it is. It would not be able to cope with the needs and demands of a large number of additional residents. The waiting list is to be seen is already long, and this would only get worse and affect the service residents need.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23059 - 8301 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23062 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery already struggles with the amount of local residents in the area as it is. It would not be able to cope with the needs and demands of a large number of additional residents. The waiting list is to be seen is already long, and this would only get worse and affect the service residents need.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23062 - 8301 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23064 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is far too narrow for it to provide access to a busy housing estate.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23064 - 8301 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23066 Object**Respondent: Miss Natalie Smith [8301]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23066 - 8301 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23069 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R26 is home to a number of protected species including turtle doves, skylarks, yellowhammers and barn owls. The turtle dove is a Section 41 species which is of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. They are vulnerable to global extinction and identified in the Red List of Endangered Species. The loss of this site to housing would inevitably mean the loss of this important breeding site and thus further loss of appropriate habitat.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23069 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23071 Object**Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The school is already full with a long waiting list and will not cope with a large influx of children. The school is already full with a long waiting list and will not cope with a large influx of children. The ground has insufficient grounds for extending. You are having a detrimental effect on the children who are already settled if you make the school move! You are having a detrimental effect on the children who are already settled if you make the school move!

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23071 - 8302 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23073 Object**Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Doctors surgery is not coping with the people already in the area. Waiting for an appointment is long which will only get worse!

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23073 - 8302 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23075 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not consulted adequately with the neighbouring authorities and considered the impact of developments in the neighbouring vicinity such as Epping Forest District Council. There are additional planned housing developments in Red Rose Farm and on Spriggs Lane near Blackmore which have not been taken into account, these will rely on Blackmore infrastructure and result in increased use of services.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23075 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23077 Object**Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The services currently in Blackmore will not cope with the number of families coming if all the houses are built.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23077 - 8302 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23079 Object**Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23079 - 8302 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23081 Object**Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is far too narrow for the access to a housing estate!

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23081 - 8302 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23083 Object **Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green Belt Land should not be used as a building ground.

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23083 - 8302 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23084 Object **Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are other more suitable and sustainable locations within Brentwood Borough Council with much better access to urban development, and locations such as Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified and no other brownfield sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23084 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23086 Object **Respondent: Mr Sonny Smith [8302]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The parking in the village is diabolical already. Blackmore is a lovely village which already has a lot of visitors. Lack of parking already affects the economy you are destroying our lovely village and affecting our economy detrimentally!

Change To Plan: The immediate withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23086 - 8302 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23087 Object **Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is minimal bus services to Brentwood and Chelmsford. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. Further housing development would have a detrimental effect on these services and does not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23087 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23088 Object **Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The primary school is already full. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. Further housing development would have a detrimental effect on these services and does not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23088 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23089 Object **Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery nearby is severely overstretched with long waits for non-emergency GP appointments. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. Further housing development would have a detrimental effect on all of these services.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23089 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23090 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Narrow local roads are already over-full and parking is congested near the local shops. Further housing development would have a detrimental effect on all of these services.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23090 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23091 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed development sites are pristine Green Belt land. Brentwood Borough Council has not demonstrated that no suitable brownfield alternative sites are available.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should demonstrate that the development is justified; and that no other brownfield alternative sites are available.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23091 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23092 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flood, and the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village which has been subject to severe flooding in the past. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and an adjacent field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the high risk of flooding. If ponds and extra drainage are required to alleviate the risk of flooding, then the development will not be deliverable as planned.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23092 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23093 Object**Respondent: Miss Emily Dimond [7227]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane, Blackmore is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements which would result from the proposed development. Indeed the lane is signed 'unsuitable for heavy vehicles'. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23093 - 7227 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23098 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I don't feel there are adequate facilities in the village to support this development i.e. doctors

Change To Plan: Withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23098 - 4876 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23100 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I don't feel there are adequate facilities in the village to support this development i.e. school places

Change To Plan: Withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23100 - 4876 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23102 Object**Respondent: Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I don't feel there are adequate facilities in the village to support this development i.e. parking

Change To Plan: Withdrawal of site R26.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23102 - 4876 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23134 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23134 - 6923 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23135 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23135 - 6923 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23136 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Flood risk/drainage assessment should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23136 - 6923 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23137 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23137 - 6923 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23138 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by other brownfield alternatives or increasing housing density on other allocated sites (outside Blackmore village). There has been no 'Housing needs Survey' undertaken to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP, and there is no justification of the numbers of dwellings proposed in the village. The LDP is therefore not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council should: conduct a 'Housing Need survey' of Blackmore village to demonstrate that the development is justified; demonstrate that no other brownfield sites are available; highway/traffic assessments, flood risk/drainage assessment and detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23138 - 6923 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23140 Object**Respondent: Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R26 is home to a number of protected species including turtle doves, skylarks, various species of bat, and barn owls. The turtle dove is a Section 41 species which is of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. They are vulnerable to global extinction and identified in the Red List of Endangered Species. The loss of this site to housing would inevitably mean the loss of this important breeding site and contrary to national policy. As it stands the LDP is not justified because it is not based on proportionate evidence.

Change To Plan: Detailed ecological surveys should be undertaken.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23140 - 6923 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23152 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: This site is on Green Belt land, amendments to Green Belt boundaries around Blackmore have not be fully evidenced and justified as exceptional circumstances, as required by national policy. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23152 - 6965 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23153 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site R25 and R26 are liable to flood, the proposed development of these sites will also increase the flood risk in the village. Red Rose Lane itself has flooded many times in the past, and a neighbouring field was rejected from the LDP proposals because of the risk of flooding.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23153 - 6965 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23154 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements that would result from the proposed development. The lane is very narrow, has ditches either side and does not have pavements or other provision for pedestrians. The lane is regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and the additional traffic would cause a major hazard. The LDP has not demonstrated that the proposed development off Red Rose Lane is sustainable.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23154 - 6965 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23155 Object**Respondent: Mr Kevin Wood [6965]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Additional planned housing developments in Blackmore will further exacerbate the stresses on Blackmore's already overloaded infrastructure and services and, subsequently, the quality of life of residents.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23155 - 6965 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23315 Object

Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been insufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. Outside the parish boundary in Fingrith Hall Lane is a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities, and more than 5 miles from any other town / village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the adverse impact of the proposed new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23315 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23317 Object

Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Blackmore village centre of sits in a hollow and is prone to flooding. Flooding has occurred numerous times since with the most recent being 3 years ago when several houses on the Green were flooded and many of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is clearly against policy NE06.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23317 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23319 Object

Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The electricity, other utilities and in particular the sewerage system are unlikely to be able to cope an additional 70 properties without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road. The sewerage system is at maximum capacity already.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23319 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23321 Object

Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local primary school is already full - new arrivals in the village are not able to get their children into the school and have to travel to schools in other areas.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23321 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23323 Object

Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Bus services are limited, infrequent and do not run into the evenings.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infra structure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23323 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23325 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is insufficient parking in the village centre causing people to regularly park on double yellow lines and there is no provision for disabled parking.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23325 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23327 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery is at capacity and waiting time for appointments are already unacceptable.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23327 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23329 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out to demonstrate why Blackmore has been specifically included in the LDP. There is no clear housing strategy for the villages and general area in the north of the Borough. There are many options that have been suggested through this process and should have been considered but have not been, including available brownfield sites nearby. The Borough Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23329 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23331 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23331 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23334 Object**Respondent: Mr John Riley [4905]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is not highly accessible and not along a transit / growth corridor.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. There may be a case for limited development in Blackmore. The deficiencies in the local infrastructure needs to be addressed before any development is allowed. Then, reduce the proposal to one site, limiting the development to no more than 25 dwellings with a mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom retirement bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23334 - 4905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23336 Object**Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23336 - 8313 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23360 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is an isolated village with minimal services i.e.; doctors already covers four villages and cannot cope, we have to wait two to four weeks for an appointment.

Change To Plan: There is more suitable locations that have already good transport links without spoiling Blackmore by putting a minimum of 70 houses on greenbelt land.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23360 - 4861 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23361 Object**Respondent: Ms Janet Parris [8315]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In 2017/2018 Brentwood Council overturned there longstanding planning policy saying that our area was deemed unsuitable, I know things have changed where there is a lot of pressure to build new homes in all area's but surely Blackmore has not changed, the inter structure cannot deal with this sort of development.

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23361 - 8315 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23364 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is an isolated village with minimal services i.e.; bus services is minimal and everyone will need their own transport, which the roads won't cope.

Change To Plan: There is more suitable locations that have already good transport links without spoiling Blackmore by putting a minimum of 70 houses on greenbelt land.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23364 - 4861 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23365 Object**Respondent: Ms Janet Parris [8315]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane itself is just a tiny country lane not suitable for a lot of traffic your also looking at plans to allow 9 property's Chelmsford Road, again more traffic surely this is not the right area for this sort of planning

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23365 - 8315 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23367 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore Primary School has less than 90 pupils - there would have to be an investment to enlarge the present premises.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.

Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.

More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23367 - 289 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

23369 Object**Respondent: Mr Stephen Allington [8316]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield land off Red Rose Lane. There has been no Housing Needs Survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23369 - 8316 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23373 Object**Respondent: Mr Stephen Allington [8316]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements if development goes ahead.

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighbourhood plan".

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23373 - 8316 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23374 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is hardly any local employment in the immediate area.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23374 - 289 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

23375 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The roads are too narrow and restricted to enable adequate flow of traffic. Once again further investment would be needed with road improvements (roundabouts etc.). There are no safety measures such as street lighting and paving - young people would be at an increased risk. Parking is a major problem in Blackmore - locals and visitors regularly use the local facilities and struggle to park.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23375 - 289 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

23377 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A major incursion onto green belt land which would significantly impact on the unique character of the parish.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23377 - 289 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

23379 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The area is a natural flood plain where drainage and sewerage would be a major problem.

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23379 - 289 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

23381 Object**Respondent: Mr. Peter Shipton [289]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The size of the proposed build is too large for a village of this size - nearly 30%!

Change To Plan: Any development would have to be significantly reduced - in addition large family houses would attract the more wealthy home-owners which most certainly would work elsewhere and commute.
Local inhabitants would be priced out making it almost impossible for them to get on the 'housing ladder'. Therefore a smaller number of affordable properties should be made available.
More investigations should be carried out on the sustainability of the utilities available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23381 - 289 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

23388 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong because Blackmore is an isolated village with minimal services. There is more suitable locations that have already good transport links without spoiling the village. With putting minimum of 70 houses on greenbelt land.

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighbourhood plan " [Not supplied].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23388 - 4861 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23400 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield land off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighborhood plan ". [Not supplied].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23400 - 4861 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23401 Object**Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. For example Epping Forest District Council which is building about 30 new houses just 1 mile north of Blackmore at the top of Fingrith Hall lane. This will have a major impact on the village amenities, and will increase traffic flow though the village, especially when added to the over 70 new properties being proposed for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23401 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23403 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties as it is a single track lane which is unsuitable for heavy construction traffic, and the following traffic generated by the 70 properties.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23403 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23404 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village has historically been subject to serious flooding, most recently being 3 years ago. Red Rose lane is susceptible to flooding and this makes it impassable to vehicles. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems, even with the adoption of SUDS.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23404 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23405 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP, and why other areas have not.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23405 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23406 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong. The infrastructure simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23406 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23407 Object

Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding approximately 200 more cars (over 70 houses in Blackmore and 30 in Fingrith Hall lane) in the village of Blackmore (which already suffers from significant parking problems) will create a real danger to pedestrians in the village. The lives of small children and old people will be put in real danger with such a large increase in traffic volumes. There is not sufficient public transport links to the surrounding areas to make this environmentally sound, as the increase in private vehicles will add to the pollution already caused during the development phase.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23407 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23408 Object**Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23408 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23410 Object**Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road. This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of it's services by the addition of more permanent dwellings.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23410 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23411 Object**Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23411 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23413 Object**Respondent: Miss Heather Jones [8318]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough: there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, but the Council have not shown that the required additional houses could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites; no evidence shows that available nearby Brownfield sites have been prioritised over greenfield; other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills) would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23413 - 8318 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23414 Object**Respondent: Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic movements if development goes ahead.

Change To Plan: Please refer to "BVHA neighborhood plan ". [Not supplied].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23414 - 4861 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23432 Object**Respondent: Mr Benjamin Rumary [8324]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23432 - 8324 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23453 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities, e.g. Epping Forest District Council (and the construction of c.30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane, and its impact on the Village).

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23453 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23455 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure it does not promote sustainable development. There are other more suitable (and / or sustainable) locations.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23455 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23457 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield (and Green Belt) land off of Red Rose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23457 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23459 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23459 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23461 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23461 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23463 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local services including Doctors surgery waiting times are already struggling to meet the demands of the existing Blackmore Population. Increasing this would be adding to this problem.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23463 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23465 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local services including limited parking are already struggling to meet the demands of the existing Blackmore Population. Increasing this would be adding to this problem.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23465 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23467 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local services including local schools are already struggling to meet the demands of the existing Blackmore Population. Increasing this would be adding to this problem.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23467 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23469 Object**Respondent: Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The impact on local wildlife e.g. adders, slowworms, grass snakes, great crested newts, voles and a variety of birds.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore. More suitable sites should have and could have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23469 - 8117 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23471 Object**Respondent: Mr Marc Cohen [4268]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: By allocating sites in Blackmore, the Plan is not compliant to:
 * NPPF Sect 2 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services
 * NPPF Sect 3 28 - local community
 * NPPF Sect 5 77/78 - decisions should be 'responsive to local circumstances' and 'reflect local needs'
 * NPPF Sect 9 103 - Development should be focused on locations, limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of travel modes.
 * NPPF Sect 14 -the area floods
 * NPPF Sect 15 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity.
 * NPPF 16 - Conserving the historic environment.

Change To Plan: * Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no proven need that Blackmore need this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being hardly any local employment.
 * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.
 * Detailed flood risk analysis required.
 * Assess smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven.
 * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) rather than rural villages not near mainline rail

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23471 - 4268 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23477 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. For example Epping Forest District Council which is building about 30 new houses just 1 mile north of Blackmore at the top of Fingrith Hall lane which will have a major impact on the local facilities, the utilities and the traffic in Blackmore, especially when added to the over 70 new properties being proposed for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23477 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23479 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties. This is a single track road, and is already dangerous for walkers and horse riders. Adding the extra volume of traffic on this road is completely unsuitable.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23479 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23481 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on The Green were flooded. Additionally several of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23481 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23483 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23483 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23485 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. Whilst there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, it is as if Blackmore has been chosen with virtually no other options being considered. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23485 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23487 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP, and why other areas have not.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23487 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23489 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Borough Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23489 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23491 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23491 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23493 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding 200 - 300 more cars (over 70 houses in Blackmore and 30 in Fingrith Hall lane) in the village of Blackmore (which already suffers from significant parking problems) will create a real danger to pedestrians in the village. The lives of small children and old people will be put in real danger with such a large increase in traffic volumes.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23493 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23495 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure (bus services, roads) simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23495 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23497 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village facilities simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23497 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23499 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The doctors simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23499 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23501 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The school simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23501 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23503 Object

Respondent: Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road. This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of its services.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23503 - 8325 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23505 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. For example Epping Forest District Council which is building about 30 new houses just 1 mile north of Blackmore at the top of Fingrith Hall lane which will have a major impact on the local facilities, the utilities and the traffic in Blackmore, especially when added to the over 70 new properties being proposed for Blackmore.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23505 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23507 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties. This is a single track road, and is already dangerous for walkers and horse riders. Adding the extra volume of traffic on this road is completely unsuitable.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23507 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23509 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on the Green were flooded. Additionally several of the surrounding roads (including Red Rose Lane) were impassable. Adding over 70 properties with their associated run-off will cause further flooding problems.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23509 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23511 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23511 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23513 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. Whilst there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, it is as if Blackmore has been chosen with virtually no other options being considered. Other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23513 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23515 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP, and why other areas have not.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23515 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23517 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Borough Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23517 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23519 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Putting a substantial residential development in the north of the village on Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane which increases the housing in a historic village by over 30% is fundamentally wrong. The infrastructure (bus services, roads) simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23519 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23523 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Village facilities simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23523 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23524 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The doctors simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23524 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23525 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The school simply cannot cope with such a large increase of people.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23525 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23527 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Adding 200 - 300 more cars (over 70 houses in Blackmore and 30 in Fingrith Hall lane) in the village of Blackmore (which already suffers from significant parking problems) will create a real danger to pedestrians in the village. The lives of small children and old people will be put in real danger with such a large increase in traffic volumes.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23527 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23529 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The pieces of land proposed in Blackmore are important wildlife and natural habitats for rare species such as newts and other creatures.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23529 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23532 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Development Plan proposal includes a plan to regularize an unauthorized traveler site on the Chelmsford Road. This will add to further overcrowding in the village and of it's services.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23532 - 6964 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23533 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities, e.g. Epping Forest District Council (and the construction of c.30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane, and its impact on the Village)

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23533 - 8326 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23537 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23537 - 8326 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23540 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are other more suitable (and / or sustainable) locations - e.g. urban extension to Brentwood - and so the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield (and Green Belt) land off of Red Rose Lane

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23540 - 8326 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23542 Object**Respondent: Mr David Barfoot [7177]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23542 - 7177 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23545 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy' for the Villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the Borough

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23545 - 8326 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23547 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23547 - 8326 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23549 Object**Respondent: Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: What plans have been made for surrounding infrastructure?
Which other sites in Essex have been identified?
Asking residents door to door
Green Belt land is identified as green belt for a reason. There are other areas that can be built on which do not impact on small already strained village.

Change To Plan: SCHOOL! This is a local village one form entry school, which is already oversubscribed. More houses equal more children.
TRAFFIC! Blackmore is already congested with cars and for parking, We do not want more traffic spoiling this beautiful village.
GP. Already overcrowded and will be put under more strain.
There is not a need for more houses here in such a small village

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 23549 - 7200 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23551 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movement

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 23551 - 8326 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23554 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flood, and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in a village that can be prone to severe flooding.

Change To Plan: No modification would address my concerns. The only plausible form of action is to stop the current Local Plan and protect the modest green belt that is left in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 23554 - 8326 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23562 Object**Respondent: Ms Eleanora Barfoot [8328]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 23562 - 8328 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23566 Object**Respondent: Mrs Hayley Hammond [8329]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object (no reason given)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 23566 - 8329 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23577 Object**Respondent: Sadie Barfoot [8330]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: (no reason provided)

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference: O - 23577 - 8330 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

23629 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Evans [8332]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object (no reason supplied)

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23629 - 8332 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23764 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane itself is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. This lane is regularly used currently by large agricultural vehicles which have to by-pass the village due to their size. They are large "Tracked" Tractors units towing large trailers which take up the full width of the lane and this closes the road to oncoming traffic. If they meet any vehicles coming the other way have to reverse to one of two temporary "Passing Places". Additionally large school buses use this lane again creating serious safety risks.

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23764 - 7193 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23767 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* One village shop/Post Office with very restricted parking

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23767 - 7193 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23770 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* A Doctors surgery whereby I genuinely hope I do not need to request urgent care. If you want any form of response you have to continuously dial repeatedly to get assistance - comments on the website page highlights this

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23770 - 7193 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23772 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure and I would point out the current challenges we face living here:

* The local village school has very limited places and resources which was put under further pressure due to a large unapproved travelling community site with some 20-30 caravans and families is also impacting on the village resources available

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23772 - 7193 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23774 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane regularly floods with the water coming down Nine Ashes Road like a river and into the lane. The ditches and limited drainage near to the junction simply cannot cope and a large area is regularly left under water during the winter months. Flooding has increasingly become an issue in recent years and has now started to erode the lane at the front of our house. This will also further impact the flooding risk in the village which has been an increasing problem.

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23774 - 7193 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23776 Object**Respondent: Mr. David Cartwright [7193]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has simply not demonstrated that they have taken into account other Brownfield sites that are available which surely must take priority over the development of Green Belt Lane between Red Rose Lane and Blackmore Village.

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from the Site Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23776 - 7193 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24196 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, its position is very isolated with narrow country roads. The bus service is very limited. Parking is a nightmare.

Change To Plan: remote site R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24196 - 7195 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24200 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The only shop is a small Co-op which already can't cope. Not long ago our post office moved to the Co-op giving a very unsatisfactory service. There just isn't enough room to support such a service.

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24200 - 7195 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24208 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The one school is already full.

Change To Plan: remove site R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24208 - 7195 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24214 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The nearby doctors surgery is severely overstretched.

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24214 - 7195 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24220 Object	Respondent: Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Flooding is already a problem, I fear this would only get worse.	
Change To Plan:	remove site R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24220 - 7195 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24226 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The accessibility including Red Rose Lane in particular is not sufficient and even farm vehicles struggle and have to bypass the village. It is already difficult to park/access the single village shop/Post Office along with the influx of the tea room which uses up all of the current parking resource available. Red Rose Lane is very narrow/winding road unsuitable for any increase in traffic. It is already dangerous with no pavements and is in constant use by dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24226 - 8370 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24232 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The village school will not cope.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24232 - 8370 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24238 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The doctors surgery will not cope.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24238 - 8370 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24244 Object	Respondent: Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose Lane regularly floods as do other areas of the village and this will be made worse by any further developments.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R26 from the Local Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24244 - 8370 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24355 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore is not part of any strategy in north of borough	
Change To Plan:	Remove R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24355 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24361 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	BBC not consulted with neighbouring authorities	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24361 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	

24362 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: There is no housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24362 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24363 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing densities on other allocated sites.		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24363 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24365 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Development off Red Rose Lane is wrong because Blackmore has modest services (school, parking, shops, doctors etc).		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24365 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24366 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Other sustainable locations appear to be ignored, Blackmore proposal is not sustainable.		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 ad R26		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24366 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24367 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Access (road width/nature)off/on Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for volume of traffic. There are already too many vehicles in/going through Blackmore		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24367 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24368 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: There is no value in being a 'heritage/preserved village/green belt if it is to be ignored		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24368 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes
24369 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Additional development would destroy the 'character' of the village without providing any identifiable improvements		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24369 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		Tests: None
		Examination: Yes

24370 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: BBC has failed to identify other brownfield sites are available		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24370 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		
24371 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Haynes [8138]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flooding: any development would require upgrading of brooks/culverts		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24371 - 8138 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		
24374 Object	Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]	Agent: N/A
Summary: No housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in LDP		
Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24374 - 8372 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii		
24376 Object	Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Blackmore is an isolated rural village with very modest services & infrastructure more suitable /sustainable locations eg urban extension to Brentwood. The locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24376 - 8372 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii		
24378 Object	Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]	Agent: N/A
Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other Brownfield sites that area available which should take priority over Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane.		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24378 - 8372 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii		
24380 Object	Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Access off/from Red Rose lane (single lane road) is completely unsuitable for large volume of traffic movement		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24380 - 8372 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii		
24382 Object	Respondent: Mr Jack Emmett [8372]	Agent: N/A
Summary: BBC failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing density on other allocated sites		
Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 24382 - 8372 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii		

24390 Object

Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate. Yet again green belt is being developed on. Blackmore struggles to deal with the amount of traffic and parking and will not cope with the new development.

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties,
Use parish council to communicate with the residents,
Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24390 - 8373 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24392 Object

Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Doctors surgeries, public amenities are already at breaking point, how will they cope.

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties,
Use parish council to communicate with the residents,
Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24392 - 8373 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24395 Object

Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Increased risk of flooding

Change To Plan: Withdraw plan as it stands. Consider brown field sites, infills and derelict properties,
Use parish council to communicate with the residents,
Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24395 - 8373 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24400 Object

Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Historic village of Blackmore is a lively viable community slowly growing naturally. Brentwood BC planning advice advocates only developing villages where there is a need to make them viable., the historic character will not be improved and road connections are easy. More of this is true for Blackmore. Moreover there has been no clear strategy for the villages north of Brentwood nor has there been any assessment of the needs of Blackmore. At the open consultation meeting in early 2018 with BBC planners it was evident that they know little about Blackmores situation or about development of houses in Epping Forest DC which are really part of Blackmore although over the border. (Friary Hall Lane 32 +; Woolmanger Road 8). On about the 12 traveller sites off Chelmsford Road.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable. Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24400 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24404 Object

Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Surface water drainage. Already poor, roads often flooded, with stalled cars, bad flood Aug 1987 when houses flooded around the Green, the south side of the Blackmore Road and the bottom half of Church Street including historic grade 1 St Lawrence Church. There has been no change to the water-ways since then, we have a "near miss" in June 2016.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable. Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24404 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24406 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Climate change predicted to increase extremes of weather! The run off of surface water from any further development will increase the risk of homes being flooded for existing residents.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24406 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24408 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sewage, pump off Ingatestone Road a the limit of coping quite often, overflows raw sewage into The Moat and thence into the River Wid fairly often. Back up in 2016 was the cause of one or two properties flooding.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24408 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24410 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Electricity supply prone to short power cuts specially in windy weather, throws timer/computer out frequently.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable.
Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24410 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24412 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: School crowded, even now some village residents cannot get their children in!

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable. Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24412 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24414 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: GP services, local GP surgery cannot recruit enough doctors so waiting times long.

Change To Plan: GP services, local GP surgery cannot recruit enough doctors so waiting times long.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24414 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24416 Object**Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking in village centre and at village hall is dire. Road connections, windy narrow country lanes prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable. Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24416 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24418 Object	Respondent: Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Epping Forest Developments will add strain on some of these infrastructure provision items	
Change To Plan:	Blackmore Village Heritage Association will be producing a Local Needs Plan in cooperation with the Local Parish Council. Other villages are reported to desire more housing to make them viable. Infrastructure - huge improvements needed. Refer back to representations.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24418 - 1497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv	
24420 Object	Respondent: Miss Nicky Joiner [8374]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No room in school	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 fromplan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24420 - 8374 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii	
24421 Object	Respondent: Miss Nicky Joiner [8374]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No room in doctors, dentists	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24421 - 8374 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii	
24427 Object	Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Policy R26, 9.201-9.205: Infrastructure and resources fully stretched at present so no capacity for further development in Blackmore	
Change To Plan:	The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the planes should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets our the Blackmore local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24427 - 8375 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24428 Object	Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Policy R26, 9.201-9.205: Blackmore has been disproportionately targeted with a 30% increase in the current population proposed.	
Change To Plan:	The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the planes should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets our the Blackmore local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24428 - 8375 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24429 Object	Respondent: Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Policy R26, 9.201-9.205: There must be more suitable brownfield sites within the borough that having to build on Green Belt in Blackmore. The Blackmore sites of R25 and R26 are entirely unsuitable for large scale development	
Change To Plan:	The proposed development in Blackmore should be removed from that plan, and any necessary development should be targeted at areas with suitable infrastructure (capacity). Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and the planes should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets our the Blackmore local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24429 - 8375 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	

24444 Object	Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose lane is a single track and not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. It is used by walkers, joggers, cyclists; dog walkers and horseriders and has no pavement. The additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users along with the lack of street lights.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24444 - 8378 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24446 Object	Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26, however all amenities and services are already stretched inc the local primary school, electricity, sewerage system, doctors surgery etc	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24446 - 8378 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24448 Object	Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no clear housing strategy for the villages and general area in the north of the borough. There are many other options that have been suggested through this process but have not been considered. A 'housing needs' survey should have been carried out which would have demonstrated why Blackmore has been specifically included on the LDP and why other more suitable areas have not been included.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24448 - 8378 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24450 Object	Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The borough Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24450 - 8378 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24452 Object	Respondent: Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Other more suitable locations eg areas around Doddinghurst which have better transport links would have been a far better proposal that the development in Blackmore which is not a sustainable development proposal for the reasons given.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan, refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) 'Neighbourhood Plan' for housing need.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24452 - 8378 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24462 Object	Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. Red Rose Lane is single track and wont cope with more traffic	
Change To Plan:	The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Yes
Full Reference:	O - 24462 - 8379 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	

24464 Object	Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Concern over flood risk on this site	
Change To Plan:	The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24464 - 8379 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24466 Object	Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. The local school is at capacity with no room for more children.	
Change To Plan:	The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24466 - 8379 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24468 Object	Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. The doctors is at capacity, waiting times are bad already.	
Change To Plan:	The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24468 - 8379 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24469 Object	Respondent: Mr Mark Mumby [8379]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Infrastructure requirements - no infrastructure improvements have been listed in R25 or R25. Electricity and services wont be able to cope with 70 extra houses.	
Change To Plan:	The issues listed shows that the modification would be to remove sets R25 and R26 from the plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association has produced a plan which should be referred to by the planners. The Plan sets out our local housing needs for our community.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24469 - 8379 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24475 Object	Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore infrastructure and amenities would not be able to cope, doctor appointments already up to 1 month & this will get worse when the residents of old Norton Heath site descend on the village	
Change To Plan:	Refer to BHVA Neighbourhood Plan - remove sites R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24475 - 8380 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24477 Object	Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore infrastructure and amenities would not be able to cope, school is full,	
Change To Plan:	Refer to BHVA Neighbourhood Plan - remove sites R25 and R26 from plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24477 - 8380 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	

24479 Object	Respondent: Mr Frederick Piper [8380]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	This is a small village which should never have been classed as category 3 it is category 4. There are various other planning applications going through for the village on Sprigs Lane & Chelmsford Road 20 properties are proposed on 4 applications.	
Change To Plan:	refer to BHVA neighbourhood plan	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24479 - 8380 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24483 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	On Green Belt	
Change To Plan:	See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24483 - 8381 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24486 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Inadequate access, Red Rose Lane too narrow and floods frequently	
Change To Plan:	See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24486 - 8381 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24487 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local amenities unable to cope with existing residents	
Change To Plan:	See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24487 - 8381 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24488 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Developer led which is against national guidelines	
Change To Plan:	See BHVA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24488 - 8381 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24491 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Would result in large increase in traffic which is already increased dramatically in last 12 months	
Change To Plan:	See BVHA neighbourhood plan which I support (remove sites R25 and R26 from plan)	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24491 - 8381 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
24495 Object	Respondent: Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The building of the proposed houses is totally unacceptable in this village. There doesn't seem to be any thought given to the local area. Especially with regard to providing local infrastructure and impacts on it.	
Change To Plan:	The use of brownfield sites to build a modest amount of houses would be much more acceptable to most people in the local areas. DO NOT build on Green Belt or Green Field sites for the good of the environment and wildlife. [Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan].	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 24495 - 8002 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	

24499 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Reed [4708]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound. Infrastructure already fails local needs: flood risk, school and doctors surgery at over capacity & struggle to cope, poor (virtually non existent) bus service, roads not suitable, insufficient parking in village centre. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities (ie: Epping and Chelmsford). Sites mentioned not suitable, Alternative sites (that are better suited have been ignored. There has been no "housing needs" survey.

Change To Plan: The only practical solution is to remove sites R25 and R26. Take heed of the BVHA neighbourhood plan which identifies the actual requirement of local residents and proposes better suited alternative sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24499 - 4708 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24502 Object

Respondent: Dr Belinda Dunbar [8382]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local GP services and schools are already struggling to cope. There is no consideration of increasing the GP services to cope with additional houses. The access roads are not adequate to take the increased volume of traffic the extra homes will bring. Flooding occurs in the area during heavy rainfall, building more homes will add to these problems. Green Belt should be retained.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 & R26 from the Local Plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which sets out our local housing needs and that the Blackmore community is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24502 - 8382 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24508 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Robinson [4899]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No "housing needs survey" has been performed to show why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Blackmore is an established village and it would appear that an increase in demand on the infrastructure is not viable. I understand that the village school s full and the Deal Tree medical centre is reported to have one of the highest patient to practitioner rations in certainly Essex. The access onto and off Red Rose Lane will not be suitable for the anticipated increase in traffic. The sites R25 and R26 have over the years suffered from persistent flooding. Around 30 houses are being or will be constructed at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 need to be removed from the plan. I suggest the planners need to read the BVHA neighbourhood plan which includes the Blackmore local housing requirements for what is clearly an existing sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24508 - 4899 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24509 Object

Respondent: Danielle Keys [8376]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose lane always floods due to bad weather. Building will increase flooding (I live in next to Red Rose lane). Also parking in and around the village. The village school, shop and doctors are at it's full capacity now.

Change To Plan: No modification will make the plan sound or legally compliant due to the size of the village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24509 - 8376 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24515 Object

Respondent: Mrs Terri Reed [4303]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sites are unsuitable for building, they are liable to flood and the road is not suitable as it is too narrow & also it regularly floods, cars get trapped. I am unaware if a housing need survey is being carried out. The infrastructure is already at bursting point. Children turned away from the local school as full; Drs surgery over stretched already; no parking in village centre. Because we are on the Brentwood borders, no account has been taken of the development being undertaken by Epping & Chelmsford RIGHT ON OUR DOORSTEP, impacting on local facilities. Alternative sites have been ignored, even when more suitable, inadequate public transport - you can't live here without a car. Most families have 2 or more.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26. Consider what Blackmore really needs not what ticks a few boxes, and what suits developers. The BHVA have worked hard to proposal alternative which are sustainable. They know the village better then the people behind the unsustainable proposal currently on the table.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24515 - 4303 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24517 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jean Drew [8383]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are more suitable and sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood. Development in Blackmore is not sustainable. The roads serving Blackmore are not designed to meet increase in traffic or HGV use for construction. Local school (1 form entry) are at capacity. Children may have to attend school elsewhere increasing traffic and pollution. There is only 1 doctors surgery covering 5 villages. Bus facilities are inadequate. It has not been demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing densities at other brownfield or allocated sites e.g. Dunton Hills. Existing flooding issues are likely to increase.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 & R26 from the Local Plan. Currently the infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering school, transport doctor and hospitals. This is a small village and plans to increase the size by 33% is just not making sense.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24517 - 8383 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24519 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Dawson [8385]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No housing needs survey carried out to justify development in Blackmore. There are more suitable and sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood. Development in Blackmore is not sustainable. The roads serving Blackmore are not designed to meet increase in traffic or HGV use for construction. Local school (1 form entry) are at capacity. Children may have to attend school elsewhere increasing traffic and pollution. There is only 1 doctors surgery covering 5 villages. Bus facilities are inadequate. It has not been demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing densities at other brownfield or allocated sites e.g. Dunton Hills. Existing flooding issues are likely to increase. BBC have failed to consider proposals for 30 dwellings across the border in Epping Forest DC.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the Village. School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area. The single Doctors surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for appointments already standing at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required. Current transport links for the villages would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24519 - 8385 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24521 Object

Respondent: Mrs Irene Saunders [8386]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound because Blackmore village is already bursting at the seams so will extremely overwhelming:- not enough school places, doctors, public transport, local shops will not be able to cope. There is already 30 dwellings in the process of being built on Fingrith Hall Lane (Epping Council). The village is already up to its maximum housing level so cannot cope with any more building development! Our village is already very busy and so Blackmore is definitely not the place to build any more dwellings.

Change To Plan: Consider local need [remove R25 and R26 form plan]

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24521 - 8386 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24523 Object

Respondent: Ms Pauline Davidson [6327]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore Village is a very small, isolated village with narrow country roads. One shop serves all and parking is very restricted. There is often flooding in the village. The plan is not sound because the resources cannot cope with the proposed developments and those already in progress around the village.

Change To Plan: Not to build on Green Belt sites. I support BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24523 - 6327 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24529 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the Green Belt, here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting, It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings.
We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24529 - 8388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24531 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the lack of infrastructure here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do. Our sewerage is pumped nobody seems to care whether the station can cope.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting, It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings.
We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24531 - 8388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24533 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the lack of infrastructure here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do. Blackmore is a Historical Village according to some Cllrs, one of the jewels in the crown of Brentwood. Sharing the title with South Weald. We are not within walking distance of any doctors, the only Hospital we have is Brentwood which has no casualty now, a blood test which is urgent the nearest hospital is a twenty mile round trip eg Basildon, Southend, Romford. We have one bus an hour.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting, It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings.
We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24533 - 8388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24535 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the lack of infrastructure here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do. Blackmore is a Historical Village according to some Cllrs, one of the jewels in the crown of Brentwood. Sharing the title with South Weald. South Weald is close to Brentwood nearer to all senior schools and junior, easily walkable to the town and station, more buses and close to the M25 yet the land there has been withdrawn from the plan this does not make sense. We are not nimbyist it is just common sense to build closer to the town. All we are told is this will be sorted by the developers.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting, It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings.
We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24535 - 8388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24537 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound because it does not take into consideration the lack of infrastructure here it just feels like they have stuck a pin in a map and said that will do. Our school is at bursting point yet we are told maybe there will be some 106 agreement money come our way. This school has been under developed since the 80's my daughter was in the relocatables list and she is about to become a Granny. The extension was never built.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting, It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24537 - 8388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24539 Object

Respondent: Mrs Diane Smith [8388]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Flooding is another hazard Brentwood chooses to ignore. This village has been Badly flooded several times. The current when this happened is very strong, damage serious and life threatening but BBC are not interested.

Change To Plan: Brentwood Council to read and discuss the plan in the correct manner not treat it as a foregone conclusion because of a cut off time. This procedure should not be allowed at such an important meeting, It was disgraceful what they did its not the first time they have done wrong at a planning meeting and they should be ashamed of their behaviour and attitude. What they did was undemocratic to say the least. They should reopen this file and study the evidence and discuss the findings. We should have a legal hearing in public which we were denied.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24539 - 8388 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24541 Object

Respondent: Mrs Tracey Dawson [8390]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear strategy for development north of the Borough.
No housing needs survey has been carried out for the village.
There are more suitable and sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood. Development in Blackmore is not sustainable.
The roads serving Blackmore are not designed to meet increase in traffic or HGV use for construction.
Local school (1 form entry) are at capacity. Children may have to attend school elsewhere increasing traffic and pollution.
There is only 1 doctors surgery covering 5 villages.
Bus facilities are inadequate.
The village is often cut off in bad weather e.g. snow.
It has not been demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing densities at other brownfield or allocated sites e.g. Dunton Hills.
Existing flooding issues are likely to increase.
BBC have failed to consider proposals for 30 dwellings across the border in Epping Forest DC.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5.
Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the village.
School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area.
The single doctors surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for appointments already standing at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required.
Current transport links for the villages would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24541 - 8390 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24544 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lorna Mitchell [8391]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No consideration to the infrastructure: doctor, dentist, school, amenities, current road access and effect that another 60-100 people in houses.

Change To Plan: No consideration to the infrastructure: doctor, dentist, school, amenities, current road access and effect that another 60-100 people in houses.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24544 - 8391 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - iii

24548 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul De Rosa [8393]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24548 - 8393 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24550 Object**Respondent: Mr Philip Dow [8394]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Road works disruption while build work is carried out.
 Parking issues.
 Schools class room overcrowding and parking issues.
 Parking issues - Local residents.
 More houses - more strain on doctors surgery - no appointments available.
 Problems when roads are flooding causing pot holes - highway maintenance.
 Shops the lack of at this present time.
 Only 1 bus on the hour every hour.

Change To Plan: Frequent bus service.
 More doctors surgery for the area.
 Adequate drainage to land.
 Electricity and gas to land.
 Disruption to roads while work commencing.
 Extensive parking facilities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24550 - 8394 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24553 Object**Respondent: Mrs Anne Davies [8395]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inadequate infrastructure to support a large increase in population.
 There are narrow roads with no pavements increasing risks of accidents.
 Doctors surgery already oversubscribed with 3 week waiting times.
 School is full to capacity.
 Electricity supply is already struggling.
 Concerned regarding potential increase in surface water run-off, overloading of drainage and increased flood risk.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24553 - 8395 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24557 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. Local Plan, unsound, failure to consult with Epping Forest District Council. Re:- 30 houses being built on Fingrith Hall Lane which will already impact on the village

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24557 - 8392 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24559 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. The school is full and not able to cope with any additional houses / families. The preschool is full and not able to accommodate any further children at this stage, it is in the village hall with no possibility of being able to increase child number

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24559 - 8392 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24561 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. Doctors filled to capacity. Residents already have to wait 4 weeks for a routine appointment. If additional houses are built this would make this service reach breaking point

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24561 - 8392 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24563 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. Bus service is not sufficient enough

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24563 - 8392 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24565 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green Belt land, unacceptable to build on

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24565 - 8392 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24567 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for the village, no infrastructure. Volume of traffic would ruin village, make it unsafe for school children

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24567 - 8392 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24569 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village prone to flooding

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24569 - 8392 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24571 Object**Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8392]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Wildlife destroyed

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites (not Green Belt) ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP plan. Refer to BHV Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24571 - 8392 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24574 Object**Respondent: Mrs Marion Woolaston [8397]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: An adequate housing needs survey requires to be undertaken. This has not happened in Blackmore. To assess the impact on traffic flows through the village, a projected traffic survey requires to be undertaken.

To ensure that Blackmore does not become an urban suburb of Brentwood, a greater and wide consultation is required with those who are impacted by the development of the village

Change To Plan: An adequate housing needs survey requires to be undertaken. This has not happened in Blackmore. To assess the impact on traffic flows through the village, a projected traffic survey requires to be undertaken.

To ensure that Blackmore does not become an urban suburb of Brentwood, a greater and wide consultation is required with those who are impacted by the development of the village

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24574 - 8397 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

24576 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Davies [8396]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Does not appear to be a strategy for maintaining local character (borough of villages); Blackmore is isolated, surrounded by Green Belt with an historic core that needs protecting; Increase in houses and population by 30% will change the village character and environment permanently; Roads are minor, narrow country lanes and additional traffic movements, both private and commercial are likely to result in more accidents and injuries. Lack of pavements and paths for pedestrians in the lanes surrounding the village. Additional traffic will affect their safety and be more dangerous. Increased traffic levels will impact on cyclists and horse riders, which use the surrounding lanes for quiet on road cycling and riding. Insufficient provision for education - school full, medical services e.g. doctors surgery already oversubscribed waiting times for appointments can be 3 weeks. Insufficient parking provision in the village. Flooding risk - building on the proposed sites can only increase surface water run-off to a drainage system that cannot cope now. Electricity supplies - Power cuts are a fairly regular occurrence as the grid seems unable to cope with existing demands.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24576 - 8396 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24582 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24582 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24584 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council. Over houses being constructed and/or planned close to Blackmore village.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24584 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24586 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc).

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24586 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24588 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24588 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24590 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24590 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24592 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue- I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24592 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24594 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24594 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24596 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The access off/from Redrose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24596 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24598 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26/Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached village survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24598 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24602 Object**Respondent: Mr Ronald Saunders [8384]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound as it does not take into consideration the massive impact it will have on Blackmore village, housing density, footfall, local shops, amenities, doctors surgeries etc. The village is already up to its maximum housing level and will not sustain any further development. At the end of Flingrith Hall Road Epping Council have granted permission for 30 dwellings which will have a direct impact on Blackmore Village another 70 is inconceivable.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan. BBC should seriously appraise alternative sites (brownfield) nearer to Brentwood centre.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24602 - 8384 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24604 Object**Respondent: Mr Anthony Walker [8401]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy, neighbouring authorities not consulted, lack of infrastructure, there are brownfield sites which should take priority over Green Field and Green Belt, Local plan is unsound. Sites are liable to flood, exacerbated by more homes. Difficult to get GP appointment, 2 weeks or more wait. School is full, one hall for key stages 1&2. Insufficient toilet facilities for staff and pupils, this would get worse. Not enough staff parking places, road outside school is narrow. Roads in village are narrow and couldn't cope with more traffic.

Change To Plan: I cannot set out any modifications which would make the local plan sound because the Blackmore Village hasn't room to make the facilities suitable to sustain a large housing estate. Brownfield sites around Brentwood should be used. [Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24604 - 8401 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24606 Object**Respondent: Mr John Warner [5018]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to the plan

Change To Plan: No change detailed

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24606 - 5018 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

24608 Object**Respondent: Mr David Wade [8402]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village is not suitable as infrastructure not suitable: roads, access, parking problems, flooding on Redrose Lane, Drainage, village school insufficiently funded PTA raises money for resources such as portacabin, library, pool projects.

Change To Plan: Smaller development on Orchard Piece and Woollard Way; better roads; consideration to the developments being proposed / happening in neighbouring boroughs. Eg 600 houses being proposed in Ongar (High Ongar/A414 area). Houses already being built at Fyfield Road, Ongar. High level of development proposed at Writtle Coff.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24608 - 8402 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24614 Object

Respondent: Mr Pete Vince [8123]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.

Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.

Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24614 - 8123 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24619 Object

Respondent: Mr Lyall Vince [8403]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policy R25, 9.197-9.200

Policy R26, 9.201-204

Object to the inclusion of R25 and R26 as: Plan is unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; no clear strategy or consultation on sites or with other boroughs; no evidence of impact assessment alone or with other borough development.

Not justified

Unsound as not properly prepared: didn't assess objectively areas local need or consultation on affordable housing need; R25 and R26 not consulted on until 2018; failed to consider other locations particularly not in Green Belt; no proportionate evidence to justify decisions of allocations.

Not consistent with national policy: Blackmore does not have sustainable infrastructure or access, is contrary to NPPF section 13 Green Belt.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan until there has been 1. A full housing need survey for Blackmore; 2. A proper consultation, including BBC taking into account alternative sites; 3. A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the Borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24619 - 8403 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24624 Object

Respondent: Mrs Tina Wilding [8405]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound because: Doctors, School, Green Belt Land, Local transport - buses. Impact of development on area and infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24624 - 8405 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24626 Object

Respondent: Terence Dearlove [8404]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore village is categorised as Cat 3 (large village) however this is outdated as the village now consists of just one small village shop (inclusive of a Post Office counter) and one small primary school. Parking to access these facilities is extremely limited thereby causing significant issues for existing residents, whilst Public transport to and from Blackmore village is already inadequate for existing residents of the village and surrounding communities. The nearby doctors surgery is currently struggling to cope. No housing needs survey has been conducted that demonstrate why Blackmore should be included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association 'Neighbourhood Plan', which clearly sets out the local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24626 - 8404 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24633 Object**Respondent: Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A residential development such as has been submitted for Blackmore will further stretch infrastructure (roads, parking, schooling, doctors, etc). There are more sustainable locations in the borough. There are "brown field" sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. This area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23 June 2016).

Change To Plan: Do not believe Green Belt land in Blackmore should be released for this development as part of BBC local plan due to all aforementioned reasons (and probably many others!)

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24633 - 8406 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24635 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan is unsound due to causing overcrowding of a small village - Blackmore. May people have cited a lack of school places and over full lists at the doctors surgery. We have no police over now and the fact is that the emergency services would be stretched further. Roads into Blackmore from A414 are little more than lanes this would cause further congestion due to extra traffic from 1 or more cars per home. Parking would be worse too. It should be remembered that Red Rose Lane fields were dedicated to Green Belt many years ago and therefore could not be built on. Earlier applications were rejected, so why should it be allowed now. If this is allowed to go ahead, how soon will it be before the development spreads further

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24635 - 7141 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24638 Object**Respondent: Giovanni De Domonocos [8407]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the village BBC have not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities. Blackmore is an isolated village with limited services. No space in the village school for our children. No adequate bus routes / parking / doctors. There is other suitable locations other than Blackmore Village. The access off / from redrose lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic. The sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24638 - 8407 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii

24642 Object**Respondent: Mr Colin Wilding [8409]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services being overwhelmed: schools; doctors; transportation hubs; more crime ie: not enough police; more demand on firefighters. More cars on road leading to very dangerous conditions for young children on footpaths.

Change To Plan: Cancel the project. Blackmore and its environs are already in danger of forever being changed. There are plenty of other brownfield sites in Brentwood to consider, we have already had our fair share of new builds in Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24642 - 8409 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24645 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alexandre De Dominicis [6951]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the village BBC have not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities. Blackmore is an isolated village with limited services. No space in the village school for our children. No adequate bus routes / parking / doctors. There is other suitable locations other than Blackmore Village. The access off / from redrose lane is entirely unsuitable for the volume of traffic. The sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24645 - 6951 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii

24647 Object**Respondent: John Drain [8410]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26 have green belt status and there are no special circumstances for development in the green belt. Both sites are developers led and have only been included in the LDP figures since 2017. The Blackmore Village is a sustainable area that does not need further housing. No local housing survey was under taken by BBC to prone otherwise. There are no planned infrastructure improvements to alleviate the local school that is up to capacity, the sewage pumping system is overloaded, the doctors surgery has one of the highest doctor / patient ratios nationally and the transport system is poor with no service after 6:00pm. BBC has not demonstrated that the required housing needs cannot be met on previously existing sites or by increasing densities within urban areas. R25 and R26 are both unsuitable sites because of the poor access onto the very narrow lane of Red Rose Lane, surface water flooding it will result in a disproportionate increase in the housing (approx. 30%) and will not be sustainable with present services.

Change To Plan: To develop away from green belt land either by increasing densities on existing sites or more sustainable areas with good transport systems and built infrastructure to cope with the increase in population. At the 8th November meeting 260 properties from the Honeypot Lane development were shifted to Dunton Village. It was surprising that a mere to could not be removed from R25 and R26. The Government has just given £100,000 to BBC to help plans for Dunton Village. The press release indicated that the number of properties has increased at Dunton Village to 4,000 from the original figure 2,600. 70 of this increase could surely come from R25 and R26.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24647 - 8410 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

24649 Object**Respondent: Jennifer Drain [8412]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26 have green belt status and there are no special circumstances for development in the green belt. Both sites are developers led and have only been included in the LDP figures since 2017. The Blackmore Village is a sustainable area that does not need further housing. No local housing survey was under taken by BBC to prone otherwise. There are no planned infrastructure improvements to alleviate the local school that is up to capacity, the sewage pumping system is overloaded, the doctors surgery has one of the highest doctor / patient ratios nationally and the transport system is poor with no service after 6:00pm. BBC has not demonstrated that the required housing needs cannot be met on previously existing sites or by increasing densities within urban areas. R25 and R26 are both unsuitable sites because of the poor access onto the very narrow lane of Red Rose Lane, surface water flooding it will result in a disproportionate increase in the housing (approx. 30%) and will not be sustainable with present services.

Change To Plan: To develop away from green belt land either by increasing densities on existing sites or more sustainable areas with good transport systems and built infrastructure to cope with the increase in population. At the 8th November meeting 260 properties from the Honeypot Lane development were shifted to Dunton Village. It was surprising that a mere to could not be removed from R25 and R26. The Government has just given £100,000 to BBC to help plans for Dunton Village. The press release indicated that the number of properties has increased at Dunton Village to 4,000 from the original figure 2,600. 70 of this increase could surely come from R25 and R26.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24649 - 8412 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

24655 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane Is a narrow lane most of which is not wide enough to allow two cars to pass one another, but given Blackmore's relatively poor public transport connections we can expect an average of at least two additional cars per household and assuming a minimum of two journeys each per day (one in and one out) that Is 280 extra cars per day along this narrow lane which has no pavements. It is unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles (see photos in attachment) with essential drainage ditches running down either side of widening the road is not a viable option without further increasing the flood risk for the rest of the village. There Is very limited parking In the centre of the village both outside the village shop and the two public houses and tea shops with visitors cars. It can be expected that this only will only spread further into the surrounding residential areas and along to the village green with the additional cars that the proposed developments will bring.

Change To Plan: Sites R2S and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that Just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan In cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24655 - 8411 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24658 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Wood [8411]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are not suitable for development due to the access road, impact on highways, impact on the school, impact on the GPs surgery, flooding issues and mitigation and benefits to the community are not in the plan.

Change To Plan: Sites R2S and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that Just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan In cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24658 - 8411 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24660 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ruth Wade [8413]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village roads are unsuitable for increased volume of traffic; Increased risk of flooding More maintenance of ditches and drains required; Village centre already congested by No. cars parked by residents and village visitors; No parking for busy shop/pub/tea rooms antique shops in centre of village insufficient parking at the sports and social club for the number of clubs/societies/organisations who are running; Underfunded local services - GPs, police, fore. For the No. of houses being proposed in the locality. Speeding cars through village passing school.

Change To Plan: Reconsideration of the size of this development. Increased investment in local school and services. Better policing. Lower speed limits. Traffic calming measures. Wider roads for accessing village from Shenfield. Better drainage

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24660 - 8413 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24667 Object**Respondent: Mr Mark Wisdom [8414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Current infrastructure already stretched: roads, GPs, parking, Blackmore Village is a small rural location with limited services and facilities, and this needs to be considered and explored In-depth when this large proposed development is being considered. New development will exacerbate this. Site liable to flood, no housing need survey provided for locality, need to show what other brownfield sites are available and should take priority over Green Belt sites like this. Impacts should be looked at.

Change To Plan: None I can think of other than a new site being found which is more sustainable

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24667 - 8414 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24676 Object

Respondent: Mr Eric John Webb [1830]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A multiplicity of shortfalls are present In the proposals for R25 and R26 Including
a) lack of employment viability;
b) Lack of transport links;
c) lack of infrastructure;
d) lack of medical facilities;
e) lack of education facilities;
f) Severe flooding problems;
g) lack of roads to build the development and subsequently deal with the substantial increase in traffic movement;
h) loss of Green Belt and
I) damage to natural habitats.

When problems are this significant, solutions must be proposed before including in the Listed Sites. Failure to do this is unsound, unjustified, ineffective and flawed.

Change To Plan: MODS

- * A clear need for the proposals to be reconsidered as part of a new 'strategy' for the Villages (Including Blackmore) in the North of the borough/North of Brentwood town.
- * Proper and appropriate consultation with Epping Forests District Council to ensure that these developments on the boundaries or the two boroughs are appropriately addressed with capable, sustainable integrated plans. [30+ houses in Fingrith Hall lane+ 4 pairs of semi's on former Nine Ashes Farm affect Blackmore I And more are being developed In King Street on the pub site]
- * Proper consideration to alternative sites in the Village- Brown field Red Rose Farm, or the area -Stondon or re-Inclusion of Honey Pot Lane. These are either more suitable or more sustainable or both.
- * Housing needs In the area do not require this density development- assign more to other areas
- * Perform a proper and appropriate Housing Need Survey and rely on the outcome of that.
- * Do not propose access to/egress from sites (such as R25 and R26 on roads entirely unsuitable for it.
- * Do not propose developments In a place (Blackmore R25 and R26) where there is already a severe flooding problem which the development will worsen and no mitigation proposal in the plans.
- * Respect results of prior planning enquiries which found that Traveller pitches Plot 3 oak Tree Farm were not appropriate. Likewise no not recognise Plots 1 and 2 which were previously not approved for entirely appropriate reasons

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24676 - 1830 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24680 Object

Respondent: Ms Shirley Dearlove [8415]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 combined with developments in Epping Forest DC area will put extreme pressure on the infrastructure and facilities of Blackmore. There has been inadequate consultation between Brentwood BC and Epping Forest DC. Blackmore should be a category 4 (small village) not 3 (large village) due to it's low population (829), it only has one shop and one small primary school. The existing doctors surgery is already struggling and will be made worse by these proposals. Existing recorded flooding issues will be exacerbated. No housing needs survey has been carried out. Contradicts previous 2016 iteration of the Local Plan which sought to limit growth in rural areas to retain local character. Development should be located in more sustainable locations such as Brentwood or Dunton Hills.

Change To Plan: The above sites should be removed from the LDP and the planners should refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan. This clearly sets out the village's local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24680 - 8415 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24682 Object**Respondent: Mrs Helen Haynes [8416]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no value in Blackmore being a heritage/preserved village/Green Belt if it is being ignored.
 Brentwood BC has failed to identify other brownfield sites which are available.
 The development off Redrose Lane is wrong because Blackmore has modest services, i.e. school, shop (one) doctors surgery.
 The development site is liable to flooding. Brooks and culverts would need upgrading.

Change To Plan: R25 & R26 removed from the Plan. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24682 - 8416 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24686 Object**Respondent: Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound.
 It will put pressure on rural infrastructure.
 The character of the village will be impacted. It is currently enjoyed by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.
 It will put pressure on local lanes.
 Bus services are infrequent.
 Medical centre, shop and school also impacted adversely.
 Other areas such as brownfield land should be developed first.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Heritage Village Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24686 - 8417 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24688 Object**Respondent: Mr Dennis Trumble [8418]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village school is full and the nearest surgery is overcrowded.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24688 - 8418 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24690 Object**Respondent: Mrs Elizabeth Thompson [5016]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I think the plan is unsound mainly due to the infrastructure, the school is oversubscribed, parking in the centre is a problem, difficult to get GP appointment, Red Rose land is single track and liable to flood.

Change To Plan: Developing on brown fields or as an extension to an urban development rather than green belt land.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24690 - 5016 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

24692 Object**Respondent: Mr Stuart Townsend [8419]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not enough facilities for current residents, new families would exacerbate this. Healthcare, roads, school, flooding are all issues.

Change To Plan: Road upgrades; drainage upgrades, healthcare improvements, education development; flood prevention, parking facilities.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24692 - 8419 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24697 Object**Respondent: Mr Desmond Temple [8420]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections: 04; 08; 09: see attached. Site allocations, disproportionate growth to Blackmore, flood risk, green belt. Blackmore infrastructure cannot cope now, without all the planned dwellings, We cant park in the village, our school is full, doctors waiting time is lengthy.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24697 - 8420 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24699 Object**Respondent: Miss Yasmin Tossun [8421]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy R25 and R26 section 09
Excess traffic , heavy demands on local amenities, more chance of local flooding and parking issues. More effort by BBC to locate and use brownfield sites and be more transparent and open about such sites that they have and could us first.

Change To Plan: More effort by BBC to locate and use brownfield sites and be more transparent and open about such sites that they have and could us first.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24699 - 8421 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24701 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susan Tossun [8422]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore cant cope with more traffic, parking and demand on schools and doctors surgery. Nine Ashes Road is already very busy especially in the mornings. The traffic emerging between Red Rose Lane and Nine Ashes Road near the school is already too busy and often dangerous. BBC must give more consideration to brownfield sites for new houses to be built on and include the brownfield locations

Change To Plan: BBC must give more consideration to brownfield sites for new houses to be built on and include the brownfield locations

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24701 - 8422 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24703 Object**Respondent: Mr. Gurpal Singh Dhesi [7270]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There will be more cars which will affect our roads
Buildings on land will increase flood risk.
There is only one Primary school which would not be enough.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24703 - 7270 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24705 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Bhupinder Dhesi [7269]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of infrastructure.
The access off Redrose Lane is not fit for purpose for level of traffic.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24705 - 7269 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24707 Object**Respondent: Mr. Gurpreet Dhesi [7268]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Building on the land will increase flood risks.
The access off Redrose Lane is not wide enough.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24707 - 7268 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24709 Object

Respondent: Mr Stuart Lucas [4956]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan is not NPPF compliant, particularly with regards to meeting local needs, local community, limiting the need to travel, flood risk (no flood risk assessment was carried out), protecting and enhancing biodiversity, conserving the historic environment. Site R25 and R26 have 2 Grade II listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Red Rose Lane being the point of access has historical significance.

Change To Plan:

Consultation with neighbouring authorities required. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no proven need that Blackmore needs this amount of houses being distant from transport links and there being little local employment. Detailed flood risk required. Assess possible smaller scale brownfield development within the area if any local need is proven. Re-assess the site allocation around the transport hub to accommodate Brentwood's housing needs. Develop a strategic approach to villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24709 - 4956 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24711 Object

Respondent: Mr Frank Tabor [8424]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to R25 and R26: no clear strategy for the villages, BBC has not adequately consulted with Epping Forest DC, Development along Red Rose Lane is wrong, it is an isolated village, services are modest, there is a poor bus service, parking is a problem. Other more sustainable locations are available, particularly brownfield sites, which should be prioritised over green belt., other allocated sites should have higher densities. The BVHA housing need survey should be taken into account. Flooding is a problem already.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R15 and R26. Planners should refer t the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24711 - 8424 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24713 Object

Respondent: Mr Shefik Tossun [8425]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The village cant sustain a large development of houses generating more traffic as well as more stress on the school with more demand for places etc. Also car parking will become a problem, More strain on doctors surgery. There are more suitable places to build new homes that will not impact the village. Hove the brownfield sites been considered. BBC have not indicated that these sites do exist and should be considered first.

Change To Plan: There are more suitable places to build new homes that will not impact the village. Hove the brownfield sites been considered. BBC have not indicated that these sites do exist and should be considered first.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24713 - 8425 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

24715 Object

Respondent: Anna Dunk [8426]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. The large scale development plan being proposed will, without a doubt, negatively effect the quality of life of its residents. The plan is being proposed by a developer who holds no knowledge of the village itself, which has resulted in a proposal that is completely inappropriate. The facilities in Blackmore are limited and an influx of new residents would be detrimental. The following reasons clarify why: 1. The proposed plan would produce overcrowding, resulting in an unacceptable increase in traffic and noise, destroying the very nature of our village. 2. There is no clear 'strategy' for the village and there are many other more suitable and sustainable locations for development. 3. Parts of the village are liable to flood. Building on the proposed land would increase the flood risk everywhere in the village. 4. There is just one shop in our village, an overcrowded primary school, and a local doctor surgery where it is extremely difficult to get an appointment. Such an increase in residents is simply unmanageable.

Change To Plan: A sound local plan would require: 1. The assessment must take into account the modest and limited services in the village, including the shop, doctor surgery, primary school and parking. 2. The character and nature of the village must be carefully considered, and the current residents quality of life must be protected. 3. BBC needs to look at the many other suitable locations in the area which can sustain this type of development. 4. The problems with flooding need to be taken into account and current problems with flooding addressed.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24715 - 8426 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24719 Object

Respondent: Mrs Christine Tabor [8427]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Objection to R25 and R26: no clear strategy for the villages, BBC has not adequately consulted with Epping Forest DC, Development along Red Rose Lane is wrong, it is an isolated village, services are modest, there is a poor bus service, parking is a problem. Other more sustainable locations are available, particularly brownfield sites, which should be prioritised over green belt., other allocated sites should have higher densities. Flooding is a problem already.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. The BVHA housing need survey should be referred to. This clearly sets out the needs of our already sustainable community and should be adhered to.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24719 - 8427 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24721 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Tomey [8428]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy ' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council. Over houses being constructed and/or planned close to Blackmore village. The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong, Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc). There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP. The access off/from Redrose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Brownfield sites should be considered before developing conservation areas like Blackmore Village. There should be a housing needs survey and a clear strategy for Blackmore Village before any development can be considered, Redrose Lane has not been considered adequately in view of its history of regular flooding, limited access for traffic and pedestrian safety. Other sites need to be considered.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24721 - 8428 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24723 Object

Respondent: Mrs Elisabeth Taylor [2918]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 9: Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200
Policy R26 - 9.201-9.205

Blackmore is a small village and infrastructure is insufficient for more development. The roads/lanes are busy and parking difficult. 30 new homes in Epping Forest DC will exacerbate problems along with R25 and R26. School is full. Need a housing need survey. Sites are liable to flooding, village floods. Impossible to get appointment at GPs. Our garden floods in heavy rain.

Change To Plan: BBC should be focusing on locations that already have the infrastructure in place that could cope with such a large development not a small village. There are villages in the area such as Stondon Massey that would welcome the development as it would bring amenities to the area that they so not currently have. Understand there are various brownfield sites that are far more suitable for development and should take priority over building on the Green Belt, sites with far wider roads which would cope with the influx of traffic better than Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24723 - 2918 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii

24725 Object

Respondent: Miss Chloe Taylor [8429]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and infrastructure is insufficient for more development. The roads/lanes are busy and parking difficult. School and GP oversubscribed. Sites are liable to flooding, construction work only increases this risk. No investigation to prove development is necessary in the village so why Blackmore? BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: I believe BBC should focus on more suitable locations that would be able to provide for the increase in population and be able to cope with such a large development. BBC has not taken into account other brownfield sites that are available that may be more suitable and should take priority over the greenfield land off of Redrose lane.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24725 - 8429 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii

24727 Object**Respondent: Mr James Taylor [8430]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and infrastructure is insufficient for more development. The roads/lanes are busy and parking difficult. Infrequent buses. Library has shut, moving to already busy Coop. Post office has shut. 30 new homes in Epping Forest DC will exacerbate problems along with R25 and R26. School is full. Need a housing need survey to show what is needed. BBC has not adequately consulted with Epping Forest DC with 30 new homes there too. Sites are liable to flooding, see this every winter. village floods. Impossible to get appointment at GPs. Our garden floods in heavy rain.

Change To Plan: Blackmore is at full capacity however there are places such as Stondon Massey which could do with a re-vamp and the freshness of a shop. Targeting a small village that is already struggling to cope with the limited resources we have. Stondon Massey would welcome and appreciate amenities and what they would bring. Brownfield sites are also a possibility and seem much more suitable than building on precious green belt land!

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24727 - 8430 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii

24729 Object**Respondent: Mr Steven Taylor [8431]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 9: Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200
Policy R26 - 9.201-9.205

30 new homes in Epping Forest DC will exacerbate problems along with R25 and R26. School is full. Need a housing need survey to show what is needed. BBC has not adequately consulted with Epping Forest DC with 30 new homes there too. Sites are liable to flooding, see this every winter. village floods. Impossible to get appointment at GPs. Our garden floods in heavy rain.

Change To Plan: BBC need to demonstrate that no brownfield sites are available. BBC also need to explain how the village infrastructure would be upgraded to deal with the increase in traffic.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24729 - 8431 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii

24736 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jasdeep Dhesi [7266]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There will be more traffic in the nearside area.
More suitable sites could have been identified.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24736 - 7266 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24738 Object**Respondent: Mrs Patricia Dean [8434]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I do not think the houses should be built on Green Belt land in Blackmore. It would put untold pressure on an already busy doctors surgery, on the small local school, public transport, parking etc.
There are more suitable sites sustainable locations. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services.

Change To Plan: I fully agree with the objectives of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24738 - 8434 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24741 Object**Respondent: Barry Robert Dean [8435]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: In my opinion there is no clear 'strategy' for the village of Blackmore. There are more suitable sites and the green belt land does not have to be touched. Building the houses in Blackmore would put unwelcomed pressure on the already very busy doctors, schools, parking and bus services etc.

Change To Plan: I fully agree with the objectives of Blackmore village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24741 - 8435 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24744 Object**Respondent: Mr Joe Emmett [8436]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure issues - doctors, schools
 Access issues Red Rose Lane - single lane
 Volume of traffic
 No housing needs survey completed.
 Proposed sites have serious access issues.
 School almost full already with no options to expand, detrimental effect on children already in attendance.
 Doctors already a very over stretched service. Would be unable to meet increased demand.
 No consultation with other Local Authorities. e.g. Epping Forest. A development of c. 30 houses already near completion. This will add to traffic and parking issues within village.
 Proposed sites are liable to flood and building on land will also increase flood risk elsewhere. Village is already prone to severe flooding.
 No clear strategy for villages in North of the Borough.

Change To Plan: None specified

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24744 - 8436 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24746 Object**Respondent: Mrs Paula Tregent [8433]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound, there will be infrastructure issues for the village which will include limited places at the local primary school and pre-school. Parking in the village will eventually become an issue to Blackmore. Our doctors surgery is always fully booked up on a regular basis, sometimes you cant get an appointment for 3 weeks! This waiting time will increase massively.

Change To Plan: Flooding will be a major issue in the village with the proposed sites and will be the flooding elsewhere in the village something that we have experienced before. Traffic through the village will increase. This will include school buses and coached for the growing increase of children going to secondary schools. Redrose Lane is a narrow lane, the extra traffic will cause issues.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24746 - 8433 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24748 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul Tregent [8437]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to R25 and R26:
 The plan is unsound, there will be infrastructure issues for my community. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure > I can never get a doctor appointment. The waiting time will increase. Parking within the village is on the increase and will get worse. Where I live is very worrying as major flooding would become a serious issue.

The local council has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt (Redrose Lane).
 Vehicular traffic in Redrose Lane will increase massively and the volume is unsuitable for such a narrow lane. As previously mentioned the proposed sites are liable to flooding.

Change To Plan: The local council has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt (Redrose Lane).
 Vehicular traffic in Redrose Lane will increase massively and the volume is unsuitable for such a narrow lane. As previously mentioned the proposed sites are liable to flooding.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24748 - 8437 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24751 Object**Respondent: Miss Harriet Davis [8440]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Current building plans that are being carried out at the moment around the village aren't on a scale that impeades and upsets a whole village. To build at this scale is only at the benefit of the developer.

Change To Plan: To make the Plan sound Blackmore should be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24751 - 8440 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24755 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Objection to R25 and R26:
The local school is full. The local surgery is overcrowded.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24755 - 5029 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24756 Object**Respondent: Mr Edward Davis [8441]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are a lot of potential surrounding areas that could easily be used without upsetting the whole village.

Change To Plan: Blackmore to be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24756 - 8441 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24758 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert Davis [4789]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increasing the size of Blackmore by a third will change the character of the village and should be drastically reduced. I understand the need for additional housing and agree with Blackmore Village Housing Association, in that a proper investigation into local needs and requirement should be undertaken.

Change To Plan: Blackmore to be removed from the Local Plan. Future Plan to be based on needs rather than goals.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24758 - 4789 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24760 Object**Respondent: Mr Raymond Thompson [4840]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increased flood risk to surrounding area, no space at doctors surgery, school is at full capacity, roads cannot cope with current traffic and any increase will be detrimental to safety due to lack of parking space etc.

Change To Plan: These fields are Green Belt and as such should be protected from development whilst there are other brownfield sites available along with urban extension (Brentwood) an increase of this many houses will be detrimental to an ancient village and will lose any heritage it has. Redrose Lane will not be capable of containing the construction traffic let alone the increase of vehicles from new residents.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24760 - 4840 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii

24762 Object**Respondent: Ms. Donna Toomey [8024]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan is unsound and not suitable for Blackmore : school is full, GP is full, impact on wildlife, traffic impact, Red Rose lane is not suitable for traffic and volume and the proposed sites are liable to flood.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan. No comment as I am totally against the building work.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24762 - 8024 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24764 Object**Respondent: Ann Davis [4404]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Support the need for more housing, but to increase the village by 30% is not justified. Completely agree with Blackmore Village Housing Association in that more investigation is needed to ascertain local needs, and that development should be led by people who live in the community rather than developers.

Change To Plan: Blackmore to be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24764 - 4404 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24771 Object

Respondent: Mrs Angela Taylor [8442]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear 'strategy ' for the villages including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council. Over houses being constructed and/or planned close to Blackmore village. The principle of residential development off of Redrose Lane is wrong, Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure (The school and preschool is full, the doctors surgery is Doddinghurst is already over subscribed, inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc). There are more suitable and or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions of Brentwood (eg Honeypot Lane), and the locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Greenfield/Green Belt land off of Redrose Lane. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore village is included in the LDP. The access off/from Redrose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: Should consider alternative sites , not Green Belt, ideally brownfield sites. Remove R25 and R26 form plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24771 - 8442 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24772 Object

Respondent: Samantha Dunk [8438]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is a lack of knowledge, interest or understanding of what the Village Needs to maintain its character and quality of life. There has been no honest assessment of the housing needs of the village and no planning strategy to protect and support the heritage and character of our village. BBC have not consulted with neighbouring authorities adequately. The increase in the number of people and traffic will produce overcrowding of our village streets and roads, noise and air pollution. The access off / from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure, the local school is full, doctors appointments are very difficult to get, parking in the narrow roads is limited. Parts of our village have severe problems with flooding and the proposed sites are liable to flood. Building on greenbelt will take away the open rural environment. BBC have not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the greenfield land off of Red Rose Lane. BBC have also not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other sites. There are other more suitable locations within the borough.

Change To Plan: There needs to be an honest and wise assessment of the housing needs of the village and a planning strategy to protect and support the heritage and character and quality of life in our village. The view of the Blackmore community need to be part of that assessment. The assessment must take into account the nature of the village, its modest services and infrastructure, local school, doctors surgery, narrow roads, limited parking. The problems with flooding must be taken into account and the current problems with flooding addressed. There needs to be a serious and honest look by the Brentwood Borough Council at other locations, outside of Blackmore, that are more suitable for development. There needs to be an understanding of the importance and value of protecting the quality of life in Blackmore village. The way of life in our village is unique, very precious and irreplaceable. We would urge you to honour and protect our village.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24772 - 8438 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24774 Object

Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Increase risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24774 - 8444 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24776 Object

Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]

Agent: N/A

Summary: More suitable and sustainable locations (elsewhere).

Change To Plan: Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24776 - 8444 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24778 Object **Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore has not got the infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24778 - 8444 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24780 Object **Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: No survey has been undertaken to demonstrate the needs.

Change To Plan: Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24780 - 8444 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24782 Object **Respondent: Mr John Dawson [8444]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: With the size of this proposal the roads are not designed/suitable.

Change To Plan: Surveys should be undertaken in this area and also investigate more suitable locations - consult residents. To provide additional facilities if this project is successful, as there is not at present the infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24782 - 8444 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24784 Object **Respondent: Mr Alan Dodd [4828]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for villages in north of the Borough.
No consultation with Epping Forest in regards to 30 houses being built nearby to Blackmore.
Local services and infrastructure including schools are already at their limit.
Parking is already a concern.
Local services have not been robustly examined in preparing the Local Plan.
There are other more suitable brownfield sites and urban extensions in Brentwood.
Not demonstrated that development could be accommodated elsewhere by increasing densities.
No housing needs survey has been carried out.
Roads are unsuitable.
High flood risk which development would increase.

Change To Plan: The already existing situation explained above is not open to modification and should be excluded from the Local Plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24784 - 4828 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24786 Object **Respondent: MR David Emmett [8445]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Major access issues on Red Rose Lane, local infrastructure is very limited and development of this size would cripple services such as doctors / school. Increased volume of traffic into and through village would have a detrimental effect on the area.

Change To Plan: Proposed sites liable to flooding which will add to serious flooding issues already regularly experience in Blackmore. Access in Red Rose Lane (single lane road) onto busy junction with Nine Ashes Road particularly at school time. Not suitable for volume proposed. No consultation with other LA's i.e. Epping Forest already large c. 30 development on Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24786 - 8445 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24793 Object

Respondent: Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 4
Policy SP01 - D(a), D(f)
Paragraphs 4.2 and 4.9
Policy SP02

Section 08
Policy NE06 8.5-8.64
Para 8.85 (iv)
Para 8.90
Para 8.101

Policy NE13

Section 09
Policy R25, 9.197-9.200
Policy R26, 9.201-204

No clear strategy for villages, why Blackmore and not others that have no special historic centre. Other locations must be more sustainable and suitable. BBC has not consulted with neighbouring authorities, 30 homes on Fingrith Hall Lane. Blackmore Village is isolated, school is full, GP is 4 weeks for an appointment, parking in village in dangerous. Children and pensioners are at risk from this. Bus service is infrequent. More residents = more vehicles. More traffic will cause more air pollution bad for people and historic buildings. Sites are on Green Belt land, should use brownfield, not identified by BBC. Redrose Lane too narrow and floods severely, June 2016 floods across village. Sewers can't cope. Should increase densities on other proposed sites. Will increase village by 30%. Unauthorised travellers site will add to the impact on school, GP, local amenities. Has this been taken into account?

Change To Plan: I believe that R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the Blackmore village Heritage Association "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out our local housing needs to avoid further development locally.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24793 - 8175 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24795 Object

Respondent: Ms Jennifer Emmett [4896]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Major access issues on Red Rose Lane, local infrastructure is very limited and development of this size would cripple services such as doctors / school. Increased volume of traffic into and through village would have a detrimental effect on the area.

Change To Plan: Proposed sites liable to flooding which will add to serious flooding issues already regularly experience in Blackmore. Access in Red Rose Lane (single lane road) onto busy junction with Nine Ashes Road particularly at school time. Not suitable for volume proposed. No consultation with other LA's i.e. Epping Forest already large c. 30 development on Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24795 - 4896 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24797 Object

Respondent: Miss Donna Taylor [8446]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not consulted enough with other councils, especially in relation to other developments in the area and their impact. (Fingrith Hall Lane). Local infrastructure already stretched, school, GP long waiting time, lack of parking in village centre,. Increased risk of flooding in an area already susceptible. No housing need survey. There are many more suitable sites within BBC to be looked at before Blackmore Village is to be considered for any further development.

Change To Plan: There are many more suitable sites within BBC to be looked at before Blackmore Village is to be considered for any further development.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24797 - 8446 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24799 Object**Respondent: Catherine Elliott [8447]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increase traffic; schools; greenbelt land; keeping a village a village

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R 26 from LDP; Consult BVHA neighbourhood policy for sustainable village development.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24799 - 8447 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24803 Object**Respondent: Heather Eltham [8449]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The BBC has not consulted adequately with neighbouring authorities (Epping Council) who are in process of building c. 30 houses at top of Fingrith Hall Lane - the impact this has on the village where the infrastructure is not sound to incorporate extra traffic. There are other brownfield sites that are available and they must take priority over our precious greenbelt. The school is at full capacity and the doctors surgery would not be able to accommodate the extra numbers.

Change To Plan: I believe sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out our Housing Needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24803 - 8449 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24807 Object**Respondent: Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local Plan has not been positively prepared. This plan does not meet the areas' objectively assessed needs and is not informed by agreements with other authorities. There is a development at the end of Thrifts Hall Road on the old Norton Heath Equestrian Centre which already has in excess of 30 houses under construction. I believe this land comes under Chelmsford Council's administration. There is another proposed development of 12 houses at the top of Nine Ashes Road - administered by EFDC, plus a development of 9 houses at the end of Spriggs Lane, Blackmore. The people occupying these homes will be using Blackmore facilities (small shop), roads (narrow, dangerous and badly maintained), school (already over- subscribed), doctor's surgery (over-burdened and extremely hard to get an appointment). Any development of the size proposed would put even extra pressure on the village and surrounding area. This is not sustainable development. The two proposed sites R25 and R26 are greenbelt and quality arable land. Red rose Lane appears to have been suddenly accepted as the village boundary. It is an ancient lane, is narrow and dangerous, and struggles to accommodate existing traffic. The turning on to Nine Ashes Road (opposite the school) is particularly dangerous with speeding traffic and poor visibility.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs to protect the heritage and character of Blackmore village and deliver the best housing solutions to meet local needs. There are already proposals put forward for development of Red Rose Farm for housing (this could be for locally required affordable housing- not high-end properties), plus other surrounding developments which need to be taken into consideration before allowing the two greenbelt sites to be used. Alternative brownfield sites on offer should be used instead of greenbelt/arable land. There needs to be a Housing Needs Survey which would address the local needs of the village before simply allowing more million pound homes to swamp the area just to make the numbers work. There needs to be a proper professionally-led investigation into the environmental effects of development to the village. Investigation into how our local services, school, doctors, transport, is supposed to cope with an influx of development. Previous information provided to the Council regarding the impact of such development should be thoroughly read and taken into account. The views of all residents of Blackmore and surrounding villages should be taken into account. The website for completion of this comment form and reference to associated documentation is extremely difficult to use, especially for those in the community who do not have access to the internet, are not PC literate, and cannot get their comments to the Council because they have no way of getting to the offices! The majority of people are simply put off giving their views because of the complex nature of communicating them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24807 - 6880 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24809 Object

Respondent: Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan is not justified

The Local Plan is not justified as an appropriate strategy, as all other reasonable alternatives have not been taken into account: The BBC have not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites available which should be taking priority over the greenfield and greenbelt land off Red rose Lane Blackmore. A large brownfield site capable of accommodating 70 houses has been proposed by the village of Stondon Massey-this has not even been considered. Why should two perfectly good pieces of arable land on the greenbelt be sacrificed when there is a brownfield site on offer? The two sites identified in Blackmore were excluded in 2016, but have been added to the LDP at a very late stage and were only briefly discussed at the end of the extraordinary meeting of the BBC in November 2017, and were the only sites put forward.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs to protect the heritage and character of Blackmore village and deliver the best housing solutions to meet local needs. There are already proposals put forward for development of Red Rose Farm for housing (this could be for locally required affordable housing- not high-end properties), plus other surrounding developments which need to be taken into consideration before allowing the two greenbelt sites to be used. Alternative brownfield sites on offer should be used instead of greenbelt/arable land. There needs to be a Housing Needs Survey which would address the local needs of the village before simply allowing more million pound homes to swamp the area just to make the numbers work. There needs to be a proper professionally-led investigation into the environmental effects of development to the village. Investigation into how our local services, school, doctors, transport, is supposed to cope with an influx of development. Previous information provided to the Council regarding the impact of such development should be thoroughly read and taken into account. The views of all residents of Blackmore and surrounding villages should be taken into account. The website for completion of this comment form and reference to associated documentation is extremely difficult to use, especially for those in the community who do not have access to the internet, are not PC literate, and cannot get their comments to the Council because they have no way of getting to the offices! The majority of people are simply put off giving their views because of the complex nature of communicating them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24809 - 6880 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24811 Object

Respondent: Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan is not effective

The local plan is not effective as it is not based on joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters - see comments under (a) above. It has not been demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other allocated sites. Other sites have been removed at a late stage which has put pressure on Blackmore to pick up the slack. The proposed site in Honeypot Lane Brentwood was withdrawn due to poor site access and the fact it is on greenbelt land. This reasoning also applies to the sites within Blackmore. It seems to be a numbers game- to fit in with government requirements to provide a certain amount of housing, and because this has not been given the correct amount of consideration in the past, the village of Blackmore is under threat of being overwhelmed. In addition, Blackmore has an illegal gypsy/travellers site on the Chelmsford Road which for years has been left unchallenged. This has now mysteriously become 'legal' and incorporated into the Local Plan. There is no clear strategy for the villages, including Blackmore, to the north of the Borough.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs to protect the heritage and character of Blackmore village and deliver the best housing solutions to meet local needs. There are already proposals put forward for development of Red Rose Farm for housing (this could be for locally required affordable housing- not high-end properties), plus other surrounding developments which need to be taken into consideration before allowing the two greenbelt sites to be used. Alternative brownfield sites on offer should be used instead of greenbelt/arable land. There needs to be a Housing Needs Survey which would address the local needs of the village before simply allowing more million pound homes to swamp the area just to make the numbers work. There needs to be a proper professionally-led investigation into the environmental effects of development to the village. Investigation into how our local services, school, doctors, transport, is supposed to cope with an influx of development. Previous information provided to the Council regarding the impact of such development should be thoroughly read and taken into account. The views of all residents of Blackmore and surrounding villages should be taken into account. The website for completion of this comment form and reference to associated documentation is extremely difficult to use, especially for those in the community who do not have access to the internet, are not PC literate, and cannot get their comments to the Council because they have no way of getting to the offices! The majority of people are simply put off giving their views because of the complex nature of communicating them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24811 - 6880 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24813 Object

Respondent: Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Local Plan is not consistent with National Planning Policy

This is not delivery of sustainable development. It is entirely developer-led. The infrastructure cannot support the amount of development proposed for Blackmore, which equates to twice the amount of development for other villages. There has been no housing needs survey undertaken to support the proposals. None of the evidence presented to BBC on the unsuitable nature of the proposed sites seems to have been taken into account, e.g. flooding, poor access, etc. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and already stretched infrastructure. The village had previously been excluded from the development plan, and back in 2016 we were told Blackmore would not be required to accept large scale additional housing numbers due to significant infrastructure issues and flood risks, plus the historic sensitivity of the village. We are now dealing purely with a numbers game - the village is being forced to take on the overflow of the perceived housing need, which has not been efficiently or effectively dealt with by the BBC.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs to protect the heritage and character of Blackmore village and deliver the best housing solutions to meet local needs. There are already proposals put forward for development of Red Rose Farm for housing (this could be for locally required affordable housing- not high-end properties), plus other surrounding developments which need to be taken into consideration before allowing the two greenbelt sites to be used. Alternative brownfield sites on offer should be used instead of greenbelt/arable land. There needs to be a Housing Needs Survey which would address the local needs of the village before simply allowing more million pound homes to swamp the area just to make the numbers work. There needs to be a proper professionally-led investigation into the environmental effects of development to the village. Investigation into how our local services, school, doctors, transport, is supposed to cope with an influx of development. Previous information provided to the Council regarding the impact of such development should be thoroughly read and taken into account. The views of all residents of Blackmore and surrounding villages should be taken into account. The website for completion of this comment form and reference to associated documentation is extremely difficult to use, especially for those in the community who do not have access to the internet, are not PC literate, and cannot get their comments to the Council because they have no way of getting to the offices! The majority of people are simply put off giving their views because of the complex nature of communicating them.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24813 - 6880 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24815 Object

Respondent: Kirsty Edwards [8450]

Agent: N/A

Summary: [Remove R25 and R26]

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24815 - 8450 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24821 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Webb [4919]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access to/from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the addition of over 70 properties. This is a single track road, and is already dangerous for walkers and horse riders. Adding the extra volume of traffic on this road is completely unsuitable. The village has already been subject to serious flooding in recent years, most recently being 3 years ago, when several houses on the Green were flooded. The sewerage, electricity and other utilities were not designed to cope with an additional 70 properties (an increase of around 30%) without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road. No appropriate mitigation is highlighted in the plan. There has been no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. Whilst there are many options that could be considered for building houses in the North of the Borough, it is as if Blackmore has been chosen with virtually no other options being considered and others - such as Honey Pot Lane and Red Rose Farm - completely ignored or withdrawn. There has been no 'Housing Needs' survey carried out which would demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LOP, and why other areas have not. The survey carried out by local reps has been entirely ignored. The Borough Council has not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan or continuing to include Honey Pot Lane (now removed from the latest draft). There are Brownfield sites available nearby (Red Rose Farm as one example) but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. 11. Other more suitable locations (eg areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore which is not a sustainable development proposal.

Change To Plan: My modification would be that sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community. Also remove the Site GT 16 - a II 8 previously unapproved pitches. Leave Blackmore IN Green Belt and restore the classification of "Rural Village in a sparse setting (which it is for roads, Buses, etc. etc. it really is) I am very unhappy that you have chosen to issue such a difficult form to complete with wholly unnecessary/inappropriate personal elements in Section A. It has taken me an unacceptable amount of time to understand and complete. I am very tempted to believe this is a deliberate attempt to stifle meaningful comment. A lot of people who hold views exactly like mine HAVE been put off from objecting because of this.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24821 - 4919 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24826 Object

Respondent: Mr Adrian Quick [8451]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Refer to attached form. The infrastructure is already stretched, and these additional developments would have a significant negative impact to the local community including provision for medical services and schooling. Bus services to larger employment locations (Brentwood Chelmsford, Epping) are totally inadequate. The designated sites have flooding issues, a problems across wider Blackmore footprint and development will cause further problems, increasing the flood rate. There are other Brownfield sites within existing urban boundaries (and local infrastructure and transport grids) better suited to development, negating the need to destroy Green Belt environments. There has been no evidence that Blackmore has a housing need requiring such scale of development. Sites R25 and R26 should be removed form the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed form the LDP and the planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24826 - 8451 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24832 Object

Respondent: Mr Ronald Qusted [8452]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is not suitable location for large number of new homes. This village walk to the shops, hall, school, etc. Already a problem with speeding and parking. More traffic will exacerbate this. 30 new homes on Fingrth Hall Lane not taken into account. Other locations more sustainable and suitable. Use brownfield sites not Green Belt. Consider surrounding villages. Village is historic, Impact on school and GP surgery will be huge. Major risk of flooding in parts of village. "016across the village, homes flooded and cars stuck. More housing will exacerbate this. Where is a Blackmore Housing Needs Survey.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP> The 'Neighbourhood Plan' from the BVHA should be looked at by the planners. This clearly sets out the local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24832 - 8452 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24834 Object

Respondent: Mrs Cynthia Kirby [8453]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are more suitable/sustainable locations than Blackmore. Services in Blackmore are already overstretched. 1) the school is already full. 2)there are so many people visiting the (one) shop and/or café or public houses that the parking in the village is chaotic and sometimes dangerous.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites (R25 and R26).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24834 - 8453 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24836 Object

Respondent: Mr David Kirby [8454]

Agent: N/A

Summary: From what I understand, there are 30 new houses under construction in Fingrith Hall Lane (Epping Forest DC). These will have a huge effect on the village services and will increase the demand for Blackmore School, Deal Tre Health Centre and the Co-operative supermarket. This will contribute to chaotic parking in the centre of the village, Fingrith Hall Road and(more importantly) Red Rose Lane. Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites. (R25 and R26).

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites. (R25 and R26).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24836 - 8454 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24841 Object**Respondent: Donna Eaton [8455]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A residential development such as has been 1. submitted for Blackmore will further stretch the infrastructure (roads, parking, schools, doctors surgeries). 2. There are other more suitable locations in the borough. 3. There are brown field sites available which should be prioritised over green field sites. 4. The area of Blackmore is known to be a flood risk (23rd June 2016). 5. Access to and from the development site entirely unsuitable for increased traffic problems.

Change To Plan: We / I do not believe green belt land in Blackmore should be released for this development as part of BBC Local Plan due to all of the aforementioned reasons. [Remove R25 and R26]

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24841 - 8455 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24842 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, adding a 100 houses and 200 vehicles would greatly affect an already dangerous road. Access to the site is via small lanes. Before adding more problem, decent thoughts should be taken to alleviate current problems.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24842 - 4847 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24844 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village school is already oversubscribed.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24844 - 4847 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24846 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Why build on Green Belt when there are plenty other suitable brownfield sites.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24846 - 4847 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24848 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Public transport is limited in the village.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24848 - 4847 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24850 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Forstner [4847]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flooding issue.

Change To Plan: Don't think turning villages into town is the answer. Destroying villages would destroy Great Britain's mall island nature.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24850 - 4847 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24852 Object**Respondent: Mr Scott Osborne [8456]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound: GP surgery is already extremely busy with appointments difficult to get Additional housing will make this worse.
 Country lanes of Red Rose and surrounding area of the village are not suitable for an increase in traffic. Local village school does not have the facilities or plot to cope with an increase of children that additional housing would bring.
 Traffic and parking in Blackmore Village is already an issue without the additional cars and traffic that these houses would bring.
 Blackmore is surrounded by Green Belt land which includes the proposed sites and the impact that such a development would have on that land, the environment and wildlife would be so detrimental to the entire area.

The choice of Blackmore for this proposed development of houses is wrong, due to all the key infrastructure issues highlighted above. Other more suitable and sustainable locations must be considered.

The current development being built at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane that is within a mile of Red Rose Lane will already have an impact on the village, therefore this must be taken into consideration with neighbouring authorities.

Red Rose lane is a flood risk, therefore this by itself should be a red flag for development but this coupled with the general unsuitability due to access and traffic issues and the lack of infrastructure must be a reason for modifications to the local plan to be made. I support the BVHA representation.

Change To Plan: The choice of Blackmore for this proposed development of houses is wrong, due to all the key infrastructure issues highlighted above. Other more suitable and sustainable locations must be considered.
 The current development being built at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane that is within a mile of Red Rose Lane will already have an impact on the village, therefore this must be taken into consideration with neighbouring authorities.
 Red Rose lane is a flood risk, therefore this by itself should be a red flag for development but this coupled with the general unsuitability due to access and traffic issues and the lack of infrastructure must be a reason for modifications to the local plan to be made. I support the BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24852 - 8456 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24854 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Fox [8457]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing survey done for village.

Change To Plan: Consideration for local needs and infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24854 - 8457 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24856 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Fox [8457]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Impact on village and liable to flooding.

Change To Plan: Consideration for local needs and infrastructure.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24856 - 8457 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24860 Object**Respondent: Mrs Faye Osborne [8458]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound due to the impact on the local school, the unsuitability of local roads for more traffic, the impact on the village, parking problems. The impact on wildlife and environment. Local services like GP hugely impacted, already difficult to get appointment.

Change To Plan: A small village like Blackmore is not suitable for sustainable development for all the reasons provided on the form.
 A large development of around 30 houses are already being developed at the top of Fingrith Hal Lane which is less than 1 minute driving from Red Rose Lane and these houses will already impact Blackmore but this has obviously not been taken into consideration.
 The flood risk and general unsuitability of Red Rose Lane due to access and traffic issues must be considered in favour of other more suitable locations

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24860 - 8458 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24862 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The two proposed development in Blackmore would completely destroy the nature of the village, given the consequent volume of traffic and cumulative impacts from 30 houses being proposed in Fingrith Hall Road, Epping.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
 - complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
 - consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24862 - 8459 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24864 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Children are being turned away from the local school due to lack of places.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
 - complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
 - consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24864 - 8459 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24866 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
 - complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
 - consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24866 - 8459 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24868 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It's already almost impossible to get doctor's appointment.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
 - complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
 - consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24868 - 8459 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24871 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There seems to have been no research into other more suitable brownfield sites which should take priority over Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: - demonstrate there are other available brownfield lands that could be used.
 - complete local survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is being included.
 - consult with neighbouring authority to ensure they are aware the development will have huge impacts on Blackmore village.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24871 - 8459 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24872 Object**Respondent: Mr David Olley [8461]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Too many houses in small village. Must be more suitable [locations]. Infrastructure poor. Schools. Flood risk. Wildlife. Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan. [remove sites R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24872 - 8461 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24874 Object**Respondent: Mrs Gemma Olley [8462]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Need to take into account the infrastructure of the village it will not cope with extra houses. Not taking into account other developments in the area (EFDC & Chelmsford Council). Schooling will be a problem. I was unable to get my 2 sons into the village school . Flooding is a problem. We will lose vital flood plains, Red Rose Lane is too narrow as an access point, also will disrupt beautiful wildlife.
Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24874 - 8462 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24876 Object**Respondent: Mr Dane Fullick [8463]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Limited public transport in and out Blackmore to support additional population.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen to the Parishes and respond positively to the plan of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24876 - 8463 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24878 Object**Respondent: Mr Dane Fullick [8463]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Being in the Green Belt, it should not be used to create urban sprawl.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen to the Parishes and respond positively to the plan of Blackmore Village Heritage Association

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24878 - 8463 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24879 Object**Respondent: Mr Dane Fullick [8463]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Deal Tree surgery already suffers with long waiting list.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen to the Parishes and respond positively to the plan of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24879 - 8463 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24882 Object**Respondent: Mr Dane Fullick [8463]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane and Nine Ashes already are prone to accidents, having witnessed a few. I do not want the increased risks of accidents due to extra road traffic especially at peak hours and school pick-up and drop-off.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen to the Parishes and respond positively to the plan of Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24882 - 8463 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24884 Object**Respondent: Mr Marcus Forstner [8160]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local roads network are already heavily congested, already large traffic during school runs and rush hours, this is a danger to children health and lives.

Change To Plan: Increase the size of our roads, schools, infrastructure network etc.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24884 - 8160 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24886 Object	Respondent: Mr Marcus Forstner [8160]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	We are already overcrowded in our schools.	
Change To Plan:	Increase the size of our roads, schools, infrastructure network etc.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24886 - 8160 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24888 Object	Respondent: Mr Marcus Forstner [8160]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site is not suitable for housing. It is within a high risk of flooding area. Building here would put local residents homes at risk and devalue all local and surrounding properties.	
Change To Plan:	Increase the size of our roads, schools, infrastructure network etc.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24888 - 8160 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24891 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Green Belt should not be built on.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24891 - 8464 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24893 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Redrose Lane is far too narrow for access to a housing estate.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24893 - 8464 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24895 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Redrose Lane is prone to flooding.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24895 - 8464 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24897 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	School is already full.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24897 - 8464 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24900 Object	Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Doctors area always fully booked, having to wait long time to get appointment.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24900 - 8464 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	

24902 Object**Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Services already struggled to accommodate families living in village.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24902 - 8464 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24904 Object**Respondent: Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose lane and Nine Ashes Rd are already a dangerous junction especially at school times, more traffic will be catastrophic. I live nearby and have witnessed collisions. There is real risk to life of pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.

Change To Plan: Remove site. Listen and respond positively to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association on behalf of our community!

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24904 - 8464 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24906 Object**Respondent: Miss Autumn Fullick [8466]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Living near Redrose Lane junction I have near misses of collision of cars, adding extra volume of traffic will increase my risk of accident. Traffic increase around the primary school will lead to increase of accidents with cars in/out and young children around the village. Protection of pedestrians down Redrose Lane is not secure.

Change To Plan: - Clear strategy for people already living in the village to be defined to help understand the scale and impacts of the site
- Justification as to why Blackmore is a suitable location over and above others in the surrounding Borough's
- Demonstration of why other brownfield sites should take priority over the Green Belt land over the Green Belt near Redrose Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24906 - 8466 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24911 Object**Respondent: Jacqueline Greagsby [8465]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Red Rose Lane is not suitable for urban development, Blackmore has modest services and infrastructure which are failing with the existing population. 2. Access to/from Red Rose Lane is unsustainable for the volume of traffic. 3. Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding and any construction on this site could push the problem onto current residents property.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA "neighbourhood plan" which clearly sets out the local planning needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24911 - 8465 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24912 Object**Respondent: Miss Autumn Fullick [8466]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Doctors surgery already suffers with long waiting list.

Change To Plan: - Clear strategy for people already living in the village to be defined to help understand the scale and impacts of the site
- Justification as to why Blackmore is a suitable location over and above others in the surrounding Borough's
- Demonstration of why other brownfield sites should take priority over the Green Belt land over the Green Belt near Redrose Lane
- Solution that protects the heritage and character of Blackmore village and local needs
- Clear communication that member of the future of the village can understand.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24912 - 8466 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24913 Object	Respondent: Miss Autumn Fullick [8466]	Agent: N/A		
Summary:	Limited public transport to support additional population.			
Change To Plan:	- Clear strategy for people already living in the village to be defined to help understand the scale and impacts of the site - Justification as to why Blackmore is a suitable location over and above others in the surrounding Borough's - Demonstration of why other brownfield sites should take priority over the Green Belt land over the Green Belt near Redrose Lane.			
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24913 - 8466 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None			
24916 Object	Respondent: Miss Autumn Fullick [8466]	Agent: N/A		
Summary:	Long waiting list of children wanting to attend Blackmore primary school.			
Change To Plan:	- Clear strategy for people already living in the village to be defined to help understand the scale and impacts of the site - Justification as to why Blackmore is a suitable location over and above others in the surrounding Borough's - Demonstration of why other brownfield sites should take priority over the Green Belt land over the Green Belt near Redrose Lane - Solution that protects the heritage and character of Blackmore village and local needs - Clear communication that member of the future of the village can understand.			
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24916 - 8466 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None			
24918 Object	Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]	Agent: N/A		
Summary:	The houses would be a blight on the local and surrounding area.			
Change To Plan:	See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.			
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24918 - 8467 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None			
24920 Object	Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]	Agent: N/A		
Summary:	Local amenities can't cope. You can't get a doctors appointment without waiting for at least 2 weeks.			
Change To Plan:	See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.			
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24920 - 8467 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None			
24922 Object	Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]	Agent: N/A		
Summary:	The local school is full.			
Change To Plan:	See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.			
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24922 - 8467 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None			
24924 Object	Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]	Agent: N/A		
Summary:	Redrose Lane and connecting junctions are already dangerous and could not cope with the extra traffic.			
Change To Plan:	See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.			
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24924 - 8467 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None			

24926 Object**Respondent: Mr Lee Fullick [8467]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose Lane and Fingrith Hall Lane are susceptible to deep flooding after more than one day of heavy rain.

Change To Plan: See Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24926 - 8467 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24929 Object**Respondent: Kay Ginivan [8468]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local plan is unsound because: 1. Blackmore is a small isolated rural village so it hasn't got the infrastructure and would affect school admissions, doctors wait times, parking, etc. 2. The Red Rose Lane is entirely unsustainable for this volume of traffic. 3. Brentwood Council hasn't looked at the used of brownfield sites that are available and take priority over the greenbelt lane off Red Rose Lane. 4. There has been no survey with regards to housing needs why Blackmore is included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Please see BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24929 - 8468 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

24932 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council did not consult with Epping Council when deciding the impacts of additional housing on Blackmore.

Change To Plan:

- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24932 - 5892 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24934 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking in the village is dangerous, with motorists often park in dangerous positions, i.e. blocking views at junctions, blocking on double yellow lines. Blackmore is an isolated with limited infrastructure and services to sustain additional housing.

Change To Plan:

- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24934 - 5892 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24936 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose lane is entirely unsuitable for additional volume of traffic being proposed. Children's poster pleading parents not to park on the double yellow line outside the school are being ignored because there is no space. How would additional housing and traffic improve this dangerous situation.

Change To Plan:

- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
- Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
- More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
- Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
- Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24936 - 5892 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24938 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local doctor surgery is full. What will be the impacts of additional housing on local residents who already have to wait for weeks for an appointment?

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24938 - 5892 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24940 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council failed to demonstrate that there are other brownfield sites that are available and should take priority over the Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24940 - 5892 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24942 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Council failed to demonstrate the required housing cannot be met by increasing density on other sites.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24942 - 5892 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24945 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council did not consult with Epping Council when deciding the impacts of additional housing on Blackmore.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24945 - 8191 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24947 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Parking in the village is dangerous, with motorists often park in dangerous positions, i.e. blocking views at junctions, blocking on double yellow lines.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24947 - 8191 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24949 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose lane is entirely unsuitable for additional volume of traffic being proposed. Children's poster pleading parents not to park on the double yellow line outside the school are being ignored because there is no space. How would additional housing and traffic improve this dangerous situation.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24949 - 8191 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24951 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local doctor surgery is full. What will be the impacts of additional housing on local residents who already have to wait for weeks for an appointment?

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24951 - 8191 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24953 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council failed to demonstrate that there are other brownfield sites that are available and should take priority over the Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane.

- Change To Plan:
- Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24953 - 8191 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24955 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Council failed to demonstrate the required housing cannot be met by increasing density on other sites.

Change To Plan: - Produce a clear housing strategy for the villages; explain why small villages with stretched capacity are preferred to more suitable and sustainable locations.
 - Consult with neighbouring authorities to determine the full impact of additional housing.
 - More suitable sites could and should have been identified.
 - Demonstrate that the required housing number cannot be met by increasing density on other suitable sites.
 - Confirm this field is not crucial in managing rain water levels.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24955 - 8191 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24957 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1- The Co-op is always in low stock most of the times. 2- The tearooms are always busy. 3- The hairdressers are always fully booked.

Change To Plan: The Council has not asked the local community what people want.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24957 - 8182 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24959 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: You have to wait for ages for a doctor's appointment.

Change To Plan: The Council has not asked the local community what people want.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24959 - 8182 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24961 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The school!!

Change To Plan: The Council has not asked the local community what people want.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24961 - 8182 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24963 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewage of the village is already full.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24963 - 8182 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24966 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We already get flooding in the area. More housing will make it worse.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24966 - 8182 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24967 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Some villagers have ideas about where fewer houses could go in the area but even then it will stretch the local facilities even more.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24967 - 8182 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24969 Object**Respondent: Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Crossing the road outside Co-op area is already dangerous with cars driving through the village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24969 - 8182 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24971 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lesley Fletcher [8469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The number suggested is far too many and would affect our lives in a detrimental way. The number of cars would increase and Blackmore and the immediate surrounding areas do not have the facilities for cars to park near our few shops and to fill our narrow lanes.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24971 - 8469 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24972 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lesley Fletcher [8469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I understand there are other brownfield sites that could be built on without encroaching on our beautiful Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24972 - 8469 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24975 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lesley Fletcher [8469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: It is already difficult to see a doctor, with an additional 100 families of 3+, this is potentially another 300+ patients to be seen by what seems an already overstretched surgery.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24975 - 8469 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24977 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lesley Fletcher [8469]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flooding in Red Rose Lane could become a greater problem with additional housing.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24977 - 8469 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24980 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Fletcher [8470]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I do not oppose to a lower number of housing built on a brownfield site but object to building on the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24980 - 8470 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24981 Object	Respondent: Mr Christopher Fletcher [8470]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	It is already difficult to see a doctor, with an additional 100 families of 3+, this is potentially another 300+ patients to be seen by what seems an already overstretched surgery.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24981 - 8470 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24983 Object	Respondent: Mr Christopher Fletcher [8470]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The increased number of cars to park near our few shops and to fill our narrow lanes is not viable.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24983 - 8470 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24985 Object	Respondent: Mr Christopher Fletcher [8470]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Flooding in Red Rose Lane could become a greater problem with additional housing.	
Change To Plan:	Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24985 - 8470 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24987 Object	Respondent: Edwin Fisher [1189]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Other residential developments continue to overload the local surgery (Deal Tree) causing GP waiting time of 4 weeks +.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 and 26 and refer to BVHA Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24987 - 1189 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24990 Object	Respondent: Edwin Fisher [1189]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	This development appears to be site-based first without consideration about effects on the area. It should be the other way round. Plan fails to take account of available facilities to support additional housing.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 and 26 and refer to BVHA Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24990 - 1189 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24991 Object	Respondent: Edwin Fisher [1189]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is insufficient car parking at the surgery to cope with this development.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 and 26 and refer to BVHA Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24991 - 1189 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
24993 Object	Respondent: Edwin Fisher [1189]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The proposed houses should be distributed around the Borough on a sound basis.	
Change To Plan:	Remove site R25 and 26 and refer to BVHA Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 24993 - 1189 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	

24995 Object**Respondent: Mrs Aileen Fisher [8471]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The level of concentrated increased in population in one location of around 20% is unwarranted and flawed.

Change To Plan: - Site R25 and R26 removed. The dwellings proposed distributed around the borough.
 - All infill and brownfield sites take priority first no matter how small before considering Green Belt.
 - Provide infrastructure first before selecting site to build.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24995 - 8471 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24997 Object**Respondent: Mrs Aileen Fisher [8471]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is already a waiting period of 4 weeks for a doctor appointment. There are insufficient numbers of doctors to cope with increasing number of patients.

Change To Plan: - Site R25 and R26 removed. The dwellings proposed distributed around the borough.
 - All infill and brownfield sites take priority first no matter how small before considering Green Belt.
 - Provide infrastructure first before selecting site to build.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24997 - 8471 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

24999 Object**Respondent: Mrs Aileen Fisher [8471]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The current car parking facilities at the local surgery are barely able to meet current needs. There is no provision in the Plan to meet increased demands.

Change To Plan: - Site R25 and R26 removed. The dwellings proposed distributed around the borough.
 - All infill and brownfield sites take priority first no matter how small before considering Green Belt.
 - Provide infrastructure first before selecting site to build.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 24999 - 8471 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25001 Object**Respondent: Mr Leslie Smith [8472]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local plan is woefully ill-conceived with no clear strategy for the villages that surround Brentwood, particularly Blackmore. The BBC has not demonstrated it has fully investigated more suitable and sustainable locations which should take priority over Greenfield and Green Belt land. The local plan is unsound. I fail to observe the plans soundness and that it has been positively prepared in line with the NPPF. Furthermore, how can the proposed site at Red Rose Lane and Fingrith Hall Lane be justified? Where is the strategy? What consideration has been given to a village with modest services and infrastructure incapable of accommodating such developments. Has BBC consulted with neighbouring authorities and the adverse impact such over development would have on the village?

Change To Plan: I strongly object to any development in Blackmore. To summarise, any or either of the proposed sites would adversely effect the residential amenity of neighbours. Access to / from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable and will be overbearing out of character in terms of its appearance compared with the existing development in the vicinity, not to mention that the character of the village will be lost.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25001 - 8472 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25004 Object**Respondent: Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Making infrastructure issues - other roads are flooded in this area and I suspect building on this scale would add is the problems - furthermore parking is often a problem in Blackmore, difficult to see appointment with the local GP service and no school places at present. 2. We have been told in the past that Blackmore village would not be required to access additional houses numbers. 3. We often have walkers and cycle and horse riders in those narrow roads so more traffic could be a danger.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA report - there are brownfield sites that should be considered first - there should be proper strategy for villages north of Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25004 - 8460 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25006 Object

Respondent: Mr John Ginivan [8476]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is rural and isolated with inadequate services and infrastructure to accommodate planned development. Brentwood BC have not look at the use of brownfield sites to take priority over greenfield (and Green Belt) land off Red Rose Lane. No survey has been carried out to justify why Blackmore needs to be developed. Access onto Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for the proposed volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25006 - 8476 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25009 Object

Respondent: Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I believe the plan in its current state is unsound, not illegally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate as it would result in an expansion of the village which current infrastructure could not support. The plan also will have a detrimental effect on the beauty of the village and the conservation area that it is. Furthermore, I do not believe we should build on land which is designated as greenbelt.

Change To Plan: The plan needs to move to a different piece of land, outside of Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25009 - 8477 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25011 Object

Respondent: Miss Claire Grant [8478]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Will increase existing flooding issues in and around village. Proposals should be reduced to 30 dwellings to allow community to cope. Facilities are already struggling. Should focus building in Brentwood. The recent development in Epping Forest DC is on the same road. Traffic will be a nightmare as Blackmore is already used as a cut through. No housing needs survey; Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy traffic.

Change To Plan: Road network to be improved, including road widening from A414 to the village. Suitable drainage, speed restrictions etc. Increased NHS facilities as it is impossible to get a doctors appointment at Deal Tree health centre. Development of local school facility to cope with an increase of 100 families in the area. The current local shop/post office is inadequate in size to cope and will need to increase. Increases in public transport. Flood improvements and preventative measures to be put in place. Increase parking facilities (nightmare as it is already!)

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25011 - 8478 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25017 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Sanders [8474]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan unsound because: needs a housing survey no consideration of infrastructure is given, school is full, 6-8 week wait for GP appointment, no local employment, limited public transport, local roads narrow and cant cope with more traffic, village becomes gridlocked due to parking.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey to be undertaken, build on Brownfield sites first, build types of houses needed in Blackmore. I support the BVH mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25017 - 8474 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25019 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Frost [8479]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Infrastructure does not support this: doctor surgery over full etc.	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25019 - 8479 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25025 Object	Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no proper consideration to the location: Red Rose Lane is a narrow carriageway unsuitable for the proposed number of additional dwellings. Blackmore is an isolated village.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross. - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25025 - 8480 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25026 Object	Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No 'Housing Need Survey' was completed to look at what is right for Blackmore and its population.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross. - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25026 - 8480 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25027 Object	Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There has been no co-operation with Epping Forest Council who have authorised construction of 30 properties in Fingrith Hall Lane.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross. - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25027 - 8480 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25028 Object	Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no clear planning strategy for the villages including Blackmore.	
Change To Plan:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross. - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest 	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25028 - 8480 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	

25029 Object**Respondent: Mr Richard Fisher [8480]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available, and which should have taken priority over the Green Belt land down Red Rose Lane. Brentwood Council has also not adequately considered other more suitable sites which are more sustainable e.g. urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place and the growth more sustainable.

Change To Plan: - Significantly reduce the amount of dwelling proposed, open up the possibility of other more suitable sites eg Tipps Cross.
 - Complete a Housing Needs Assessment
 - Create a clear strategy co-operating with other neighbouring councils eg. Epping Forest

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25029 - 8480 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25031 Object**Respondent: Ms Victoria Sanders [8482]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan unsound because: needs a housing survey no consideration or research of infrastructure is given, regarding lack of public transport, condition of roads, no parking in village, School oversubscribes and over 8 week wait for GP appointment. This will be made worse by increased population and not considered or tackled. Build on brownfield sites first and conduct a housing survey. Build the types of houses which are needed by the people of Blackmore. The reasons are self explanatory. I support the BHVA.

Change To Plan: Build on brownfield sites first and conduct a housing survey. Build the types of houses which are needed by the people of Blackmore. The reasons are self explanatory. I support the BHVA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25031 - 8482 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25035 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Plan has not considered other building outside the Plan with other Councils.

Change To Plan: Fully support the aims and objectives of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25035 - 8483 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25039 Object**Respondent: Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Building on greenbelt; 2. Infrastructure of school, surgery, parking, drainage; 3. Lack of consultation re local needs; 4. Local wildlife habitat leading to more flooding because of habitat removal; 5. Impact from top of Fingrith Hall Lane!!! Epping Borough. 6. More traffic pollution, risk of road accidents increases could lead to injury and deaths; 7. Local shop couldn't cope with the extra load; 8. Village will end up being part of London sprawl; 9. The profound historical nature and heritage will be deeply impacts; 10. Blackmore be a 'through' way / short cut from Red Rose at top of Fingrith Hall Road.

Change To Plan: 1. I would like the proposed sites R25 and R26 removed from local development plan. 2. Consult the BVHA neighbourhood plan for sustainable development. 3. Why doesn't Brentwood Council lead the way to protect green belt and historical heritage sites - Blackmore at the top of the list. 4. Green alternative use to those sites eg allotments, solar panels on both to serve the village.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25039 - 5024 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25041 Object**Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The infrastructure has not been considered: Roads are not big enough. Red Rose Lane is too narrow for heavy good vehicles, states so on signage in the area.

Change To Plan: Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25041 - 8483 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25043 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Schools are at capacity.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25043 - 8483 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25045 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Flooding.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25045 - 8483 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25048 Object	Respondent: Mr Alan Snook [8484]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	This is Green Belt and should be kept that way. There at not enough community facilities in the area. IE: doctors surgeries, buses, rubbish clearance, sewerage, road infrastructure is not adequate for extra traffic, The plan is totally unsound in respect of Blackmore.	
Change To Plan:	I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission. I wish to be represented by BVHA.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25048 - 8484 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
25051 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	GP surgery at capacity of intake of patients.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25051 - 8483 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25053 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The infrastructure has not been considered - parking.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25053 - 8483 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25055 Object	Respondent: Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There are more suitable locations; areas in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.	
Change To Plan:	Fully support the aims and objects of Blackmore Village Association and their own Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25055 - 8483 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25057 Object	Respondent: Mrs Sandra Eaton [8486]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Section 09 (site allocation) policy R25 & R26. Unsound proposal, drainage flooding, doctors appointment, network inadequate infrastructure etc. There are other Brown Field sites in the area that could be developed. BBC should investigate other non-Green Belt sites for development.	
Change To Plan:	BBC should investigate other non-Green Belt sites for development.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25057 - 8486 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	

25060 Object

Respondent: Ruth Jones [8485]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. The village school is not large enough to accommodate a large increase in numbers and if was made 2 classes larger it would lose its village school feel. 2. It is difficult to get appointments at our GO surgery as it is. 3. Blackmore would lose its small village feel and identity. 4. More houses would mean more traffic and would make the roads less safe for pedestrians, particularly children. 5. Cheaper housing would change the demographic of the area. 6. Not all villages need to have affordable housing. I couldn't have afforded to live here when I got married but it was somewhere I aspired to and with hard work we could eventually afford to live here after a few years. 7. The village already has a problem with flooding without building on it further.

Change To Plan: I agree with the Blackmore Heritage Association Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25060 - 8485 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25064 Object

Respondent: Mr Steven Jacobs [4408]

Agent: N/A

Summary: N/A

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25064 - 4408 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25066 Object

Respondent: Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development is in a Green Belt area - which is not in line with national policy to develop. Also existing infrastructure needs updating and replacing for existing residents before any additional development is needed.
Do not proceed with the development.

Change To Plan: Do not proceed with the development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25066 - 7953 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25070 Object

Respondent: Diane Jones [8488]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear strategy for Blackmore in north of BBC. Lack of consultation with nearby authorities (i.e. Epping FDC) - north part of Fingrith Hall Lane houses being built. Infrastructure - our modest services are already over stretched - school is full doctors appointments are hard to get. Traffic and parking - this will increase massively in the village will be dangerous. There are more suitable sites on and around Brentwood - i.e. old Toomey site on Ingrave Road has been empty for absolutely years as have many others in BBC Ongar Road former commercial park in town centre. No housing needs survey conducted to show why Blackmore is in the LDP. Access in/out Red Rose Lane unsuitable for volume of traffic the developments will produce accidents will happen. Proposed sites do flood - building on these will increase flood risk elsewhere in village

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 need to be removed from the LDP.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25070 - 8488 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25074 Object

Respondent: Mrs Josephine Snook [8489]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound relating to Blackmore because; Green Belt land should not be built on. Cant get a doctors appointment as it is. The village is liable to flooding. Red Rose Lane is way too narrow for an access point, The clues in the title (lane). There are other more suitable sites.
I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission.

Change To Plan: I am a member of BVHA and fully support their objectives and delivery of their mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25074 - 8489 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25076 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Goddard-King [8490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore cannot sustain more traffic and increased population. The school is already not able to cope with the numbers of pupils needing places.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and 26. The planners should refer to the BHVA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25076 - 8490 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25078 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Goddard-King [8490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local surgery is not able to cope with the number of registered patients.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and 26. The planners should refer to the BHVA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25078 - 8490 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25080 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Goddard-King [8490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The roads and speeding traffic is too much for a rural village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and 26. The planners should refer to the BHVA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25080 - 8490 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25082 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Goddard-King [8490]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A loss of green sites damages the rural environment and countryside feel, reducing a sense of village living.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and 26. The planners should refer to the BHVA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25082 - 8490 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25084 Object

Respondent: Mr David Greagsby [8491]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are other parts of the Borough that is more suitable. Brentwood has not undertaken a full review of existing brownfield sites to establish whether they can be developed before using Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed; planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Pplan which sets out the local planning need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25084 - 8491 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25086 Object

Respondent: Mr David Greagsby [8491]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is not suitable for urban development, is prone to flooding. Any construction on this site could put the problem on residents' property within Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed; planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Pplan which sets out the local planning need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25086 - 8491 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25087 Object

Respondent: Mr David Greagsby [8491]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brentwood Council has not undertaken a full review of existing brown sites to establish whether they can be developed before using Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed; planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Pplan which sets out the local planning need for our already sustainable community

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25087 - 8491 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25090 Object

Respondent: Mr David Greagsby [8491]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Access to/from Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic such a development would generate!

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed; planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Pplan which sets out the local planning need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25090 - 8491 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25092 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Gill [8492]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Other locations and housing developments by neighbouring Councils have not been taken into account when proposing the site for sites R25 and R26. Housing development from neighbouring Councils are close to Blackmore village and will have a major impact to the village infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed ffrom the Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25092 - 8492 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25094 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Gill [8492]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A housing need survey was not conducted with this (impacts on the village's infrastructure) in mind.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25094 - 8492 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25096 Object

Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Neighbouring authorities (Epping and Chelmsford) have not been consulted and no consideration has taken place around the additional impacts of their proposed development; there is already work started for 30 houses and further planned.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25096 - 4758 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25098 Object

Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A housing needs survey was not conducted. There is no proof that the required housing needs cannot be met elsewhere, for example, brownfield sites, urban extension in Brentwood, increase density at other allocated sites.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25098 - 4758 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25100 Object	Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	School cannot cope with this increase in population.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25100 - 4758 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25102 Object	Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Buses and roads cannot cope with this increase in population.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25102 - 4758 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25104 Object	Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Doctors and dentists cannot cope with this increase in population.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25104 - 4758 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25106 Object	Respondent: Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The site and the village are liable to flooding. Building will increase this flood risk.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which outlines our local housing needs.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25106 - 4758 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25108 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore is a small village with limited facilities. It has one shop transport links are very poor with the bus service very limited indeed cancelled at one time and has traffic problems. The imposition of 70 houses is grossly excessive and also totally disproportional to the total required.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25108 - 4942 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25109 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There is no strategy for villages and no housing needs survey has been done by the council.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25109 - 4942 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25113 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The area is liable to flood and further building would only worsen this.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25113 - 4942 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	

25115 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Some natural habitat for the local wildlife would be lost.	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25115 - 4942 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25117 Object	Respondent: Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The school is already at full capacity	
Change To Plan:	Take Blackmore out of the LDP as it was in a previous draft.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25117 - 4942 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25120 Object	Respondent: Mr Bruno Giordan [8104]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Inadequate account has been taken of the infrastructure limitations of the location.	
Change To Plan:	A more central location in the Borough would have better transport links, access to schools and surgeries.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25120 - 8104 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25122 Object	Respondent: Mr Bruno Giordan [8104]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The intrusion into Green Belt is unnecessary and damages village's character.	
Change To Plan:	A more central location in the Borough would have better transport links, access to schools and surgeries.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25122 - 8104 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25124 Object	Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore has been allocated 70 which represents 60% of land released in villages in what is described in the LDP as a 'borough of villages'. This is totally disproportionate.	
Change To Plan:	A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25124 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25127 Object	Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The LDP has not shown that the 70 houses could not be built by increasing density on the more urban sites. Denton Village could easily absorb this amount for example.	
Change To Plan:	A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25127 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25129 Object	Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No Housing Needs Survey has been made, except by Blackmore Village Heritage Association, to ascertain local needs and to show why Blackmore has been included.	
Change To Plan:	A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25129 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	

25131 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There already are other sites within the Blackmore boundaries that have been submitted to Brentwood Planning for development as well as building by Epping Council on our borders. All of which will be using our services and infrastructure adding to further congestion in an already busy village. There is a large, illegal, travellers site in Chelmsford road that additionally impacts all the roads, parking, infrastructure, school, doctor's surgery, services etc.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25131 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25134 Object

Respondent: Brenda Juniper [8493]

Agent: N/A

Summary: School already full; Village congestion already dangerous too many cars, limited parking, especially weekends and summer when there are many visitors to village. At the present time Blackmore is a pretty 'village' why spoil it, there are plenty of brown field site in Brentwood use those. Doctors already struggling to give appointments. Red Roe Lane is an historic road having been used to avoid the village when the plague was rife. There is an estate being built in Fingrith Hall Road which comes under Epping Council all those folk will use village amenities as we are closest.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25134 - 8493 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25135 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: More sustainable locations with better infrastructure, more schools, & surgeries, etc etc such as the urban areas of Brentwood are available.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25135 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25137 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The doctors' surgery is overwhelmed. It is not possible to get an appointment for weeks. At time of writing this was until at least the end of April.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25137 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25139 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local primary school, that is listed as an asset in the plan, is oversubscribed with a waiting list.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25139 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25141 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brownfield sites have not been properly considered before the green belt and green field sites.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25141 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25143 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure cannot support this additional build which could mean upwards of 200 people, 140 cars, 250 car journeys. Traffic and parking is already a problem and will only get worse as planning departments in Brentwood and Epping continue to approve building plans .

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25143 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25145 Object

Respondent: Valerie Godbee [4943]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There doesn't appear to have been much, if any, consultation with Epping & Chelmsford Borough Councils. 30 properties have been built in Fringrith Hall Lane which will impact the village and the inhabitants.

Change To Plan: A clear plan needs to be implemented for Blackmore and the other villages in the north of the Borough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25145 - 4943 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25147 Object

Respondent: Mr Paul David Jackson [7387]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The access road, Red Rose Lane is a single track and not suitable for the volume of traffic. Other brown field sites should take priority over green field sites. Greenfield sites were established to protect the countryside and this ideal should be followed. The development proposed is out of proportion to the size of the village. BBC does not appear to have taken into consideration the plot at the top of Fringrith Hall Lane (part of Epping Forest District Council) within 1 mile of the development of about 40 units. There has been no housing needs survey carried out.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan should follow the guidelines and be legally compliant.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25147 - 7387 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25149 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council has not considered other buildings outside the Plan with other Councils.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25149 - 8494 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25150 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are suitable locations; Blackmore village does not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25150 - 8494 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25152 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The infrastructure has not been considered - eg. schools

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25152 - 8494 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25154 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The infrastructure has not been considered - eg. GPs, hospitals.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25154 - 8494 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25158 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The infrastructure has not been considered - eg. flooding.

Changes to Plan:

I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25158 - 8494 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25159 Object**Respondent: Iris Jones [8495]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is narrow and winding, cars have to slow down to pass. There are ditches on either side and no footpaths. The exit onto Nine Ashes Road often floods and is a particularly junction, right by the school. An increase in traffic would be a great risk. Blackmore is a very small village and despite being very isolated has a minimal bus service. There is one shop a full school that is already over stretched and a doctor surgery that isn't cope now. The narrow roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic and already car parking problems. Blackmore village cannot possibly cope with the strem of the proposed developments on its infrastructure. I therefore consider the plan to be unsound. Why choose Blackmore greenbelt when there are other locations within Brentwood Borough Council more sustainable.

Change To Plan: Greenbelt should not be built on. I agree with the Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25159 - 8495 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25163 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Geary [8494]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose lane will not be able to cope with heavy good vehicles.

Change To Plan: I fully support the aims and objects of BVHA and their own Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25163 - 8494 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25165 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Green Belt must be protected for future generations.

Change To Plan: "Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25165 - 5703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25167 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of highway.

Change To Plan: "Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No

Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25167 - 5703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25169 Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Lack of utilities (sewage).		
Change To Plan:	"Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25169 - 5703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		
25171 Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Lack of doctors.		
Change To Plan:	"Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25171 - 5703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		
25173 Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Red Rose Lane is far too narrow as an access point.		
Change To Plan:	"Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25173 - 5703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		
25175 Object	Respondent: Mr Paul Gardiner [5703]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Village is liable to flooding - from river Wid.		
Change To Plan:	"Green Belt land will not be built on in Brentwood" - quoted by Alex Burghart (our local MP) in a meeting not 12 months ago.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25175 - 5703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		
25177 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Inadequate consultation with Epping Council as 30 houses are already being built on Fingrith Hall Lane which will have impacts on Blackmore.		
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25177 - 8496 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		
25179 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Local school is full.		
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25179 - 8496 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		
25181 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A	
Summary:	Deal Tree health centre already struggles with population of surrounding villages.		
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No	Tests: None Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25181 - 8496 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None		

25183 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Local transport system is not available hence more cars on the road creating yet more pollution and people driving to work, taking children to school.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 25183 - 8496 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25187 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Brentwood Council have demonstrated whether there are brownfield sites available which should take priority over Green Belt.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 25187 - 8496 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25189 Object	Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Lawrenson [8496]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Red Rose Lane is a flood area and any building will increase flood risk.	
Change To Plan:	Remove sites R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 25189 - 8496 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25191 Object	Respondent: Mr Thomas Lennon [747]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	To add approximately 70 homes will add approximately 25% to increase the village population. The village has a history that reaches back to the era of Henry XVIII and the Plague.	
Change To Plan:	Only brownfield lands are appropriate. SP02 states that growth is prioritised in highly accessible areas.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 25191 - 747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25193 Object	Respondent: Mr Thomas Lennon [747]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Both R25 and R26 have ecological values, with sightings of bats, owls, all are protected species.	
Change To Plan:	Only brownfield lands are appropriate. SP02 states that growth is prioritised in highly accessible areas.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 25193 - 747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25194 Object	Respondent: Mr Thomas Lennon [747]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Blackmore has a history of flooding.	
Change To Plan:	Only brownfield lands are appropriate. SP02 states that growth is prioritised in highly accessible areas.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 25194 - 747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25197 Object	Respondent: Mr Thomas Lennon [747]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Site is in Green Belt.	
Change To Plan:	Only brownfield lands are appropriate. SP02 states that growth is prioritised in highly accessible areas.	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?: No
Full Reference:	O - 25197 - 747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	

25199 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Pressure on school.

Change To Plan: - Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25199 - 8497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25201 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Pressure on doctors. Already difficult to get an appointment.

Change To Plan: - Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25201 - 8497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25203 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Mander [4562]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development should not occur on the greenbelt. Councillors should visit the surveys take by L.A. when it asked land holders to give details of potential sites, large and small, for dwellings. The survey findings could provide some answers. It covers all Brentwood area. As it now appears green belt is no longer an issue in Blackmore await the support of our Brentwood Councillors in our bid to protect the very ancient village of Blackmore.

Change To Plan: [Remove R25 and R26]

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25203 - 4562 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25205 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Excess traffic on local roads causing pressure on already pot-holed roads.

Change To Plan: - Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25205 - 8497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25207 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking in local areas in centre of Blackmore village.

Change To Plan:

- Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25207 - 8497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25209 Object**Respondent: Mrs Rose Linton [8497]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Insufficient amenities for the excessive amount of houses/ people.

Change To Plan:

- Regular bus services
- More doctor surgeries
- Adequate sewage
- Extension to parking facilities
- Extension to school
- Disruption to electricity, gas supply while work is being carried out to be kept at minimum.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25209 - 8497 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25211 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is liable to flooding; building on this will increase flood risk with impacts on current residents.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore.
Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25211 - 8498 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25213 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are more suitable and sustainable locations - e.g. the Urban extension to Brentwood. The locations stated in Blackmore do not promote Sustainable development considering the limited facilities currently available.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25213 - 8498 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25215 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore especially is an isolated village and access is via roads that have not been designed to meet the number of cars let alone the amount of heavy vehicles that would be required to build the number of houses in the current LDP.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25215 - 8498 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25217 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local schools are running at full capacity and are a single entry form. Therefore the children might have to be schooled outside of the village therefore increasing the traffic and pollution in the area.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25217 - 8498 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25219 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Access to Doctors appointments. In fact there is only 1 Doctors surgery covering all 5 Villages which are all being impacted by the LDP.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25219 - 8498 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25221 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Transport/ Bus facilities are hardly adequate.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25221 - 8498 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25223 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jackie Locke [8498]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC have not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increasing the housing density on other (Allocated or Brownfield) sites such as Dunton.

Change To Plan: Remove number of proposed houses in Blackmore. Currently the Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved covering School, transport, doctor and hospitals.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25223 - 8498 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25225 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan is not compliant with NPPF on many points:

* NPPF Sect 2 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services

* NPPF Sect 3 28- local community have been ignored in production of the plan.

* NPPF Sect 5 77 /78 - decisions should be 'responsive to local circumstances' and 'reflect local needs'. There is no proven need for these houses.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25225 - 4711 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25227 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]

Agent: N/A

Summary: NPPF Sect 9 103 - development should be focused ... on locations ... limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of travel modes. This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest stations accessed via local rural lanes.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25227 - 4711 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25229 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25229 - 4711 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25231 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not compliant with NPPF Sect 15 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25231 - 4711 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25233 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not compliant with NPPF 16- Conserving the historic environment. R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Red Rose Lane being the point of access for both developments having historical significance as a local plague road from the time of the Black Death.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities * Location needs to be re-assessed. * Detailed flood risk analysis required. * Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area. * Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) * Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25233 - 4711 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25235 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. Fingrith Hall Lane is the entrance to a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities and more than 5 miles from any other town/village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 (40 + 30) new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25235 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25237 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Also, Red Rose Lane, along with many other roads in and around the Blackmore area, is used regularly by walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog-walkers and horse riders. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users. There are also very few street lights in Blackmore and none in Red Rose Lane which adds more risk.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25237 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25239 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore sits in a dip and is prone to flooding. Since the major development of the village in the 1970s there have been a number of occurrences of flooding. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is clearly against policy NE06.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25239 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25241 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. The electricity, other utilities are unlikely to be able to cope an additional 70 properties without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road. Power cuts are a regular feature, especially in adverse weather.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25241 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25243 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewerage system is at maximum capacity already.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25243 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25246 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Bus services are limited, infrequent and do not run into the evenings.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25246 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25248 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is insufficient parking in the village centre causing people to regularly park on double yellow lines and double park along the residential part of Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25248 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25250 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery is at capacity and waiting time for appointments are already unacceptable.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25250 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25252 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear housing strategy for the villages and general area in the north of the Borough. There are many options that have been suggested through this process and should have been considered but have not been.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25252 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25253 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local primary school is already full - new arrivals in the village are not able to get their children into the school and have to travel to schools in other areas.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25253 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25255 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out which would have demonstrated why Blackmore has been specifically included in the LDP, and why other more suitable areas have not been included.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25255 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25257 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25257 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25258 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25258 - 7046 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25263 Object**Respondent: Mrs Michelle Morgan [4505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Neighbouring authorities not been adequately consulted. Blackmore does not have the infrastructure to meet the needs of 30% more residents. Doctors already very full, school at capacity. Health and safety impact of additional traffic in volume. Other more suitable sites such as extension to Brentwood. Brownfield sites should take priority over greenbelt. No housing needs survey undertaken. Likelihood of flooding - village is already prone to flooding. The Plan does not have a fair distribution access to

Change To Plan: Significant reduction in planned houses - on brownfield land.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25263 - 4505 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

25264 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has not been sufficient consultation with other neighbouring authorities. Fingrith Hall Lane is the entrance to a development of 30 new (large) houses by Epping Forest District Council. These properties are 1.3 miles from Blackmore village centre and its amenities and more than 5 miles from any other town/village with similar amenities. This will exacerbate the impact of the proposed 70 (40 + 30) new properties being proposed for Blackmore on the infrastructure and amenities.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25264 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25266 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Also, Red Rose Lane, along with many other roads in and around the Blackmore area, is used regularly by walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog-walkers and horse riders. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users. There are also very few street lights in Blackmore and none in Red Rose Lane which adds more risk.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25266 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25268 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village centre of Blackmore sits in a dip and is prone to flooding. Since the major development of the village in the 1970s there have been a number of occurrences of flooding. The addition of 70 properties will further reduce the available open land to soak up water and therefore flooding occurrences will increase. Blackmore is not just a high flood RISK area, flooding in Blackmore is actually an ISSUE. Therefore any development in Blackmore is clearly against policy NE06.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25268 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25270 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. The electricity, other utilities are unlikely to be able to cope an additional 70 properties without counting the 30 extra properties in Fingrith Hall road. Power cuts are a regular feature, especially in adverse weather.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25270 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25272 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewerage system is at maximum capacity already.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25272 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25274 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The local primary school is already full - new arrivals in the village are not able to get their children into the school and have to travel to schools in other areas.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25274 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25276 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Bus services are limited, infrequent and do not run into the evenings.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25276 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25278 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is insufficient parking in the village centre causing people to regularly park on double yellow lines and double park along the residential part of Fingrith Hall road.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25278 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25280 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors surgery is at capacity and waiting time for appointments are already unacceptable.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25280 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25282 Object**Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear housing strategy for the villages and general area in the north of the Borough. There are many options that have been suggested through this process and should have been considered but have not been.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25282 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25284 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out which would have demonstrated why Blackmore has been specifically included in the LDP, and why other more suitable areas have not been included.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25284 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25286 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council have not shown that the required additional houses for the Borough could not be delivered by increasing the housing density on the other allocated sites in the plan. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25286 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25288 Object

Respondent: Mr John Laing [8501]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association(BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25288 - 8501 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25291 Object

Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]

Agent: N/A

Summary: A proper survey hasn't been done.

Change To Plan: There must be plenty of brown field sites available. Keep Blackmore a village instead of turning it into a town.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25291 - 8502 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25293 Object

Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Should not build on Green Belt.

Change To Plan: There must be plenty of brown field sites available. Keep Blackmore a village instead of turning it into a town.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25293 - 8502 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25295 Object

Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The school cannot take any more people.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25295 - 8502 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25296 Object**Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors cannot take any more people.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25296 - 8502 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25299 Object**Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The risk of flooding is great.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25299 - 8502 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25301 Object**Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The amount of car will snap up the village which already has far too many cars.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25301 - 8502 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25303 Object**Respondent: Mrs Doreen Larney [8502]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Limited bus services running hourly and finishes at 7pm and only for 6 days a week.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25303 - 8502 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25305 Object**Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: A proper survey has not been done.

Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25305 - 4990 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25307 Object**Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The schools cannot take any more.

Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25307 - 4990 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25309 Object**Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The doctors cannot take any more.

Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25309 - 4990 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25311 Object**Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewer will not take extra water and will flood.

Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25311 - 4990 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25313 Object**Respondent: Mr Alfred Larney [4990]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village has many powercuts already so the extra load will cause many problems.

Change To Plan: There must be many more sites available. We also have to cope with 30 houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25313 - 4990 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25315 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore has a history of flooding recently due to water run-off, due to amount of hard-standing and nowhere for the water to go. Building on this site will just compound this.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25315 - 8503 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25317 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Difficult to get doctors' appointment.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25317 - 8503 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25319 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Transport links are poor.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25319 - 8503 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25321 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose Lane is a narrow lane where 2 cars cant pass in places.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25321 - 8503 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25322 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development would spoil the enjoyment of walkers and cyclists who use Redrose Lane as a circulation road around the village in promoting good health.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25322 - 8503 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25325 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The town in Brentwood is suitable for further development as there are already facilities and services in place.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25325 - 8503 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25327 Object**Respondent: Mrs Alison Lester [8503]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore borders Epping Forest and Chelmsford Council areas who have both approved numerous property extensions, new build and housing development near Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Make public the 'Duty to Cooperate' result. Go and visit the area to see the extent of development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25327 - 8503 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25329 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore has a history of flooding recently due to water run-off, due to amount of hard-standing and nowhere for the water to go. Building on this site will just compound this.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25329 - 8504 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25331 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Difficult to get doctors' appointment.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25331 - 8504 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25333 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Transport links are poor.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25333 - 8504 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25335 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose Lane is a narrow lane where 2 cars cant pass in places.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25335 - 8504 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25337 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development would spoil the enjoyment of walkers and cyclists who use Redrose Lane as a circulation road around the village in promoting good health.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25337 - 8504 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25339 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The town in Brentwood is suitable for further development as there are already facilities and services in place.

Change To Plan: Promote town centre growth, promote road safety and do not build in bottleneck and create potential black spot. The current flooding problem will have to be lived with but should not be increased.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25339 - 8504 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25341 Object**Respondent: Mrs Nicola Lester [8504]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore borders Epping Forest and Chelmsford Council areas who have both approved numerous property extensions, new build and housing development near Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Make public the 'Duty to Cooperate' result. Go and visit the area to see the extent of development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25341 - 8504 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25343 Object**Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inadequate consultation with Epping Forest Council which has, or will soon, impact Blackmore village with 30 houses built on Fingrith Hall Lane.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25343 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25345 Object**Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The Deal Tree Centre GP Surgery already struggles with existing population and could not cope.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25345 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25346 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The school is full and cannot cope. More pollution on our roads from school buses or parents vehicles travelling elsewhere.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25346 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
25348 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The proposed development in Blackmore does not promote sustainable development. There are more obvious opportunities to develop in and around Brentwood Town Centre.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25348 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
25351 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The sites are liable to flood and the existing homes will be adversely affected.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25351 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
25353 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	No clear strategy for the villages in the north of the village.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25353 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
25354 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	The Council has not demonstrate whether there are available brownfield sites which should take precedence over Green Belt green field in Blackmore.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25354 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
25357 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Access to/from Redrose Lane is totally unsuitable for the volume of traffic that would ensue as a result of the proposed development.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25357 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No
25359 Object	Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	There has been no housing needs survey to explain why Blackmore has been included in the Plan.	
Change To Plan:	Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference:	O - 25359 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
Tests:	None	Examination: No

25361 Object**Respondent: Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Public transport is relatively scarce in Blackmore making it unsuitable for development. Nearest train stations are Brentwood (7.5 miles) and Ingatestone (4.4 miles).

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25361 - 6958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25364 Object**Respondent: - Neil Stainer [2334]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not Nimbyism but BBC have been lazy and not thought through Blackmore option. Red Rose lane is too small for access and there are safety issues. Access an issue, localised flooding, impacting on existing homes, services and infrastructure limited, need a housing survey, not sustainable and negative impact on Village.

Change To Plan: BBC have not identified suitable brownfield sites before submitting Green Belt suggestions - renew and resubmit, There are many other suitable sites identified in part 2 of the LDP.

BBC has not identified and demonstrated that the housing requirement could not be met by increasing housing density on other allocated sites.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25364 - 2334 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25365 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound. No village plan has procured.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25365 - 8505 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25367 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not enough thoughts have been given to the flooding issue.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25367 - 8505 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25369 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The sewage pumping station is at capacity.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25369 - 8505 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25373 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: At the moment it takes three weeks to see a doctor. With 2,600 patients per doctor, this is one of the highest in the country. With more inhabitants this will increase.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25373 - 8505 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25375 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: School is at capacity.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25375 - 8505 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25377 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking is already a problem. Development will increase the problem in the village centre and at the school.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25377 - 8505 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25379 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Blackwell [8505]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village is sustaining its grocery shops, tea room, public house. No further properties required.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25379 - 8505 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25382 Object**Respondent: Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Inadequate and unsuitable access from Redrose Lane.

Change To Plan: If the Council can demonstrate the need for extra housing, then there are more suitable and sustainable sites than Blackmore, eg. Brentwood

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25382 - 8506 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25383 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Sanders [4923]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound, needs housing need survey, infrastructure not sufficient, school, GP appointment delay, no employment in village, non existent public transport, lanes narrow and unsuitable, grid locked village centre already, parking problems.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey should be completed, build on brownfield sites, build type of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25383 - 4923 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25385 Object**Respondent: Mr Paul Sullivan [8507]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure of area taking into consideration of GPs available. schools, use of roads, lack of paths, street lighting and wildlife in area.

Change To Plan: Fully support Blackmore Plans for village and their objectives. (BVHA)

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25385 - 8507 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25387 Object**Respondent: Mrs Debbie Spencer [6959]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound plan: infrastructure issues. Red Rose lane is unsuitable. Sites liable to flood, increase flood elsewhere, school full, GP at capacity, inadequate bus service, traffic bad in village centre, with development on Woolmongers/Norton Heath, making it worse, danger to residents on roads.

Change To Plan: Need a clearer strategy for villages. The volume of traffic will be chaotic from & to Red Rose Lane access. Why has Blackmore been included in the local plan delivery as NO housing needs survey has been carried out. We have modest services in our village and so increase traffic will be severe. Our beautiful church has no parking so when there is a wedding, christening or any type of service the visitors park in the centre of the village & surrounding roads, Adding to congestion, There are other suitable locations so why our green field sites? The borough council has not shown there are other brownfield sites available which would take priority over greenfield sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25387 - 6959 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25389 Object	Respondent: Mrs Anne Stockman [8508]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Infrastructure does not support this	
Change To Plan:	Dr surgery already full	
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25389 - 8508 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	
25391 Object	Respondent: Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Unnecessary expansion of Green Belt instead of using available brownfield sites.	
Change To Plan:	If the Council can demonstrate the need for extra housing, then there are more suitable and sustainable sites than Blackmore, eg. Brentwood.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25391 - 8506 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25393 Object	Respondent: Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Destruction of local habitat and protected species.	
Change To Plan:	If the Council can demonstrate the need for extra housing, then there are more suitable and sustainable sites than Blackmore, eg. Brentwood.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25393 - 8506 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25395 Object	Respondent: Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Lack of infrastructure eg. doctor's surgery, currently a 4-week wait for appointments.	
Change To Plan:	If the Council can demonstrate the need for extra housing, then there are more suitable and sustainable sites than Blackmore, eg. Brentwood.	
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: None	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25395 - 8506 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	
25398 Object	Respondent: Mrs Debbie Stevens [8509]	Agent: N/A
Summary:	Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. No consultation with adjoining boroughs, Huge effect on Blackmore primary school almost full, health centre almost full. As a parent we are able to walk to primary school. In 13 years I am more worried of number of illegally parked vehicles outside the school, Woollard Way is near school, the increase in the number of speeding vehicles. More residents would make traffic worse. More traffic exiting Woollard Way 100 yards from already busy school. This is a risk that should not be taken, This whole project is a business deal with not consideration at all to the residents - the people!	
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: No
Full Reference:	O - 25398 - 8509 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	

25404 Object

Respondent: Mr Craig Stevens [4958]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. No consultation with adjoining boroughs, new homes will drain resources, impact on local school, already at capacity, as is GP. Will increase local traffic by at least 300 vehicles, Increase local traffic, road risks, road damage, and local roads not suitable for this r plant machinery. BBC failed to demonstrate that there aren't more suitable locations, already more suitable brownfield sites before green belt. Level 3 flood risk in village, new development will increase this risk downstream, roads and homes. No strategy on this impact on Blackmore. Blackmore is of historical heritage and importance new homes will heavily impact on this. These changes will be damaging and irrevocable and seemed to have been totally ignored by the planners to date.

Conduct a meaningful local housing survey with residents and listen to and respond to the concerns and needs of local residents before any planning decisions are made, It is my opinion that after meaningful consultation with local residents and a large and appropriate reduction in proposed development, small scale sympathetic development would be welcomed and supported.

Change To Plan: Conduct a meaningful local housing survey with residents and listen to and respond to the concerns and needs of local residents before any planning decisions are made, It is my opinion that after meaningful consultation with local residents and a large and appropriate reduction in proposed development, small scale sympathetic development would be welcomed and supported.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25404 - 4958 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25408 Object

Respondent: Mrs Malanie Sanders [8511]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04; 08; 09 - R25 and R26. Unsound plan: no housing need survey, not sustainable as no infrastructure consideration, particularly as school full, 6-8 week wait for GP, no jobs available in village, no public transport, roads narrow and unsuitable, in area by shop it gets gridlocked due to parked cars. Housing needs survey should be undertaken, build on brownfield sites first, build the types of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Change To Plan: Housing needs survey should be undertaken, build on brownfield sites first, build the types of houses needed in Blackmore, I support the BVHA mission.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25408 - 8511 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25412 Object

Respondent: Mr William A Smith [8512]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections HRA, R25 and R26: This plan is not dealing with a problem, it is making one, We do not have the infrastructure in this village or town. I need myself a good hospital, a GP appointment, these are both overstretched and difficult to obtain, they do their best but we have far too many people per doctor. Our village now is not properly maintained. No street cleaning, no road repairs, no police, long waiting times nationally for ambulances. These things are important for young and old alike. There is nothing in this local plan that deals with this. Developers build, take the money and leave us with the mess these plans solve nothing to alleviate anything, I also have lived in this town 80 years.

Change To Plan:

We need the investment to go with the plan not just houses we need massive improvement too infrastructure sewers, schools, Drs hospitals transport, better roads, we need a consultation to the whole of Brentwood, this is a devastating plan to our village and a disaster to Brentwood. We need government money to carry this out. I too question the site at South Weald. Be withdrawn. I lived there all my young life. It is within easy reach of the M25 amenities, easy access to the city, town within walking distance, the site is available. Give me one good reason why you turned it down.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25412 - 8512 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

25413 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is all green field land comprising of wildlife habitat and numerous trees.

Changes to Plan:

The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or for it to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25413 - 6846 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25415 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are many available brownfield sites in Brentwood which would be more suitable.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25415 - 6846 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25417 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Housing development would be dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians and young children because of the lack of parking facilities and development would increase the volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25417 - 6846 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25419 Object

Respondent: Mr David Smith [4872]

Agent: N/A

Summary: See 09 Policy R25 and R26

Blackmore as a contained village already suffers from small access roads, more traffic and building is going to ruin the roads. Any new housing needs to consider local needs, affordable housing, pressure on public transport, school, doctors etc. There are better locations around Brentwood and have other authorities been consulted? Epping forest etc.
None. No new housing in any quantity can be sustained in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: None. No new housing in any quantity can be sustained in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25419 - 4872 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

25421 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Development will increase flooding.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25421 - 6846 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25423 Object

Respondent: Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no place available: schools, doctors.

Change To Plan: The Plan would need too many modifications to make it work or to be sound, e.g. schools, doctors, roads. Transport rail and airport would need upgrading. Most of the upgrading would cause immense disruption and would also mean people's gardens would be in danger and also more of our Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25423 - 6846 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25425 Object

Respondent: Mr Bryan Moreton [8513]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We don't need more vehicles in our village.

Change To Plan: I don't see that any modification could make the Plan sound because building on Green Belt is immoral.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25425 - 8513 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25426 Object

Respondent: Mr Bryan Moreton [8513]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Very poor infrastructure, no or very poor public transport, long waiting line for doctors appointment. The additional population which will bring their families with them would mean additional vehicles, traffic, pollution, parking issues. We don't need more vehicles in our village.

Change To Plan: I don't see that any modification could make the Plan sound because building on Green Belt is immoral.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25426 - 8513 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25430 Object

Respondent: Mrs Anne Sands [8514]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 4, 8, 9 - R25 and R26. Unsound because: too much traffic in the village, Blackmore school is bursting plus morning traffic is increasing and dangerous, Flood risk, not enough parking in the village, doctors appointments already like gold dust, narrow lanes, risk for the cyclists and horse riders. Take R25 and R26 OUT of the LDP and please consider BVHA consultation plan.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 OUT of the LDP and please consider BVHA consultation plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25430 - 8514 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25432 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gloria Moreton [8515]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound because all things have not been considered. No more room for school. No early or late bus to get to work or to the station. Fingrith Hall Lane is congested. We're a compact village, any expansion or building will affect the unique atmosphere. Where are they going to put the roads? Redrose lane is too narrow. No thank you.

Change To Plan: Start again. This Plan is useless and fit for failure. Everyone needs a house to live in but not at the expense of others. More interaction with other Councils. Epping Forest building at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane will have too much impact on Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25432 - 8515 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25434 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen Sullivan [8516]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Relates to section 09: R25 and R26. Local plans unsound infrastructure schools, GPs, other sites close by being built on by EFDC & Chelmsford, heavy use of roads, no paths, no street lights, wildlife, Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: Blackmore village plans aim to need the needs & objection of the village I fully support their plans

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25434 - 8516 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25436 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Murrell [8517]

Agent: N/A

Summary: [blank]

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25436 - 8517 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25438 Object

Respondent: Miss Wendy Schweitzer [8518]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 9 Negative impact on village, unnecessary Green Belt site. Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA development plan

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA development plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25438 - 8518 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25440 Object**Respondent:** Mrs Lorraine Murrell [8519]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: [blank]

Change To Plan: Please refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25440 - 8519 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25442 Object**Respondent:** Mr Sean Moore [8520]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Major impacts on a village that's at stretching point without all the funding and infrastructure to meet its needs. Also impacts on wildlife, flooding issues in the area, infrastructure. There are more suitable brownfield sites elsewhere. Three local boroughs wanting to build within 5-10 miles of Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Create new communities in areas where you can build all the correct infrastructure, local amenities in keeping with the local areas and generate new housing that don't have an impact on others.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25442 - 8520 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25444 Object**Respondent:** Mr Sean Moore [8520]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Honeyput Lane was taken off at last minute due to poor access and being on Green Belt which R25 and R26 have the same issues if not far worse.

Change To Plan: Create new communities in areas where you can build all the correct infrastructure, local amenities in keeping with the local areas and generate new housing that don't have an impact on others.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25444 - 8520 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25445 Object**Respondent:** Mrs Shui-Lin Moore [8521]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: There are more suitable sites. The village is just about coping with the capacity of the village as it is; there are already lots of traffic to cope with. Putting more dwellings in these plots will only impact on the roads and access and will completely change the ambience of what is currently a beautiful surrounding countryside and turn it into a circus. Doctors services are already stretched to stretching point. Development on this site does not offer sustainable development, nor does it offer good ratio of children to school or patient to doctor.

Change To Plan: There is much more land in Stondon Massey where additional housing would not cause as much stress to an already stretched village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25445 - 8521 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25448 Object**Respondent:** Mr Graham Martin [8522]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and is of historical interest with many ancient buildings. The village is prone to flooding should Green Belt be covered with hard standing. There is insufficient road width and parking to cope with additional housing. There is insufficient school places and doctors.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25448 - 8522 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25452 Object**Respondent:** Hazel Mills [8523]**Agent:** N/A

Summary: Epping Forest District Council was not consulted about the 30 homes being built at the top of Fringrith Hall Lane, hence no consideration was given to the impact this will have on our village. No clear strategy has been outlined for Blackmore in the north of the borough. Our doctors surgery is oversubscribed - no more patients please!! The school is full, don't ruin it by overfilling the classrooms. Where would the excess water go? There's nowhere to park as it is! We love the wildlife here - please don't destroy their homes.

Change To Plan: Remove plans for sites R25 and R26. Suggest the Planners refer to the BVH Neighbourhood Plan which illustrates the villages housing needs relevant to maintaining a sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25452 - 8523 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25456 Object**Respondent: Edward Mills [8524]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The village infrastructure is insufficient to deal with a significant increase in population in terms of oversubscribed school and doctor surgery. I totally disapprove of building on greenfield sites.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 need to be removed from the Local Development Plan. We need housing that fulfils a sustainable community as outlined in BVH Neighbouring Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25456 - 8524 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25459 Object**Respondent: Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities (Epping Forest and their development of 30 dwellings at the top of Fringith Hall Lane and the effect on Blackmore facilities. There has been no consultation on actual requirements for Blackmore and what services will be required) to service additional housing. It is currently almost impossible to get a doctors appoint, transport to and from Brentwood is a bar adware. The village is already congested without 70 more houses as the cars that will bring. The lone school is already full and no space to extend it.

Change To Plan: To sustain 70+ houses the road system with need to the upgrades and facilities (medical, schools and transport) will need to be in place before building commences.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25459 - 4709 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii, iv

25462 Object**Respondent: Doddinghurst Infant School (Ms. Ingrid Nicholson) [4339]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no consultation on the actual requirements for the village of Blackmore for example the services that will be required to meet the demand that the additional housing will bring. There has also been no consultation with neighbouring authorities, ie, Epping Forest and their allowed development of 30+ houses at the top of Fringith Hall Lane and the effect these additional houses will have. The current social amenities, health education and transport one already over subscribed and therefore any additional housing will need these facilities upgraded prior to any building commence. This has not been identified in the proposed plan.

Change To Plan: In order to accommodate the 70 additional houses the current road system will need to be upgraded and in place. The current school provision is operating close to maximum and there is no room to expand the school. The local health centre is also under pressure and it can take up to 3 weeks to get a doctors appointment unless classed as an emergency.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25462 - 4339 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25466 Object**Respondent: Mr Terry Sands [8525]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 4,8, 9_ policies R25 and R26. Unsound. Protect Green Belt, my house id built on a building envelope and for this I paid a premium, flood rick, unsuitable roads, health risk form more traffic, parking issues, GP over run, village attracts and encourages cyclists, impact to existing village wildlife increase on local services - rubbish collection, recycling.

Change To Plan: Sections 4,8, 9_ policies R25 and R26. Blackmore is an historic village renowned for its village feel and qualities. The reason it has remained jewel in Essex is because of the protected Green Belt land. The government encourage "brownfield" site to be built on and there are many more suitable site, which would not impact on this traditional English village, Access in these medieval country lanes is not suitable for the increase volume of cars, The school & doctors would be unable to cope with this large growth in the population, and this would have an impact of the villagers wellbeing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25466 - 8525 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25468 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Staples [8526]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Flood risk - the allocated amount of properties is disproportionate to the size of the village, this is Green Belt land and is a designated area for agriculture and to provide habitat for wildlife.
Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets our local housing need for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets our local housing need for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25468 - 8526 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25470 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jane Staples [8527]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policies R25 and R26. This is Greenbelt land which is set aside as a safe haven for wildlife. There is a very real risk of flooding as it has in the past, the building of these properties will increase the risk of flooding further into the village. We have approx. 300 properties in the village at present the infrastructure cant cope wit another 70, when will this end?!

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan' which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25470 - 8527 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25472 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Saxton [4882]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. Unsound because increased risk of flooding, local amenities, i.e. schools, doctors, parking areas will not be able to cope. The proposed development will greatly increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village, No development should be allowed that requires access via Red Rose Lane, There has not been adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities as an example to development in Fingrith Hall Lane.

Change To Plan: The proposed development will greatly increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village, No development should be allowed that requires access via Red Rose Lane, There has not been adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities as an example to development in Fingrith Hall Lane.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25472 - 4882 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25474 Object**Respondent: Mr David Saxton [4286]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. Unsound. Increased risk of flooding local school will not be able to cope, Insufficient capacity at doctors. In adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities as an example to development in Fingrith Hall Lane. There should not be any development that accesses Red Rose Lane. The proposed development will increase the flood risk in the village.

Change To Plan: In adequate consultation with neighbouring authorities as an example to development in Fingrith Hall Lane. There should not be any development that accesses Red Rose Lane. The proposed development will increase the flood risk in the village.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25474 - 4286 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25476 Object**Respondent: Mr M. Skidmore [1160]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 & R26. The infrastructure of Blackmore is not suitable for housing on this scale, Green Belt should be protected, Blackmore is prone to flooding. I endorse and support the neighbourhood plan written by BVHA

Change To Plan: I endorse and support the neighbourhood plan written by BVHA

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25476 - 1160 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25478 Object**Respondent: Mrs Elaine Stares [8528]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 R26. Unsound. More houses - already being built on outskirts of Blackmore, covered by other Councils, why are they able to build too near Blackmore, using the infrastructure/facilities of that village and nearby Doddinghurst, which are already under pressure, roads, doctors, shop, school, etc. Use of Brownfield sites not fully investigates as alternative. Loss of Green Belt, being pushed out towards Red Rose lane just because land owners have offered plots for sale and BBC have shortage of house numbers. Not for the good of Blackmore or the village is beautiful and historical and at the moment fairly peaceful , with an abundance of wildlife, Puts pressure on surrounding facilities / villages. At least 2 cars per household, pollution & road damage. People use care as very limited public transport.

Need a full housing needs survey to fit the needs of the village not the needs of BBC or developers/landowners. If this development is allowed to progress, infrastructure is an issue. The village also suffers from flooding, Roads, school, doctors, traffic, parking, litter, damage to countryside is a real issue. Needs thorough independent investigation.

Change To Plan: Need a full housing needs survey to fit the needs of the village not the needs of BBC or developers/landowners. If this development is allowed to progress, infrastructure is an issue. The village also suffers from flooding, Roads, school, doctors, traffic, parking, litter, damage to countryside is a real issue. Needs thorough independent investigation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25478 - 8528 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25480 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lesley Stone [8529]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 R26. Use brownfield. Protect special, unique country village of Blackmore, with a great community spirit. Not got infrastructure to support more homes, doctors full, busy with cars already.

Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out housing needs for a sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from LDP and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out housing needs for a sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25480 - 8529 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25482 Object**Respondent: Mrs Debbie Martin [8530]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Very busy road, not enough parking, which would increase to a dangerous amount. Local school already at max capacity. Doctors impossible to get an appointment which will get worse.

Change To Plan: I am in total support of the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25482 - 8530 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25484 Object**Respondent: Mrs Diane Mills [8533]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Misuse of Green Belt - Overcrowding of local services e.g. GP - Generation of local traffic - Negative impact on local infrastructure - Destruction of wildlife habitat.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26. Consult BVHA for local development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25484 - 8533 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25486 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Mills [6982]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Overload of sewage system. Inappropriate use of Green Belt. Overloading of local school.

Change To Plan: Development removed from the Plan. Any development to consider local needs.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25486 - 6982 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25488 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lorraine Mitchell [8534]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This would alter the character of a lovely countryside that was enjoyed by local residents, clog up streets with traffic, prolong the waiting time to see a doctor. How would the local school cope. Public transport is poor with no bus running at nights and on Sundays. There are plenty other Brown field lands so no need to erode the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Support the mission of the BVHA. Not necessary to erode Green Belt for the sake of fulfilling housing need.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25488 - 8534 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25490 Object

Respondent: Mr Steve Mitchell [8535]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The existing doctor's surgery is already running over full capacity and almost impossible to get an appointment. School struggles to meet local needs. Flooding is an issue, building on these sites will increase the risk of flooding for existing homes. Housing density could be increased on identified sites. Blackmore does not have the infrastructure compared to urban area. Use Brown field sites instead of encroaching the Green Belt which would open the floodgate for future development and destroy the character of a beautiful Essex village.

Change To Plan: Support the BVHA. Why not use brown fields instead?

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25490 - 8535 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25492 Object

Respondent: Stuart Moulder [4713]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear strategy for the village. More suitable brownfield sites elsewhere. There is no housing need demonstrated in Blackmore that cannot be met elsewhere in Brentwood. Redrose Lane is not suitable for expected traffic. Site is liable to flooding. Current infrastructure cannot cope with additional population.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25492 - 4713 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25494 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Moulder [4719]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a quite historic village in the Green Belt, its character will be eradicated by further urbanisation, road use and population growth. With development earmarked at site R23 the nature of the village will be lost as Hook End/Doddinghurst spreads towards Blackmore. Local infrastructure and service cannot support growth, e.g. healthcare, school, roads, parking, public transport. Site is liable to flooding. Brownfield sites elsewhere would be a better residential site.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25494 - 4719 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25496 Object

Respondent: Mrs Hilery Morse [8536]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site is not sustainable. Dangerous country lane. Site is in Green Belt. Blackmore should remain a small village with natural habitat. Flood was experienced from time to time. GP and local school and other facilities e.g. sewage, water, public transport do not have capacity. We don't want to end up as "outer London. Keep the village as it is intended.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26. Refer to BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No **Duty to Co-operate?:** No **Sound?:**No **Tests:** None **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25496 - 8536 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25498 Object

Respondent: Mr Frank Stone [8538]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are brownfield sites available in Brentwood, it currently takes 4 weeks to get a GP appointment so this area hasn't for adequate medical facilities, There is a shortage of fresh water in this area. The road infrastructure cannot support further development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and that planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out housing needs for a sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified **Duty to Co-operate?:** Not Specified **Sound?:**No **Tests:** i, ii, iii **Examination:** No

Full Reference: O - 25498 - 8538 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25502 Object

Respondent: Mrs Melanie Simpson [8539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26
Section 04 - Policy SP01 ad SP02
Section 08. Policy Ne06 paras 8.85; 8.90; 8.101
BBC not considered lack of infrastructure in area, schools, doctors, buses, roads, bin collection, etc. Sites are Green Belt green field, us brownfield. There was no housing need survey. Village prone to flood, more houses will exacerbate this.
I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.
Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.
Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Change To Plan: I believe BBC should remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites and find a more suitable and sustainable "brownfield" site that could cope with the residential development and perhaps an urban extension to Brentwood where the infrastructure is already in place.
Necessary to build a refuse tip - al have been removed from local area, hence the increase in fly tipping etc.
Do a housing needs survey, to check schools, doctors, services, etc.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25502 - 8539 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25509 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gladys Skinner [8540]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections R04, R08 (flood and Green Belt) and R09. Blackmore Village doesn't have the infrastructure for houses in Red Rose Lane, The volume of traffic at present has already reached its limit. Also I understand that flooding could be a real possibility.
Sites R25 and R26 should be remove from the plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be remove from the plan. Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25509 - 8540 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25511 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Snelling [6960]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Chair of Blackmore Primary School Governors, not enough space and facilities for existing pupils let alone new comers. Never is infrastructure provided first before a population increase, Access to healthcare and GP limited, Until all facilities (education, roads, healthcare etc) are available there should be no development. No additional burden on already stretched resources.
Types of housing not checked ad balanced to prevent speculators and private investors making money at the expense of affordable for young/old members of the community.
Identify alternative brown sites; preserve Green Belt in perpetuity, undertake a housing needs survey to identify relevant data, invest in infrastructure, particularly to reduce constant flooding in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Identify alternative brown sites; preserve Green Belt in perpetuity, undertake a housing needs survey to identify relevant data, invest in infrastructure, particularly to reduce constant flooding in Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25511 - 6960 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii, iv

25513 Object

Respondent: Miss Carole Scott [8541]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26
Infrastructure issues.
I would have thought more suitable sites could have been and should have been identified, The locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development, I have lived here since 1993 and cannot believe the impact this will cause on our village particularly with regard to flooding.

Change To Plan: I would have thought more suitable sites could have been and should have been identified, The locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development, I have lived here since 1993 and cannot believe the impact this will cause on our village particularly with regard to flooding.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25513 - 8541 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25515 Object

Respondent: Mr Kenneth Sexton [4860]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Lived in the village for 50 years when it was a vibrant well serviced village. This has changed. The proposed development would not regenerate the village but have the opposite effect - GP, school, sewage, flood, parking, etc 30+ new homes in Epping on Fingrith Road plus this proposal will overburden existing infrastructure, Impact on roads and parking. Day visitors make this worse. I commuted to Poplar for 25 years, using every option, ended up parking at Shenfield which was expensive. Crossrail will make this worse and add to road congestion.

Scrap the existing plans, go back to the drawing board for a re-think. Blackmore cannot cope with over development. You will make peoples lives miserable and

frustrating. "Do we have human rights over this matter" to comply with Government's demands are causing rash and unworkable plans to be implemented. THINK AGAIN.

Change To Plan: Scrap the existing plans, go back to the drawing board for a re-think. Blackmore cannot cope with over development. You will make peoples lives miserable and

frustrating. "Do we have human rights over this matter" to comply with Government's demands are causing rash and unworkable plans to be implemented. THINK AGAIN.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25515 - 4860 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25517 Object

Respondent: Mrs June Sexton [8542]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Fingrith Hall Road is congested, parking problems, dangerous for prams and mobile scooters, pedestrians. Pressure on local shop, long queues, more homes will make this worse. School is full,

Need common sense. Village used to have better services, more shops, a police house. Village can't cope with more homes, people and cars.

This small village is not able to cope with all the people. Vehicles parking. Our doctors surgery is unable to cope at the moment. People having to wait 4-6 weeks to make an appointment with a GP. This is a small village and will not cope with the numbers that are due to live here.

Change To Plan: This small village is not able to cope with all the people. Vehicles parking. Our doctors surgery is unable to cope at the moment. People having to wait 4-6 weeks to make an appointment with a GP. This is a small village and will not cope with the numbers that are due to live here.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25517 - 8542 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25519 Object

Respondent: Miss Faye McCarthy [8543]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is too narrow. No room for it. Coop cannot take it. Public bus runs once an hour cannot take it.

Change To Plan: This Plan should not go through as Blackmore is not big enough.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25519 - 8543 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25521 Object

Respondent: Mr Terence Stenning [8544]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Lived here for 18 months but am aware of existing issues which would be exacerbated by new homes. School is full so new ones would travel elsewhere. Older children could not attend after school activities as school transport has left. Public transport is poor. More parents driving to jobs elsewhere. Pedestrians are unsafe due to busy roads and poor pavements, there is no health centre or chemist in village which is problematic for non-drivers.

Whilst a small organic growth of the housing stock in Blackmore should be possible, large scale development should be located around Brentwood itself. Here are found more convenient facilities and better transport.

Change To Plan: Whilst a small organic growth of the housing stock in Blackmore should be possible, large scale development should be located around Brentwood itself. Here are found more convenient facilities and better transport.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25521 - 8544 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

25524 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ann Stenning [8546]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09: R25 and R26

Although I have no objections for building of a few more houses in Blackmore I feel that 70+ is excessive.

My main worry is the increase in traffic. We live in the busy Chelmsford Road and there are no footpaths along a lot of it so it is dangerous at the best of times to walk into the village for the shop etc.

If we take the car into the village we are adding to the parking problem, especially around the coop. Other reasons are the lack of school places and a health centre which would make it unsuitable for young families or older people.

Change To Plan: No change supplied

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25524 - 8546 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

25525 Object**Respondent: Mr Chris McGovern [8545]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Roads wont be able to cope. Also will raise issues relating to rights to unobtrusive views from my Grade II Listed Homestead; it will have a detrimental effect on that view.

The village infrastructure will be severely tested by development at Fingrith Hall Lane, let alone the LDP if it went ahead. Services are already at breaking point, any increase will be severely detrimental to existing and new residents.

Change To Plan: LDP to be significantly shrunk or move away from Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25525 - 8545 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25527 Object**Respondent: Mrs Melanie Snelling [8547]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26 - a and c

My house is already prone to flooding and the proposed houses will increase this risk - the field off Red Rose lane is often like a pond at the moment.

Red Rose Lane is far too small for extra traffic, This area is Green Belt land and should not be built on, Services such as our school (already full) and our doctors surgery are all stretched - appointments are difficult and would be worse if there are more families due to the proposed housing. We have not been surveyed as to whether houses are needed in this area. BBC should look for other brownfield sites or extend the Brentwood urban area.

Do not build on greenfield or Green Belt land. Invest in infrastructure first, Have a clear strategy for the villages including Blackmore. Improve state of the roads and car parking facilities, Have a housing needs survey.

Change To Plan: Do not build on greenfield or Green Belt land. Invest in infrastructure first, Have a clear strategy for the villages including Blackmore. Improve state of the roads and car parking facilities, Have a housing needs survey.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25527 - 8547 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25529 Object**Respondent: Mrs Francesca McCarthy [8548]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Redrose lane is too narrow. My house, as a Grade II Listed homestead, has rights to view of open land. If the LDP goes ahead my view will be affected. There is a nearby development of 30 houses from Epping Council and I already noticed more traffic. Schools, doctors and all services are at breaking point.

Change To Plan: Under no circumstance should this plan go ahead as it would alter the character of Blackmore Village.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25529 - 8548 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25535 Object**Respondent: Mr. James Simpson [4462]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09 Policy R25 - 9.197-9.200; Policy R26, 9.201-9.205:
Section 4 Policy SP01-D(a) D (f) Para 4.9,4.2; Policy SP02

Section 8: Policy NE 06, 8.5-8.64 - para 8.85 (iv), 8.90, 8.101; Policy NE13

As a local teacher I worry about the impact on local infrastructure that is already struggling. Schools, doctors, buses, roads. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services that cannot cope with further pressure on the services. There needs to be a housing needs survey. Brownfield sites should be used. Access from/to red Rose lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic; the village is prone to flooding and when it does Red Rose land is the only way through the village - if there are homes built will this increase the flooding? There is no clear strategy for BBC on this proposal.

Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Change To Plan: Both sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should look at the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly states the housing needs of the local community. Green Belt land should not be built on when brownfield sites are available. Housing needs survey should be done.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25535 - 4462 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25537 Object**Respondent: Mr Tony Severn [8550]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore village currently has one school which is over subscribed, one doctors surgery with ridiculously long waiting times. Another problems is parking in the village. The access from Red Rose Lane would be totally unsuitable for the volume of traffic caused by this development.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25537 - 8550 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25542 Object**Respondent: Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 04, 08 09 - R25 R26

Limited consultation on this with neighbouring authorities, no housing needs survey, stretched infrastructure - school, GP, congestion, parking, bus services. Need evidence of other sites being considered, brownfield or urban extensions, which would regenerate the High Street. Fields in village prone to flooding, new homes would increase this. Red Rose Lane is bounded by ancient hedgerows, providing a green boundary to Blackmore. This development would destroy that.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25542 - 8107 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25544 Object**Respondent: Mrs Pauline Roberts [8551]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound as GP is full, roads for access too narrow, liable to flood. I moved here to live in the countryside and this will gradually be taken away. I pay very high council tax for the privilege of living here. I already live on a cut through for traffic to the A12, more traffic from the development will make it worse

Change To Plan: I support the aims and objectives of the BVHA

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25544 - 8551 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25549 Object

Respondent: Mrs Alison Ratcliffe [5040]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sections 04,
08 - Green Belt and Flooding
09 - R25 R26
There is no clear strategy for villages (Inc. Blackmore) in north of borough.
Principle of development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. There are modest services and infrastructure in Blackmore (an isolated village). School is full, GP waiting times are over 4 weeks, parking in the centre of the village is already a nightmare.
BBC not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met on other (allocated) sites.
There has been no housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP.
Access on/off Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic. Equally access via Woollard Way 'hammer heads' would be problematical.
Flooding in the village - proposed sites are liable to flood and therefore building on this land will also increase flood risk elsewhere in the village.

Change To Plan: I fully support the plan put forward by Blackmore Village Heritage Association.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25549 - 5040 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25554 Object

Respondent: Mr Richard Romang [6974]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear strategy for rural communities in borough. Blackmore has been stripped of public services.
No consideration of development already occurring around Blackmore, recent planning decisions in Blackmore to reduce the housing stock whilst 30 new homes on Fingrith Hall Lane with their impact on village. Neighbouring Councils not consulted.
Development is ill considered as village has reduced public services, poor infrastructure, inadequate transport links, oversubscribed school and GP, parking problems, all cant cope with existing community. Parking controls not enforced, roads often unpassable
Development will push village envelop out into surrounding agricultural land and set an endless precedent for developers.
This development, not mentioned in previous LDP drafts, does not demonstrate an example of sustainable development and more suitable sites appear to the available in Shenfield and Brentwood.
Brownfields sites do not appear to have ben investigated fully and should take precedent over green belt. The ancient hedgerow boundary to Red Rose Lane also appears not to have been considered. It has been cut back hard for the first time in decades.
Document doesn't demonstrate required housing density? For Brentwood cannot be included as part of the provision identified in other allocated sites in the borough.
Housing needs survey not been done, so why was Blackmore selected for development and how would housing type be decided?
Existing road infrastructure inadequate - congestion, parking, road sizes.
Proposed sites and access roads are liable to flood and more homes increase this risk. Red Rose Lane floods regularly as does access to the village around the pond.

Change To Plan: Changes have been set out in the BVHA neighbourhood plan and I refer to this document. Happy to be represented by the BVHA and Roger Keeble

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25554 - 6974 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25556 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Rothery [8552]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Retain Green belt; more homes will decimate the area, use the brownfield sites - have they been considered? Local infrastructure is insufficient - GP, police, schools, pre-school. 70 properties = 300+ people. More building = loss of land = more flooding. Roadways unsuitable. No reasonable proof to support tenability of proposal. Where will wildlife go?

Change To Plan: Accept that the continued building on Green Belt land is unsustainable and will have dire short term and long term consequences for existing local community. Stop building on Green Belt and concentrate on re-developing existing brown field sites should the need for voracious new builds be required in semi and rural locations. AS such sites R25 and R26 should be removed.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25556 - 8552 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25561 Object**Respondent: Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sections 04, 08, 09 - policy R25 and R26 Blackmore village cannot cope with any further demand on its infrastructure. Presently school is at its capacity and medical centre is also struggling with patients having to wait unacceptable time to get an appointment.

Change To Plan: I agree with BVHA neighbourhood plan and planners need to heed th Blackmore local housing requirements.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25561 - 4897 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25563 Object**Respondent: Mrs Susan Rayner [8553]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policies R25 and R26. Local schools, doctors surgery parking in Blackmore for shop/pubs - all at capacity - especially doctor where we have to wait weeks for an appointment! Congestion at cross road in centre of village especially with through traffic breaking speed limit, delivery lorries for coop shop and buses and cyclists. Green Belt land being used for housing and increased risk of flooding to properties in Church Street.

Change To Plan: Blackmore is a small village with an historic character and building may more homes on Green Belt land will destroy the character of this lovely old village. In my view no modification would be suitable! The housing development underway at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane (although under Epping Council) will also put a strain on the Blackmore centre.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25563 - 8553 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

25565 Object**Respondent: Mr Hugh Rayner [8011]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Too much strain on local infrastructure - schools, medical, doctors waiting times for appointment and could result in increased flooding to village. Parking already impossible in village. More suitable sites should have been identified.

Change To Plan: More suitable sites should have been identified.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25565 - 8011 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

25567 Object**Respondent: Mr Lyn Robbins [8554]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Do we need more housing in Blackmore. Not enough consideration for those living here. Local issues need to be addressed before any new development. Local serviced are already oversubscribed i.e. schools, doctors surgery, already a month is required for Drs appointment waiting at hospitals is obscene!! Transport for elderly is always being threatened. Flooding should be addressed first.

Change To Plan: Object to building on Green Belt in principle.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25567 - 8554 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, iii

25569 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lisa Rawlings [8555]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26. Should do a housing need survey; consult neighbouring boroughs impact on traffic, schools, doctors; Village is isolates and hasn't the infrastructure for new homes including GP, schools; Village susceptible to flooding, new homes will make this work; use alternative brownfield sites; use alternative more sustainable sites near to Brentwood; roads are small and unsuitable for more traffic, especially Red Rose Lane; Visitors exacerbate parking problems, new homes will make this worse.

Change To Plan: Country lanes in and out of the village will need to be repaired and maintained, maybe even widened to allow for the extra volume of traffic. Car parking around the sports and social / village hall will need to be increased to allow for the extra people using the facilities.
The flooding that leads to major disruption in the village at certain times would have to be investigated and plans to deal with this need to be put in place before any buildings work should take place.
The village school would have to be extended to allow for the extra children, including extra teachers and support staff. I hope the council have put the extra money aside for this.
More people would mean more demands on the transport links into Brentwood and Chelmsford which are poor now - without the volume of more people. Better links have to be considered and put in place by the council.
An extra doctors surgery should be built to take some of the existing load away from the Deal Tree Health Centre and to cope with the extra footfall. Or more doctors need to be employed to work in the existing centre.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25569 - 8555 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, iii

25571 Object

Respondent: Mr Geoffrey Rose [8556]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26. If 30 or more houses are built at the Red Rose site this will have an adverse impact on the village. There are already issues with flooding and main drainage. We are not able to get appointments at the doctors surgery in good time and the school is already overloaded. It is supposed to be Green Belt and some rogue dwellings have been allowed without planning.

Change To Plan: It will be too much for a wonderful village to cope with. maintain the Green Belt.
We need R25 and R26 removed and review the BVHA plan. We have enough housing already for the existing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25571 - 8556 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25573 Object

Respondent: Mrs Rosalind Rose [8557]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26.
30 new dwellings on Fingrith Hall Lane will impact on village, school, GPs and drainage as above the village. Red Rose site in area already prone to flooding, more homes will increase this. We have limited bus service which needs improvement is more residents. Blackmore has very limited facilities for large population and school already full and GP has long wait time for appointments as already absorbing people form large Mountnessing development. Green Belt was designed to maintain some of the countryside of Britain and should be upheld.
We need R25 and R26 to be removed and it is necessary for the BVHA should be looked at as it states that the neighbourhood plan shows quite plainly that our local housing needs are suitable for our sustainable community.

Change To Plan: We need R25 and R26 to be removed and it is necessary for the BVHA should be looked at as it states that the neighbourhood plan shows quite plainly that our local housing needs are suitable for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25573 - 8557 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25575 Object

Respondent: Mrs Patricia Mountstevens [8559]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC did not consult or consider neighbouring authorities, Epping Forest is constructing 30 dwellings at Fingrith Hall Lane and other sites being planned are also not taken into consideration. BBC not shown that the housing required could be met by using other allocated sites. Brownfield lands should be considered before Greenfield Green Belt. Blackmore does not have infrastructure to cope with additional housing, its lanes are too narrow for increasing traffic, flooding issue will be increased if more buildings are built.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list and consider other sites.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25575 - 8559 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25577 Object**Respondent: Mr Gerald Mountstevens [4911]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No consideration when taking into account the development at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane. No strategy for north of the Borough. The illegal caravan site beyond Sprigg Lane appears to get bigger. All of this will put traffic flow within and through the village unsustainable. Blackmore's limited service cannot cope. Area is prone to flooding. Unclear if available brownfield sites in Blackmore has been considered first. No Housing Need Survey has been conducted.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list and consider other sites.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25577 - 4911 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25579 Object**Respondent: Mr John Richardson [4858]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC have pasted houses onto a Green Belt area around Blackmore to achieve that LDP targets and failed to consider the effects on the community and infrastructure. Additional housing around Blackmore not considered (32 new homes). Has BBC discussed local development with neighbouring councils? The effect on local Highways by additional housing.

Blackmore village has a vibrant centre that has congestion due visitors to this with parking on pavements, parking on double yellow lines. Also no designated disabled parking spaces. No enforcement. This will be exacerbated by new homes. BBC say the developers have undertaken a flood survey for their land, what about adjacent land with the history of flooding. The school and GP are full, with long GP waiting list which will be exacerbated. Monies collected for infrastructure will be spent elsewhere. Parish Cllrs were not allowed to debate this in the full council meeting on 08 Nov 2018, this is undemocratic. Travellers site in Chelmsford Road was deemed illegal but now LDP making it legal but on what grounds? Previous development proposals there failed due to insufficient sewerage capacity, how will this be addressed. It is apparent that the Blackmore area is the "dumping ground" to make up the numbers and imposing a housing mix without carrying out a housing need survey.

Change To Plan: Please refer to 'BVHA neighbourhood plan'.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25579 - 4858 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25581 Object**Respondent: Mr Neil Ratcliff [8561]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. Infrastructure does not support this.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26. Doctors surgery all ready over booked.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25581 - 8561 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25583 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Ryan [4937]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26. Flooding is an issue and areas of proposed sites are prone to flooding, will increase with new homes; Infrastructure not sufficient parking, schools, doctors how will be combatted? BBC not considered other sites being developed; Access via Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for that volume of traffic; no clear and cohesive strategy for north villages in borough; Need to justify why ignored alternatives. Each element of the decision seems flawed with no firm and valid justification, Opposing arguments and not countered with just responses.

Change To Plan: Please refer to 'BVHA neighbourhood plan'. I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25583 - 4937 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25588 Object

Respondent: Mr Simon Richardson [8562]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is unsound.

- a) There is no proof that Blackmore needs this number of houses
- b) There has been no discussion with the villagers.
- c) No cooperation with any local neighbouring authorities. 30 houses have just been built outside the village in EFDC area that will impact on the village. 8 houses recently built at what was Nine Ashes Farm again in EFDC area.
- d) The LDP does not comply with NPPF Guidance:
 - No protection of Green Belt
 - Development is not located to minimize travel
 - Local community not consulted
 - There is no proven local need
 - There has been no Flood Risk Assessment
 - The location does not 'minimize travel' as required

Change To Plan: All of the above points should be reassessed with local involvement.
Local housing need to be assessed.
The size of the local school needs to be considered
The Doctors surgery is already oversubscribed and consideration needs to be given on to how address this.
Flooding is an issue and needs greater consideration. The Woollard Way field (R25) is often flooded.
Not an issue as a field but this surface water will need to go somewhere if the field is concreted over. (as a local villager my Father used this field and its ponds to water his horses).
Any development of this size needs to be located nearer to good transport links.
Small brownfield developments need to be considered.
Blackmore does need some small scale development especially for the older population. Downsizing would be an option that would free up existing larger properties.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25588 - 8562 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25594 Object

Respondent: Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Policies: R25; R26; SP02; SP02; NE06; NE13

This will put intolerable pressure on GP services the local surgery fails to me demand. Blackmore is a small community based around a small number of roads that are not designed to meet the inevitable increase in traffic due to a wholly inadequate public transport service. It is the level and scale of this development that is excessive and inappropriate.

Change To Plan: A significant reduction in the scale and number of houses to be built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25594 - 8563 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25596 Object

Respondent: Mr Nicholas Rogers [8564]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 09 R25 and R26. Blackmore village is far too small for another 70 plus houses, the infrastructure of the roads with more traffic, coming to and fro. The local primary school could possibly not cope with the amount of families coming in. Deal Tree Health Centre is busy as it is, let alone with more houses.

Change To Plan: Refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan. I support BVHA representation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25596 - 8564 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25601 Object

Respondent: Mr Matthew Romang [8565]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 04; 08 - green belt flooding; 09 - R25 and R26

The strategy for rural villages like Blackmore isn't clear in the document, . Red Rose lane is unsuitable for an increase in traffic flow, due to the access onto/off of the road; the proposed sites are areas known for flooding and development will also increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore; the principle of the red rose lane development is wrong - Blackmore is an isolated village with limited infrastructure and poor public transport, which would struggle more.

Change To Plan: Refer to VHA neighbourhood plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25601 - 8565 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25607 Object

Respondent: Mr David Rolfs [8566]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC have pasted houses onto a Green Belt area around Blackmore to achieve that LDP targets and failed to consider the effects on the community and infrastructure. Additional housing around Blackmore not considered (32 new homes). Has BBC discussed local development with neighbouring councils?

The effect on local Highways by additional housing.

Blackmore village has a vibrant centre that has congestion due visitors to this with parking on pavements, parking on double yellow lines. Also no designated disabled parking spaces. No enforcement. This will be exacerbated by new homes. BBC say the developers have undertaken a flood survey for their land, what about adjacent land with the history of flooding. The school and GP are full, with long GP waiting list which will be exacerbated. Monies collected for infrastructure will be spent elsewhere.

Parish Cllrs were not allowed to debate this in the full council meeting on 08 Nov 2018, this is undemocratic. Travellers site in Chelmsford Road was deemed illegal but now LDP making it legal but on what grounds? Previous development proposals there failed due to insufficient sewerage capacity, how will this be addressed. It is apparent that the Blackmore area is the "dumping ground" to make up the numbers and imposing a housing mix without carrying out a housing need survey.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25607 - 8566 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25613 Object

Respondent: Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Insufficient consultation with neighbouring boroughs; Red Rose Lane is not suitable for access; Severe flooding in village will get worse and sewage pumping station cant cope; No housing need survey; Already problems with cars - congestion, parking, poor bus service,; destroy wildlife and habitat; green belt should be protected; primary school is full; no clear housing strategy to consider other sites than R25 and R26.

Change To Plan: As there seems to be considerable doubt that all aspects of the planning process have been adhered to R26 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Leave Blackmore in the Green Belt and restore its classification as a Rural Village in a setting with non f the amenities enjoyed by areas such as Mountnessing and Ingrave i.e. a through road., regular buses over an extended time frame, a doctors surgery that can be reached on foot. BBC should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out local housing need for our already sustainable community.

Please note that this was a very difficult form to fill in as many on us have limited knowledge of the planning process!

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25613 - 8567 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25615 Object

Respondent: Mrs Maureen Murrell [8560]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Other brown field sites around Brentwood are more suitable. Green Belt in Blackmore should not be built on. Too much traffic making it difficult to walk in the village. Doctors cannot take any more patients.

Change To Plan: Roads have to be widened, drainage updated, school enlarged.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25615 - 8560 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25616 Object**Respondent: Mr Brian Marchant [8569]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Other brownfield sites suitable and available not fully investigated, village life not considered, school not considered, access road not considered, no cooperation from the Council. Blackmore is being picked on, let's have more sensible options from Council's leader.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 removed. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25616 - 8569 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25625 Object**Respondent: Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is deficient in respect of Blackmore Village and unsound on all 4 tests. In particular:

1. There is no clear 'strategy' for the villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough.
2. BBC has not consulted adequately with Epping Forest District Council, over the houses being constructed and/or planes, close to Blackmore Village.
3. The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. Blackmore is an isolated village with modest services and infrastructure. (The school is full, the doctors surgery in Doddingtonhurst is already over-subscribed, inadequate bus service, narrow lanes and already dangerous parking, sewerage system is overloaded already etc).
4. There are more suitable and/or sustainable locations, eg urban extensions or Brentwood, (Eg Honeypot Lane) and the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.
5. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available and which should take priority over the Green Field/Green Belt land off of Red Rose Lane.
6. BBC has failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other (allocated) sites.
7. There has been no 'housing needs survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore Village is included in the LDP.
8. The access off/from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic movements.
9. The entire village is prone to severe flooding, and sites R25 and R26 are both liable to flood. Building on this land will only increase the flood risk elsewhere in the village.
10. Both fields (R25 and R26) are teeming with wildlife - hundreds of birds nest in the hedgerows within and around the fields. We have photographic evidence (stills and videos) of certain protected species (bats, barn owls, great crested newts).

Change To Plan: The plan overall is not the issue - I am challenging policies R25 and R26 Blackmore's inclusion in the LDP solely. Please refer to the attached Blackmore Village Survey of July 2018, which is hereby re-submitted. Blackmore Village Heritage Association will have an updated "Neighbourhood Plan" available.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25625 - 4874 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25632 Object**Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There are greenfield sites available (for example adjoining existing urban areas) in preferable and more sustainable locations.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Represent many residents in Blackmore and surrounding area against inclusion of R25 and R26 in the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25632 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25634 Object**Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsustainable developments because of inadequate access and narrowness of Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25634 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25636 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsustainable developments because loss of "very good" agricultural land, of loss of biodiversity.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Represent many residents in Blackmore and surrounding area against inclusion of R25 and R26 in the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25636 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25637 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsupported by relevant and up to date evidence base. Evidence regarding flooding shows the sites to be unsuitable.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25637 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25640 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsustainable developments because they don't fulfil the three sustainability objectives: economic, social or environmental. There is only limed employment in Blackmore so benefits would be limited and short term. Service are limited in the Village and children are being sent elsewhere for education. There is a reliance on the car, the sites are at risk of flooding, require the release of high grade agricultural land in the Green Belt. The access road is narrow and infrastructure works would harm the character of the area and loss of historic hedges and habitat. Other more sustainable locations should be allocated in preference - refer to SA. Nos: 038A,253, 277B, 297, 218B 053B, 189, 318, 288B, 153, 280, 024A and 130.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25640 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25642 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Sites R25 and R26 are inherently unsuitable and unsustainable developments because it will result in disproportionate increase in the housing stock

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25642 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25649 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Infrastructure and facilities within the village are already at capacity. (Shop, primary school, two village halls, a sports and social club, tennis courts, football and cricket pitches, a flood-lit Multi-Use Games Arena. Three pubs, Anglian Church, Baptist Church). There is a very limited bus service and s thus remote. It is over 6 miles to Brentwood and so residents are reliant on the car. There is social harm from some children being shipped out to other schools. There is only limited employment.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25649 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25652 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: The Parish Council and BVHA also take issue with the proposed allocation of Blackmore as a Category 3 settlement within the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy (see pages 21-25 of the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan). Therefore the Local Plan, with proposed allocations R25 and R26 and the allocation of Blackmore as a "larger village", is unsound in that it has not been positively prepared, is not justified, is not effective nor consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019 edition)(the NPPF).

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25652 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25656 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: Development on R25 and R26 has historically been discounted, most recently as 2016. There is no change in local circumstances justifying development on sites R25 and R26 now.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25656 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25658 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: The restricted access that Redrose Lane affords is inconsistent with Brentwood Borough Council's removal of Honey Pot Lane from the LDP on grounds of restricted access. At the Extraordinary Brentwood Council Meeting of 8th November a site known as Honeypot Lane, included in the Plan since inception, was withdrawn. This allocation, designed to include social and low-cost housing within 500m of the Town Centre, was removed due the narrowness of a small section of the road access that created a 'pinch-point', despite being bordered by open land providing opportunity for road widening. Unlike the continuously narrow and unpaved Redrose Lane, Honeypot Lane enjoys a double-width carriageway for all but a short section and is split between 20mph and 30mphs limits. Redrose Lane, where the national speed limit applies, is posted with weight restriction warning; whereas Honeypot Lane is not.

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25658 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25660 Object

Respondent: Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) **Agent:** N/A
[1921]

Summary: There is no evidence of a need for housing in the village of Blackmore. If there is a need then it has not been quantified by reference to number of type/size of property. The proposed allocation accounts for a disproportionately large amount of development in "larger villages" within the Borough (i.e. >50% of the proposed Green Belt release in larger villages comes from Blackmore alone).

Change To Plan: Amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate them for housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25660 - 1921 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25665 Object

Respondent: Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: 70 homes could end up with 280 people (4 people per household) plus at least 200 cars (or more). Infrastructure will not be able to cope with this amount. Schools, hospitals, doctors, traffic and litter and at the end of the day we have lost our Green Belt. Blackmore will end up the same as Billericay, a sprawl of estates.

Change To Plan: Please refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25665 - 8597 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25669 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Newcombe [8598]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The history of Blackmore many years ago was known as the black swamp and was a very wet area. This is why it is not a large village due to flood risk. Most of the land is given over to Green Belt because of this reason. There are many brown sites which could be used without flood risk.

Change To Plan: Please refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25669 - 8598 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25674 Object

Respondent: Miss Charlotte Newton [8599]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no discussions with the village regarding proposed development.
Should find out what needs improving before adding houses to the village.
Plenty of places elsewhere that need new housing.
Property in the village is not affordable but that's what makes it a lovely place to live.
Adding more houses has a negative effect on local/government services (e.g. schools, doctors, hospitals, teachers etc).
Would more building work be needed at the school to accommodate growth.
The village has small narrow roads not equipped for builders/machinery.
There is an issue with parking around the village especially during school term.

Change To Plan: Site that need removing from the LDP as follows: R26 and R25.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25674 - 8599 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25678 Object

Respondent: Mrs Tina Newton [8600]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There was no consultation with the village on selecting these sites.
Councillors had not read the document outlining the villagers concerns.
Would put pressure on the flood plain, sewage, schools, doctors, traffic and environment.
Parking is already an issue, the Coop, tea rooms, two public houses and day trippers.
It's hard to get a doctors appointment now, you have to go to a walk in centre in Harold Wood.
Local school will not be able to cope.
The roads around the village are not made to carry so much traffic, the cyclist that visit daily hold the traffic up now.

Change To Plan: Stondon Massey want more housing so why was their plan rejected?

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25678 - 8600 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25680 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Newton [8601]

Agent: N/A

Summary: How and where in the said plan are the numbers to back up the facts on school numbers, doctors appointments delayed times.
No proof of need for planned houses.
No consultation with the residents of Blackmore of the needs of the villagers.
Proposals in addition to new houses being built up Fingrith Hall Road will add to parking issues at teamrooms and Co-Op.
The drain/sewer system is at breaking point and struggles when we get heavy rain adding another load of houses onto this is a plan that is doomed to fail.

Change To Plan: If the need for more housing is proven then why has Stondon Massey not been looked at? This it would appear is a village that will be happy to have new houses built.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25680 - 8601 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25682 Object

Respondent: Mrs Joan Marchant [8602]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Land is liable to flooding and increases severe flooding to Blackmore. More suitable locations in Brentwood and elsewhere. There is too much traffic in this area, roads are not suitable, doctors and schools are full, parking is awful. Village life and character not considered.

Change To Plan: R25 and R26 to be removed from the Plan. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25682 - 8602 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25684 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lesley Moss [7053]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Infrastructure in the village will be threatened. Flooding problem will be a real threat when the field at Woollard way is cemented over. Schools and doctors are full. Parking problems make it dangerous to cross the roads. We are threatened with buses discontinuing. There are other suitable sites, why pick on us?

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25684 - 7053 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25685 Object

Respondent: Mr and Mrs Brian and Lesley Moss [2905]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan is unfair and unsound. Infrastructure is unable to cope, doctors and schools are full. Library was closed. No guarantee that the bus service will still be in place next year. Wifi cannot cope. 30 houses are being built on our border. Village regularly floods.

Change To Plan: Keep Blackmore a village, not a new town.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25685 - 2905 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25688 Object

Respondent: Mr Barry Monery [8004]

Agent: N/A

Summary: When I bought my property the searches showed that the land could not be built on, that's why I bought my property. This site is in Green Belt which must not be built on.

Change To Plan: The Council have a duty of care for our village for future generations.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25688 - 8004 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25690 Object

Respondent: Miss Jean Monery [8007]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to local authority overturning Green Belt regulation. Blackmore is in Green Belt and legally should not be built on.

Change To Plan: Move the planning of houses to areas that needs more people/families.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25690 - 8007 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25692 Object

Respondent: Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council have not consulted adequately with the neighbouring authorities. The Plan did not consider the impact of development on the village, which has small roads, inadequate parking, limited services; the school is full, doctors surgery is full, buses do not run regularly. There is just no infrastructure. Flooding is an issue. No strategy outlined for the village. We have no police in the area to make sure the increased population abide the law. Emergency service will find it hard to reach rural areas. Site is in Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Look for more suitable, available sites in Brentwood instead of using Green Belt. Refer to BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25692 - 4848 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25699 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Morgan [4987]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with Duty to Cooperate. Blackmore does not have infrastructure and resource to accommodate the additional population. Parking is a massive problem, too many people park and turn at Jericho Place. Schools are full, parents have to pay for bus service or drive children to out of town schools. Doctors are full. No police or youth organisation. The nearest supermarket is far away. Development will change village character and way of life.

Change To Plan: Look for other sites in Brentwood that are suitable and have infrastructure. Refer to Blackmore BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25699 - 4987 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25701 Object

Respondent: Mr & Mrs John & Linda Hornett [8604]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The additional 400 people and 200 cars is like a brand new village/community. The surrounding roads are dark country lanes, lighting them and installing mini roundabouts will ruin this ancient village. There are houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane. There is no plans for medical or school facilities for an already packed village.

Change To Plan: You cant make a road bigger to accommodate extra houses unless you demolish existing homes so the Local Plan would never won.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25701 - 8604 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25703 Object

Respondent: Mr Alan Moody [1825]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The detrimental effect of extra 70 houses in Blackmore has not been adequately evaluated. Local roads are too narrow and congested. Schools and doctors are full. The effect of houses being built on Fingrith Hall Lane in Epping Forest has not been taken into account. Plan is non NPPF compliant in regards to Green Belt and preserving historic towns.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26 from the Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25703 - 1825 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25705 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Miers [3959]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the Villages. No account has been taken of the c.30 dwellings at Fingrith Hall Lane nor severe impact on the endangered species seen on site. Blackmore is an isolated village within the Green Belt, with very poor local services: no library, very poor bus service, congested lanes, severe parking problems, schools and doctors are at capacity, inadequate provision for waste water removal. BBC has not shown that housing needs can be accommodated by other brownfield sites or by increasing housing density on other sites. No Housing needs survey has been undertaken.

Change To Plan: Brownfield sites must be explored within BBC, to preserve our Greenfield/Green Belt areas. This will take pressure from small village lanes, ensuring any developments should be adjacent to main transport artery.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25705 - 3959 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25707 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Mass [8605]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Coucil shows no clear strategy for the villages, fails to consult with neighbouring authorities. No housing need survey has been undertaken. There are more suitable sustainable sites. Blackmore does not have adequate infrastructure. Site is on Redrose Lane which has inadequate access and is unable to accommodate additional traffic. Parking is at capacity. The village has a flood risk.

Change To Plan: Increase density on other sites.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25707 - 8605 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25709 Object

Respondent: Mass and Co (Mr John Mass) [3669]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Council shows no clear strategy for the villages, fails to consult with neighbouring authorities. No housing need survey has been undertaken. There are more suitable sustainable sites. Blackmore does not have adequate infrastructure. Site is on Redrose Lane which has inadequate access and is unable to accommodate additional traffic. Parking is at capacity. The village has a flood risk.

Change To Plan: Increase density on other sites.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25709 - 3669 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25715 Object

Respondent: Mrs Caroline Parkin [8606]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local school is full, and this goes for other local services. Have Epping Forest Council been consulted? The impact of development on the village way of life will be huge and will change what we love about the area.

Change To Plan: Infrastructure of the village needs better consideration. Consult with neighbouring Councils.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25715 - 8606 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25717 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jill Pritchard [4269]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1-Other development from neighbouring Council have not been considered. 2-Existing infrastructure cannot cope with additional people and cars, i.e. the doctors surgery, school, parking. 3-The areas in the Plan, i.e. Redrose Lane is susceptible to flooding. 4-Redrose Lane is very narrow and unsuitable for heavy goods vehicle. 5-Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available which should take priority over Green Belt greenfield land off Redrose lane.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA aims and objectives and their Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25717 - 4269 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25719 Object

Respondent: Miss Lisa Philips [8607]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Overburden of existing services e.g. GP. Local bus services insufficient to support larger community. Building on Green Belt land.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25719 - 8607 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25721 Object

Respondent: Mr Hylton Palmer [8154]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound due to: a. Green Belt/ Brownfield consideration b. wildlife c. infrastructure d. local school at capacity e. GP at capacity f. Doddinghurst shopping centre car park at capacity g. inadequate public transport h. inadequate room to access from Redrose Lane i. flooding issues j. water and sewage at capacity.

Change To Plan: More investigation required into Brownfields. Remove R25 & R26 from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25721 - 8154 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25723 Object

Respondent: Mrs. June Palmer [3739]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound due to: a. Green Belt/ Brownfield consideration b. wildlife c. infrastructure d. local school at capacity e. GP at capacity f. Doddinghurst shopping centre car park at capacity g. inadequate public transport h. inadequate room to access from Redrose Lane i. flooding issues j. water and sewage at capacity.

Change To Plan: More investigation required into Brownfields. Remove R25 & R26 from the Plan. Refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25723 - 3739 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25725 Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Pounds [8608]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Little consideration was given to rural villages. The effect on infrastructure and the capacity to serve new houses has not been properly considered. If infrastructure is enlarged it will completely change the characteristic of the village and way of life for residents and Blackmore will lose its heritage. There has not been sufficient consultation with residents, and there must be more suitable locations available.

Change To Plan: Confine all new housing development to the edge of Brentwood town as it has better infrastructure, facilities and it would not be adversely affected by changing the whole characteristics and way of life for its residents.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25725 - 8608 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25727 Object

Respondent: Mr Darryl Pounds [8609]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Little consideration was given to rural villages. The effect on infrastructure and the capacity to serve new houses has not been properly considered. If infrastructure is enlarged it will completely change the characteristic of the village and way of life for residents and Blackmore will lose its heritage. There has not been sufficient consultation with residents, and there must be more suitable locations available.

Change To Plan: Confine all new housing development to the edge of Brentwood town as it has better infrastructure, facilities and it would not be adversely affected by changing the whole characteristics and way of life for its residents.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25727 - 8609 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25729 Object

Respondent: Mrs Irene Power [8610]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Doctors surgery already full. Narrow country lane, unsuitable for more cars. Redrose Lane too narrow to access, also flooding.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA Village Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25729 - 8610 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25730 Object

Respondent: Mr Terence Power [8611]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Doctors surgery already full. Narrow country lane, unsuitable for more cars. Redrose Lane too narrow to access, also flooding.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA Village Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25730 - 8611 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25733 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beth Pardoe [8613]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound. No mention of extending the local school and GP which are both at capacity. Parking is becoming increasingly difficult with many people resorting to parking on pavement. Cumulative impacts from development at Fingrith Hall Lane. Redrose Lane is wholly unsuitable: it's liable to flood, too narrow for vehicular access, it's popular to walkers but it has no pavement. There are more suitable sites but Brentwood Council seems to have ignored completely. Development would have far reaching negative and harmful impacts on the village overall.

Change To Plan: R25& R26 to be removed. Refer to BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25733 - 8613 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25735 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janet Pincombe [8614]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is liable to flood, access to Red Rose Lane is not suitable per the volume of traffic which will be using it daily. Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that required housing could not be built on Brown field site. The infrastructure of the village is not suitable for a large scale development such as this i.e. school, doctor, car parking, shop.

Change To Plan: Brownfield sites should be investigated before building on greenfield sites.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25735 - 8614 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25737 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Poulton [8119]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site is liable to flooding and impact on flood risk areas in the village. Brownfield site available in the borough has not been utilised. Nearby development in other local authorities not considered, which would have an impact on already stretched services and infrastructure. Red Rose Lane is narrow and unsafe for increased access caused by development. No local consultation to consider local needs.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local needs as submitted in the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25737 - 8119 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25739 Object

Respondent: Mr Stephen Poulton [8149]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Greenfield Green Belt being prioritised whilst brownfield site available in the borough has not been utilised. Site is liable to flooding and impact on flood risk areas in the village. Nearby development in other local authorities not considered, which would have an impact on already stretched services and infrastructure. Red Rose Lane is narrow and unsafe for increased access caused by development. No local consultation to consider local needs. Lack of consultation with neighbouring authorities to consider developments nearby.

Changes to Plan:

Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local needs as submitted in the BVHA.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local needs as submitted in the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25739 - 8149 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25741 Object

Respondent: Ms Judith Phillips [8615]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound. Green Belt land. Narrow lanes unsuitable for traffic levels. Red Rose Lane is mainly used by villagers for pleasant country walks or bike rides. Village only small cannot take this level of housing without materially changing the character of village. Traffic already too much, parking difficult, doctor cannot cope now.

Change To Plan: BVHA Village Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25741 - 8615 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25743 Object

Respondent: Mr Douglas Piper [603]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound. This is Green Belt land. Local amenities already overstretched, doctors and schools are at capacity. This is too large an increase for a village this size.

Change To Plan: I support BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25743 - 603 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25746 Object

Respondent: Lloyd Piper [8616]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound. Local amenities cannot cope with such increase in number, it will change the dynamics and atmosphere of the village life for the worse. Red Rose Lane is too narrow for access and floods every year. These are 2 green field sites, there are other alternatives. Stondon Massey has a brownfield site it wishes to develop. This is just Brentwood Council taking easy option as they have been approached by 2 developers.

Change To Plan: Support BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25746 - 8616 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25748 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kay Parkinson [4599]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Lack of consultation with Epping Council regarding 30 new houses on Fingrith Hall lane which will have major impacts on Blackmore's local facilities, utilities and traffic. Red Rose Lane is narrow and unsuitable to be a main access to new properties. This will exacerbate flooding. An increase of 70 properties (30% of the village's size) without counting the 30+ properties in Fingrith Hall Lane would put pressure on sewage, water and electricity. There are many alternatives options but no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. No 'Housing Needs' survey has been carried out.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25748 - 4599 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25750 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kay Parkinson [4599]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The required houses could be delivered by increasing the density on other sites. However, the Council didn't demonstrated so. No evidence that the brownfield sites were prioritised before Green Belt. This 30% increase in Blackmore would severely affect this historic village, its facilities and utilities. The retail, medical, school, road and transport facilities barely meet the village's requirements. Its roads and lanes are narrow and don't have footpaths, additional traffic would create danger to pedestrians, and aggravate parking problems. A far better proposal would be locations that have transport infrastructure and links, e.g. Doddinghurst, Brentwood, Dunton Hills. Wildlife wasn't considered.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25750 - 4599 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25754 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Parkinson [8617]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The required houses could be delivered by increasing the density on other sites. However, the Council didn't demonstrated so. No evidence that the brownfield sites were prioritised before Green Belt. This 30% increase in Blackmore would severely affect this historic village, its facilities and utilities. The retail, medical, school, road and transport facilities barely meet the village's requirements. Its roads and lanes are narrow and don't have footpaths, additional traffic would create danger to pedestrians, and aggravate parking problems. A far better proposal would be locations that have transport infrastructure and links, e.g. Doddinghurst, Brentwood, Dunton Hills. Wildlife wasn't considered.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25754 - 8617 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25755 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher Parkinson [8617]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Lack of consultation with Epping Council regarding 30 new houses on Fingrith Hall lane which will have major impacts on Blackmore's local facilities, utilities and traffic. Red Rose Lane is narrow and unsuitable to be a main access to new properties. This will exacerbate flooding. An increase of 70 properties (30% of the village's size) without counting the 30+ properties in Fingrith Hall Lane would put pressure on sewage, water and electricity. There are many alternatives options but no clear housing strategy for the North of the Borough. No 'Housing Needs' survey has been carried out.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. Planners should refer to the BVHA 'neighbourhood plan'. This clearly sets out our local housing needs, and would avoid further development in the Blackmore area which is an already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25755 - 8617 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25758 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Pegram [8618]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: We have had development neighbouring our village which has caused more traffic, Red Rose Lane cannot safely take any increase in traffic. Doctors is full, school oversubscribed and parking restricted on country lanes. Brownfield should take priority over Green Belt. Red Rose Lane and other roads are already high flood risk area. The Borough should consider brownfield sites more suitable for development.

Change To Plan: Blackmore village should be removed from the list of proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25758 - 8618 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25760 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher Parkin [8619]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound for the following reasons: - Local school already oversubscribed. - Not consulting other authorities on their plan, huge effect on village life.

Change To Plan: Consultation of other Councils. Other considerations of land - brownfield.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25760 - 8619 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25762 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Pritchard [8620]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 1. Other buildings not considered. 2. Extra traffic, making roads more dangerous, also adding to roads parking, and making cycling more dangerous. 3. Red Rose Lane is prone to flooding and not suitable for lorries. 4. I believe that more suitable sites in Brentwood.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25762 - 8620 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25764 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Pallet [1313]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound. No positive infrastructure. Additional housing to levels suggested (which will probably be exceeded) will cause adverse strain on: doctors, schools, the only shop-parking, roads, drainage, wildlife.

Change To Plan: Need to have clearer strategy for the North of the Borough. Epping Forest should be liaised with. the Council should demonstrate why more suitable brownfield sites which could have been used were ignored, and why they are considering Green Belt whilst originally they said they would not. Liaise with local groups to build moderate number of homes.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25764 - 1313 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25766 Object**Respondent: Mr Vessenin Paounov [8621]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is a beautiful village, it is sustainable as it is with a sense of community and Green Belt land should not be built on.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA's objectives.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25766 - 8621 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25768 Object**Respondent: Mr David Pegram [8622]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not taken into account the 30 houses being built on Fingrith Hall Lane. There are many sites more suitable for development and would not affect day to day living of their neighbour. 70 houses would affect parking, traffic and flood risk issues in the village. Why can't BBC spread the number to Doddinghurst, Kelvedon Hatch, Blackmore, Hutton, Shenfield, Ingrave, South Weald. BBC has taken the easy option. See flooding photo attached.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from proposal list.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25768 - 8622 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25770 Object**Respondent: Ms Paula Pegram [8625]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Risk of flooding, recent mitigation work at the Green only pushed the problem to the bank of Blackmore Mead to burst causing flood at Red Rose Lane. See enclosed photo. Development will make it worse. The nearby development on Nine Ashes, Highwood, Fingrith Hall Lane caused more traffic. Doctor surgery is full, local school oversubscribe and will need extension into Green Belt. Brownfield should be prioritised over Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from proposal list.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25770 - 8625 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25772 Object**Respondent: Mr James Pegram [8626]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is inadequate for the level of traffic new development would bring, other nearby development already increased traffic. There are many suitable brownfield sites. We are a small village with restricted parking. Doctors surgery full, school oversubscribed. Green Belt should be protected and village preserve. Development will put many homes at risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from proposed development.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25772 - 8626 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25774 Object**Respondent: Mrs Tracy Goddard-King [8627]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing strategy for Blackmore, no clear housing needs analysis of the area. No proper infrastructure analysis to suggest that the proposed development would not have adverse impacts on the local areas in terms of flooding, traffic, flood, school, doctor, crime, police arrangement. No evidence of exploring other options.

Change To Plan: R25 & 26 to be removed from the Plan. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25774 - 8627 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25776 Object**Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development on Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan. Green Belt sites should only be developed when all other brownfield sites are considered and rejected or considered and developed.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25776 - 4779 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25778 Object**Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan fails to take into account of development impacts on village in terms of amenities including roads.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs for our community which is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25778 - 4779 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25780 Object**Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan fails to take into account of development impacts on village in terms of amenities including schools.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs for our community which is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25780 - 4779 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25782 Object**Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan fails to take into account of development impacts on village in terms of amenities including medical facilities.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs for our community which is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25782 - 4779 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25784 Object**Respondent: Ms Tina Harrington [4779]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan fails to take account of the already busy roads running through the village and the impacts on wildlife and inhabitants.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing needs for our community which is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 25784 - 4779 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25786 Object**Respondent: Mr Andrew Harris [8628]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not good use of Green Belt. Strain on electric supply, water supply, doctors, drainage. Wild life. Flooding. Road access. More cars on the roads. School too small.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult BVHA local policy.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25786 - 8628 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25792 Object**Respondent: Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Agree with points raised by BVHA - lack of school places, lack of parking, poor bus service, GP full, Red Rose Lane unsuitable for heavy vehicles and is narrow, dangerous for children to walk to school.

The form is complicated and full of legal jargon. Not clear even after visit to council offices. BVHA helping to portray view of myself and others. The borough set the building limits for Blackmore in the 1960s, considered infrastructure and Green Belt. Since then gas has been supplied and water pressure improved. We still have power cuts. The council set the village boundary and infrastructure right in the 1960s and has helped to preserve this wonderful village. There is no justification for the need to build on Green Belt land adjoining Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25792 - 8010 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25807 Object**Respondent: Mrs Mandy Hamilton [8633]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plots are frequently flooded and the houses adjacent to the field. The roads on Nine Ashes road near junction with Red Rose Lane are very busy around school time so development will only make this worse. There are rarely sufficient parking spaces which will only be made worse with the new development. The local primary school has already been refusing children who live in the parish and appears to be at full capacity. BBC does not appear to have taken into account the building within the Epping district which borders Blackmore which will have a further detrimental effect.

Change To Plan: Since this LOP was published representatives of Stondon Massey have actively sought development on a site they have highlighted in order to sustain their village. This clearly seems like an obvious solution. Just because this news has come to light after the latest LOP has been published, it should be urgently considered. BBC has not sufficiently demonstrated that other brown field sites are not available. These should have been the primary focus of any building.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25807 - 8633 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25809 Object**Respondent: Miss Lois Hamilton [8632]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plots are frequently flooded and the houses adjacent to the field. The roads on Nine Ashes road near junction with Red Rose Lane are very busy around school time so development will only make this worse. There are rarely sufficient parking spaces which will only be made worse with the new development. The local primary school has already been refusing children who live in the parish and appears to be at full capacity. BBC does not appear to have taken into account the building within the Epping district which borders Blackmore which will have a further detrimental effect.

Change To Plan: Since this LOP was published representatives of Stondon Massey have actively sought development on a site they have highlighted in order to sustain their village. This clearly seems like an obvious solution. Just because this news has come to light after the latest LOP has been published, it should be urgently considered. BBC has not sufficiently demonstrated that other brown field sites are not available. These should have been the primary focus of any building.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25809 - 8632 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25811 Object**Respondent: Mr Max Hamilton [8631]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plots are frequently flooded and the houses adjacent to the field. The roads on Nine Ashes road near junction with Red Rose Lane are very busy around school time so development will only make this worse. There are rarely sufficient parking spaces which will only be made worse with the new development. The local primary school has already been refusing children who live in the parish and appears to be at full capacity. BBC does not appear to have taken into account the building within the Epping district which borders Blackmore which will have a further detrimental effect.

Change To Plan: Since this LOP was published representatives of Stondon Massey have actively sought development on a site they have highlighted in order to sustain their village. This clearly seems like an obvious solution. Just because this news has come to light after the latest LOP has been published, it should be urgently considered. BBC has not sufficiently demonstrated that other brown field sites are not available. These should have been the primary focus of any building.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25811 - 8631 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25813 Object**Respondent: Fairview New Homes Ltd (Ms Faye Wilders) [8365]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Parking is a nightmare, school is full, GP is at capacity, post office has closed. Should show there are other suitable areas for these building works can take place. I believe it will drop house prices on all property in Blackmore which is unfair to residents already having property.
I give my full support for BVHA to voice my views

Change To Plan: I believe it will drop house prices on all property in Blackmore which is unfair to residents already having property.
I give my full support for BVHA to voice my views

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25813 - 8365 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25815 Object

Respondent: Mr Graham Hesketh [8634]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This plan does not meet areas objectively assessed. It is not informed by agreements with other authorities - Chelmsford and Epping - residents from these developments will utilize facilities in Blackmore which when added to the proposed 70 new dwellings will cause congestion, environmental concerns as well as sustainability to the surroundings. There will be a possibility of a near 100% doubling of capacity within the area. The sites proposed at Orchard Piece and Redrose Lane are greenbelt sites with quality arable land. The local plan is not justified as an appropriate strategy as all other reasonable alternatives have not been taken into account. There are other Brownfield sites available which should be taking priority over the Greenfield and Greenbelt land in Blackmore. There is no clear strategy for the villages especially those in the north of the borough. No housing survey has been undertaken to support the proposals. It would appear that none of the evidence presented to the BBC on the unsuitable nature of the proposed sites has been taken into consideration such as the flooding and poor access to the sites from Redrose Lane. This development would appear to be a direct contradiction of the LDP - specifically policies related to climate change and sustainable transport.

Change To Plan: More needs to be addressed as to how the heritage and character of the village of Blackmore can be protected in order to meet the housing solutions for local needs. Proposals already put forward and referred to in this document such as Red Rose Farm and Spicers Lane must be investigated thoroughly as these are already Brownfield sites and so development should take place on them before Greenbelt ones considered. Reference has been made to good arable land that will be built on. This should be investigated further. Houses that are likely to be built by developers will no doubt be extremely expensive as they play the numbers game in order to make us much profit as possible before going on to their next project leaving the community to pick up the pieces. This means it is imperative for a Housing Needs Survey to be done so as to address the local needs of the village. This development of 70 or more houses will have a significant environment impact on a village and not enough has been done to investigate these effects on this village, especially flooding. Not only is there a problem with the environment but the impact on local services such as doctors (already overstretched), school (oversubscribed) and roads (narrow and dangerous with greater traffic) needs to be investigated in a thorough context. Information sent to the council previously regarding the impact of such developments should be revisited. What has changed? One has to feel from reading reports and getting version of events at what happened at the EGM to pass the LDP that the discussion on this developmental area had already been decided with only 15 minutes discussion allocated to such a monumental decision about Blackmore. As the area concerned has one independent councillor who is not a member of the ruling party were his views discarded? Yet the site at Honeypot Lane which is a more accessible site and can accommodate 200 houses was at the last moment decided to be inadequate by the ruling party so necessitating the need for the inclusion of the Greenbelt fields in Blackmore. This needs to be investigated fully. Brentwood Borough Council have made it reasonable difficult for residents in this area to reply to the LDP as they only take responses on line or you have to download the forms in order to respond. This makes it difficult in a village where internet access is not great, many are elderly and not PC literate. Thus many residents will not have a chance to air their views. It could be a majority of the people are put off giving their views because of the complex nature in which BBC have made this process of review.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25815 - 8634 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25817 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not shown alternative brownfield sites that are available-they should be used before Green belt land. The access would be impossible with that amount of traffic. We do not have the infrastructure to take this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem. Surely Epping Forest Council would have more sites available than a tiny village like Blackmore. We need to preserve our small village and green belt.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25817 - 4693 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25826 Object

Respondent: Miss Jade Hayes [8136]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no proven local need nor accessibility to local services. The local community has not been consulted on the LDP. A survey by a local group has been completely ignored by the Council. The Green Belt should be protected and although other sites that were looked at in the Allocation have been discounted for Green Belt impact. The local flooding in the recent past has been ignored. There is a need to 'Conserve historic environment'. The centre of the village is a conservation area. The character of Red Rose Lane an historic plague road around the village will be completely destroyed by the development.

Change To Plan: Consultation is required with neighboring authorities and the local community. An assessment of local need for housing is required. A survey of traffic impact on the surrounding area is required. There is already a development of 30 houses just outside the village that will impact the traffic flow. Detailed flood risk analysis required. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need if any is proven. Larger developments like this should be placed nearer the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) and nearer to possible employment opportunities. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25826 - 8136 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25837 Object

Respondent: Lisa Houston [8636]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No clear "strategy" for the Villages in the North of the Borough. More suitable and sustainable locations. The locations in Blackmore do not promote Sustainable development considering the limited facilities available. BBC fails to demonstrate there are other brownfield sites available. Inadequate services available: school places, GP surgeries, lack of public transport. Proposed sites in Blackmore are all liable to flooding. There has been no "Housing Needs Survey". BBC have failed to consider the impact on Blackmore of the 30 dwellings proposed off Fingrith Hall Lane, with the BBC failing to consult EFDC.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the Village. School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area. The single Doctors surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for an appointment at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required. Current transport links for the village would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the aging population.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25837 - 8636 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25847 Object

Respondent: Mr John Hughes [4500]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. However, all amenities and services are already stretched - utilities, the local primary school is already full, Bus services are limited, insufficient parking in the village, the doctors surgery is at capacity. A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore. The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed. Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25847 - 4500 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25853 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. However, all amenities and services are already stretched - utilities, the local primary school is already full, Bus services are limited, insufficient parking in the village, the doctors surgery is at capacity. A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore. The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed. Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25853 - 8637 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25860 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. However, all amenities and services are already stretched - utilities, the local primary school is already full, Bus services are limited, insufficient parking in the village, the doctors surgery is at capacity. A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore. The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed. Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25860 - 8638 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25867 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Hughes [8639]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There are no infrastructure requirements listed in policy R25 or R26. However, all amenities and services are already stretched - utilities, the local primary school is already full, Bus services are limited, insufficient parking in the village, the doctors surgery is at capacity. A 'Housing Needs' survey should have been carried out. There are Brownfield sites available nearby but there is no evidence these have been considered in preference to using greenfield, Green Belt land. Other more suitable locations (e.g. areas around Doddinghurst, urban extensions to Brentwood, increasing the size of the Dunton Hills proposal) which all have better transport links would have been a far better proposal than the development in Blackmore. The proposed sites are important wildlife and natural habitats for many creatures to live undisturbed. Red Rose Lane is a single track road and is not suitable for the extra volume of traffic generated by the proposed housing. Red Rose Lane has no pavements and so the additional traffic will bring increased danger to these users.

Change To Plan: Due to the many issues listed above it is clear that the sensible modification would be to remove sites R25 and R26 from the Plan. Blackmore Village Heritage Association (BVHA) has produced a 'neighbourhood plan' which should be referred to by the Planners. This clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25867 - 8639 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25872 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sara Harris [8122]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village not a town, cannot cope with extra traffic. School is too small, doctors' appointment is hard to get. Green Belt land must not be built on. Wildlife on site will be disturbed.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25872 - 8122 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25874 Object

Respondent: Mr Patrick Hinchin [6750]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is narrow, not suitable for traffic. It is on marshy ground, flooded after heavy rain. If site is built on it will remove the ability to absorb water and lead to flooding on other area. Doctors' surgery and school are at capacity. Bus service, shops, sewage and water not able to cope. Other Brownfield sites are available, why go after Green Belt. No housing survey.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25874 - 6750 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25876 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Helliard [8640]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Roads unsuitable for extra traffic and lorries. Not enough doctors to cope with extra population. The area is heavily congested. School is full, children have to travel to other areas, most of the time by car, this will be worsen.

Change To Plan: Further consultation with residents. Remove R25 & R26. Look at a proper plan for infrastructure needs.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25876 - 8640 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25878 Object

Respondent: MR ALAN BOWLAND [8121]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26 % increase in housing will change the nature of the village and ignores the impact on services and infrastructure - GP, school, car parking, traffic. Concerned the sites will exacerbate current surface water flooding problems. The plan needs to consider the other new development in Epping Forest district. Infrastructure should be provided before development taking place.

Change To Plan: The housing needs should be distributed fairly across all rural areas not centred on one apparently convenient village. Brownfield sites should be identified before utilising green field (Green Belt) land. The need of the village should be considered first and not the requirement of developers to make profits.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25878 - 8121 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25880 Object

Respondent: Mrs Judith Bowland [8642]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We were consulted on what Blackmore needs, this does not. Parking, is bad and will get worse, especially on Fingrith Hall Lane. Access lanes are too narrow. Area already flood, more homes will exacerbate this. No plans for sewerage provision. School is full and more cars on the road to use other schools. GP is full. % increase is colossal and will damage village. A small increase would be appropriate or in towns like Brnetwood. Why have no brownfield sites been put forward before using the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Changes to Plan:
We need housing for first time buyers and properties for the older population to downsize to. I see no evidence that the developers will prioritise these needs. The lanes need widening BEFORE any extra houses are built. Other infrastructure need increasing before building eg extra capacity in sewage disposal. Extra classrooms and teacher in the primary school. An extra doctors surgery is needed to service all the villagers in the locality. There are brownfield sites available but developers make a higher profit if they can use green belt land: location, location, location.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25880 - 8642 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25882 Object

Respondent: Mr Allan Hilliard [8641]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to building on Green Belt sites as it will set precedents to other sites. There are already new developments around Blackmore, flooding in Blackmore will get worsened by more building. Brownfield sites in Brentwood should be used first. Bus services may get suspended, local school is at capacity.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25882 - 8641 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25884 Object

Respondent: Mr Ray Brooks [8643]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 and R26. The infrastructure in the village will not take more houses in the area, for example the doctors cant cope now I already find it hard to get appointments. Only 1 bus ever hour the school is already full to its capacity. Also the access in Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable being a narrow lane.

Change To Plan: You would need a bigger school, more frequent bus service, also a new doctors surgery. The roads in the area will need to be wider. The small shop and post office is already very busy and often runs out of things.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25884 - 8643 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25886 Object**Respondent: Ms Kay Hewitt [8644]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: School and doctors oversubscribed. Parking issues. Flooding and sewage system. Building on Green Belt not acceptable when Brownfield sites are available.

Change To Plan: Remove Plan as it stand. Discuss with Parish Council. Build on Brownfield sites and infills.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25886 - 8644 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25889 Object**Respondent: Miss Alison Bell [8646]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 09, R25 and R26. Infrastructure does not support this.

Change To Plan: Doctors surgery almost full, difficult to get an appointment. Do not believe schools have capacity.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25889 - 8646 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25890 Object**Respondent: Mrs Barbara Head [8645]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Children have to travel on full buses to surrounding areas for school. How will more children get to school? There are other sites in Brentwood with better links. Road traffic will treble. Doctors are full, elderly people or those with disability struggle to have appointments.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local people.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25890 - 8645 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25892 Object**Respondent: Mr Dennis Holla [8647]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Too much traffic on the roads already, buses are infrequent. Doctors oversubscribed. Buses taking children to school are often full. People will rely on cars to travel, each family will have 2-4 cars.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult with local residents.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25892 - 8647 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25894 Object

Respondent: Mr Andrew Borton [8648]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The plan is contradictory. Borough of villages is considered where it enhances the vitality of rural communities. Blackmore does not fit with this as it already has vitality and doesn't need any more.
Blackmore is assigned a Cat 3 status therefore the proposed development does not align with 'limited urban extensions appropriate to its rural settings'.
Policy SP01 notes development supported where it enhances character and settlement setting ... and traffic generation has no adverse effects. The proposed development is the polar opposite of both these statements.
Blackmore has a vibrant community but suffers from inadequate parking at local shops and amenities. More housing of any number will impact on the safe use of these by increasing traffic congestion. Blackmore is also a 'mecca' for the cycling community and increased vehicle use would pose risks to the safety of other cyclists and the general community.
Flooding is a well known risk to Blackmore and whilst no doubt the proposed housing scheme will require a demonstrable SUDS design, in practice these are not always reliable. The increased risk to flooding and cost of repairs is of real concern.
The road systems in and out of Blackmore are at certain points suitable only for single car traffic, especially the bridge leading into the village green. Further traffic flow would worsen the existing conditions.
The heritage of Blackmore is well documented and the development pays little respect to that and the local plan.
Whilst it is accepted that additional housing is required Blackmore does not fit with the local plan and there are far better, more suitable areas in the Borough.

Change To Plan: 1 There seems to have been little coordination with other neighbouring authorities who may welcome additional housing.
2 Villages should be encouraged to remain as such and their legacy maintained, The local plan will extract from this.
3 The local plan is hugely limited in the identification of other sites that would be more suitable for development.
4 There is a lack of a survey demonstrating why Blackmore has been selected.
5 Infrastructure concerns seem entirely lacking.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25894 - 8648 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii

25896 Object

Respondent: Mr David Bennett [8649]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Section 09 R25 and R26
The village has a poor bus service and the local school cannot sustain more children moving into the village. The doctors is unable to accommodate Blackmore and surrounding villages.
The village drainage system is insufficient now and would not cope with additional houses over the past five years there has been a number of occasions when our drainage has been blocked.

Change To Plan: Local roads would need to be improved and more parking facilities. Additional schools would be required. the local area would require a better bus service to both Brentwood and Chelmsford. Local drainage system would need to be improve to cope with additional housing.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: None Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25896 - 8649 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

25900 Object

Respondent: Mr Peter Birch [8158]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There doesn't appear to be any coherent idea for the villages including Blackmore, no cohesion with neighbouring authorities. Should be considering other new development in other boroughs. The Blackmore community will be jeopardised by the proposed plan.
Traffic is a problem, congestion on the Ongar Road, parking in Blackmore near shops is difficult, GP is overrun.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan. Please refer to the BHVA neighbourhood plan. Remove Blackmore from the proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25900 - 8158 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25904 Object**Respondent: Mr Peter Bartrop [8650]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 08 Flood Risk and Green Belt
Section 09 R25 and R26

There doesn't appear to be any coherent strategy for the villages including Blackmore, strain on amenities, 4 weeks for GP appointment, limited bus service would mean more traffic. Brentwood Borough Council has not demonstrated that the required housing could not be met by increased housing density on other allocated sites, There is no housing need survey, sites are liable to flood and new homes will increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: A detailed housing needs survey needs to be undertaken for Blackmore Village and I endorse the objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25904 - 8650 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25908 Object**Respondent: Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 08 Flood Risk and Green Belt
Section 09 R25 and R26

There doesn't appear to be any clear strategy for the villages including Blackmore, strain on facilities, such as school places and doctors. Very limited bus service and roads and lanes would be stretched and struggle to cope with more traffic. There is no housing need survey to say these sites are most suitable. Sites are liable to flood and new homes will increase flood risk elsewhere in Blackmore.

Change To Plan: A detailed housing needs survey needs to be undertaken for Blackmore Village and I endorse the objectives of BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25908 - 8651 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25910 Object**Respondent: Mr Luke Holmes [8652]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25910 - 8652 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25918 Object**Respondent: Miss Ami Holmes [8653]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25918 - 8653 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25931 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25931 - 8574 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25937 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Foreman [4394]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to policy due to impact on Blackmore including flood risk, traffic and transport, GP, schools, Green Belt. Sites unsuitable.

Change To Plan: In view of my comments on how this would impact on the character of the village, I cannot see how any modifications could be made to the local plan that could rectify the whole situation. [Remove R25 and R26 from plan].

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25937 - 4394 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25939 Object

Respondent: Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support BVHA and their submission. Reading the Local Plan at the Council Offices was daunting as is filling in this form. In the early 1960s the LPA set the limits to the village taking into consideration public utilities, sewage and drainage capacity whilst maintaining the Green Belt around the village. Little has changed since then except getting mains gas and water pressure has improved. The planners got it right then but now there is no justification for building on the Green Belt and there are many brownfield sites in the borough which would allow the housing target to be met. Object to sites R25 and R26 being in the plan.

Change To Plan: Object to sites R25 and R26 being in the plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25939 - 5045 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25941 Object

Respondent: Mrs Pauline Farthing [7120]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village, no buses at weekend, full up school, long GP waiting lists. Must be brownfield sites more suitable than Blackmore. We have already had Gypsies adding to impact on services, a new development on Fingrith Hall Road, 5 more on Spriggs Lane. Village prone to flooding which would be exacerbated with more homes.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan. This is a complicated form, the wording is terrible, it is purposely made complicated to stop ordinary people having a say in things.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25941 - 7120 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25947 Object

Respondent: Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Object to the inclusion of Blackmore sites as strategy for site choice is not justified, impacts not detailed or mitigated and no account of other recent development in the area.

Change To Plan: The Blackmore Sites should be removed from the Local Plan until there has been:
(1) A full housing need survey for Blackmore
(2) A proper consultation, including the BBC taking into account alternative sites
(3) A properly formulated strategy from BBC in relation to protecting the heritage and character of the villages within the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25947 - 4547 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25949 Object

Respondent: Mr Ben Holmes [8654]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved, development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25949 - 8654 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25957 Object

Respondent: Mr Mark Holmes [8655]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: Brownfield sites should be chosen before green belt. The flooding of a few years ago has improved , development would cause more problems. Blackmore school would be unable to cope with this amount of development. Waiting times for appointments to see local doctors would be prolonged

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25957 - 8655 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25965 Object

Respondent: Mr Barry Coldham [8656]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound due to infrastructure - lanes too narrow, school at capacity, GP appointments difficult to get, parking at shop will become dangerous, flood risk will increase. Not positively planned as not in original LDP, plans on green belt when non green belt available.

Other options available including area not on green belt in Stondon Massey, a village that would welcome more dwellings.

To make current proposal more sound you would need to increase school capacity and doctors surgery. Also make roads more accessible and decrease flood risk.

Change To Plan: Other options available including area not on green belt in Stondon Massey, a village that would welcome more dwellings.

To make current proposal more sound you would need to increase school capacity and doctors surgery. Also make roads more accessible and decrease flood risk.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25965 - 8656 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

25968 Object

Respondent: Mr John Caton [4881]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, there is no clear strategy for villages and has not considered brownfield sites which should be prioritised over Green Belt sites, this is developer led and not thought through by BBC, ignored adjacent authority development, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, the number of homes will overwhelm village - school and GP. Parking already a problem and shops, cafes, pubs already insufficient. Extend the urban development to Brentwood town instead.

Change To Plan: Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan, which was properly composed and states what the village and villagers need. Far too many of what might have been thought of as affordable, have been extended, modified to the maximum and are no longer affordable. There are very few properties left in Blackmore of a smaller, single storey bungalow type. The sites R25 and R26 should be taken out of the LDP for the reasons given.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25968 - 4881 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25973 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8657]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, there is no clear strategy for villages and has not considered brownfield sites which should be prioritised over Green Belt sites, this is developer led and not thought through by BBC, ignored adjacent authority development, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, the number of homes will overwhelm village - school and GP. Parking already a problem and shops, cafes, pubs already insufficient. Extend the urban development to Brentwood town instead.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. In accordance with local needs smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the chance to down size releasing their larger homes.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25973 - 8657 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25977 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The LDP has changed from original plan to that considered at Reg 18, with no explanation of why some sites have been included after initially being promised they will be excluded eg Blackmore vs Honeypot Lane. The late changes to the plan curtailed the amount of time available to appropriately consider and challenge it. There has been insufficient, if any, coordination with neighboring Councils and this leads to developments agreed by one council adversely affecting communities in another councils area. Eg Epping Forest & Brentwood. There is no evidence that any C.I.L. required from developers would be sufficient to do an adequate job of protecting the local community. Nor is there any requirement for such levy to be exclusively used for the benefit of the community impacted by the development. There is no evidence of a Housing Needs Survey being completed for Blackmore. There is no evidence of appropriate investigation into other brownfield sites that are available and should take precedence over the Green Belt Sites.) It is unsound to arbitrarily place disproportionate growth on one existing community which will cause it harm, leaving others with nothing at all when they would actually like some development to improve their sustainability. Eg Blackmore v Stondon Massey.) No consideration has been given to Counties "Protected Lanes" & "Quiet Lanes" policies. Blackmore plans refer to type of development and require allocations for local & affordable housing which is unachievable. There is a lack of employment viability; transport links; infrastructure; medical facilities; education facilities; Severe flooding problems; roads to build the development and subsequently deal with the astronomical increase in traffic movement; loss of Green Belt and damage to natural habitats

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25977 - 4759 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25978 Object

Respondent: Mr Eugene Cullen [8658]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no local housing need survey for Blackmore, not demonstrated that housing could not be reached by increasing housing elsewhere, there must be more suitable sites/locations like urban extension to Brentwood, there is no clear strategy for villages in north of borough, access via Red Rose lane is unsuitable, area prone to flooding and more homes will make this worse.

Change To Plan: Support BVHA in its mission

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25978 - 8658 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25986 Object

Respondent: Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The LDP has changed from original plan to that considered at Reg 18, with no explanation of why some sites have been included after initially being promised they will be excluded eg Blackmore vs Honeypot Lane. The late changes to the plan curtailed the amount of time available to appropriately consider and challenge it. There has been insufficient, if any, coordination with neighboring Councils and this leads to developments agreed by one council adversely affecting communities in another councils area. Eg Epping Forest & Brentwood. There is no evidence that any C.I.L. required from developers would be sufficient to do an adequate job of protecting the local community. Nor is there any requirement for such levy to be exclusively used for the benefit of the community impacted by the development. There is no evidence of a Housing Needs Survey being completed for Blackmore. There is no evidence of appropriate investigation into other brownfield sites that are available and should take precedence over the Green Belt Sites.) It is unsound to arbitrarily place disproportionate growth on one existing community which will cause it harm, leaving others with nothing at all when they would actually like some development to improve their sustainability. Eg Blackmore v Stondon Massey. No consideration has been given to Counties "Protected Lanes" & "Quiet Lanes" policies. Blackmore plans refer to type of development and require allocations for local & affordable housing which is unachievable. There is a lack of employment viability; transport links; infrastructure; medical facilities; education facilities; Severe flooding problems; roads to build the development and subsequently deal with the astronomical increase in traffic movement; loss of Green Belt and damage to natural habitats

Change To Plan: Question 5 - bullets 1-3 * Due to the significant issues surrounding the acceptance of Reg 18 by BBC I think it would be necessary to independently reconsider the entire process to ensure that it was handled appropriately, and if not, repeat the process correctly before proceeding to Reg 19. Other bullets * New officials who understand the local issues and can make their voices heard with independence, in an environment that is willing to listen would be a prerequisite to getting any issues of this magnitude considered in a fair and democratic fashion. * Removing Blackmore from the List of Sites as previously promised or allocating the 70 houses to Dunton Hills, as already done for other sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25986 - 4700 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

25993 Object**Respondent: Hannah Cook [8659]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for traffic, it floods. Infrastructure not sufficient: school at capacity, bus service inadequate, GP service appointments unavailable, minimal amenities all problems exacerbated with new homes. More suitable locations closer to built up areas like Brentwood

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25993 - 8659 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i

25996 Object**Respondent: Mr David Coates [8133]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not enough infrastructure, village too crowded already, lack of space at local school, not enough 'village' parkin facilities (Blackmore village).

Change To Plan: Access off Red Rose Lane is total unsuitable for volume of traffic, the whole principal of building 50+ homes in the village (approx. 30 in Red Rose Lane) is just wrong. The village is already full. There are modest services (GP, school, shops, parking, bus services). There has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. The proposed sites are liable to flooding, flood risk will increase if build on land.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25996 - 8133 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

25999 Object**Respondent: Mrs Clare Corby [8186]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. The access roads are extremely unsuitable for this volume of traffic, Blackmore is a modest village with low and ineffective services and infrastructure. Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan. This clearly sets out our local housing needs.

Change To Plan: Blackmore is a modest village with low and ineffective services and infrastructure. Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan. This clearly sets out our local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25999 - 8186 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26000 Object**Respondent: Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is one of the few remaining small historical villages. It would be a terrible thing to lose such an attraction. Its wonderful church, village green and lovely country roads. The infrastructure of such a small village can't support such a level of development therefore I consider the plan to be unsound.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Should not build on green belt land. Backing the BVHA.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26000 - 8660 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26011 Object**Respondent: Mr james Corby [8661]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The principle of residential development off of Red Rose Lane is wrong. Blackmore is an isolated village with very modest and ineffective services and infrastructure. there are more suitable locations nearer to Brentwood. The locations in Blackmore so not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26011 - 8661 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26013 Object**Respondent: Mr Alex Corby [8663]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: There is no clear strategy for the villages in the north of the borough including Blackmore. Brentwood/Basildon council have not consulted with neighbouring authorities and the impact of housing already being built. The access off from Red Rose Lane is entirely unsuitable for this volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the plan and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26013 - 8663 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26015 Object**Respondent: Hazel Cowing [2817]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Need to demonstrate why Blackmore is in the LDP, amenities not sufficient, will impact transport, destroy picturesque village, more properties could make Blackmore be classed as a small town.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 and refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan for local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26015 - 2817 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

26017 Object**Respondent: Miss Lucy Corby [8664]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No clear strategy for northern villages, Brentwood/Basildon have not consulted with neighbouring authorities about houses already being built. access off Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for volume of traffic increase.

Change To Plan: remove R25 and R26 from plan, refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan regarding local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26017 - 8664 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26019 Object**Respondent: Ms Julie Currey [8665]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to sections 4, 8, 9 - policies R25 and R26.
Insufficient infrastructure, already at capacity - schools, roads, GP, parking. Not considered other new development, increases size of village by 1/3.
Remove R25 and R26 from plan and consider alternatives.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan and consider alternatives.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26019 - 8665 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26021 Object**Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8662]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is not sound. Blackmore as a village does not have the resource or infrastructure to even support a development of this scale. The roads are far too narrow to allow access on such a huge scale and the limited resources of schools and streets will not be able to cope. It appears consideration has not been given to other alternative available to the council.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs, for our already sustainable community. Consideration has not been given to the BVHA Neighbourhood plan. Also further review must take place regarding impacts and other developments in progress and brownfield opportunities.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26021 - 8662 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26032 Object**Respondent: Ms Linda Cearnns [5013]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan unsound - need a housing need survey to justify sites, use brownfield sites first. Need to consider flood and sewerage problems. utilities, transport, schools, medical facilities, roads, access, need to consult more with Epping Forrest DC.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from plan as sites not justified

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26032 - 5013 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26034 Object

Respondent: Mrs Louise Coldham [8666]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound - development to be built on quality arable land and in Green Belt. Infrastructure issues - flood, narrow lanes, parking, sewerage, school places, GP, safety of walker / cyclists / horse riders.

An historic village with visitors who come to enjoy the quaintness and scenery. There would be more suitable locations that would not impact on the unique nature of the popular village. Other non-Green Belt sites should be priority, access not appropriate, school and GP are full.

Change To Plan: An historic village with visitors who come to enjoy the quaintness and scenery. There would be more suitable locations that would not impact on the unique nature of the popular village. Other non-Green Belt sites should be priority, access not appropriate, school and GP are full.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26034 - 8666 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii

26035 Object

Respondent: Ms Julie Chandler [8352]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The entrance to the fields are not on a suitable road - liable to flooding the surrounding roads will not take the added traffic flow.

It seems no-one has taken an overview or strategy view of development around the villages they have just been dictated by developers and money.

Consultation with Epping Forest would be needed.

There are too many properties to be built for people that will need busses, shops and schools.

If they are to build affordable housing they need affordable infrastructure. There is no capacity for this. Elderly and young families need busses, shops and school and the ability to get in and out of the village. The village is a good 3 miles in the middle of no-where there needs to be adequate transport, roads for people that live in the village and any carers or visiting family.

The parking outside the shop is already busy and dangerous utilised by not only people from Blackmore but all the surrounding villages.

More suitable sites would be near to towns such as Brentwood or Ingatestone.

These houses will not be far for the people that need housing because those people would be able to afford the cost of living in a small village such as this. A car is needed as cabs are £25+ per journey. Children need to be taken to and from school as the local school is full and this will limit the ability for the parents to work.

Change To Plan: Find other more suitable sites near to amenities

Use a site that isn't an area of natural beauty which contributes to green belt

Find an area where there are already adequate roads to service it

Provide housing for people where the cost of living isn't as high as Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26035 - 8352 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26036 Object

Respondent: Mrs Trina Chambers [8348]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Infrastructure insufficient: schools already full, long wait time for GP and not enough parking spaces available.

Change To Plan: The sites in Blackmore need to be removed now! You need to listen to and respond positively to the plan constructed by Blackmore Village Heritage association on behalf of our community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26036 - 8348 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26038 Object

Respondent: Ms Elaine Harris [8667]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I consider the proposal to build numerous houses within our small beautiful village appalling! We recently moved to the village and do not wish this wonderful place to change. I object to building on green belt land. The village is prone to flooding and thus development will increase the risk. Our small community does not have the infrastructure to cope with all the additional people these homes would contain. The local primary school is already full. The roads congested. The doctors surgery oversubscribed. Children play out, I feel additional traffic and access to the site would result in an accident.

Change To Plan: I do not consider any modification can be made. The proposal should be cancelled, there are more suitable sites where houses could be built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26038 - 8667 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26040 Object

Respondent: Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]

Agent: N/A

Summary: UNSOUND: The flooding of a few years ago has just been alleviated this would cause more problems in that area. Blackmore would be unable to cope with this amount of development. We already have waiting lists for appointments to see local doctors. The parking is already a problem.

Change To Plan: To remove Blackmore from this list of proposed sites

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26040 - 8668 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26048 Object

Respondent: Malcolm Hurford [7304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local plan does not fulfil the following NPPF requirements (by paragraph number): 8.a.b.c - to meet local need, accessible services. 28 the views of the local community have not been included in production of the plan. 77/78 There is no proven need for these houses. 103 This development of 70 houses will rely on private cars for transport being at least 7 miles from the nearest rail stations being accessed via local rural lanes. The limited bus services are not supportive of employment during normal working hours. Sect 14 -area known locally to flood although no focused flood risk assessment has been carried out. History of flooding shows both Chelmsford Road and Redrose Lane become impassable during heavy rainfall. 174/175 - to protect and enhance biodiversity. Section 16 - R25 and R26 have two Grade 2 listed buildings on the boundary of the development. Redrose Lane being the point of access for both developments is signed by the Highways authority as "Not suitable for heavy goods vehicles". This lane has been assessed by the local community by way of the procedure used in the Brentwood Borough Council Protected Lanes report.

Change To Plan: Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs. Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no prove that Blackmore needs this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little or no local employment. Detailed flood risk analysis required - to identify suitable locations out of flood risk areas. The historic lanes in and around Blackmore should be assessed to the established procedure and allocated "Protected Lane" status where they meet the necessary requirements. Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments - support a policy of partnering owners of brownfield sites to develop local area needs where proven. Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood. Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26048 - 7304 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26059 Object

Respondent: Mrs Joann Cook [8669]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not enough infrastructure, village too crowded already, lack of space at local school, not enough 'village' parking facilities (Blackmore village). Access off Red Rose Lane is total unsuitable for volume of traffic, the whole principal of building 50+ homes in the village (approx. 30 in Red Rose Lane) is just wrong. The village is already full. There are modest services (GP, school, shops, parking, bus services, sewerage). There has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. The proposed sites are liable to flooding, flood risk will increase if build on land.

Change To Plan: There are more suitable sites - brownfield, not Green Belt, remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:Not Specified

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26059 - 8669 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26061 Object

Respondent: Mr Tony Cook [8670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Not enough infrastructure, village too crowded already, lack of space at local school, not enough 'village' parking facilities (Blackmore village). Access off Red Rose Lane is total unsuitable for volume of traffic, the whole principal of building 50+ homes in the village (approx. 30 in Red Rose Lane) is just wrong. The village is already full. There are modest services (GP, school, shops, parking, bus services, sewerage). There has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. The proposed sites are liable to flooding, flood risk will increase if build on land.

Change To Plan: There are more suitable sites - brownfield, not Green Belt, remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26061 - 8670 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26063 Object**Respondent: Mr David Chalkley [8671]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Limited amenities - shop, GP, school, lanes congested and unsafe, sewerage overloaded, need significant investment in the village and infrastructure. There are more suitable locations, Red Rose Lane access is limited and ridiculous to suggest it could cope with this volume of traffic. Greenfield and Green Belt land should not be touched, use other brownfield sites.

Change To Plan: There are more suitable locations, Red Rose Lane access is limited and ridiculous to suggest it could cope with this volume of traffic. Greenfield and Green Belt land should not be touched, use other brownfield sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26063 - 8671 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26065 Object**Respondent: Mr D. Cormack [1447]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policies R25 and R26, paras 9.197-205
Services and infrastructure already has strain, GP, traffic already a problem, would get worse, environmental repercussions, should not use Green Belt land, use brownfield elsewhere.
Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association neighbourhood plan regarding local housing need. remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Change To Plan: Refer to Blackmore Village Heritage Association neighbourhood plan regarding local housing need. remove R25 and R26 from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26065 - 1447 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26069 Object**Respondent: Mr John Bell [8672]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan is unsound and totally unsuitable for the village of Blackmore: the facilities and infrastructure of Blackmore is not sustainable for more dwellings, R25 and R26 have to be removed from the plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan for local housing need.

Change To Plan: Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan for local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26069 - 8672 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26071 Object**Respondent: Mr Gary Bedford [8673]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Already pressure on infrastructure. Schools, congested roads, parking, and road safety, GP appointments. Not an ideal area to build new homes, will ruin the village and cause overcrowding.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26071 - 8673 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

26073 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christine Bedford [8674]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore is already straining to fulfil its needs in providing schooling and doctors, a possible extra 200 people with possibly as many cars would be a great strain on the already busy roads.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26073 - 8674 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

26075 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object to the inclusion of the sites on Green Belt land. The two Blackmore sites fail to give an objective assessment of the development and infrastructure requirement; address the impact on the village with a 27% increase in size has been underestimated in respect of impact on the lives of the occupants of the village and of other residents in close proximity to the development; mitigate the effects of traffic emissions and manage climate and/or ensuring the area is well served by public transport; fully examine the redevelopment of the brownfield sites; in their obligation to preserve Green Belt as laid out in the Sustainability Appraisal; by the local planning authority to provide evidence of any assessment of local housing needs in Blackmore. No consideration given to the two Grade 11 listed properties on the boundary of the development, Redrose Lane which is proposed as the access point to both development is not suitable as it is a country lane not designed to take large volumes of traffic and is unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles

Change To Plan: A fully evidenced survey of the suitability of these proposed sites is required taking into account the obligations of the local authority to protect green belt and the heritage assets in Blackmore village. Detailed flood risk analysis is required. Assess fully any available or new currently unknown brownfield sites in more suitable locations. Meaningful consultation with neighboring authorities namely Chelmsford to consider the suitability of unmet housing needs being covered with an agreement with other authorities. Evidence and develop a strategic approach for the north of the borough

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26075 - 4275 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26089 Object

Respondent: Mrs Carole Cole [8675]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Concerns over schools in the area, ie more traffic in and round Blackmore, Doddinghurst and nearby villages. Also Dr's surgery seems difficult to get appointments now, without new housing in the area.
Take R25 and R26 out of the plan and consider the alternatives.

Change To Plan: Take R25 and R26 out of the plan and consider the alternatives.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26089 - 8675 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

26092 Object

Respondent: Mr David Holland [8676]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local schools are struggling to cope already. More houses will increase demand. The local GP services are also struggling to cope and more homes will place even more pressure on them. The current road infrastructure will not be sufficient for more traffic. Flooding is a risk factor in the area and building more houses will aggravate this.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and that Planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs as the Blackmore community is already sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Yes

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26092 - 8676 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26109 Object

Respondent: Mr James Hughes [8677]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The 30 huge houses by Epping District council very close to the boundary of Blackmore Parish means that the village amenities are already under pressure- and this has not been accounted for within any of the plans. The single track is not suitable for extra traffic without marked improvements to the road - including fixing pot holes and filling ditches on either side. It is also continually used by the public - on foot and on horseback - and is part of at least one major cycle route. There are no walkways so the extra traffic will increase the danger to road users. The local school and doctor's surgery are already at capacity. The internet connection is appalling, the sewage system is at tipping point, there are frequent power-cuts in the area already, Public Transport is almost non-existent in the village and parking anywhere is a nightmare. A survey should have been carried out to demonstrate the need for housing - and in particular the need for 'type of housing'. There are more suitable locations with better access to larger towns in the area: extensions to Brentwood or possibly increasing the size of the proposal for Dunton Hills would all have better transport links for commuters, on better kept roads

Change To Plan: Due to issues I have made clear I believe it is the Council's duty to remove sites R25 and R26 from the LDP such that they do not overwhelm local amenities and services; such that they do not cause further flooding by removing crucial green spaces and such that they are not driving forward with plans that would adversely affect live in the surrounding areas. Blackmore is not an affordable area for young people trying to get on the 'property-ladder': so any attempt to provide affordable housing within that area is counter-intuitive.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26109 - 8677 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, iii, iv

26119 Object

Respondent: Mr. James Harris [8678]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village and development of this size on green belt land is inappropriate. There is no consideration re: 30 houses built in Fingrith Hall Lane under EFDC, which will use services of Blackmore- doctor, shop, school- none which can cope now. There are plenty of other urban sites that could take this development without ruining the local infrastructure. In addition to the proposed development there are plans for additional homes on Chelmsford Road and Spriggs Lane for 20 additional homes. Red Rose Lane is an unsuitable lane for this traffic as it floods.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26119 - 8678 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26124 Object

Respondent: Mr Adam Harris [8679]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Red Rose Lane is an unsuitable lane for this traffic. It floods and is unpassable every time we have rain. Development of this size on green belt land is inappropriate. No consideration re: 30 houses built in Fingrith Hall Lane under EFDC, which will use Blackmore services- doctor, shop, school - none which can cope now. There are plenty of other urban sites that could take this development without ruining the local infrastructure. No consideration of the 20 additional homes planned for Chelmsford road and Spriggs Lane.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26124 - 8679 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26129 Object

Respondent: Mrs Beverley Holla [8680]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. No trains, bus one an hour everyone must drive. In my col de sack each household has 3, 4, 5 cars. 2. The roads are very narrow and dangerous every month at least one car (a Tesco delivery lorry last week) turned upside down in ditch. 3. Cannot get appointment with doctor surgery. 4. Roads too dangerous for children to cycle. 5. Plenty of space nearer to Brentwood.

Change To Plan: Remove the proposed sites field 25 and 26 from local development plan. Consult local people they know how congested and dangerous the roads are winding and very narrow.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26129 - 8680 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26132 Object

Respondent: Mrs Hazel Town [4993]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound as representation was not allowed at the public meeting as the meeting ran over planned time so Blackmore was not allowed to speak. The village infrastructure cannot cope with 70 more houses - consideration has not been made regards: The school is at capacity; GP is full and wait for appointments more than 2 weeks, sewerage is at capacity; village is a conservation area with listed buildings; problems with car parking on the pavements; access lane is narrow; danger of accidents particularly from school with more cars; more new development is happening on Spriggs Lane; sites are liable to flooding, already experienced in village; sites are in Green Belt and a conservation area of great natural beauty.

Change To Plan: The only way you can make the plan acceptable is to find ground which is not Green Belt and not within a conservation area. We are already losing too many of our beautiful places in England and especially Essex.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26132 - 4993 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26137 Object

Respondent: Mrs Jane House [8681]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Extra traffic - roads already very busy. Extra population. Lack of supporting infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA Neighbourhood Plan for local development plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26137 - 8681 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26140 Object**Respondent: Mr Christopher House [8682]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of infrastructure - school / doctor places. Roads not fit for traffic.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from LDP. Consult BVHA Neighbourhood Plan for local change.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26140 - 8682 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26142 Object**Respondent: Miss Helen Sheard [8487]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local plan is unsound as it doesn't consider other new development, impact on infrastructure such as schools, GP, parking, congestion. Access road is too narrow. Will damage quality of life of current residents. No brownfield sites have been taken into account, other sites should be used. Proposal is not sustainable, no plan to prove what the influx of extra tenants will do to the village. Sites flood, there is a lack of services in the area. It is a cover up for the lack of action taken by the BBC to deal with the perceived housing need.

Change To Plan: The plan needs to provide the best housing solution without destroying the heritage, charm and character of Blackmore Village. Other developments in the surrounding area need to be taken into consideration before using the greenbelt land. The other more suitable sites should be used for example brownfield sites rather than the arable green belt land. A housing needs survey which would address local needs and not just houses to make up numbers needs to be undertaken. The environmental effects of the village development need to be assessed and taken into consideration. An investigation of how the Village is able to be sustainable with the influx of development and new tenants.

Information that has already been provided needs to be read and taken into account along with the views of the current residents of the village. There should also be an opportunity for all residents to take part and express their views and have them taken into account. Even if they are unable to understand lengthy forms or are unable to communicate their views due to the complexity of the information or the way it is being presented to them

It is clear the infrastructure of the village would need updating for the size of development and the additional usage. Some of this would be needed in the conservation area to address the issues of flood risk, This would need to be considered before the planning was granted, I am unable to say whether these modifications would make the plan sound or cost effective as no such evaluations have been made.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26142 - 8487 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26144 Object**Respondent: Ms Charlotte Hall [7147]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Infrastructure and services - roads, parking, schools, doctor surgery - are completely unsuitable and insufficient for the amount of houses proposed. Area is liable to flood which will only get worse with additional development. No clear strategy for villages in the north of the borough. The plan has failed to demonstrate that the 70 proposed houses could not be absorbed into other allocated sites. Proposed access route on Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable. 9. There are other more suitable and sustainable options i.e. urban extension to Brentwood. There hadn't been a housing needs survey to justify why Blackmore has been included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: As previously stated no attempt has been made to survey plots by Brentwood Borough Council. This should be done before proposing a green belt site. The 70 houses planned for plots R25 and R26 should be re-allocated to an area that has suitable infrastructure capacity to accommodate the additional people and traffic. The 70 houses should be re-allocated to an area that had an identified housing need. This isn't that area in Blackmore. The argument against development of R25 and R26 were not heard because the extraordinary council meeting in November has gone on for too long. These arguments should have been heard and not just voted through with no discussion.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26144 - 7147 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26146 Object**Respondent: Mrs Margaret Brooks [8683]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Village can't cope with more traffic, parking a problem, schools full, GP is full.

Change To Plan: You would need to widen roads, increase the school size, would need another shop, more parking, another GP surgery, Red Rose Lane or Orchard Piece would not be able to cope with any more traffic.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26146 - 8683 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26148 Object

Respondent: Mr Kevin Hall [6734]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Infrastructure and services - roads, parking, schools, doctor surgery - are completely unsuitable and insufficient for the amount of houses proposed. Area is liable to flood which will only get worse with additional development. No clear strategy for villages in the north of the borough. The plan has failed to demonstrate that the 70 proposed houses could not be absorbed into other allocated sites. Proposed access route on Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable. 9. There are other more suitable and sustainable options i.e. urban extension to Brentwood. There hadn't been a housing needs survey to justify why Blackmore has been included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: As previously stated no attempt has been made to survey plots by Brentwood Borough Council. This should be done before proposing a green belt site. The 70 houses planned for plots R25 and R26 should be re-allocated to an area that has suitable infrastructure capacity to accommodate the additional people and traffic. The 70 houses should be re-allocated to an area that had an identified housing need. This isn't that area in Blackmore. The argument against development of R25 and R26 were not heard because the extraordinary council meeting in November has gone on for too long. These arguments should have been heard and not just voted through with no discussion.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26148 - 6734 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26151 Object

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Hall [8684]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I do not feel BBC has properly investigated other sites for development which would be suitable and not GREEN BELT. Access from Red Rose Lane is unsuitable as it is a narrow country lane. The proposed sites are liable to flooding and will exacerbate the flooding problem already exists. The existing infrastructure and services - roads, parking, schools, doctor surgery is at capacity.

Change To Plan: No development

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26151 - 8684 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26154 Object

Respondent: Mr David Hall [4867]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated that there are no brownfield sites that are available which should take priority over green belt land. There are other more suitable locations e.g. urban extension to Brentwood. The proposed sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk. The school will not be able to accommodate more children. The doctors surgery can barely cope with the existing population.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26154 - 4867 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26159 Object

Respondent: Laura Harris [8685]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no consideration re: 30 houses built in Firgrith Hall Lane in EFDC, which will use services of Blackmore - doctor, shop, school - none which can cope now. There are plenty of other urban sites that could take this development. The infrastructure is not sufficient. In addition to the plan there are 20 homes on Chelmsford Road, Spriggs Lane. Red Rose Lane is an unsuitable lane for this traffic, it floods.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26159 - 8685 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26164 Object

Respondent: Susan Harris [8686]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is no consideration by BBC re: 30 houses in Firgrith Hall Lane in EFDC, which will use Blackmore services - doctors, shop, school. These cannot cope now. The infrastructure, namely Red Rose Lane is not sufficient for the amount of additional traffic. No consultations with EFDC which border village. There are other urban sites which could be developed. There is also other sites planned for development on Chelmsford Road, Spriggs Lane which amounts to 20 additional homes.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26164 - 8686 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26166 Object**Respondent: Mr Reginald Dawson [8687]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: * There has been no "Housing Needs Survey" to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP

* There are more suitable and sustainable locations - e.g. the Urban extension to Brentwood . The locations stated in Blackmore do not promote Sustainable development considering the limited facilities currently available

* Blackmore especially is an isolated village and access is via roads that have not been designed to meet the number of cars let alone the amount of heavy vehicles that would be required to build the number of houses in the current LDP.

* The local schools are running at full capacity therefore the children would have to be schooled outside of the village therefore increasing the traffic and pollution in the area

* Inadequate services available: to provide adequate School places in the Village. Access to Doctors appointments. In fact there is only 1 Doctors surgery covering all 5 Villages which are all being impacted by the LDP. Transport I Bus facilities are hardly adequate

* BBC fails to demonstrate there are other brownfield sites available

* These other Brownfield sites which are available which should take priority over the Greenfield (and Green Belt) land.

* BBC have failed to demonstrate that the required housing could not be met by increasing the housing density on other (Allocated or Brownfield) sites

* Proposed sites in Blackmore are all liable to flooding, therefore building on this land will no doubt increase the probability of flooding in the village with the impact on current residents

* The BBC have failed to consider the impact on Blackmore of the 30 dwellings proposed off Fingrith Hall Lane, with the BBC failing to consult Epping Forest District Council

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5 Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the Village School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area The single Doctors surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for appointments already standing at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required Current transport links for the villages would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the aging population

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26166 - 8687 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26168 Object**Respondent: Mr John Eaton [8124]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound. Inadequate infrastructure to support development i.e. doctors surgery, road network, drainage etc. There are other brown field sites in the area that could be developed, e.g. Stondon Massey.

Change To Plan: BBC should investigate other none Green Belt sites for development.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26168 - 8124 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26170 Object**Respondent: Mr Stephen Holland [8689]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Lack of infrastructure. Increase flood risk. Use of Green Belt inappropriate. Increase of traffic flow.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26170 - 8689 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26173 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Jones [8690]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: R25 and R26, Green Belt policy in section 08.

the green Belt was set up to stop villages being changed for ever by over-building. I feel 70 houses is far too many but also feel a smaller number say 20 would be reasonable. The local schools and doctors will be overstretched. There is not enough public transport to sustain this number of houses proposed.

Change To Plan: I agree with the Blackmore Village heritage Association plans.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26173 - 8690 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26182 Object**Respondent: Mr Ken Holmes [8691]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound because: 1. Access at Redrose Lane unsuitable for traffic. 2. Available brownfield sites should take priority over greenbelt. 3. Blackmore is not equipped to deal with more population on this scale. The school and doctors surgery are already stretched to capacity. 4. There are more suitable / sustainable locations than Blackmore.

Change To Plan: Remove Blackmore from the list of proposed sites.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26182 - 8691 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26183 Object**Respondent: Mrs Janet Jacobs [8692]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to 09 [R25 and R26], 04, 08

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26183 - 8692 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26185 Object**Respondent: Mrs Catherine Jennings [8693]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Object to R25 and R26. Proper procedures have not been followed resulting in Blackmore suddenly having 96 houses pushed on it after years of being assured that this gem of the Brentwood villages was safe. Regard to other nearby developments has only just been recognised - Top of Fingrith Hall Road, Woolmongers Lane and Spriggs Lane flats; also travellers in Chelmsford Road and Ingatestone Road. Also large mobile home site at Elm Farm.

Change To Plan: Extensive infrastructure improvement needed for flood prevention, sewage clearance, road and parking improvements, school crowded, poor road connections along windy narrow country lanes prone to flooding.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26185 - 8693 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

26187 Object**Respondent: Mrs Louise Woodford [8398]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: I consider the plan to be unsound as it will ruin the character of a beautiful village. The traffic, noise and disturbance, the visual impact, the strain on schools, doctor surgeries and loss of privacy will have a negative impact on everyone living in and around the village. I feel there are more suitable areas of Essex to build more houses. A sleepy village surrounded by greenbelt / an abundance of wildlife is not the place to cause such a disturbance.

Change To Plan: Modify the location. There are areas of Essex where houses can be built without causing such disturbance to people or wildlife.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26187 - 8398 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26189 Object**Respondent: Mrs. Susan Miers [8695]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No account has been taken of the c.30 dwellings at the top end of Fingrith Hall Lane. Blackmore and the impact these will have locally. Blackmore is an isolated village within the Green Belt, with very poor local services. No Library, very poor bus service, congested village lanes, severe parking problems at peak times, long delays 5/4 weeks for the local health center. Current primary school in need of development for any additional pupil intake. BBC has not shown that other brownfield sites are available. BBC has not shown that increased housing developments could be achieved by increasing housing density on other allocated sites. No Housing needs survey has been undertaken to show why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Local lanes are at capacity during peak travel times and the additional vehicle use of access to and from the site from Red Rose Lane opposite the Village Primary School will present significant traffic problems. There is inadequate provision for waste water removal in Blackmore. No report on these two sites in Blackmore have taken into account the biodiversity of impact on the local wildlife using these two greenfield sites which have not been in productive arable use for the last 20 years at least, and therefore are vital corridors for wildlife. Any development on these two greenfield sites will seriously affect the following bird species on the Birds of Conservation and Concern 4 (BOCC4) endangered listings. Red List . Starling, Song Thrush, House Sparrow, Tree Sparrow, Linnet, Twite, Yellowhammer. And on the BOCC4 Amber List. Dunnock, Bullfinch.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26189 - 8695 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26193 Object**Respondent: Mr Conrad Dixon [8688]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is unsound as it is not based n evidence relating to Blackmore, it ignores impact of village of greater surface water flooding risk; ignores capacity of local infrastructure - sewers, roads, public services. Plan is not legally compliant
Plan is not drawn up in cooperation with other local authorities

Change To Plan: It is clear that significant remediation of infrastructure would be needed for a sustainable development. Some of these would need to be in the conservation area to address flood risks, and that would have to be considered before work could be committed. I am unable to say whether these modifications would make the plan sound, sustainable , to even financially viable, as no such evaluation has been made.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26193 - 8688 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26195 Object**Respondent: Mr John Eaton [8124]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound proposal, inadequate infrastructure to support development ie GP, roads, drainage etc. there are other brownfield sites in the area that could be developed eg Stondon Massey.

Change To Plan: There are other brownfield sites in the area that could be developed. Eg Stondon Massey.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26195 - 8124 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26197 Object**Respondent: Cariss Tsui [8694]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Need to consider other development impact and infrastructure as well as this site, access is too narrow, school, GP both full. Build in better locations - Stondon Massey, brownfield sites, Don't build on Green Belt. Sites not justified , flooding, poor access, services.

Change To Plan: The plan needs to provide the best housing solution without destroying the heritage, charm and character of Blackmore Village. Other developments in the surrounding area need to be taken into consideration before using the greenbelt land. The other, more suitable, proposed sites should be used for example brownfield sites rather than the arable, greenbelt land. A housing needs survey which would address local needs and not houses just to make up the numbers needs to be undertaken. The environmental effects of the village development need to be assessed and taken into consideration. An investigation of how the Village is able to be sustainable with the influx of development and new tenants. Information that has already been provided needs to be read and taken into account along with the views of the current residents of the village. There should also be an opportunity for all residents to take part and express their views and have them taken into account. Even if they are unable to understand lengthy forms or are unable to communicate their views due to the complexity of the information or the way it is being presented to them.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26197 - 8694 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26201 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jacqueline Owen [4760]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Section 04
Section 08
Section 09 - policies R25 and R26.
Local plan is unsound due to failure to consult with Epping Forest District Council RE: 30 houses being built at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and impact on village.
There is not clear strategy for the village including Blackmore in the north of the borough.
Red Rose Lane is a narrow dangerous lane not road with a band which is blind for pedestrians and traffic with no pavement facilities. School parking is congested in this area impeding traffic into the village, at entry to Redrose Lane in Nine Ashes Road.
Doctors waiting lists for appointment is 4 weeks at times. The village is an unsafe area for pedestrians due to narrow uneven pavements and parking. Blackmore school is full to capacity. Buses for commuters without cars (teenagers etc) is unsatisfactory - no later than 7PL. Counted 8 Skylarks in fields adjacent to Nine Ashes Road last year, will they remain with heavier traffic on Rod? Blackmore Road floods (above waist high).

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP plan. Refer to BVHA neighbourhood plan which sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community. Such plans will merge Blackmore into an urban sprawl, something counter to Brentwood's statement to preserve our environment, heritage and character.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26201 - 4760 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26203 Object	Respondent: Ms Pauline Barry [8699]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Adverse impact on local amenities. Already too many cars on road.		
Change To Plan: Use brownfield sites instead.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26203 - 8699 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii	Tests: i, ii	Examination: Not Specified
26205 Object	Respondent: Mr Ron Beazley [4831]	Agent: N/A
Summary: This plan is ill thought out and will cause many problems with traffic in the centre of Blackmore. There are far too many vehicles at present and these additions will only add to the danger for particularly older residents and school children		
Change To Plan: We should not have more major infrastructure in Blackmore but should allow development of brownfield sites. With so many additional people local services which are already at breaking point will be over burdened and unable to operate satisfactory.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26205 - 4831 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified
26208 Object	Respondent: Mrs Eileen Beazley [8700]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Please listen to Blackmore villages. Visitors know Blackmore as a beauty spot in the middle of chaos. If further development is approved all its charm and uniqueness will disappear.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26208 - 8700 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv	Tests: i, ii, iii, iv	Examination: Not Specified
26209 Object	Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]	Agent: N/A
Summary: 1. Brentwood Borough Council failed to consult with neighbouring authorities i.e. Epping Forest District Council regarding 30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and its impact on our village. The people use our facilities in the village.		
Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26209 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	Tests: None	Examination: Yes
26211 Object	Respondent: Mr Neil Beney [8701]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Increase local traffic. The land that it is being built on is known to flood. The doctors is at its full capacity. Size of the school in the village.		
Change To Plan: I believe that there is no modification that can be made.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26211 - 8701 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - iii	Tests: iii	Examination: Not Specified
26213 Object	Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]	Agent: N/A
Summary: 2. No clear strategy for the village including Blackmore in the north of the Borough.		
Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26213 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None	Tests: None	Examination: Yes

26215 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. To have a residential development off Red Rose Lane is totally wrong - Blackmore is an isolated unique village with modest services and infrastructure. Also, this is a lane and not a road.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26215 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26217 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. There must be other more suitable and/or sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood to the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26217 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26219 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 5. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available which take priority over Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane before grabbing Green Belt land as an easy option which would benefit the developer.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26219 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26223 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 6. No housing need survey has been conducted for our village to demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26223 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26226 Object**Respondent: Mr John Caton [4881]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The development is developer led. No consideration for the adjacent authorities Plans - EFDC, who have permitted 30-40 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall, and have permission pending in Woolmongers lane. The proposed access is unsuitable. The construction of so many dwellings will overwhelm the Blackmore infrastructure - school is already full, the doctor surgery is difficult to get appointments now, parking is already insufficient. The urban extension to Brentwood which is already planned could be extended.

Change To Plan: BBC planners should refer to the Blackmore Village neighbourhood plan, which was properly composed and states what the village and villagers need. Far too many of what might have been thought of as affordable, have been extended, modified to the maximum and are no longer affordable. There are very few properties left in Blackmore of smaller, single storey bungalow type. The sites R25 and R26 should be taken out of the local development plan for the reasons given.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26226 - 4881 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26227 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 7. Blackmore has a history of flooding so would be concerned that more housing would further increase the flood risk elsewhere.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26227 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26229 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 8. Our school is full. My grandchildren who live in the village are driven to another school everyday 2 miles away. Also parents driving children to school cause chaos each day with inconsiderable parking and annoying local residents when using their roads to park.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26229 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26234 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 9. Our doctor practice is full, have trouble now getting appointment.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26234 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26236 Object**Respondent: Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The number of houses proposed is far too many for the small village. The infrastructure cannot cope - lack of parking, schools and doctor surgery are at capacity. New development will affect the wildlife. The new developments will change the whole feel of the village. In the past the village has been flooded. The site proposed are liable to flooding. More houses means more cars means more pollution

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 and R26

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26236 - 7016 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26238 Object**Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 10. The traffic using our village has increased in the last 10 years and is now horrendous. The residents cannot park in the centre of the village to shop because there is no parking available. We have visitors to the village which are welcomed and they use the businesses, but other are racing through our village to get to the A12 and M11 etc when there are accidents breakdown on the A12 and exit at the Mountnessing roundabout.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: None Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26238 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26240 Object

Respondent: Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 11. At a recent meeting at our village hall where BBC planners attended, they referred that Lanes were Roads; this is not the case. They are lanes with ditches either side and difficult to drive down hoping that no-one meets you coming the other way. These lanes are used by horse riders, cyclists and cyclists who race and belong to clubs and Blackmore is a favoured venue for these cyclists.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26240 - 8118 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26245 Object

Respondent: Mrs Susan Capes [8702]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The local infrastructure is already at capacity - GP services, schools, narrow roads, limited parking. Blackmore is already prone to flooding. Transport links from the village to town are poor. There is no proven need for more housing in Blackmore. The proposed development is on Green Belt land when there are Brown Belt area more usefully located closer to Brentwood and Shenfield. The proposal does not take into account the increased housing from areas of private development within Blackmore. Blackmore is small village of historical importance and character. Further development, will damage it irreversibly.

Change To Plan: I do not think that any modification will be able to make the plan sustainable for Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26245 - 8702 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26247 Object

Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Brentwood Borough Council failed to consult with neighbouring authorities i.e. Epping Forest District Council regarding 30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and its impact on our village. The people use our facilities in the village.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26247 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26249 Object

Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. No clear strategy for the village including Blackmore in the north of the Borough.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26249 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26254 Object

Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. To have a residential development off Red Rose Lane is totally wrong - Blackmore is an isolated unique village with modest services and infrastructure. Also, this is a lane and not a road.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26254 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26257 Object**Respondent: Mrs Beryl Caton [8704]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Development of the proposed site has not been proven to be what is required in the village. Development by neighbouring authorities (e.g. Epping DC) have not been considered. Brownfield sites within BBC's authority have not been considered over Green field sites. The proposed development of 90 plus houses is far too many for the existing infrastructure, particularly Red Rose Lane for traffic 'and often local roads, doctors surgery and the local primary school.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDO. In accordance with 'local needs' some smaller homes could be allowed which would give existing residents the choice to "downsize", redeeming their (?) home.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26257 - 8704 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26258 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 4. There must be other more suitable and/or sustainable locations e.g. urban extensions to Brentwood to the locations in Blackmore do not promote sustainable development.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26258 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26260 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 5. BBC has not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available which take priority over Green Belt land off Red Rose Lane before grabbing Green Belt land as an easy option which would benefit the developer.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26260 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26262 Object**Respondent: Mr Steven Corby [8705]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: The proposed sites are liable to flood and building on this land will also increase the flood risk elsewhere in a village that is prone to severe flooding. Brentwood Borough Council has failed to demonstrate that the provided housing could not be met by increasing housing density on other allocated sites. They have also not demonstrated that there are other brownfield sites that are available which should have priority over the greenfield site off Red Rose Lane.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BCHA Neighbourhood Plan which (?) sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26262 - 8705 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26263 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 6. No housing need survey has been conducted for our village to demonstrate why Blackmore has been included in the LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26263 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26266 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 7. Blackmore has a history of flooding so would be concerned that more housing would further increase the flood risk elsewhere.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26266 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26268 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 8. Our school is full. My grandchildren who live in the village are driven to another school everyday 2 miles away. Also parents driving children to school cause chaos each day with inconsiderable parking and annoying local residents when using their roads to park.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26268 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26269 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 9. Our doctor practice is full, have trouble now getting appointment.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26269 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26272 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 10. The traffic using our village has increased in the last 10 years and is now horrendous. The residents cannot park in the centre f the village to shop because there is no parking available. We have visitors to the village which are welcomed and they use the businesses, but other are racing through our village to get to the 414 and M11 etc when there are accidents breakdown on the A12 and exit at the Mountnessing roundabout.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26272 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26274 Object**Respondent: Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: 11. In my opinion, Blackmore is a unique village and should remain so, it is its openness that gives it its identity and quaintness.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26274 - 8703 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26279 Object**Respondent: Mr Michael Williams [8706]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Major concerns about flooding in village due to additional strain on the drainage / sewage systems. Overload on already strained infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors surgery, parking facilities. Additional traffic and parking problems on already overused country lanes which were not designed for heavy traffic. Building on green belt is not acceptable when brown fill sites are available.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26279 - 8706 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26284 Object

Respondent: Mrs Julie Ann Williams [8707]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Major concerns about flooding in village due to additional strain on the drainage / sewage systems. Overload on already strained infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors surgery, parking facilities. Additional traffic and parking problems on already overused country lanes which were not designed for heavy traffic. Building on green belt is not acceptable when brown fill sites are available.

Change To Plan: 1. Remove the site from the plan and look at alternative brown fill sites and building fills. 2. Ask and consult local residents about what is required in the local district. 3. Discuss with the local councillors who know their area.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26284 - 8707 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26286 Object

Respondent: Mr Jon Watson [7112]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The sites propose in Blackmore are within the greenbelt. There is an exceptional need for housing in Blackmore and in the absence of any special circumstances it would appear that the proposal is entirely inappropriate. There is already severe pressure on vital services such as schooling and health care. Blackmore is a small village which will lose its character completely if this huge development goes ahead.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26286 - 7112 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26289 Object

Respondent: Mr John Wollaston [8183]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been insufficient consultation with either the village or neighbouring councils to show clearly what impact these developments will have on the village and its environment. Access to basic services and infrastructure is limited - schools, doctors, roads, parking sewage and drainage. The choice of Red Rose Lane, a narrow country lane, as a site for major urban expansion is wholly inappropriate and could only operate safely with major expansion of it and the surrounding roads. Transport links for commuters are currently inadequate and would inevitably increase the demand for use of private transport.

Change To Plan: There has been no adequate housing need survey. There has been no projected traffic survey to assess the impact of the proposed development. The needs to be greater consultation with those impacted by the development of the village and ensure that it does simply become a urban suburb of Brentwood.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26289 - 8183 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26293 Object

Respondent: Mr Neil Warner [8709]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I understand that there has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. There should be clear evidence that all brownfield sites in the Borough have been fully utilised in an development plan. There is insufficient local infrastructure to cope with the planned housing expansion.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing need.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26293 - 8709 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26297 Object

Respondent: Mrs. Gillian Warner [8710]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Brownfield sites in the Borough as a whole should be developed before ever considering green field and green belt sites. I understand there has been no "housing needs survey" to demonstrate that Blackmore should be in the LDP. The infrastructure in and around the village is already exhausted. Blackmore cannot take more housing without extensive changes to the infrastructure.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out local housing need

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26297 - 8710 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26299 Object

Respondent: Ms Nicoltte Unwin [8711]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Schools over populated. Doctors over populated. 3 week waits. (Removal of main Port Office to ingatestone) a year which makes queries in shop very busy all the time.

Change To Plan: Cannot believe you are even thinking about building houses here as there seems to be houses going up everywhere example Ford Motor Company. Brentwood 350 house within the next 5 years. 100s of houses at bughleigh Park Chelmsford as a massive estate being build in Witham. Is this really needed.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26299 - 8711 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26301 Object

Respondent: Mr Alex Atkins [8126]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Brentwood Council has not consulted with Epping Forest Council. 2. No Housing Need Survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. 3. Blackmore has a history of flooding, concerned with future flood risks in the village. 4. The village will not be able to cope with the increased volume of traffic. 5. Worried that Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that all brownfield sites are being used over Green Belt land. 6. The infrastructure of the village is already full. The doctors, primary school and local shop already have parking issues.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26301 - 8126 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26303 Object

Respondent: Ms Hayley Atkins [8712]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Brentwood Council has not consulted with Epping Forest Council. 2. No Housing Need Survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. 3. Blackmore has a history of flooding, concerned with future flood risks in the village. 4. The village will not be able to cope with the increased volume of traffic. 5. Worried that Brentwood Council has not demonstrated that all brownfield sites are being used over Green Belt land. 6. The infrastructure of the village is already full. The doctors, primary school and local shop already have parking issues.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26303 - 8712 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26305 Object

Respondent: Ms Margaret Allan [8713]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a village with no infrastructure to cope with the proposed dwellings, i.e. parking, bus service, schools, doctors full to capacity at the moment. There must be more suitable sites available in the Borough before using Green Belt sites. The road access from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for the volume of traffic planned for this site. The proposed sites are liable to flood, and will increase the risk of flooding to the rest of the village.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26305 - 8713 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26307 Object

Respondent: Mr John Allan [8714]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Has the impact of c.30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane been considered what effect will it have on the village.
2. If you built in this area how is the infrastructure going to cope i.e. traffic, schools, doctors full
3. There must be brownfield sites that should be looked at before using Green Belt sites.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26307 - 8714 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26309 Object

Respondent: Mr Christopher J Atkins [8715]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Council not consulted with Epping Forest District Council regarding 30 dwellings at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane and its impact on village.
2. No clear strategy for the village.
3. Development off Red Rose Lane is totally wrong. Blackmore is an unique village and should remain so.
4. Use brownfield sites before Green Belt.
5. Traffic in village is bad.
6. Doctors full to capacity.
7. Flooding a huge problem.
8. No housing need survey has been conducted for our village
9. Do not kill off the habitats of the wildlife and wild flowers to replace with houses.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26309 - 8715 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26311 Object

Respondent: Mr Paul Anthony [6823]

Agent: N/A

Summary: - Major concerns over local infrastructure. Havent seen any plans to ensure issues around roads, flooding, safety will be addressed.
- How are other housing development e.g. Fingrith Hall Lane being considered- haven't seen nothing on this?
- Dealing with parking by Co-op and outside schools
- How will flood risk be mitigated?
- School is full
- Explain why brownfields sites are not more suitable
- Traffic is already dangerous, there has been no planning for how this would be dealt with to make it safe for pedestrians.

Change To Plan: - Full and transparent review of flood risk mitigation strategy.
- Show plans for infrastructure improvements around traffic and parking
- Consider other sites, brownfield sites where there will be better infrastructure, schools, shops and show the result of this review. Demonstrate what other sites were considered and why not suitable.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26311 - 6823 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26314 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lorraine Wisdom [8718]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The residential development of off Red Rose Lane will worsen the already stretched local services due to the increased number of residents i.e. doctors surgery, schools (primary and senior). Parking in the village is limited. Volume of traffic is detrimental and unsuitable for the location on/from Red Rose Lane. Proposed sites are liable to flooding and development on this land will increase the flood risk in the village has suffered from flooding previously. No housing need survey conducted. Brownfield sites should be developed first before building on greenbelt. Additional housing development in a 3-4 mile radius (Roman Road, Mountnessing 91; Toby Lane 90+) will want to use the facilities in surrounding area including Blackmore village. Has this been looked into my BBC and any effect it has or will have on our services locally?

Change To Plan: None I can think of other than a new site being found which is more suitable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26314 - 8718 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26316 Object

Respondent: Mr Thomas Bury [8717]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 1. Although there is need for new affordable housing, this is vast over-egging of the cake, given the ongoing construction of 30+ new dwellings at the top of our lane.
2. The infrastructure and services in the village are totally inadequate to deal with such a housing population "explosion". The primary school would have to be rebuilt, the surgery is already overburdened.
3. There has been no consultation or housing need survey.
4. Red Rose Lane floods regularly.
5. Access to Red Rose Lane via/from any direction is simply not designed to cope with the volume of traffic.

Change To Plan: Plan's objectives should be:
1. more pragmatic approach with thorough consultation
2. a staged evolution to how many houses are built as opposed to this planned "revolution"
3. detailed, budgeted, thought through plans for the village's road and transport system, enlargement of school, the implication for the surgery, post office.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26316 - 8717 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26318 Object

Respondent: Ms Lynn Baggott [8721]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Unsound as other building projects are under consideration and are not included in the BBC Plans. Doctors surgery full, school full. Traffic will cause many problems as most households have at least 2 cars and living in Blackmore, a car is essential. Epping Council are building on the boundary of Blackmore and this will have serious impacts on what at the moment is still a village of historic interest to many visitors.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed. The BVHA Plan clearly sets out our local housing needs.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26318 - 8721 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26320 Object

Respondent: Mr Alan Bird [8722]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Endorsed the fears expressed by all regarding grossly overload already stretched amenities. It is very difficult to get a doctor appointment, parking is a problem. I believe the local school is already full. Traffic has become quite dangerous on our narrow roads with many large lorries.

Change To Plan: Site R25 & R26 removed from the LDP. Refer to BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which sets out housing needs for our community.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26320 - 8722 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26325 Object

Respondent: Ms Maria J Bennett [8723]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposed development positioned on a road subject to flooding (where it meets Nine Ashes Road and Red Rose Farm). Red Rose Lane far too narrow to accommodate increased volume of traffic. Blackmore already had a new development at the top of Fingrith Hall Lane; another substantially larger development will greatly impact on waiting times at GP surgery, volume of parked vehicles, congestion in the centre of the village, local school capacity, as well as further generated traffic from parents/buses taking children to neighbouring village school.

Change To Plan: Consideration should be given to the potential flood risks and impacts on the rest of the village. Is the road going to be widened? School and GP should be consulted, how will they cope with the increased number of residents?

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26325 - 8723 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26332 Object

Respondent: Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Blackmore is a small village with narrow street and limited services. The existing infrastructure - schools, doctor surgery, roads, parking, sewage and drainage - are already overstretched and unable to support additional development. The area is prone to flooding which will only be worsen by development.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. Blackmore Village Heritage Association in cooperation with the local Parish Councils will be producing a local needs plan that will look at the actual needs within the local area for what is already a sustainable community rather than producing a plan that just seeks to help the Borough Council meet its housing quota, and planners should instead refer to this and produce an updated plan in cooperation with the local community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26332 - 8720 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26334 Object**Respondent: Mr Robert J Brittleton [8724]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated or shown other suitable sites (brown belt) for consideration. The primary + preschool are full. The Plan will not only have a detrimental effect on schools but also the doctors which are vastly oversubscribed. There will be an increase in traffic to local shop where there is very little parking causing unsafe condition on the village roads. No housing need survey to demonstrate why Blackmore was chosen. There are more suitable sites not considered. Red Rose Lane is too congested, liable to flood. The infrastructure in the village cannot sustain the amount of proposed houses.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 & R26 should be removed from LDP.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26334 - 8724 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26336 Object**Respondent: Mrs Kelly BRITTLETON [8097]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: BBC has not demonstrated other suitable Brown Belt sites considered. Blackmore infrastructure i.e. school, pre-school, doctors, shops, parking and traffic will be threatened, unsafe and unmanageable with the increase in houses. There are more suitable locations but BBC has not demonstrated why Blackmore or why Green Belt. or why not increasing density on other allocations. Red Rose Lane is a lane and unsuitable as it is opposite an already congested part of the village by schools and clubs. Proposed sites are liable to flood. Our heritage village should be protected, not stressed.

Change To Plan: Re-allocate suitably elsewhere: Dunton, Stondon Massey, Brentwood
Sites R25 & R26 removed from Plan
Planners should read and refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26336 - 8097 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26338 Object**Respondent: Mr & Mrs Melvin & Joy Wright [8725]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No comments made on form. Modifications read: We feel both sites R25 & R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan shows what housing needs require. We have no infrastructure to accommodate the people you wish to place in the house you wish to build.

Change To Plan: We feel both sites R25 & R26 should be removed from the LDP. The BVHA Neighbourhood Plan shows what housing needs require. We have no infrastructure to accommodate the people you wish to place in the house you wish to build.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26338 - 8725 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26340 Object**Respondent: Mrs. P. Bakdwin [8726]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Housing shouldn't be built to accommodate the overspill of London. Brentwood is currently considered outer London but it won't be long before it becomes part of Greater London. More schools are needed with smaller class sizes. The existing infrastructure is insufficient. Concerned about the transformation of the area is the development goes ahead.

Change To Plan: Is this the best site are there not enough small infill plots around Brentwood or are they not economically viable for builders (Take look at the Manafly(?) Directors actual income of building companies)>

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26340 - 8726 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26342 Object**Respondent: Mrs Jeannette Butcher [8727]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Increased traffic and flooding. Doctor surgery is full.

Change To Plan: Remove from LDP

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26342 - 8727 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26344 Object	Respondent: Mr Michael Black [1291]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The infrastructure, eg car parking, doctors surgery, schools, will struggle to cope with the increase in number of families coming into the village, Blackmore.		
Change To Plan: There are a number of other sites that should be considered before Blackmore.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26344 - 1291 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii		Tests: ii
		Examination: Not Specified
26346 Object	Respondent: Mrs Ruth Black [8728]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Other developments are not being taken into consideration. Impact on village school, doctors surgery, parking and road etc.		
Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26346 - 8728 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii		Tests: i, ii, iii
		Examination: Not Specified
26348 Object	Respondent: Mr Cliff Black [8729]	Agent: N/A
Summary: I do not feel that other developments by councils such as Chelmsford and Epping Forest are being taken into consideration and the strain they will add to Blackmore public services. The access roads to the proposed sites in Red Rose Lane do not appear to support this level of development		
Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: No	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26348 - 8729 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified
26350 Object	Respondent: Mrs Janet Birch [8730]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Infrastructure and services unable cope now - parking, doctors surgery - only one shop.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26350 - 8730 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified
26354 Object	Respondent: Mr Arthur Birch [4769]	Agent: N/A
Summary: Blackmore has only modest facilities and would struggle to accommodate these developments. Locally traffic seems to be mushroomed. Parking in the village centre is difficult. I think there are other allocated sites which could accommodate these developments more easily.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26354 - 4769 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified
26358 Object	Respondent: Mrs Maureen Butler [5017]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The infrastructure of the village is no capable of with standing the amount of housing being proposed.		
Change To Plan:		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26358 - 5017 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified
26360 Object	Respondent: Mrs Beryl Burgess [5030]	Agent: N/A
Summary: The local infrastructure and services - parking, doctors surgery, bus service - are not sufficient and cannot support the proposed development. Area prone to flooding.		
Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan.		
Legally Compliant?: Not Specified	Duty to Co-operate?: No	Sound?:No
Full Reference: O - 26360 - 5030 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv		Tests: i, ii, iii, iv
		Examination: Not Specified

26377 Object

Respondent: Mrs Kim Barber [8731]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound as no clear strategy for villages, inc. Blackmore, in the north of the borough. Sever impact on Blackmore of construction of dwelling as village cannot support services, i.e. school, doctors, bus service, etc. No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26377 - 8731 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26385 Object

Respondent: Mr. Colin Barber [919]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Plan is unsound as no clear strategy for villages, including Blackmore, in the north of the borough. Sever impact on Blackmore of construction of dwelling as village cannot support services, i.e. school, doctors, bus service, etc. No 'housing needs survey' to show why Blackmore is included in LDP.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP. The planners should refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out our local housing needs for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26385 - 919 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26387 Object

Respondent: Mr Martin Clark [2456]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan is not NPPF compliant on many points: e.g. to meet local need, to include local community, responsive to local circumstances, to limit the need to travel, to carry out flood risk assessment, to protect and enhance biodiversity, to conserve the historic environment.

Change To Plan: * Consultation required with neighboring authorities this would show several developments that would impact on local services in Blackmore and cater for some local housing needs.

* Location needs to be re-assessed. There is no proven need that Blackmore need this number of houses being distant from transport links and there being little local employment.

* Detailed flood risk analysis required.

* Assess possibility of smaller scale brownfield developments within the area to cater for local need If any is proven.

* Re-assess the development of sites around the transport hubs (Brentwood, Dunton, etc.) to cater for the Borough's housing needs and reduce the demands on the already stretched rural infrastructure to the north of Brentwood.

* Develop a strategic approach to the Villages north of Brentwood by consultation.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26387 - 2456 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26392 Object

Respondent: Mrs Anita Clark [8168]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Very little local infrastructure. Local roads are rural and not designed for large traffic flow, 70 houses will add 100+ cars to the village. R25 and R26 are far from employment opportunities. There is no proven need for houses in this area. The local community's opinions and local survey results have been ignored. Sites R25 and R26 were discounted under previous plans why is it now deemed to be acceptable to develop on these Green Belt sites? There is no 'joined up' strategy for the villages in the north of the borough or discussion with adjacent authorities.

Change To Plan: To be legally compliant the plan needs to comply with the NPPF guidance. This calls for:

* Local community Involvement. There has been none to meet local needs. There is no proven need. * Green Belt to be protected. R25 and R26 are on Green Belt land. Locations need to be selected to minimize the need to travel. Blackmore is a small village with few local employment opportunities. * All of these Issues need to be assessed for the LDP to comply.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26392 - 8168 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26394 Object**Respondent: Mr John Adkins [8734]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Adding 70 houses to the village is excessive - to share the existing shop, schools etc it does not take into account the 30+ houses being built by Epping Forest Council outside our village but will all expect to be 'serviced' by the existing village. Not possible unless we can ban them from using our facilities.

Change To Plan: Offset the number of houses by 30 (the number being built by Epping Forest Council next to our village) so 70-30=40 absolutely maximum.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26394 - 8734 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26398 Object**Respondent: Ms Anne Adkins [8735]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Not legally compliant. No consultation.

Change To Plan: Remove R25 & R26. Consult local needs.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26398 - 8735 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26401 Object**Respondent: Ms Elizabeth Arthur [8736]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Plan is completely unsound. Site is in Green Belt, only brownfield sites should ever be considered. Traffic access via Blackmore is already compromised with poor parking, narrow lane and busy. A huge increase of local traffic will make the village a car park. Infrastructure is suited to a small village, not such an increase in population. Flooding: our roads are already compromised by filed run off, more houses will cause considerable damage to property.

Change To Plan: A far more in depth study of other suitable options to provide housing.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26401 - 8736 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26403 Object**Respondent: Ms Mandy Anthony [8737]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Unsound. No demonstration of how flooding or general infrastructure will be dealt with. Blackmore cannot cope with this number of houses: schools are busy and I haven't seen anything that proves new problems will be managed.

Change To Plan: Would like to see what plans have been prepared to consider: - flood risk - safety issue relating to increased traffic - how this plan has been drafted in line with other regions, e.g. Epping houses being built at Fingrith Hall Lane - show the housing needs survey - sustainable plan for Blackmore.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26403 - 8737 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

26410 Object**Respondent: Mrs Ella Bradley [4875]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure - schools, doctors surgery, parking, drainage, roads - unable to cope.

Change To Plan: I really can't see what modifications could be considered in view of the infrastructure of the village. In view of my previous comments - the potential flooding - the narrow lanes - the parking - schools, doctors at full capacity.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26410 - 4875 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26412 Object**Respondent: Mr. Gordon John Beman [8739]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: All local services and infrastructure is at capacity - roads, drainage, schools, doctor surgery, parking, shop. Area is prone to flooding.

Change To Plan: Plots R25 and R26 should both be removed from the LDP on two points. 1. We already have several plots under consideration for development by property developers both in and surrounding areas. 2. BBC have chosen to ignore several suitable sites for development including neglected "brownfield options".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26412 - 8739 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, iii, iv

26414 Object **Respondent: Mr. Robert Beeching [3839]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: No consideration of developments in other neighbouring authorities. Local schools and medical facilities are at capacity. Flooding issues.

Change To Plan: Green belt land should be developed as a last resort - there are plenty of other sites in around Brentwood where better facilities exist.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26414 - 3839 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26416 Object **Respondent: Mr Peter Burgess [4863]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - school, doctors surgery, parking. Area prone to flooding. No housing needs survey done.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the BVHA Neighbourhood Plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26416 - 4863 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26419 Object **Respondent: Ms Margaret Boreham [8033]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - school, doctors surgery, parking. Area prone to flooding. No housing needs survey done.

Change To Plan: scrap it

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26419 - 8033 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii

26422 Object **Respondent: Mr David Baines [8740]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure are at capacity - school, doctors surgery, parking. Area prone to flooding. No housing needs survey done. More suitable locations elsewhere. Lack of consideration of village needs.

Change To Plan: Consider the local needs as outlined by the BVHA plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26422 - 8740 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26431 Object **Respondent: Mrs Rachel Caward [8742]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore services and infrastructure - roads, drainage, parking, schools, doctor surgery - are already at capacity and cannot accommodation any additional people / dwellings.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26431 - 8742 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26432 Object **Respondent: Mr Lee Caward [8741]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Blackmore services and infrastructure - roads, drainage, parking, schools, doctor surgery - are already at capacity and cannot accommodation any additional people / dwellings.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of proposed houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. The infrastructure would have to be greatly improved with roads into the village being improved. School places would need to be found without having to drive to another part of Brentwood thus increasing pollution. A new GP Surgery would be needed as the only one in the village is under substantial pressure with waiting time for appointments at up to 3 weeks. Links for the villages via public transport would need to be sufficient for the ageing population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26432 - 8741 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26442 Object**Respondent: Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Blackmore seems to have been chosen by developers rather than BBC as other non-greenbelt sites are available in Stondon Massey and surrounds. Remove R25 and R26 from the LDP and consult BVHA local neighbourhood plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26442 - 7309 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26447 Object**Respondent: Mrs Wendy Dunbar [8743]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 to be removed from the LDP and Planners to refer to the BVHA neighbourhood plan which details the local housing needs, etc.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26447 - 8743 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26449 Object**Respondent: Mr Reginald Dawson [8744]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Remove and drastically reduce the number of houses in Blackmore to a maximum of 5. Infrastructure would have to be dramatically improved with improved roads into the Village. School places would need to be found without increasing the need to drive to another village or Brentwood thus increasing pollution in the area. The single doctor surgery which supports all 5 parishes is already under immense pressure with waiting times for an appointment already standing at up to 3 weeks. A new doctors surgery or funding for more doctors would be required. Current transport links for the villages would need to be guaranteed to be sufficient for the aging population.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26449 - 8744 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26451 Object**Respondent: Mr Lewis Pincombe [8745]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: use local other brownfield site in the area before using green belt land. Simple.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26451 - 8745 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - ii, iii, iv

26453 Object**Respondent: Mrs Lindsey Pavitt [8746]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs modifying to consider other local areas suitable for development in the Brentwood locality. The Local Plan also has to be reviewed to consider other development in progress of 30 or more houses within 2 miles of Blackmore which will put more pressure on the village roads and amenities. Where will children from the existing new development and the proposed development go to school? Can roads within and around Blackmore cope with considerably more traffic? The existing roads are narrow, in a poor condition and with pot holes at the sides already. Areas in the village which already, or in the past, have flooded quite seriously must surely be considered before more houses are built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26453 - 8746 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26455 Object

Respondent: Mr Anthony Pavitt [8747]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: The Local Plan needs modifying to consider other local areas suitable for development in the Brentwood locality. The Local Plan also has to be reviewed to consider other development in progress of 30 or more houses within 2 miles of Blackmore which will put more pressure on the village roads and amenities. Where will children from the existing new development and the proposed development go to school ? Can roads within and around Blackmore cope with considerably more traffic? The existing roads are narrow, in a poor condition and with pot holes at the sides already. Areas in the village which already, or in the past, have flooded quite seriously must surely be considered before more houses are built.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26455 - 8747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26460 Object

Respondent: Mr John Orbell [4805]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No housing need surgery completed. Site is greenbelt and should not be built on. The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. No consultation with the local community and no consideration of developments within neighbouring authorities.

Change To Plan: Sites R25 and R26 be removed from the LDP Plan. You need to refer to the Blackmore Village Heritage Association for our Local Housing Needs for our sustainable community. We do not want unwanted and unjustified large scale development. There has been no 'Housing Needs Survey' to demonstrate why Blackmore is included in the LDP. Was it not the Brentwood Borough Council who said "we will continue to protect our key assets including the environment, heritage and character of the borough".

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26460 - 4805 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26464 Object

Respondent: Mrs Karen York [8748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited.

Change To Plan: Please refer to the plan put together by BVHA

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26464 - 8748 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26467 Object

Respondent: Cllr Roger Keeble [1990]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The area is prone to flooding and will be worsened if the development goes forward. The local services and infrastructure - school, doctor surgery, roads, drainage, parking - are already at capacity. Public transport is very limited. Limited employment opportunities in the village. No consideration of the developments in neighbouring authorities. The original draft Plan discounted Blackmore as it did not align with the council's strategy, and this has not changed.

Change To Plan: The moving of 25 and R26 sites out of the LDP could be mitigated by increasing the numbers of properties built at Dunton Garden Village. This occurred with the transfer of 260 properties to DGV in amendment I of the extraordinary council on 8th November 2018. This was done because the access to the properties down Honeypot Lane which is bounded by historical hedges, deep ditches and no change of a pavement for pedestrians. 70 houses could be included into the urban area by increasing density of development in areas where both transport and employment lines are far superior to R25 and R26.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26467 - 1990 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26493 Object

Respondent: Mr Surinder Panesar [8749]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Impact on natural environment including increased flooding risk and going against the purpose of the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP and planners should refer to the BVHA neighbourhood Plan which clearly sets out the local housing needs, for our already sustainable community.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26493 - 8749 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26494 Object **Respondent: Mrs Annabelle Panesar [8750]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site allocations are inappropriate.

Change To Plan: Site R25 and R26 to be removed. BVHA neighbourhood Plan sets out the local housing needs, that are sustainable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26494 - 8750 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26499 Object **Respondent: Mrs Linda Watkinson [4984]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Site is in the green belt. Development should be focused in more sustainable areas, and not in areas like Blackmore which is in the greenbelt. Local services and infrastructure are at full capacity - school, GP surgery, roads, drainages, sewage utilities. Limited public transport.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26499 - 4984 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

26502 Object **Respondent: Ms Lesley Whan [8751]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Local services and infrastructure are already at capacity - school, GP surgery, limited parking. Area is prone to flooding. Site is green belt.

Change To Plan: The road system is inadequate - major changes would have to be made. Realising the pressure that local councils are facing with direct figures in new builds. Surely, less greenbelt area can be found. The area regularly suffers power cuts therefore a major upgrade would be necessary. Similarly, water pressure is extremely low therefore there would be a major impact on the local population. An extension, or new build, would have to be made at Blackmore Primary School. In conclusion therefore what would be the best for the above, and some of the others that haven't been mentioned. Who would fit the bill?

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:No Tests: i, ii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 26502 - 8751 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii

26507 Object **Respondent: Mr John Fowles [8373]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The plan is unsound, not legally compliant and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate. yet again green belt is being developed on. Blackmore struggles to deal with the amount of traffic and parking and will not cope with the new development. Doctors surgeries, schools, public amenities are already at breaking point, how will they cope. Increased risk of flooding.

Change To Plan: Withdraw the plan as it stands. Consider brownfield sites, in fills and derelict properties. Use parish council to communicate with the residents. Establish a realistic proposal via the residents/parish council

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26507 - 8373 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

26573 Object **Respondent: Mr & Mrs Gunthardt [8790]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: Our objections to the proposed development reflected the general views expressed by our Parish Council and those of a large proportion of the Village population. We feel strongly that the proposed development including the latest revised LDP would negatively impact on the unique character of the Blackmore Village and put undue strain on its already strained infrastructure and services including traffic and parking facilities, access to the local school, lack of adequate medical facilities, flooding etc. We also understand that there are now plans to build a further 70 properties just outside our borough which will cause further strain on the resources and infrastructure of our village. We fully support the efforts and views expressed by our local Parish Council. We trust that you will fully take into account of the views expressed by the residents of our village.

Change To Plan: Remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:Not Specified Tests: None Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 26573 - 8790 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - None

22689 Support

Respondent: Mr Richard Swift [1747]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support Policy R26 to release this site from the Green Belt to provide new homes for first time buyers, local residents and for those wishing to downsize without leaving Blackmore. The village will lose its vitality and potentially current services if it doesn't continue to thrive.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22689 - 1747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22690 Support

Respondent: Mr Richard Swift [1747]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There has been no new development in Blackmore for almost 50 years, I imagine many local people would want to be able to move to a new modern home and remain close to their roots.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22690 - 1747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22691 Support

Respondent: Mr Richard Swift [1747]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The site North of Orchard Piece has good natural barriers and is only a short walk to the centre of the village. Redrose Lane represents the edge of the settlement. We have never experienced surface water flooding since 1956 on this site. A development in this site will actually improve the water management in this area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22691 - 1747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22694 Support

Respondent: Mr Richard Swift [1747]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Locally based, Crest Nicholson has won national awards for the standard of its housing design and landscaping and has the expertise and capacity to deliver housing which is lacking in the local area.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22694 - 1747 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22695 Support

Respondent: Ms Virginia Stiff [1748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: All the relevant evidence has been considered for this plan, taking into account all the constraints that have had to be taken into account. This site is a logical extension to the existing settlement boundary of Blackmore. It would represent limited release of Green Belt land to meet local needs to 2033 and ensure Blackmore village remains a vital "inclusive, balanced, sustainable community" (S03). The site was first supported in the SHLAA (2010) and in the Draft Site Assessment (July 2013) Ref G070A.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22695 - 1748 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22699 Support

Respondent: Ms Virginia Stiff [1748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: During the past 50 years, very little housing has been allowed in the village and, given the population has increased by a third during this time, I believe now is the time to allow other families to benefit from being able to live in the village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22699 - 1748 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22700 Support

Respondent: Ms Virginia Stiff [1748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Approving development of this site would ensure the village of Blackmore thrives and is indeed invigorated. The Council will ensure that any services such as education and healthcare where there are extra demands will be given additional investment.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22700 - 1748 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22701 Support

Respondent: Ms Virginia Stiff [1748]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I have known this land for almost 60 years and have never known it to flood.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22701 - 1748 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22703 Support

Respondent: Mrs Christine Blythe [4718]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This site is suitable for Green Belt release in order to provide new homes for the local community and to ensure development is not limited to the centre and south of the Borough. It will also help address insufficient housing stock for down-sizing in Blackmore and provide a boost to the village.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22703 - 4718 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

22706 Support

Respondent: Mrs Christine Blythe [4718]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The last development in the village of Blackmore took place in the 1960s; therefore Policy R26 would serve to: update the housing stock to meet new design and energy efficient features (SP01: Sustainable development); increase housing in a larger village to meet local needs in the next 15 years (SP02: Managing growth); ☐ Provide mixed housing, with some smaller units in a desirable setting that will encourage social interaction (HP01).

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 22706 - 4718 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23273 Support

Respondent: Mid and South Essex STP (Kerry Harding) [3791]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Anticipated mitigation as a result of development on this site should include contribution towards increasing capacity by means of extension, reconfiguration or refurbishment or/and recruitment costs.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23273 - 3791 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23915 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Savills UK (Mr Ben Thomas) [2271]

Summary: Strongly support the principle of allocating Land north of Orchard Piece (R26) but object to the indicative housing quantum. Releasing this site from the Green Belt to meet Blackmore's existing and future housing and socio-economic requirements is entirely appropriate, in accordance with the Settlement Strategy. However, the reduction in quantum of homes from 40 to 30 homes does not align with detailed technical evidence, nor is it compliant with Plan Policy HP03 which seeks to maximise the density of development (at a minimum of 35 dwellings per hectare) through a design-led approach.

Change To Plan: The wording of the site allocation be amended to reinstate the indicative capacity of the development to circa 40 units.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23915 - 2509 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, iii

23917 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Savills UK (Mr Ben Thomas) [2271]

Summary: Some residents have noted incidents of surface water ponding along Redrose Lane during excessive periods of rainfall. However, the area noted is beyond the eastern boundary of the site where the watercourse is culverted under Redrose Lane. Given the local topography, the flooding depth in Redrose Lane has a negligible impact upon the site. As a precautionary measure, the minimum floor level of the proposed dwellings will be raised by approximately 300mm. In addition, ditches along the boundary of development could be implemented. The engineered SuDS will provide a betterment to the existing situation.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23917 - 2509 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iii, iv

23922 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Savills UK (Mr Ben Thomas) [2271]

Summary: Support but concern over clarity and enforceability of the requirement to reserve 25% of the proposed dwellings for people with a strong and demonstrable local connection or those over 50 years of age, and these dwellings should comprise affordable housing. There is no definition of the type or tenure of 'affordable housing' that 25% of the dwellings should comprise. Clarification is required whether these affordable dwellings would be provided by a Registered Provider or retained and sold by the developer. If the latter, the Council needs to provide further detail as to how 'residents requiring separate accommodation' or 'close relatives of existing local residents who have a demonstrable need to either support them or be supported by them' would be defined and identified.

Change To Plan: Clarify whether the affordable dwellings would be provided by a Registered Provider, or retained and sold by the developer, in which case the Council also needs to provide further detail as to how 'residents requiring separate accommodation' or 'close relatives of existing local residents who have a demonstrable need to either support them or be supported by them' would be defined and identified.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23922 - 2509 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

23923 Support

Respondent: Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]

Agent: Savills UK (Mr Ben Thomas) [2271]

Summary: The policy should allow flexibility in that if there is no interest in the 25% units to be reserved for local residents within certain period of time, then these units could be provided to alternative occupiers. This would need to be secured in the S106 agreement attached to any planning permission for the site.

Change To Plan: Flexibility should also be built into the wording of this policy to ensure that this provision of 25% dwellings to be reserved for local residents is subject to market demand and that within a certain time frame, if there is no interest in these units from those with a demonstrable local connection, then these units could be provided to alternative occupiers. This would need to be secured in the S106 agreement attached to any planning permission for the site.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23923 - 2509 - POLICY R26: LAND NORTH OF ORCHARD PIECE - i, ii, iv

22224 Object **Respondent: Mr Peter Drew [8212]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I do not agree with building on green belt land. The infrastructure currently will not support the increase in housing planned. The doctors surgery can not cope now with the population locally

Change To Plan: I do not agree that local transport is sustainable in the future. The local bus was threatened recently. The doctors can not cope with the current population, increasing the housing will only make the situation worse.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22224 - 8212 - 9.201 - ii

22257 Object **Respondent: mr Steve Whalley [4328]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: I have lived in Blackmore for 33 years. The site on Redrose Lane has been subjected to flooding and waterlogged on many many occasions. The additional drainage would only exacerbate this situation. It's unsuitable for development.

The additional rainwater and foul water drainage would overload the system in the centre of Blackmore leading to flooding in this historic part of the village.

Change To Plan: Remove from the LDP

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22257 - 4328 - 9.201 - i

22199 Object **Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: A housing needs survey has not been done. The council has not shown that there is a housing need locally or the quantity and type of housing needed.

Change To Plan: Undertake a local housing needs survey for the Villages in the north of the Borough and use the evidence from that to plan for local housing development.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22199 - 8199 - 9.202 - i, ii

22200 Object **Respondent: Mrs Helen Whalley [8199]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: This proposed main vehicular access from Red Rose Lane is completely unsuitable for this volume of traffic due to its narrow and rural nature. To alter this old rural road would not be appropriate to the rural setting of the area. Section 2.10 of the Settlement Hierarchy chapter of the LDP states 'Development should be appropriate to the rural setting of the area'.
Red Rose Lane is unsuitable for this volume of traffic because it floods regularly.
The three junctions with faster main roads are not suitable for this volume of traffic. I am concerned that there would be accidents.

Change To Plan: Avoid changes to the rural setting of Red Rose Lane.
Avoid an increase in the volume of traffic on/off Red Rose Lane.
Avoid an increase in the volume of traffic at the junctions of Red Rose Lane and the main roads.
Avoid an increase in the volume of traffic on Red Rose Lane which floods regularly.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22200 - 8199 - 9.203 - ii

22259 Object **Respondent: mr Steve Whalley [4328]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: The ancient plague road of redrose lane is not suitable for the amount of traffic associated with this development. It is not suitable for this purpose.

Change To Plan: remove from LDP

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: i Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22259 - 4328 - 9.203 - i

22494 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Paragraph 9.203 makes reference to the main vehicular access for the site to be via Redrose Lane.

ECC have previously advised that vehicular access from Redrose Lane may not be able to meet highway standards. It would be more appropriate to take access from Orchard Piece, or after further consideration Fingrith Hall Road.

The paragraph should therefore be amended to reflect this.

Change To Plan: Amend paragraph 9.203 as follows -

The development will take its main vehicular access from Orchard Piece and/or Fingrith Hall Lane...'.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?:No Tests: iii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22494 - 6776 - 9.203 - iii

22499 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request additional paragraph after paragraph 9.210 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after 9.210 -

The proposed development area is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22499 - 6776 - Brentwood Enterprise Park - ii, iii, iv

22329 Object**Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Retain and enhance the existing bridleway on site and ensure traffic safety measures on A127 bridge.

Change To Plan: It is imperative that these bridleways are preserved and the link over the A127 made safer as these two sites are to be developed, thereby increasing the volume of traffic using them. These bridleways serve to link two networks severed by the M25 and A127 and allow access to those living to the south and south west of the site to access Great Warley and Thorndon beyond.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22329 - 3855 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

22501 Object**Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Criterion D. b. of Policy E11 refers to potential access points via M25 Junction 29 and Warley Street (B186) and associated slip roads.

Currently unclear how access to site can be achieved directly from J29 of M25 as consequence of Lower Thames Crossing improvements to this junction, which includes segregated left turn slip road from A127 to M25 southbound. BBC therefore need to demonstrate that can achieve suitable access arrangements for all modes of travel, including appropriate mitigation/improvements. BBC should also demonstrate what discussions have taken place with Highways England, ECC as Highway Authority, and site promoter to ensure that access arrangements are deliverable and agreed.

Change To Plan: BBC need to demonstrate that suitable access arrangements for all modes of travel can be achieved, including appropriate mitigation/improvements.

BBC should also demonstrate what discussions have taken place with Highways England, ECC as Highway Authority, and the site promoter to ensure that access arrangements are deliverable and agreed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22501 - 6776 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - ii, iii

22579 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy wording is ambiguous and lacks a commitment to deliver biodiversity net gain.

Change To Plan: Policy wording should be amended as follows (removing the caveat "where appropriate"):

c. protect and enhance the adjoining Local Wildlife Site (Hobbs Hole) "to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity";

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22579 - 2414 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - iv

23163 Object

Respondent: Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It is unclear why the employment sites at Brentwood Enterprise Park (Site ref E11), Land at East Horndon Hall (site E13) and at Dunton Hills Garden Village (Site ref RO1) are proposed in the pre-submission Local Plan. It is not always the case that employment land should be located at busy junctions or along the A127 corridor where it would add to traffic flows on a road at current capacity. The sites are not located close to existing centres and are without easy access for workers other than by car. Alternative locations and options should be investigated including the A12 corridor possibly as part of edge of settlement expansion and in mixed use schemes; in principle objection due to Green Belt impact; impact of this combined with the Lower Thames Crossing.

Change To Plan: It is considered that site E11 should be deleted from the plan.

Notwithstanding our principle objection on greenbelt and sustainability issues if the site is proposed for development an alternative use that capitalize on its M25 location (i.e. a service station) could be considered.

It is considered the Brentwood Draft Local Plan and supporting evidence base will require further major revision and consultation with ongoing duty to cooperate with adjoining local authorities. In particular the preparation of the draft Brentwood Local Plan should be reviewed to take account of the outcome of testing of other spatial options being considered including the evidence by the South Essex authorities as part of the preparation of a Joint Strategic Plan.

Further work is required to develop the evidence base including the justification for the selection of the spatial options and dismissal of reasonable alternatives, housing capacity and supply further transport evidence and other infrastructure.

Due to the issues highlighted in this response and to the earlier documents it is considered that Brentwood Council needs to carefully consider how it proceeds with the preparation of the Local Plan and the timetable for its production. It is recommended that the Brentwood Plan with its current spatial strategy and site allocations should not be submitted for Examination.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23163 - 2461 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - ii, iii

23184 Object

Respondent: London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Local Plan does not evidence why the Brentwood Enterprise Park would be an acceptable use at an important location in the Green Belt other than to refer the difficulties of accommodating the quantum of development within other parts of the Brentwood borough and the opportunity to capitalize on the connections in the Brentwood Growth Corridor (para. 7.23b).

Change To Plan: Policy PC03 Employment Land Allocations, Policy E11 Brentwood Enterprise Park and Site Allocation E11 Brentwood Enterprise Park should be amended:

- * to demonstrate why the proposal is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework
- * to provide explicit commentary on the likely significant implications of the proposal for the wider strategic highway network given the proximity to Havering
- * to recognize the importance of working with other stakeholders (such as Transport for London and London Borough of Havering so that there can be certainty that the impacts of the Brentwood Enterprise Park proposal are satisfactory and can be accommodated without any adverse impact on the network beyond Brentwood
- * to recognize the role of the established joint working between authorities along the A127 corridor to ensure that the significant growth along this corridor is understood, assessed and mitigated as necessary.
- * to recognize the merit of the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground or Memorandum of Understanding between relevant stakeholders to recognize the issues involved and set out a joint commitment to recognizing these and addressing them
- * to recognize that the scale of the Brentwood Enterprise Park proposal and the traffic it will generate is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts for the wider area (including Havering) and that these need to be considered and mitigated
- * to include cross reference to Policy BE11 Strategic Transport Infrastructure

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23184 - 7966 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i

23185 Object

Respondent: London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]

Agent: N/A

Summary: E11 adjoined the A127, a key route into Havering and intersects with the A12 at Gallows Corner. The A127 is already well trafficked, Gallows Corner is already highly congested and has environmental problems. The extent of development along the A127 corridor was previously objected in principle. The proposal doesn't recognise the likely environmental impacts of additional traffic along the A127. Policy E11's reasoned justifications include potential access points via Junction 29 and the expectation of development to mitigate its impacts on the local and strategic road network, this does not adequately address its implications on the wider highway network.

Change To Plan: Policy PC03 Employment Land Allocations, Policy E11 Brentwood Enterprise Park and Site Allocation E11 Brentwood Enterprise Park should be amended:

- * to demonstrate why the proposal is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework
- * to provide explicit commentary on the likely significant implications of the proposal for the wider strategic highway network given the proximity to Havering
- * to recognize the importance of working with other stakeholders (such as Transport for London and London Borough of Havering) so that there can be certainty that the impacts of the Brentwood Enterprise Park proposal are satisfactory and can be accommodated without any adverse impact on the network beyond Brentwood
- * to recognize the role of the established joint working between authorities along the A127 corridor to ensure that the significant growth along this corridor is understood, assessed and mitigated as necessary.
- * to recognize the merit of the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground or Memorandum of Understanding between relevant stakeholders to recognize the issues involved and set out a joint commitment to recognizing these and addressing them
- * to recognize that the scale of the Brentwood Enterprise Park proposal and the traffic it will generate is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts for the wider area (including Havering) and that these need to be considered and mitigated
- * to include cross reference to Policy BE11 Strategic Transport Infrastructure

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23185 - 7966 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i

23186 Object

Respondent: London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The proposal should highlight the joint working taking place between authorities along the A127 corridor because this is an important means to the various authorities ensuring the scale and timing of development along the corridor is taken into account. Havering strongly supports the work of the A127 Task Force group of authorities and interested parties in lobbying for improvements to the A127 Corridor in the recognition of the growth planned along it.

Change To Plan: Policy PC03 Employment Land Allocations, Policy E11 Brentwood Enterprise Park and Site Allocation E11 Brentwood Enterprise Park should be amended:

- * to demonstrate why the proposal is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework
- * to provide explicit commentary on the likely significant implications of the proposal for the wider strategic highway network given the proximity to Havering
- * to recognize the importance of working with other stakeholders (such as Transport for London and London Borough of Havering) so that there can be certainty that the impacts of the Brentwood Enterprise Park proposal are satisfactory and can be accommodated without any adverse impact on the network beyond Brentwood
- * to recognize the role of the established joint working between authorities along the A127 corridor to ensure that the significant growth along this corridor is understood, assessed and mitigated as necessary.
- * to recognize the merit of the preparation of a Statement of Common Ground or Memorandum of Understanding between relevant stakeholders to recognize the issues involved and set out a joint commitment to recognizing these and addressing them
- * to recognize that the scale of the Brentwood Enterprise Park proposal and the traffic it will generate is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts for the wider area (including Havering) and that these need to be considered and mitigated
- * to include cross reference to Policy BE11 Strategic Transport Infrastructure

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23186 - 7966 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i

23200 Object

Respondent: Highways England (Heather Archer) [8309]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Highways England has concerns in regards to the Local Plan developments impacts on the Strategic Road Network. Although policies BE11 and BE16 identify the need that "any significant impacts from the development on the highway network on highway safety must be effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree". The transport impacts of Dunton Hills and the Brentwood Enterprise Park site policies imply that they will be assessed in isolation. This assessment should be done as part of the wider Local Plan picture.

Change To Plan: For clarity, we suggest that the wording is amended to reflect that there is a need to mitigate the impacts of the full Local Plan rather than the developments within it individually. Any single development may have no discernible impact whereas cumulatively the Local Plan impacts may require mitigation. Accordingly we are looking for evidence on the cumulative impacts of the Local Plan. Similarly, you may wish to amend the wording of policies relating to individual allocations, particularly the strategic allocations for Dunton Hills in Policy R01 (ii) under Transport Impact Mitigations and Brentwood Enterprise Park in Policy E11. These two policies suggest that impacts for these two developments will be assessed in isolation rather than as part of a bigger Local Plan picture.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: Not Specified

Tests: None

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 23200 - 8309 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - None

23623 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Authority deemed the erection of temporary buildings on a small part of Codham Hall Farm (south of the A127) as inappropriate development in the Green Belt and yet is proposing Brentwood Enterprise Park on the same site occupying about ten times the area.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified Brentwood Enterprise Park should be removed from the Plan, and employment growth re-allocated to a site or sites in the Borough where the development would not detract from the openness of the Green Belt.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23623 - 6185 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - ii

23624 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Authority has sought to justify the location of Brentwood Enterprise Park on the basis that the site would occupy previously developed land. But the land has not been developed. Temporary permission was granted in 2010 for the use of a small portion (about 3 ha) of this site for the storage and distribution of excavated material. This was to enable a company to fulfil a contract to replace all the gas mains from Southend-on-Sea to East London. A larger area has been used, again on a temporary basis, as the depot for the widening of the M25. The position underlying these temporary uses is that the site will return to its original state. Yet in paragraph 9.205 of the Plan the Authority describes the site as previously developed land. In treating the Brentwood Enterprise Park site as developed land the Authority has based its decision on distorted evidence.

Change To Plan: In order to make the Plan justified Brentwood Enterprise Park should be removed from the Plan, and employment growth should be re-allocated to a site elsewhere in the Borough that has genuinely already been developed or is otherwise suitable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23624 - 6185 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - ii

23625 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Dunton Hills Garden Village, with Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment area, would further reduce the narrowest and most critical section of the Metropolitan Green Belt, would promote the coalescence of Southend with London, together with the series of employment sites proposed on the A127 corridor would constitute ribbon development, would interfere with the edges of the Green Belt as proposed would replace a strong Green Belt boundary with a weak one, does not exhibit any of the four characteristics that indicate potential suitability for Green Belt boundary adjustment and that breaking the circle of open land around London would be unlawful

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village and the Brentwood Enterprise Park from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23625 - 6185 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - ii, iv

23626 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Dunton Hills Garden Village and Brentwood Enterprise Park developments would frustrate the objectives of the Thames Chase Community Forest.

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village and the Brentwood Enterprise Park from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23626 - 6185 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - ii, iv

23627 Object

Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Authority has cynically offloaded its housing and other needs to an edge of the Borough where a neighbouring borough will shoulder the infrastructure burden. And that the Authority has ignored the fact that the infrastructure on the Basildon-Southend corridor cannot realistically be improved.

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village and the Brentwood Enterprise Park from plan.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23627 - 6185 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - ii, iv

23282 Support

Respondent: Wood (on behalf of National Grid) (Ms Lucy Bartley) [8094]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The site is crossed or in close proximity to an electricity transmission asset: ZB Route. Please see enclosed plan referenced ET329 (GT113). The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect its assets.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23282 - 8094 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

23285 Support

Respondent: Wood (on behalf of National Grid) (Ms Lucy Bartley) [8094]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site is crossed or in close proximity to National Grid gas transmission asset FM18. Please see enclosed plan referenced GT113 (ET329). The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect National Grid's assets.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23285 - 8094 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

23309 Support

Respondent: Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We note the significant allocation of additional employment land, in particular through the Brentwood Enterprise Park. In the light of its proximity to London, it could be useful to discuss related collaboration opportunities, specifically including land for distribution and logistics, as well as wider sustainability implications.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: No

Full Reference: S - 23309 - 6093 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, ii, iii, iv

23733 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: We do not concur with part C d) of Policy E11, which requires that the public right of way is preserved and enhanced. Whilst it is recognised that the right of way will need to be maintained, this may be through appropriate diversion if required. The policy wording presently is ambiguous in this regard and may imply that the right of way must be preserved in its current form. This could pose a risk to delivery and would not be a justified and effective approach.

Change To Plan: Request that sub-paragraph 'd.' of part C of Policy E11 be amended so that it reads as follows: "preserve, through diversion if necessary, and where appropriate enhance the existing Public Right of Way through the site".

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23733 - 5124 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, iv

23735 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: References to infrastructure requirements in part D. c., d. and e. should be amended to make clear that such provision will be required where appropriate. The wording is overly prescriptive and lacks flexibility would not therefore be a justified and effective approach. It may not, for example, be appropriate to provide direct walking connection towards junction 29 and the western site boundary. The site should not be responsible for provision of new transport links alone. The implementation of a wider strategy for sustainable travel and public transport should be delivered by appropriate local authorities, with relevant contributions sought from developers.

Change To Plan: We consider this part of the policy should be amended to read:
c. provide well-connected internal road layouts which allow good accessibility for bus services or sustainable transport measures where appropriate
d. potential travel planning measures and connection to new public transport links with the surrounding area; and
e. provision for walking and cycling connections within the site and to the surrounding area where appropriate

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23735 - 5124 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, iv

23737 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Removal of Site from the Green Belt: The NPPF does not define what constitutes 'exceptional circumstances'. However, case law may assist BBC and the preparation of its Local Plan in this respect, in particular, the judgment in Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council & Ors. [2015] EWHC 1078. BBC has evidenced a substantial need for development; and there are clearly severe limitations on options to meet this need without altering the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances in accordance with the NPPF and the Calverton judgment have been demonstrated to justify amending the Green Belt boundary to remove the site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23737 - 5124 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - None

23738 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Landscape Sensitivity and Landscape Capacity Study: Potential and Strategic Allocation Options report by Crestwood considers the Site E11 within the Low Landscape Character Area and to have high capacity for development. It is considered the plan has been positively prepared in the way it has considered and identified sites that have are shown to have capacity in terms of effect on the surrounding landscape.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23738 - 5124 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, iv

23740 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Modification in terms of jobs provision needed. The Economic Futures states that Brentwood Enterprise Park will provide a total of 4,070 new jobs. We do not consider this figure to be justified, principally because it is based on an over-assumption of the amount of office space that may be provided. The number of jobs will depend on final mix of uses however estimates based on employment density guidance indicates in the region of 2,000 jobs, due mainly to the lower estimation for the amount of office space to be provided by the scheme.

Change To Plan: Estimated number of jobs that Brentwood Enterprise Park can provide, based on employment density guidance, is in the region of 2,000 jobs.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23740 - 5124 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, iv

23741 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Transport and Access: The BEP Site allocation is ideally located to provide direct access to the strategic road network for the commercial vehicles generated by the proposed business uses on site. Access to the strategic road network for BEP which is compatible with the LTC proposals for J29 is achievable, and therefore the allocation of the BEP is not compromised by the LTC. Fundamentally however, the allocation of sites including BEP, Childerditch Industrial Estate, West Horndon and DHGV along the A127 all make a strong business case for the implementation of a robust and efficient package of sustainable transport measures.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23741 - 5124 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - None

23744 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: The latest Lower Thames Crossing proposals include potential slip roads at Junction 29 and would therefore conflict with both the existing and currently proposed access arrangements for the BEP. Certain land around junction 29 and the A127 will likely be needed for transport works should the LTC project proceed, as shown in our Appendix B. Accordingly, Policy E11 wording should be amended to acknowledge the above access options and to provide for the land to be released from Green Belt for such purposes should that be required. This approach has been used in East Herts District.

Change To Plan: Appendix 2 of the Plan should be amended having regards to the map in our Appendix B which shows the additional land that may be necessary to be released from the Green Belt in order for it to be developed for transport works to facilitate access to the BEP Site.

The first paragraph of Policy E11 should be amended to read as follows:

"Land south east of M25 Junction 29, as shown on Appendix 2, is allocated to provide high quality employment development and a significant number of jobs.

In addition, the areas of land (shown on the plan at Appendix 2) shall be released from the Green Belt for works to provide access to the site should this be necessary.

The final extent of the land that is released for such works shall be identified in a planning application and shall be kept to the minimum necessary to provide an appropriate and safe access to the Brentwood Enterprise Park Site along with any associated highway and infrastructure works.

Development proposals for the Brentwood Enterprise Park site should consider the following: [...]"

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23744 - 5124 - POLICY E11: BRENTWOOD ENTERPRISE PARK - i, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.206

22496 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: BBC needs to satisfy itself that Local Plan has clear economic strategy, with robust phasing and delivery mechanisms in place to ensure that full employment requirements can be delivered over whole Plan period, in line with NPPF paragraph 23. It is important given 55% of BBC's employment land allocation in Plan is proposed at BEP. Site still has uncertainty over access and how and when will be delivered. Furthermore, BBC's evidence base (Economic Futures 2013-2033 Report 2018) indicates there is need for site to be delivered early in Plan period, in order to accommodate local businesses that may be affected by employment land re-allocation proposed in Plan.

Change To Plan: Clarity is sought on the deliverability and phasing of employment land allocations in order to meet requirements outlined in the Local Plan.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22496 - 6776 - 9.206 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.208

22502 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Criterion D. b. of Policy E11 refers to potential access points via M25 Junction 29 and Warley Street (B186) and associated slip roads. Currently unclear how access to site can be achieved directly from J29 of M25 as consequence of Lower Thames Crossing improvements to this junction, which includes segregated left turn slip road from A127 to M25 southbound. BBC therefore need to demonstrate that can achieve suitable access arrangements for all modes of travel, including appropriate mitigation/improvements. BBC should also demonstrate what discussions have taken place with Highways England, ECC as Highway Authority, and site promoter to ensure that access arrangements are deliverable and agreed.

Change To Plan: Paragraph 9.208 needs to be amended to demonstrate the latest position in respect of access to the site, and what discussions have taken place with Highways England, ECC, and the site promoter to ensure that access arrangements are deliverable and agreed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22502 - 6776 - 9.208 - ii, iii

22498 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Currently it is unclear how access to the site can be achieved directly from J29 of the M25 as a consequence of the Lower Thames Crossing improvements to this junction, which includes a segregated left turn slip road from the A127 to M25 southbound. BBC therefore need to demonstrate that suitable access arrangements for all modes of travel can be achieved, including appropriate mitigation/improvements. BBC should also demonstrate what discussions have taken place with Highways England, ECC as Highway Authority, and the site promoter to ensure that access arrangements are deliverable and agreed.

Change To Plan: BBC need to demonstrate that suitable access arrangements for all modes of travel can be achieved, including appropriate mitigation/improvements.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22498 - 6776 - 9.209 - i, ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations Employment Allocations

23730 Object

Respondent: Sphere 25 - Planning Consultancy (Mr Peter Jeffery) [8235]

Agent: Sphere 25 - Planning Consultancy (Mr Peter Jeffery) [8235]

Summary: The Plan is unsound because it does not identify the required quantum of employment land to deliver the economic and employment growth objectives of the plan. Inclusion of Land Lying to the South of Brook Street would resolve this as it would help to provide a high quality site in a strategic location to deliver a range and mix of jobs and inward investment during the Plan period to 2033. The plan allows for growth to meet employment targets but does not allocate land, which can generate significant growth and prosperity.

Change To Plan: Further employment land needs to be allocated within the plan. Please refer to the detailed submission made by Sphere 25 on behalf of Cambria Autos Plc, regarding the proposed allocation of the Land Lying South of Brook Street.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23730 - 8235 - Employment Allocations - i

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations Childerditch Industrial Estate

22504 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.214, 9.219, and 9.224 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.214, 9.219, and 9.224 -

The proposed development area is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22504 - 6776 - Childerditch Industrial Estate - ii, iii, iv

22503 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. c. of Policy E12 makes reference to development having consideration of improvements to A127 junction.

The detailed information for access to this site should be set out in the Policy, consistent with the other site allocation policies. This should be informed by the outputs of the transport modelling for the Local Plan, which is currently on-going.

Change To Plan: The detailed information for access to this site should be set out in the Policy, consistent with the other site allocation policies. This should be informed by the outputs of the transport modelling for the Local Plan, which is currently on-going.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22503 - 6776 - POLICY E12: CHILDERDITCH INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - iii

24364 Support

Respondent: Childerditch Industrial Estate [8371]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: Childerditch Industrial Estate: Policy E12 is supported. We consider that it is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and necessary for the reasons set out elsewhere in these representations. Policy E12 proposes to allocate land that has previously been promoted at the Range North (site 112D) and the land to the south (site 112E), in addition to the existing Childerditch Industrial Estate, to provide a total developable area of 20.64 hectares across the entire Estate. The release of these sites from the Green Belt is justified and will ensure that the Plan has been positively prepared. At present, Childerditch Industrial Estate offers some 35 units. As part of the work supporting these representations, CMP Architects have undertaken an analysis of the Estate to identify how the existing Park could be regenerated for existing occupiers, redeveloped in areas to maximise efficiency, and expanded for future employment growth demand. The proposed masterplan at Appendix 1 provided for indicative purposes to support these representations, demonstrates the deliverability of the site over a period of time. The proposed allocations will extend the size of the Estate and as a whole, it is considered that it has the potential to accommodate around 50 units following redevelopment. The development of The Range North (site 112D) as a first phase will assist with the provision of funding to begin the process of upgrading the existing units and infrastructure at the Estate, which will ultimately lead to the development of the southern extension. This infrastructure will include an improved primary route through the core of the site and a number of secondary routes stemming from this to provide access to the different areas of the site. . It is very much expected that development will commence on site within the first few years of the Plan period. . In respect of Part B, criterion b) of Policy E12, we support the principle of improving walking and cycling links within the land owned by our client, which extends to Little Warley Hall Lane. However, we object to Part B, criterion c) of Policy E12, as it is not considered to be necessary (refer to Appendix 2 included in the submitted documents).

Change To Plan: Part B, criterion b) should be removed from Policy E12.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 24364 - 8371 - POLICY E12: CHILDERDITCH INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - i, ii, iii, iv

22506 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.214, 9.219, and 9.224 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.214, 9.219, and 9.224 -

The proposed development area is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22506 - 6776 - Codham Hall Farm - ii, iii, iv

22330 Object**Respondent: Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Please see our representations against site allocation E11 as the comments here apply equally to this site. The existing bridleways in both of these sites are linked by the A127 bridge which needs to include some safety measures eg a traffic light system due to the number of HGV's using the bridge.

Change To Plan: Retain and enhance the existing bridleways on this site and improve the safety and traffic management on the A127 bridge to ensure users' safety.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22330 - 3855 - POLICY E10: CODHAM HALL FARM - i, ii, iii, iv

22580 Object**Respondent: Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Policy wording lacks a commitment to deliver biodiversity net gain.

Policy wording is ambiguous and includes an unnecessary caveat; this creates a potential loophole that could allow developers to forego enhancements.

Change To Plan: Policy wording should be amended and the caveat "where appropriate" removed, as follows:

b. protect and enhance the adjoining Local Wildlife Site
(Codham Hall Wood) to deliver a measurable net gain in biodiversity;

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22580 - 2414 - POLICY E10: CODHAM HALL FARM - iv

23722 Support**Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]**

Summary: At 9.6 ha of employment land, the Codham Hall site is one of the largest employment sites and therefore provides a significant proportion of the employment land requirement; it is important that its development is supported and encouraged. Its allocation therefore assists in the Local Plan strategy relating to economic growth being positively prepared and justified.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23722 - 6122 - POLICY E10: CODHAM HALL FARM - i, iv

23725 Support**Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]**

Summary: In the absence of Policies map and clarity within Policy E10, it is not clear whether the whole site is removed from the Green Belt. With the majority of the site already being utilised for employment purposes and the whole site not contributing to the Green Belt purposes, the whole site should be removed from Green Belt. Currently the whole site is not shown as white land and has green hatching. Policy should clarify that landscaping, amenity, access and ancillary uses are appropriate in this area.

Change To Plan: Allocation Boundary: Policy E10 should therefore be clear that the site as a whole is removed from the Green Belt. It would be clearer and more effective if the site as a whole was shown as white land to clarify that landscaping, amenity, access and ancillary uses are appropriate in this area. There is otherwise the risk that a planning application for such uses could be considered against Green Belt policies rather than as being in accordance with Policy E10.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23725 - 6122 - POLICY E10: CODHAM HALL FARM - None

23726 Support**Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]**

Summary: Removal of Site from the Green Belt: The NPPF does not define what constitutes 'exceptional circumstances'. However, case law may assist BBC and the preparation of its Local Plan in this respect, in particular, the judgment in *Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council & Ors*. [2015] EWHC 1078. It has been demonstrated that removal of the site from the Green Belt will not cause significant harm to the Green Belt as a whole. Exceptional circumstances in accordance with the NPPF and the *Calverton* judgment have been demonstrated to justify amending the Green Belt boundary to remove the site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23726 - 6122 - POLICY E10: CODHAM HALL FARM - i, iv

23727 Support

Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Potential Access and Impact of Lower Thames Crossing: It is important that the Codham Hall Farm allocation reflects the potential need for enhanced access to the Brentwood Enterprise Park (BEP). The plan in Appendix A shows the potential land required to support the BEP access solution, which could affect the land currently shown as white land under E10. It is considered that the employment land lost to support this access solution, if utilised, is sourced elsewhere on the site to ensure no overall loss.

Change To Plan: The whole land within Policy E10 should be shown as white (released from Green Belt), allowing the employment and ancillary uses to be located within the site as required without compromising the amount of employment floor space provided. Such flexibility in where the uses are provided will be justified and positively prepared.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23727 - 6122 - POLICY E10: CODHAM HALL FARM - None

23728 Support

Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Support site allocation but object to: Criteria b regarding the adjoining Local Wildlife Site Codham Hall Wood. The LWS is outside of the allocation area and our client's control. The policy should therefore not require enhancement and this part of the requirement should be removed. Criteria c regarding Public Right of Way: whilst the need to maintain public rights of way is recognised the current wording fails to provide for potential diversion if required. Criteria d regarding walking and cycling connections should be changed to state "potential to walking and cycling connections".

Change To Plan: Amend the development principle criteria as suggested.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23728 - 6122 - POLICY E10: CODHAM HALL FARM - i

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations 9.219

23729 Object

Respondent: S&J Padfield and Partners (SJP) [6122]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: Paragraph 9.219 seeks the submission of a workplace travel plan to promote sustainable transport. In the case of site E10 this is regularisation of existing uses and that additional infrastructure improvements are unlikely to be justified. A Framework Travel Plan will consider the implications of increased growth at the site and opportunities for sustainable transport. There is currently no travel plan in place on the site for the existing employment uses, with the production of a travel plan for the whole site therefore being an improvement of the current situation and a benefit of allocating of the site.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23729 - 6122 - 9.219 - i, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations East Horndon Hall

22507 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.214, 9.219, and 9.224 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after paragraphs 9.214, 9.219, and 9.224 -

The proposed development area is at potential risk of flooding from surface water as show on the EAs Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps. Any development within this area should be directed away from areas of existing flooding and where possible should try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. It should however be ensured that any development within this area complies with flood risk mitigation measures outlined in the Essex SuDS guide.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22507 - 6776 - East Horndon Hall - ii, iii, iv

23619 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: That Dunton Hills Garden Village, together with Brentwood Enterprise Park and the East Horndon employment area, would further reduce the narrowest and most critical section of the Metropolitan Green Belt, would replace a strong Green Belt boundary with a weak one and would promote the coalescence of Southend with London.

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village and East Horndon Hall from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23619 - 6185 - POLICY E13: EAST HORNDON HALL - ii, iv

23620 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: That Dunton Hills Garden Village together with the series of employment sites proposed on the A127 corridor would constitute ribbon development.)

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village and East Horndon Hall from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23620 - 6185 - POLICY E13: EAST HORNDON HALL - ii, iv

23621 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: That the developments at Dunton Hills and East Horndon would ruin the setting of All Saints' Church East Horndon, a Grade I listed building and would harm the setting of several Grade II listed buildings.

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village and East Horndon Hall from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23621 - 6185 - POLICY E13: EAST HORNDON HALL - ii, iv

23622 Object**Respondent: Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: That the Dunton Hills Garden Village development and the East Horndon employment site would be unacceptably close to a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

Change To Plan: Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village and East Horndon Hall from plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 23622 - 6185 - POLICY E13: EAST HORNDON HALL - ii, iv

22251 Support**Respondent: Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]****Agent: N/A**

Summary: Extra employment sites are vital to the plan.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22251 - 4610 - POLICY E13: EAST HORNDON HALL - None

23845 Support**Respondent: MM Properties Ltd [6076]****Agent: Savills UK (Ms Catherine Williams) [3823]**

Summary: Strongly support site E13. Site makes a significant contribution to the provision of new employment floorspace in Brentwood, is deliverable and appropriate to be released from the Green Belt. However, the draft wording of Policy E13 is not clear which part of the site the 5.5ha of employment land relates and whether this comprises additional employment land or whether it should include existing business uses within the red line area, see attached. Moreover, the extent of the developable area and floorspace should include the existing garden centre and East Horndon Hall, previously developed sites, and the additional floorspace.

Change To Plan: The wording of the site allocation policy should therefore be amended as follows:
"5.5 ha of *additional* employment floorspace (principally use classes B1, B2, B8 and any associated employment generating sui generis uses). Any planning application shall include elements of landscaping to improve visual amenity".

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: Yes Tests: N/A Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23845 - 6076 - POLICY E13: EAST HORNDON HALL - i, ii, iii, iv

23868 Support

Respondent: East Horndon Developments Ltd [8341]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Pryor) [2581]

Summary: Support allocation of East Horndon Hall as employment allocation and release from the Green Belt. Site location at the junction of the A128 and A127 has been identified as a key gateway area. It is well related to public transport infrastructure and the primary road network. The allocation of site is in line with Policy PC01, PC02 and PC03. The Council's evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal shows that this is a site that performs well.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23868 - 8341 - POLICY E13: EAST HORNDON HALL - i, ii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations Land adjacent to A12 and Slip Road, Ingatestone

22508 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified.
3. Effective.
4. Consistent with National Policy.

Request additional paragraph after paragraph 9.229 to ensure factual representation of the current position in respect of flooding, in line with paragraphs 155 and 156 of the NPPF.

Change To Plan: Insert following wording as additional paragraph after 9.229 -

The site falls within the Mountnessing CDA. Any development within this area should where possible try to have a positive impact on existing areas of flood risk downstream of the development. Early engagement with the LLFA in this area is critical to ensure that existing and potential flood risk is properly managed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22508 - 6776 - Land adjacent to A12 and Slip Road, Ingatestone - ii, iii, iv

CHAPTER: Chapter 9. Site Allocations POLICY E08: LAND ADJACENT TO A12 AND SLIP ROAD, INGATESTONE

22510 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Criterion B. a. of Policy E08 states that vehicular access should be via Roman Way

ECC have previously advised that vehicular access via Roman Road may not be able to meet highway standards, and that BBC need to provide the evidence to demonstrate that safe and suitable access(es), for all highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists can be achieved. This will need to be undertaken in consultation with ECC as the Highway Authority, and Highways England who control the A12 and its slip roads.

Change To Plan: Replace criterion B. a. with the following wording -

safe and suitable access(es) for all highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists to be achieved in consultation with, and subject to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority, and Highways England who control the A12 and its slip roads;

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22510 - 6776 - POLICY E08: LAND ADJACENT TO A12 AND SLIP ROAD, INGATESTONE - iii

22511 Object **Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]** **Agent: N/A**

Summary: 3. Effective.

Paragraph 9.227 makes reference to the main vehicular access for the site to be from Roman Road.

ECC have previously advised that vehicular access via Roman Road may not be able to meet highway standards, and that BBC need to provide the evidence to demonstrate that safe and suitable access(es), for all highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists can be achieved. This will need to be undertaken in consultation with ECC as the Highway Authority, and Highways England who control the A12 and its slip roads.

Change To Plan: Replace first sentence of paragraph 9.227 with the following wording -

The development should achieve safe and suitable access(es), for all highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists. This will need to be undertaken in consultation with ECC as the Highway Authority, and Highways England who control the A12 and its slip roads.

Legally Compliant?: Yes	Duty to Co-operate?: Yes	Sound?: No	Tests: iii	Examination: Yes
Full Reference: O - 22511 - 6776 - 9.227 - iii				

CHAPTER: Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory
Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory

23106 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The housing target for Brentwood as approved in November 2018 is likely to be subject to a recalculation following Government's indication that it will make clear in national Planning Practice Guidance that the 2014-based CLG Household Projections should be used instead of the 2016-based ONS Household Projections; which identified an OAN for Brentwood is 452 homes per annum. This could cause the plan to be less effective and justified.

Change To Plan:

1) The Local Plan must be adjusted to incorporate previously discounted development sites, particularly in the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor to restore the flexibility in site supply across a broader range of spatial locations, thereby improving the Plan's effectiveness and deliverability. 2) The methodology to the Local Plan's Housing Trajectory needs to be published and open for comment and challenge of its assumptions.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23106 - 369 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i

23171 Object

Respondent: Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Delivery of DHGV will commence in 2022/23 at a rate of 100 homes per annum, climbing to 300 homes per annum by 2026/27. This seems overly optimistic given that the allocation is currently within Green Belt, requires masterplanning and will need to go through a planning application and elements of the condition discharge process before development can commence. No evidence is provided as to how the housing trajectory has been developed. No evidence or any form of a development framework/masterplan for DHGV explains how the proposed accelerated rate of delivery will be possible.

Change To Plan: Basildon Council therefore seeks for evidence to be provided demonstrating the realistic delivery trajectory for DHGV so that the potential short-medium term pressures on services and facilities in nearby settlements can be assessed, understood and planned for by service providers and neighbouring authorities. This will help ensure adequate mitigation provisions can be put in place to reduce any potential negative impacts on Basildon Borough residents living nearby. This will make the Plan justified and effective.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23171 - 369 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i, iv

23657 Object

Respondent: EA Strategic Land LLP [279]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Ms Leona Hannify) [8333]

Summary: Furthermore, the proposed stepped housing trajectory is unjustified and simply reinforces the affordability challenges in the borough which need to be urgently addressed. There are a range of delivery issues with the housing trajectory for the first five year of the plan period which further demonstrates that the Council need to allocate additional land in order to meet their housing requirements.

Change To Plan: Site West of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon is fully in accordance with the spatial strategy focused on transit orientated growth and should be allocated. No significant constraints with developing an urban extension at West Horndon, in addition to Dunton Hills Garden Village was identified by the Sustainability Appraisal. If Brentwood is to attempt to meet the housing needs, this approach is required.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23657 - 279 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

23671 Object

Respondent: M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]

Summary: There is a long process before development on larger sites can begin, which render their ability to come forward quickly uncertain; therefore, it is totally unrealistic to project that 100 homes will be completed at Dunton Hills Garden Village as early as 2022/23, or for strategic sites are expected to deliver 1,555 dwellings within 5yrs of adoption. It would not be justified to rely on these sites to meet short term housing delivery.

Change To Plan: Appendix 1 should be amended to reflect the evidence provided by available evidence on the delivery of major developments. Additional smaller sites capable of providing homes in the early years of the plan period also need to be allocated.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23671 - 8054 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

23693 Object**Respondent: Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Miss Emma Gladwin) [6745]**

Summary: We would caution against some of the anticipated delivery in the housing trajectory, which is overly optimistic. There is a long process before development on larger sites can begin, it would not be justified to rely on these sites to meet short term housing delivery. The stepped trajectory with a high reliance on strategic sites has less flexibility compared with allocating further smaller sites in providing short term housing land supply.

Change To Plan: The Council should take the opportunity to allocate further smaller sites within the Local Plan, assisting in providing flexibility and improving housing delivery in the short term.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23693 - 7463 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

23702 Object**Respondent: BPM Investments Ltd [8338]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Richard Clews) [5526]**

Summary: There is a long process before development on larger sites can begin, which render their ability to come forward quickly uncertain; therefore, it is totally unrealistic to project that 100 homes will be completed at Dunton Hills Garden Village as early as 2022/23, and for strategic sites are expected to deliver 1,555 dwellings within 5yrs of adoption. It would not be justified to rely on these sites to meet short term housing delivery.

Change To Plan: Appendix 1 should be amended to reflect the evidence provided by available evidence on the delivery of major developments. Additional smaller sites capable of providing homes in the early years of the plan period also need to be allocated.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23702 - 8338 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

23787 Object**Respondent: RS2 Properties Ltd [8339]****Agent: Mr. Stuart Willsher [7331]**

Summary: Dunton Hills Garden Village is identified as being capable of delivering 2,700 dwellings during the plan period, with the site being capable of delivering 100 dwellings starting from 2022/23 (i.e. within 3 years), and then between 150 - 300 dwellings each year thereafter. This level of growth from such a strategic allocation does not appear realistic; it is unlikely that the Local Plan will be adopted until 2020 at the earliest.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23787 - 8339 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

24089 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: Concerned to note that Dunton Hills Garden Village is anticipated to deliver housing completions from 2022/23, falling within the first five years of the plan. DHGV is a proposed major strategic development, intended to provide a new settlement supported by a range of facilities and infrastructure, and delivery of which will require a long process, therefore should not be relied on for short term housing delivery. To ensure the Local Plan is sound, there is a need for smaller sites to be supported by policies which will allow their short term delivery.

Change To Plan: To ensure the Local Plan is sound, there is a need for smaller sites to be supported by policies which will allow their short term delivery.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24089 - 250 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

24090 Object**Respondent: Countryside Properties [250]****Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]**

Summary: Site R16&17 can be delivered earlier than the stated timescales in Appendix 1 of the PSLP. In order to make the housing trajectory sound, amendments to the trajectory must be made to reflect the earlier delivery of the site in the plan period.

Change To Plan: Amendments to the trajectory must be made to reflect the earlier delivery of site R16&17 in the plan period.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24090 - 250 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i, iv

24110 Object

Respondent: Marden Homes Ltd [8363]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Laura Dudley-Smith) [5158]

Summary: Question how likely the 100 homes at Dunton Hills will be completed by 2022/23. DHGV is a proposed major strategic development, intended to provide a new settlement supported by a range of facilities and infrastructure, and delivery of which will require a long process, therefore should not be relied on for short term housing delivery. To ensure the Local Plan is sound, there is a need for smaller sites to be supported by policies which will allow their short term delivery.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24110 - 8363 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

24145 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: The housing trajectory suggest that DHGV will deliver 750 dwellings by 2026. However, given the recent research, adopting the lag of seven years from a Plan adoption date by end of 2019 (which is highly ambitious) would mean there would be no deliveries on site until after 2026. Paragraph 9.33 states that of the 6,700 homes, 4,000 are to be delivered after 2033. However, this is caveated by the statement 'subject to further feasibility and assessment of impact', calling into doubt whether 4,000 can be delivered on site.

Change To Plan: The Plan places significant reliance on the timely delivery of Dunton Hills Garden Village. This is not a positive strategy for meeting housing need and does not provide the flexibility required to address changes in circumstances. The allocation should be complemented by the allocation of small sites, to improve deliverability.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24145 - 8368 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - ii, iii, iv

24153 Object

Respondent: Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]

Agent: Sworders (Mrs Rachel Bryan) [5481]

Summary: Appendix 1 of the Plan sets out this housing trajectory, which demonstrates that no units will be delivered in 2019/2020 from the site allocations, and only 66 units are proposed to be delivered in 2020/2021, with 318 in 2021/2022 and 632 in 2023/2024. This does not comply with the requirements of the NPPF, which states in paragraph 23 that:

'Strategic policies should provide a clear strategy for bringing sufficient land forward, and at a sufficient rate, to address objectively assessed needs over the plan period, in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.'

Change To Plan: The Plan should be amended to allocate a number of additional smaller and medium sized sites, as required by paragraph 68 of the NPPF, which will ensure provision of a five year housing supply, to enable continued delivery of homes throughout the Plan period.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24153 - 8368 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i, iii, iv

24168 Object

Respondent: Turn2us [6753]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Sam Hollingworth) [6123]

Summary: Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) is projected to delivery housing completions within the first five years of the plan. This is a major strategic development, delivery will require significant amount of work, time and coordination and input of stakeholders. before development can even begin. Therefore, it is totally unrealistic to project that 100 homes will be completed at DHGV as early as 2022/23.

Change To Plan: Allocate additional smaller sites capable of providing homes in the early years of the plan period in order to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: None

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24168 - 6753 - Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

CHAPTER: Appendix 1: Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory
Plan Housing Trajectory

23762 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Jen Carroll) [6751]

Summary: The results of the 2018 HDT confirmed that Brentwood have delivered 50% of the housing requirement over the last three years and this is below the threshold - 20% buffer. The Borough's most recent reported five-year housing land supply is 4.1 years. This is predicated on a requirement which, when considered in relation to the latest guidance, understates need and an overstated supply. A five-year supply of 653 dwellings compared to a requirement of 2,712 represents a 1.2-year housing land supply.

Change To Plan: This acute housing land supply shortage demonstrates the importance of allocating sites through the Local Plan which can delivery early in the plan period, and support the existing supply of housing.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23762 - 6751 - Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i, ii, iii, iv

23832 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr Alasdair Sherry) [6713]

Summary: The Borough's most recent reported five-year housing land supply is 4.1. However, when considered in relation to the latest guidance, understates need; and a supply which is overstated. Having regard to the Standard Method and the need to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement, the total five-year requirement for the Borough is 2,712 dwellings. Even before critical review of the supply, the PSLP will not provide a five-year supply. We are concerned to note that Dunton Hills Garden Village is projected to delivery housing completions from 2022/23. begun. The ability of larger sites to come forward quickly is unlikely and problematic.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23832 - 6713 - Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - ii, iii, iv

24127 Object

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: It is noted that the current PSD makes provision for 7,752 new residential dwellings (net) to be built in the Borough over the plan period 2016-2033 at an annual rate of 310 dwellings per year to 2022/23, followed by 584 dwellings per year from 2023/24-2033. This approach adopts a stepped trajectory; resulting in the backloading of housing delivery beyond 2023 which we understand is in part due to a high proportion of Draft designated GB edge of settlement sites not being available for development until later in the plan period. Whilst our Client supports BBC's ascertain to direct housing growth to allocated sites in highly accessible locations along the transit/growth corridor, our Client considers that the starting point for examination of the Plan should be that a straight, rather than stepped trajectory should be used - to avert a significant, historic under-delivery of housing to persist(acknowledging that BBC are continuing to under-supply against its housing requirement until at least 2022/3).

Change To Plan: In light of comments raised above (in addition to our Client's comments to Draft Policy RO4 and RO5), we contend that the housing trajectory referenced within Appendix 1 of the PSD should be reviewed and adjusted to recognise that the Ford Warley site (both the northern and southern parcel) can be delivered earlier in the plan period (1-5 years versus the 9-17 years as currently drafted), irrespective and in isolation of the Council Depot - which our Client has indeed raised in both previous rounds of consultation on the local plan (including the Call for Sites and PSA). Indeed, and as BBC officers are aware, Ford will be vacating the Warley Site in 2019, with Conceptual masterplanning already undertaken and submitted to BBC; demonstrating the deliverability and suitability of the Site for a significant quantum of residential development on the Site (please refer to 'Garden in the Woods' Conceptual Masterplan at Appendix A2; as submitted to BBC in May 2017 as part of the Call for Sites consultation).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24127 - 3769 - Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i, ii, iii, iv

24155 Object

Respondent: Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]

Agent: David Russell Associates (Mr David Russell) [487]

Summary: Reliance and build rate of Dunton Hills Garden suburb is not realistic. This will squeeze delivery at Dunton Hills into an eight-year period with a resulting annual build rate requirement of nearly 340. The planning permission is likely to be slower than described, there are no documents of support from Basildon Council. The Emerging Basildon Local Plan shows no proposals relating to the Dunton Hills project on its side of the border. Instead it shows the whole area as Metropolitan Green Belt land. All the above indicates that there has been a lack of cross-border cooperation on the Dunton Hills proposed land allocation since 2016. The quantity and timing of new housing delivery from this site, set out in the Pre-Submission Document, are not soundly based. We believe the whole project is now mired in a controversy that involves two of the Borough's local authority neighbours. This must cast doubt on whether the Duty to Cooperate has been fully followed. Therefore at present the whole project is surely in jeopardy.

Change To Plan: The Pre-Submission Document relies very heavily on the Dunton Hills Strategic Allocation. If it were not accepted, or only partially accepted, a review of all the Plan's allocations would be needed and alternatives, like our client's site at Pilgrims Hatch, be reconsidered to make up the deficit.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24155 - 2788 - Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i, ii, iii, iv

24268 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: A total of 7,752 dwellings be provided in the Borough between 2011-2033 with 310 homes per year to 2022/23 and then 584 per year from 2022/23 taking forward a "stepped delivery" approach to deal with a projected shortfall in the first 5 years of the PSLP. This is mainly because a greater proportion of homes to be delivered in the PSLP comprise sites located in the Green Belt, resulting in longer lead times to delivery. Whilst we do not raise objections in principle to the stepped approach as far as our clients are concerned there is a prospect that some sites in the Green Belt have the prospect of coming forward earlier, particularly smaller and medium sized developments. This certainly includes this site R24, and R23 that is the subject of a separate representation. The stepped approach proposed, there are still issues with BBC's over-optimistic estimates and assumptions on the delivery of larger strategic sites proposed for allocation in the PSLP. Of the new allocations, 4,578 homes are made up of strategic allocations (of which 2,700 are at DHGV and are to be delivered in the Plan period) and 1,510 are other allocations. The strategic sites therefore represent 68% of the total number of new homes of which some 59% are allocated at DHGV. The ability of larger strategic sites to come forward quickly has been the subject of recent assessments in the Independent Review of Build Out, the Letwin Review (2018); and issues with their complexity, have been ably set out in the Lichfield's study From Start to Finish (2016). Both provide empirical evidence that the early delivery of such sites can be problematical due to a range of factors, including establishing required infrastructure requirements and the timing of housing delivery associated with those requirements, as well as the prolonged or protracted nature of the planning process. The Lichfield's report confirms that the planning process takes, on average, 2.5 years for the planning application determination period for up to 500 units; this can double for sites over 1,000 units. Two of the strategic sites within the PSLP's allocations also comprise developed sites currently in employment uses. The strategic sites are expected to deliver some 1555 homes within 5 years of an assumed adoption in 2020/21. Given the issues set out above it is considered that this is unrealistic and it would not be justified or the most appropriate strategy to rely on these sites for short term housing delivery. Therefore emphasises the need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Change To Plan: Need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24268 - 2741 - Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i, ii, iii, iv

24311 Object

Respondent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. Andy Butcher) [2741]

Summary: A total of 7,752 dwellings be provided in the Borough between 2011-2033 with 310 homes per year to 2022/23 and then 584 per year from 2022/23 taking forward a "stepped delivery" approach to deal with a projected shortfall in the first 5 years of the PSLP. This is mainly because a greater proportion of homes to be delivered in the PSLP comprise sites located in the Green Belt, resulting in longer lead in times to delivery. Whilst we do not raise objections in principle to the stepped approach as far as our clients are concerned there is a prospect that some sites in the Green Belt have the prospect of coming forward earlier, particularly smaller and medium sized developments. This certainly includes this site R24, and R23 that is the subject of a separate representation. The stepped approach proposed, there are still issues with BBC's over-optimistic estimates and assumptions on the delivery of larger strategic sites proposed for allocation in the PSLP. Of the new allocations, 4,578 homes are made up of strategic allocations (of which 2,700 are at DHGV and are to be delivered in the Plan period) and 1,510 are other allocations. The strategic sites therefore represent 68% of the total number of new homes of which some 59% are allocated at DHGV. The ability of larger strategic sites to come forward quickly has been the subject of recent assessments in the Independent Review of Build Out, the Letwin Review (2018); and issues with their complexity, have been ably set out in the Lichfield's study From Start to Finish (2016). Both provide empirical evidence that the early delivery of such sites can be problematical due to a range of factors, including establishing required infrastructure requirements and the timing of housing delivery associated with those requirements, as well as the prolonged or protracted nature of the planning process. The Lichfield's report confirms that the planning process takes, on average, 2.5 years for the planning application determination period for up to 500 units; this can double for sites over 1,000 units. Two of the strategic sites within the PSLP's allocations also comprise developed sites currently in employment uses. The strategic sites are expected to deliver some 1555 homes within 5 years of an assumed adoption in 2020/21. Given the issues set out above it is considered that this is unrealistic and it would not be justified or the most appropriate strategy to rely on these sites for short term housing delivery. Therefore emphasises the need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Change To Plan: Need to review the ability of smaller or medium sized sites such as R23 and R24 to provide for greater flexibility and more homes which have a far greater prospect for short term delivery to ensure the Local Plan is sound.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24311 - 2741 - Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - i, ii, iii, iv

24383 Object

Respondent: Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance [2627]

Agent: Strutt & Parker (Mr Rory Baker) [8242]

Summary: The Council is required to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply at any point in the plan period. In terms of the five-year housing requirement, the NPPF (paragraph 73) confirms a 20% buffer should be applied to the initial calculation in the event the results of the Housing Delivery Test show that delivery has fallen below 85% of the requirement. The PPG confirms the requirement to apply such a buffer in such circumstances also applies where the Local Planning Authority are seeking to confirm their five-year housing land supply through a recently adopted Local Plan. The 2018 Housing Delivery Test measurement for Brentwood Borough shows that only 51% of the Borough's housing requirements were met over the last three years; well below the figure required to avoid a 20% buffer having to be applied. The Borough's most recent reported five-year housing land supply (Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement as at 31 March 2018 (November 2018) ('HLSS') is 4.1 years. However, this is predicated on a requirement which, when considered in relation to the latest guidance, understates need; and a supply which, again when considered in relation to latest guidance, overstates supply. As such, the actual housing land supply is considerably less. Looking at this in detail, the HLSS considers an annual need of 343 dwellings, resulting in a total requirement once the 20% has been applied of 2,058 dwellings. However, applying the latest guidance and the Standard Method, the Borough's housing requirement is 452 dwellings per annum. Applying the 20% buffer, this results in a five-year requirement of 2,712 dwellings. In terms of supply, the HLSS includes sites without detailed planning permission and without evidence such sites will be delivered within five years. As per the NPPF, such sites cannot be considerable deliverable for the purposes of the five-year housing land supply. Table 1 of the HLSS suggests that at least 1,042 dwellings in the reported supply; 2 Paragraph: 038 Reference ID: 3-038-20180913; 3 Paragraph: 037 Reference ID: 3-037-20180913; did not have planning permission. Once these are removed from the supply calculation, the five-year supply comprises 653 dwellings. It is unclear if and how many of the dwellings categorised as having extant planning permission are on major sites which only benefit from outline permission. Such sites would also have to be discounted. As such, the figure of 653 dwellings may overstate housing supply. A five-year supply of 653 dwellings compared to a requirement of 2,712 represents a 1.2-year housing land supply. The acute housing land supply shortage underlines the importance of allocating sites through the Local Plan which can deliver early in the plan period, and the need to avoid over reliance on large strategic sites which inevitably take a considerable time to bring forward. The housing trajectory provided as Appendix 1 to the PSLP projects that it will enable completion of 2,305 dwellings between 2019/20 and 2023/24 (or, to be precise, it projects 2,305.1 dwellings). Having regard to the Standard Method and the need to apply a 20% buffer to the housing requirement, the total five-year requirement for the Borough is 2,712 dwellings. Therefore, even before critical review of the supply, the PSLP will not provide a five-year supply of housing.

Change To Plan: Additional smaller sites capable of providing homes in the early years of the plan period also need to be allocated in order to ensure the Local Plan is sound - i.e. land to the south of Lodge Close, Hutton.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24383 - 2627 - Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - ii, iv

23808 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: SUPPORT & COMMENT: the timing of the supply of houses accords with the proposed phasing and Hermes' management of the existing leases on the estate. Please note comments in relation to the numbers of new dwellings the site can accommodate.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23808 - 3738 - Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory - None

CHAPTER: Appendix 2: Site Allocations

Appendix 2: Site Allocations

22591 Object

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Please see attached document, which sets out the responses I gave to the site allocations in the consultation in 2018 (NB: reference numbers are different -- why did the Council change them all, I wonder?). The Council seems to have largely ignored my comments.

Change To Plan: Make the Green Belt an absolute priority. For the sites that remain after having discounted the Green Belt ones, impose a minimum density, requiring developers to opt for blocks of flats rather than houses. Where a developer wishes to build houses, they must be terraced, and a strong justification made for the lower density.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22591 - 4539 - Appendix 2: Site Allocations - ii

26390 Object

Respondent: Dr Eleanor Beddoe [8732]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R25 in appendix 2 appears to be in direct contravention of the strategic development objectives in section 3. It is outside the strategic growth areas, in a category C village which does not possess the infrastructure required to support this number of new houses. It does not consider neighbouring developments by Epping council and the combined impact on the village. There is not demonstrable evidence that will consideration of alternatives including brownfield site has be considered.

Change To Plan: Revise site allocations to focus on urban extension to Brentwood or similar in identified growth areas. This would make the proposed development and associated plan more consistent and suitable when measured against its own objectives.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26390 - 8732 - Appendix 2: Site Allocations - i, ii

23736 Support

Respondent: St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]

Agent: Strutt & Parker LLP (Mr. James Firth) [2048]

Summary: The reference in Appendix 2 to the Brentwood Enterprise Park Site's delivery forecasting being "Years 5-15" should be amended instead to state: "Years 1 - 15" in order to reflect the intentions of the landowners and St Modwen and in particular the potential for early delivery of a phase of development using the existing access arrangements.

Change To Plan: The reference in Appendix 2 to the Brentwood Enterprise Park Site's delivery forecasting being "Years 5-15" should be amended instead to state: "Years 1 - 15".

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23736 - 5124 - Appendix 2: Site Allocations - i

22513 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Within the site allocation proformas there is an inconsistency in the format between the employment and residential allocations (employment years 1-5 etc, residential 2012/22 - 2022/23).

It is recommended that one format is used.

Change To Plan: Amend format to ensure consistency.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22513 - 6776 - Residential-led Site Allocations - iii

24058 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]

Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]

Summary: The forecasted delivery times for the proposed sites in the plan is ambitious. The level of growth for strategic sites such as Dunton Hills is not realistic and there is no evidence to support this. The plan is unlikely to be adopted until 2020 at the earliest and with the complexity of the applications for Dunton Hills, this will be delayed still further so the timetable there is unrealistic. Therefore more smaller sites are needed to be flexible to meet the 5 year land supply for housing.

Change To Plan: Add Land at rear of Mill House Farm to plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24058 - 8359 - Residential-led Site Allocations - i

24063 Object

Respondent: Mr Terry Haynes [8359]

Agent: Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr Matthew Wood) [8360]

Summary: Land at rear of Mill House Farm is suitable and should be added. Evidence base should be revisited. Site is a suitable urban extension to Hook End, it would be well placed to assist in enhancing the villages. The Green Belt study confirms suitability of the site with moderate impact on the Green Belt. Other sites with similar impact are in the plan.

Change To Plan: Add land rear of Mill House Farm to plan

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24063 - 8359 - Residential-led Site Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

25712 Object

Respondent: Ms Norma Jennings [5444]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I believe that problems besetting the Clapgate scrapyard site include difficulties involving access. Yet to invest in providing this could help to solve the problems. Traffic from the large amount of houses destined for Pilgrims Hatch, with access to the Doddinghurst Road, will make the road even more congested at peak times and will result in "rat runs" along minor roads. Traffic from those houses on the William Hunter Way site will put an ENORMOUS amount of pressure on Brentwood's congested unofficial ring road, comprising Western Avenue and Western Road. The junction with the latter and Weald Road is totally inadequate with traffic lights so close to the mini roundabout there. To build these houses will deprive the town of valuable car parking space and dissuade outsiders from visiting Brentwood.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 25712 - 5444 - Residential-led Site Allocations - i, ii, iii, iv

25801 Object

Respondent: Mr Matthew Ionescu [8576]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Sawyers Hall Lane development would result in loss of greenery and increase in local pollution. Urbanisation in these areas could further effect the biodiversity and quality if further traffic is added

Change To Plan: Has considered local opinion to an extent but requires further local consultation with residents.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 25801 - 8576 - Residential-led Site Allocations - iii

26396 Object

Respondent: Mr Gareth Beedoe [8733]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R25 will have a detrimental impact on both the human and natural environment of the village. It fails to adhere to the strategic objectives of the plan. The village of Blackmore has a substantial heritage value to Essex and as such development should only be considered if no further option is available. Brentwood Borough Council have not demonstrated that there are not other brownfield sites in the key growth areas which should take priority over this proposed greenfield development. Equally, there has been no housing needs survey to demonstrate why Blackmore is even being considered in the local plan.

Change To Plan: Removal of development site R25 would move the local plan consistent with the strategy outlined within the document. By focusing on brownfield sites in the key growth areas, the borough council would be demonstrating for greater sensitivity to the heritage of the area and preserve an idyllic rural village location

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii

Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 26396 - 8733 - Residential-led Site Allocations - i, ii

CHAPTER: Appendix 2: Site Allocations

Residential-led Site Allocations, R02 - Strategic Allocation - West Horndon Industrial Estate

23809 Support

Respondent: Hermes Fund Managers Limited (Mr. Matthew Chillingworth) [3738]

Agent: McGough Planning Consultants (Mr Chris McGough) [2061]

Summary: Its unclear how BBC have worked out the gross and net figures as set out in the table. Its also the case that the Plan's gross to net calculations given for all the larger residential allocation sites varies, sometimes considerably. R02 site measures 17.6ha in total, which nets down to 15ha in the latest draft masterplan. The current layout is showing the number of dwellings to be nearer to 750, well over the figure of "around 580 new homes" set out in the policy. Its also noted that the density of development is lower in the Hermes' latest masterplan (50dph) than that suggested by LP (56.7dph), although this depends on the chosen base.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: Yes

Tests: N/A

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: S - 23809 - 3738 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R02 - Strategic Allocation - West Horndon Industrial Estate - None

24172 Object

Respondent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Agent: Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]

Summary: The site is allocated for development and signposted in Policy SP02: Managing Growth. The site is currently in the Green Belt and the allocation anticipates the development of around 825 homes and associated infrastructure and facilities. The land to the east of the Chelmsford Road is in two ownerships, and both land promoters have agreed the principles of an overall master plan with Brentwood Borough Council. The Draft Local Plan anticipates that the homes will be delivered between 2023/24 and 2030/31; Redrow Homes is intending to see its portion of the new housing completed prior to this period, enabling it to contribute to the 5-Year Housing Land Supply. Redrow Homes, concerned to see its part of the Draft Plan implemented as quickly as possible, which requires the Draft Plan to be adopted equally soon, has considered the case made in the Draft Plan for the release of land from the Green Belt.

Change To Plan: Redrow Homes propose: 1- A new policy to follow on from Policy SP02, in Chapter 4 (Managing Growth): Alteration of Green Belt Boundaries The areas of land covered by the following policies are removed from the Green Belt: RO3, (and all others concerned) The Council has arrived at these alterations on the basis of a sequential examination of brownfield and other sites not in the Green Belt, of a review of densities of development and of discussions with neighbouring local authorities to test the scope for them meeting some of the need for housing arising in Brentwood. The exceptional circumstances that justify the alterations are the severe shortage of land not within the Green Belt and suitable for development, making it impossible for the Council to meet its housing need other than through limited alterations of Green Belt boundaries. The Council has selected sites for boundary alterations where there will be least harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. 2- A new line to be added in the sequential test set out in para 3.23 Using Land Sequentially and the table revised to focus on land types: - Brownfield land within urban areas - Greenfield land within urban areas - Brownfield land within the Green Belt - Greenfield land within the Green Belt 3- Policy NE13 (Site Allocations in the Green Belt) is altered as follows: These sites are de-allocated from the Green Belt to allow development to take place...4- Para 8.117 is deleted.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24172 - 7948 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R03 - Strategic Housing Allocation - Land north of Shenfield - i, ii, iii, iv

24134 Object

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary: Ford notes that Draft Figure 7.6 and Appendix 2 of the PSD includes Part of allocation RO4 - 'Ford offices Eagle Way' (southern parcel of the Ford owned land) as an Existing Employment Site, whereby 2ha of land is proposed to be retained for employment purposes. However, there is no further evidence and/or explanation provided for this designation, which our Client indeed questioned and requested within our previous representations to the PSA consultation. With the new employment allocations alone, BBC appear to have more than supply of employment land to meet its overall forecast needs over the plan period - questioning the requirement to retain 2ha of employment floorspace at the Ford site (whereby there appears to be very limited, or indeed no market demand for such space with no real planning basis for the 2ha figure referenced). Accordingly, it is anticipated that the new supply through the 'Proposed Allocations' should sufficiently compensate for the full release of the Ford site for residential with the Draft allocation for the Site revised accordingly including the removal for the requirement for 2ha of employment land. It is also considered that the distance from Brentwood and Shenfield town centres and train stations would not be an attractive location for commercial investment - acknowledging that typically businesses requiring commercial properties of this size today, would pursue sites within close proximity of strategic infrastructure, trunk roads and more extensive local facilities and services. As such, and in light of current national policy parameters which specifically seek to promote sustainable forms of development, Ford wishes to object to the retention of employment uses at the Site - acknowledging that such a use is not considered an appropriate, or viable use of the Site in the future (contrary to the NPPF 2018).

Change To Plan: Client therefore respectfully requests that the Site is removed from the listed 'Existing Employment Allocations' under Draft Figure 7.6. We also note that no reference is made to the re-provision of the Council Depot which we understand is likely to be retained for employment purposes into the early years of the plan period (given its current operational status).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 24134 - 3769 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R04 - Ford Headquarters and Council Depot, Warley - Southern Site - i, ii, iii, iv

24135 Object

Respondent: Ford Motor Company (Mr Clive Page) [3769]

Agent: Icen Projects Limited (Mr Andrew Gale) [6082]

Summary:

Ford notes that Draft Figure 7.6 and Appendix 2 of the PSD includes Part of allocation RO4 - 'Ford offices Eagle Way' (southern parcel of the Ford owned land) as an Existing Employment Site, whereby 2ha of land is proposed to be retained for employment purposes. However, there is no further evidence and/or explanation provided for this designation, which our Client indeed questioned and requested within our previous representations to the PSA consultation. With the new employment allocations alone, BBC appear to have more than supply of employment land to meet its overall forecast needs over the plan period - questioning the requirement to retain 2ha of employment floorspace at the Ford site (whereby there appears to be very limited, or indeed no market demand for such space with no real planning basis for the 2ha figure referenced). Accordingly, it is anticipated that the new supply through the 'Proposed Allocations' should sufficiently compensate for the full release of the Ford site for residential with the Draft allocation for the Site revised accordingly including the removal for the requirement for 2ha of employment land. It is also considered that the distance from Brentwood and Shenfield town centres and train stations would not be an attractive location for commercial investment - acknowledging that typically businesses requiring commercial properties of this size today, would pursue sites within close proximity of strategic infrastructure, trunk roads and more extensive local facilities and services. As such, and in light of current national policy parameters which specifically seek to promote sustainable forms of development, Ford wishes to object to the retention of employment uses at the Site - acknowledging that such a use is not considered an appropriate, or viable use of the Site in the future (contrary to the NPPF 2018).

Change To Plan:

Client therefore respectfully requests that the Site is removed from the listed 'Existing Employment Allocations' under Draft Figure 7.6. We also note that no reference is made to the re-provision of the Council Depot which we understand is likely to be retained for employment purposes into the early years of the plan period (given its current operational status).

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

O - 24135 - 3769 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R05 - Ford Headquarters and Council Depot, Warley - Northern Site - i, ii, iii, iv

22598 Object

Respondent: Cllr Philip Mynott [8283]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

Site R12 should never have been retained in the final version of the plan. [Should take design led approach to density and retain office space].

Change To Plan:

Remove site R12

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?:No

Tests: iii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference:

O - 22598 - 8283 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R12 - Land at Hunter House, Brentwood - iii, iv

22293 Object

Respondent: Daniel Lucas [6973]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

See point below on changes. In a nutshell the policy is not treating it's community/residents and potential new residents/business owners fairly. It is not a true representation of each sites outcome it is just a site allocation.

Change To Plan:

1. The local plan needs to consider its adjoining residents by confirming that it will only impact an entrance and exit via Chatham Way. As it stands it does not detail the environmental impact and access points that could later become part of the plan and it is this that makes a non compliant true representation.

2. Transparency upon the sites use needs to be indicated and with it such environmental concerns factored, non compliance to full visibility is the problem.

3. Address parking visitor spaces, business spaces, resident spaces and there number allocation.

4. Drainage resolution indicated, facts to be provided and a resolution sort first and foremost.

5. Estimated heights, sizes provides greater transparency accuracy.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: No

Sound?:No

Tests: i, ii, iii

Examination: No

Full Reference:

O - 22293 - 6973 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R13 - Chatham Way car park, Brentwood - i, ii, iii

22208 Object

Respondent: Mr Matthew Vice [8213]

Agent: N/A

Summary: In summary, there is an extensive list of fundamental design issues with the current proposals which WILL have a negative impact on not only my property but the borough as a whole. Its clear that the Council have a brief to provide a certain number of residential units and they are looking to provide them without considering the blatantly obvious implications. Simply postponing these issues to the next stage is not acceptable as they need to be resolved prior to any further progress.

Change To Plan: 1. The car parking provision needs to be resolved and the only way for this to be achieved is a below ground basement to house the car parking. The existing car park is full on most days and if the number of spaces is reduced this will have a detrimental effect on the town center.
2. The number of residential units is not appropriate given the already congested nature of the town center. The development should be dominated by commercial units to improve the high streets retail offering. This needs to include a cinema and restaurants to attract visitors from outside the town.
3. The height of the buildings should be reduced to lessen the impact on daylight for the existing buildings.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: ii, iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22208 - 8213 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R14 - William Hunter Way car park, Brentwood - ii, iii

22593 Support

Respondent: Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The density of this site could be made much higher, given the town centre location. Blocks of flats would be preferable to hosues.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?:Not Specified Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 22593 - 4539 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R14 - William Hunter Way car park, Brentwood - None

22176 Object

Respondent: Mrs Lisa Bryanton [5596]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Our home is on this land you have squared off so does that mean our house is going? The rain water goes into a stream on our land, once concrete is down then this will have to take the excess of water and our garden will be flooded.

Change To Plan: Our house is not showing on the land which is worrying and we need to know we are not going to be put in hardship by our garden flooding as well as issues with our home insurance. The field flood all the time and Redrow have been provided with evidence of this. We would ask building work is comply complete on the land that was built on with the Nursery and the land not built on the leads to the railway line is left as it always has been.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: ii Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22176 - 5596 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R21 - Land south of Ingatestone - ii

22181 Object

Respondent: mr James Kemble [8176]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Site R21 includes the Council Recycling/Waste facility south of the former Garden Centre. The Recycling/Waste facility should be retained in its present location on the edge of the village but away from residences. The proposal to build houses on the field currently used as a gravel depository south of the Recycling / Waste Centre ignores the dangerous access to the A12 which would be created.

Change To Plan: Delete Site R21 (former Garden Centre, Recycling/Waste Centre and field south of Recycling/Waste Centre) from the list for building on.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?:No Tests: ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22181 - 8176 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R21 - Land south of Ingatestone - ii

22211 Object

Respondent: MR NEIL MILLER [8214]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I do not believe that the area has adequate infrastructure to support new housing. The is very little public transport serving this location.

Change To Plan: Improve public transport, Another doctors surgery in the locality

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: i, ii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22211 - 8214 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R25 - Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore - i, ii

22529 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R25 is inherently unsuitable developments because of inadequate access

Change To Plan: Remove site R25 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22529 - 8074 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R25 - Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore - i, ii, iii, iv

22530 Object

Respondent: Holmes & Hills LLP (Mr Michael Harman) [8074]

Agent: N/A

Summary: R26 inherently unsuitable developments because of inadequate access,

Change To Plan: Remove site R26 from plan

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: i, ii, iii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22530 - 8074 - Residential-led Site Allocations, R26 - Land north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore - i, ii, iii, iv

22514 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 3. Effective.

Within the site allocation proformas there is an inconsistency in the format between the employment and residential allocations (employment years 1-5 etc, residential 2012/22 - 2022/23).

It is recommended that one format is used.

Change To Plan: Amend format to ensure consistency.

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22514 - 6776 - Employment Site Allocations - iii

22515 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: 2. Justified
3. Effective

Access is stated as being M25 Junction 29 and/or Warley street (B186).

Currently unclear how access to site can be achieved directly from J29 of M25 as consequence of Lower Thames Crossing improvements to this junction, which includes segregated left turn slip road from the A127 to M25 southbound. BBC therefore need to demonstrate that suitable access arrangements for all modes of travel can be achieved, including appropriate mitigation/improvements. BBC should also demonstrate what discussions have taken place with Highways England, ECC as Highway Authority, and the site promoter to ensure that access arrangements are deliverable and agreed.

Change To Plan: BBC need to demonstrate that suitable access arrangements for all modes of travel can be achieved, including appropriate mitigation/improvements.

BBC should also demonstrate what discussions have taken place with Highways England, ECC as Highway Authority, and the site promoter to ensure that access arrangements are deliverable and agreed.

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: ii, iii

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22515 - 6776 - Employment Site Allocations, E11 - Brentwood Enterprise Park - ii, iii

22708 Object

Respondent: Mr Colin Foan [2992]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I strongly object to the site south of East Horndon Hall being re-designated from Greenbelt to an Employment site (Policy E13) with the proposed intensification of building an industrial estate on the site. The evidence - namely Greenbelt change of designation, flood risk, and transport and infrastructure - as presented does not justify the change and a series of possible alternatives have not been examined in this consultation or the preceding Regulation 18 consultation.

Change To Plan: I recommend that the proposed E13 part of the plan is removed and if necessary the requirement for employment land is fulfilled by using space at other nearby sites.

Legally Compliant?: No

Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified

Sound?: No

Tests: i, ii, iv

Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 22708 - 2992 - Employment Site Allocations, E13 - East Horndon Hall - i, ii, iv

24102 Object

Respondent: Freeths LLP (Mr Paul Brailsford) [5642]

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Paul Brailsford) [5642]

Summary: Although broad support is given for the flexible approach of the required employment size, this flexibility should be reflected in the stated "Development Principles" that underpin the Policy as per the November 2018 draft rather than relegated to the reasoned justification. The National Planning Practice Guidance is explicit that "the local plan should make it clear what is intended to happen over the life of the plan, where and when this will occur and how it will be delivered". As drafted Policy E08 is not sufficiently clear and the support for flexibility in terms of accessible uses should therefore be reinstated under the Development Principles part of the Policy.

Change To Plan: suggest redrafting the text to stated "other uses outside of Class B that enable job opportunities, taking account of market needs." The requested changes are wholly consistent with the statement at paragraph 9.226 that the "primary purpose of the policy is to deliver jobs for the local area" and should therefore be acceptable.

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: iii, iv Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: O - 24102 - 5642 - Employment Site Allocations, E08 - Land Adjacent to A12 and Slip Road, Ingatestone - iii, iv

24103 Support

Respondent: Freeths LLP (Mr Paul Brailsford) [5642]

Agent: Freeths LLP (Mr Paul Brailsford) [5642]

Summary: Support the removal of the site from the Green Belt.

Change To Plan:

Legally Compliant?: Not Specified Duty to Co-operate?: Not Specified Sound?: No Tests: N/A Examination: Not Specified

Full Reference: S - 24103 - 5642 - Employment Site Allocations, E08 - Land Adjacent to A12 and Slip Road, Ingatestone - iii, iv

CHAPTER: Appendix 3: Monitoring Framework

Table 1: Monitoring Framework. Broad parameters for monitoring policy implementation

22516 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Chapter 8 Natural Environment NE01.

3. Effective.

Additional monitoring point required.

Change To Plan: Insert the following text after the third sentence -

Increase in Positive Conservation Management of Local Sites (LoWS and LoGS) for reporting to Government SDL 160-00

Legally Compliant?: Yes Duty to Co-operate?: Yes Sound?: No Tests: iii Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22516 - 6776 - Table 1: Monitoring Framework. Broad parameters for monitoring policy implementation - iii

CHAPTER: Appendix 4: Proposed changes to the Brentwood Policies Map

Appendix 4: Proposed changes to the Brentwood Policies Map

23731 Object

Respondent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587]

Agent: JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587]

Summary: The Appendix 4 of the pre-submission, Regulation 19 Document identifies that the production of a new Policies Map will require changes to the 2005 Proposals Map. Maps setting out the changes to the Plan were stated to be published as part of the Regulation 19 but this has not happened. As such, the plan preparation and consultation process has not adhered to requirements in failing to publish all relevant documents for consultation. The assessment of the site boundaries / inclusion of Protected Urban Open Space, particularly land at Playfield at Brentwood Ursuline is unknown and formal representation is not possible.

Change To Plan: Publication of the Policies Proposals Map to enable it to be consulted upon and to provide context to the references to it within the draft Submission Plan.

Legally Compliant?: No Duty to Co-operate?: No Sound?: No Tests: ii, iv Examination: Yes

Full Reference: O - 23731 - 2587 - Appendix 4: Proposed changes to the Brentwood Policies Map - ii, iv

22264 Object

Respondent: Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The text accompanying 'Heritage Asset' relates to infrastructure not a Heritage Asset.

Change To Plan: Replace the existing text with the following -

A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).

Legally Compliant?: Yes

Duty to Co-operate?: Yes

Sound?: No

Tests: iii

Examination: No

Full Reference: O - 22264 - 6776 - Appendix 6: Glossary - iii