



Consultation Report On the Draft Local Plan 2016

January 2018

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

2. The Formal Process

3. The Consultation Processes So Far

Issues and Options 2009
Your Neighbourhood 2011
Preferred Options 2013
Strategic Growth Options 2015

4. Consultation on the Draft Local Plan 2016

Methods of communication and engagement
Representations (comments) Made
Table 1: Representation Breakdown: Whole Document
Table 2: Representation Breakdown: Housing Sites
Table 3: Representation Breakdown: Employment Site

5. Garden Village Update

6. Conclusion

7. Next steps

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Public Participation Report. Summary of Responses
(by Chapter)

Appendix 2: Sites Only Public Participation Report

Appendix 3: Consulted Organisations

Appendix 4: Adverts, Press Release, Web Text and Consultation Events

Appendix 5: Table of Numbers of Representations Received, by Section.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Statement of Consultation provides an overview of the Brentwood Borough Council public consultation, with residents, stakeholders and interested parties as part of its Local Plan preparation. From the 10 February to the 23 March 2017, the Council invited comments on the Draft Local Plan consultation. This document will describe how these consultations, as well as the Sustainability Appraisals and evidence base, will shape future planning policy.
- 1.2 Once completed, the Statement of Consultation, with the Draft Local Plan, will assist the independent planning Inspector during the Local Plan Examination. It will help establish whether the Local Plan complies with legislation, regulations and guidance.

2. The Formal Process

- 2.1 The engagement processes of the Draft Local Plan consultation and the preparation of this Consultation Statement are in accordance with statutory requirements set out in regulations 18, 19, 20, 22(1), 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the Duty to Co-operate set out in Localism Act 2011 section 33A as well as Brentwood Statement of Community Involvement adopted in December 2012.
- 2.2 Section 33A of the 2011 Localism Act imposes a duty to co-operate in relation to the planning of sustainable development. The duty pertains to Local Planning Authorities as well as other public bodies.
- 2.3 The Town and County Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 identify the statutory consultees as the Environment Agency; Historic England; Natural England; the Civil Aviation Authority; the relevant Clinical Commissioning Group (as representative of the NHS); the Office of Rail Regulation; Transport for London (as the Integrated Transport Authority); any Local Enterprise Partnership (in this case the South East Local Enterprise Partnership); each relevant Highway Authority; and the Marine Management Organisation.
- 2.4 There has been recent legislative, regulative and guidance changes from:
 - Housing White Paper (February 2017)
 - Neighbourhood Planning Act (April 2017)
 - Planning for the right homes in the right places (September 2017)
- 2.5 These changes will be taken into consideration in drafting new planning documents.
- 2.6 Brentwood Borough Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) requires that the public and stakeholders are consulted on realistic and meaningful options as well as relevant regulatory assessments (i.e. Sustainability Appraisal; Strategic Environmental Assessment; and Habitat Regulations Assessment as applicable).

2.7 Brentwood Borough Council supports a continuous process of engagement in which it considers views on Local Plan development even outside of formal consultation periods. This approach is described in the SCI. Full details of the SCI can be found at: <http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=2380>

2.8 The rest of this Statement of Consultation is structured as follows:

Section 3 provides background information on previous Local Plan consultation undertaken prior to the Draft Local Plan 2016;

Section 4 highlights the methods that were used during the consultation period and a statistical summary of the representations received;

Section 5 provides an update on the proposed Garden Village.;

Section 6 provides a conclusion; and

Section 7 sets out the next steps.

Appendix 1: Gives the full summary of the Council responses in the *Public Participation Report*. This is by chapter.

Appendix 2: Sites Only Public Participation Report

Appendix 3: Consulted Organisations

Appendix 4: Adverts, Press Release, Web Text and Consultation Events

Appendix 5: Table of Numbers of Representations Received, by Section.

3. The Consultation Process So Far

3.1 Previous Local Plan consultations were undertaken as follows:

- Issues and Options - Pathway to Sustainable Brentwood Consultation, November 2009
- Your Neighbourhood Consultation, May - June 2011
- Preferred Options Consultation, July – September 2013
- Strategic Growth Options, January - February 2015. Plus: Dunton Garden Suburb, joint consultation with Basildon Borough Council.

3.2 Where required, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) updates or interim assessment work has been undertaken. The SA process is undertaken in parallel with and informs successive stages of Local Plan preparation. These documents can be found on the Council's website at:
<http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=694>

Issues and Options 2009

3.3 During 2009, Brentwood Borough Council and Local Strategic Partnership consulted on issues and options facing the Borough up to 2031.

- 3.4 Following the 2009 Consultation, in light of changing national policy and legislation the Council decided to bring the Core Strategy together with site allocations and development management policies to produce a Local Plan rather than a suite of separate documents as part of a Local Development Framework.
- 3.5 Copies of the Pathway to a Sustainable Brentwood consultation leaflet were sent to all Borough residents and other stakeholders. Views were sought on a vision, objectives, spatial options to guide future development in the Borough and broad themes, such as sustainable use of resources, environmental protection, and meeting people's needs. Focus groups reflecting on key issues raised by the consultation were held in January 2010.
- 3.6 The Council consulted on Issues and Options for the Core Strategy in November 2009. This sought views on a vision, strategic objectives and spatial options. The most popular spatial option for Brentwood was to focus growth in and around Brentwood town. Strong support was shown for the proposed objectives, in particular, preserving the natural and historic environment, biodiversity and visual character of Brentwood, suggesting strong community priority is placed upon the preservation of Brentwood's natural and built assets.

'Your Neighbourhood' Consultation 2011

- 3.7 As part of the Council's work towards a new Local Development Plan, and to reflect the localism agenda, a Borough-wide consultation with individual neighbourhoods was undertaken. It was designed to give local residents, business and other members of the community an opportunity to put forward their views, aspirations and priorities for their area and to influence the Borough's planning policies. Consultation analysis can be found on the Council's website. Consultation events with street stalls were identified as a pro-active way of reaching people across the Borough.

Preferred Options 2013

- 3.8 Consultation on the Local Plan 2015- 2030 Preferred Options took place between 24 July and 2 October 2013. With the aims to increase public awareness and encourage them to have a say, the Council has carried out an extensive consultation.
- 3.9 Publicity and awareness raising: branding, press releases, Parish bulletins, posters, and social media were used to raise people's awareness of the Draft Local Plan, to give details of how to get involved and to act as further means of reaching some local groups.
- 3.10 Making information accessible and available: Details of the Draft Local plan and information of the Consultation events were made available via the Council's website, phone calls and drop-in sessions as well as printed media.
- 3.11 Events: Consultation events in the form of High Street stalls and attending Family Fun Days as well as Parish Council Meetings to provide opportunities for a wide range of local community to discuss details about the Preferred Options and give their feedback.
- 3.12 Responses to the consultation were invited via:

- An online version of the Plan on the Council's website
- Email
- Letter

3.13 Consultees on the Local Plan database were sent updates and information.

3.14 The contacts database comprised of:

- Statutory consultees – (such as government agencies, neighbouring authorities, Parish Councils, and prescribed bodies as part of Duty to Cooperate)
- General consultees – local organisations and groups
- Other consultees – who made representations to earlier stages of the Plan or requested to be kept informed.

Strategic Growth Options 2015

3.15 The Consultation took place for a six week period between 6 January to 17 February 2015. The consultation aimed to update the options for new development, along with the opportunities and constraints due to changes in regional and national planning since the 2013 Preferred Options consultation. The Strategic Growth Options was accompanied by an Interim Sustainability Appraisal.

3.16 In addition to the Strategic Growth Options, a policy development document was drafted with Basildon Borough Council and consulted on during the same period.

3.17 The key changes were:

- The need to meet the objectively assessed housing need within the borough and the consequences of failing to do this;
- Reviewing employment land and job provision in light of the related housing supply position;
- New Gypsy and Traveller assessment; and
- Basildon Borough proposals to the West of Basildon, up to the boundary with Brentwood.

3.18 Publicity and awareness raising: continued use of branding, press releases, Parish bulletin and drop-in sessions, posters, and social media were used to raise people's awareness of the Strategic Growth Options, to give details of how to get involved and to act as further means of reaching some local groups.

3.19 Making information accessible and available: Details of the Strategic Growth Options and information of the Consultation events were made available via the Council's website, phone calls and drop-in sessions as well as printed media.

3.20 Events: Consultation events in the form drop-in sessions, with staff available to answer questions. As well as attending Parish Council meeting to provide

opportunities for to discuss details about the Draft Local Plan and give their feedback.

- 3.21 Responses to the consultation were invited via:
- An online version of the Plan on the Council's website
 - Email
 - Letter
- 3.22 Consultees on the Local Plan database were sent notification of the consultation, updates and information.
- 3.23 A total of 1005 people or organisations / groups made representations on the Strategic Growth Options. A total of 9502 comments were made. Consideration has been given to all the points raised and these are available in the 2016 Statement of Consultation. This is available on the Brentwood Borough Website at: <http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/pdf/09022016154825u.pdf>

Dunton Garden Suburb (2015) Joint Document with Basildon Borough Council

- 3.24 The Dunton Garden Suburb joint consultation took place in tandem with the Strategic Growth Options consultation, which explored the concept for cross-boundary development on the land west of Laindon/Dunton (Basildon Borough) and east of West Horndon (Brentwood Borough). A two week extension to the consultation period for the Dunton Garden Suburb was made.
- 3.25 A separate Consultation statement has been produced for this document as it did not form part of the emerging plan, but instead provided an opportunity for both Councils to consult on an initial concept. This Consultation Statement is available on the Brentwood Borough website at:
<http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/pdf/04012016154404u.pdf>

4. Consultation on the Draft Local Plan 2016

Methods of Communication and Engagement

- 4.1 The consultation took place for a six week period between 10 February to the 23 March 2016. It consulted on a range of planning policies and potential sites for new housing and employment development within the borough the Draft Local Plan was accompanied by an Interim Sustainability Appraisal.
- 4.2 The Draft Local Plan set out the proposed strategy, policies and land allocation to meet future needs over the period 2013 to 2030, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.3 Publicity and awareness raising utilised use of Council local plan branding, press releases, Parish bulletins, posters, and social media. These were used to raise people's awareness of the consultation on the Draft Local Plan and to encourage representations to be made to the Council (comments on the Draft Local Plan), to give details of how to make these representations (comments) on the Draft Local Plan, and to act as further means of reaching some local groups and individuals.

- 4.4 The Draft Local Plan and information of the consultation events were made available via the Council's website, posters, phone calls and drop-in sessions as well as printed media.
- 4.5 The public drop-in sessions were arranged throughout the borough to give opportunity to ask questions on the Draft Local Plan, the strategy the Council were proposing in order to allocate new development sites and on the planning policies which were to guide new development within the Borough. Much of the discussion at these drop-in events was based around the proposed sites, the opportunities and constraints of the sites and alternative options.
- 4.6 Each person or organisation who had previously commented on draft planning documents was either emailed or sent a letter directly, informing them about the consultation and the drop-in events. This was in addition to Planning Policy Newsletters that had been sent out digitally, updating the progress of the Draft Local Plan prior to consultation. This information was also placed on the Council's website. Appendix 3 lists any of the organisations and groups that were contacted.
- 4.7 Representations (comments) to the consultation were invited via:
- An online version of the Plan on the Council's website
 - Email
 - Letter
- 4.8 Appendix 4 gives examples of the text and methodology used to increase awareness of the Draft Local Plan consultation beyond the notification of those on the Council's consultation database.

Representations (comments) Made

- 4.9 With the fundamental issue facing the borough of a finite capacity of brownfield sites within urban areas, higher development needs put pressure for the release of Green Belt sites in order to meet those needs in full.
- 4.10 A process of sequential land use was proposed by the Draft Local Plan, prioritising brownfield sites within urban areas before brownfield sites in the Green Belt, strategic sites and then Green Belt Sites. The proposed release of Green Belt for new homes was less than 1.5% of the land area of the borough. A new Garden village site was proposed in the south of the borough (now known as Dunton Hills Garden Village).
- 4.11 The full report of representations received with the Council's responses is available in *Appendix 1: Public Participation Report. Summary of Responses (by Chapter)*, and sites only Public Participation Report in Appendix 2.

Petitions/Group Responses

- 4.12 Included within the representations, the Council received 3 petitions:
- Honeypot Lane 1 – 288 signatories – “NO to housing development at land off Honeypot Lane, Brentwood, Essex”
 - Honeypot Lane 2 – 36 signatories - “Object to the potential development at land off Honeypot Lane. Traffic in this area is already at its maximum

and there is no easy access to this land that will not carve up Honeypot Lane and Weald Road. Parking is a real problem and we can take no more. Our local facilities and schools are already oversubscribed and at breaking point. A development here will have a detrimental effect on those homes in Honeypot Lane, Weald Road, the Homesteads and historic South Weald. Please remove this site from the potential developments identified for Brentwood.”

- South Hill Residents Association Petition - 66 signatories – “South Hill Residents Association Ltd members face a continual financial burden to maintain the estate roads which are not constructed to adoptable standards. The estate currently suffers through traffic accessing London road via Hill Road, South Weald Road and Hillside Walk. The increased volume of traffic accessing Honeypot Lane from a 250+ housing estate in Honeypot Lane would see a significant increase in traffic wanting to use our private roads putting an increased financial burden on SHRAL members.”

4.13 Additionally, there were group representations from four resident’s associations

- Dunton Community Association Questionnaire – 73 Signatories. 68 Responded with their objections and concerns regarding the proposed Garden Village and impacts from development in the A127 corridor. There were five signatories who were supportive of the Draft Local Plan proposals for the south of the borough.
- Billericay Action Group. Billericay Action Group objects to Brentwood Borough Council meeting its Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). Meeting the OAN effects SE Essex in a number of undesirable ways, including the unnecessary creation of Dunton Garden Suburb on the edge of Basildon.
- Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association. We object on the principle grounds that site 044 should remain as protected urban open space, development as proposed will give serious adverse highway conditions, both congestion and safety, the development will not be in keeping with the area.
- Hatch Road Neighbourhood Association. Objects to proposed development off Doddington Road, either side of the A12 and any development in the vicinity of Hatch Road due to access, transport and services.
- Land East of Nags Head Lane. A number of similar responses objecting to this location were received expressing concern over impact on existing residents and Green Belt.

Numerical Breakdown of the Representations Received

- 4.14 A total of 1281 people or groups made representations to the Draft Local Plan 2016 consultation. Many consultees made multiple representations in response to the draft policies and particularly on proposed sites. In total, 3942 representations were made, approximately 11.6% were submitted directly onto the Council’s online Local Development Plan portal, 51.7% of which were

submitted via email and the remaining 36.7% were submitted on paper. Of the 3942 representations made, 12.8 were in support; 24.8 were comments and 62.4 % were objecting to part or all of the Draft Local Plan.

- 4.15 A numerical breakdown summary is given below in Table 1. Tables 2 and 3 give the numerical breakdown of the representations received for the proposed housing and employment sites. The full numerical breakdown is in Appendix 5.

A total of 3942 Representations were made by 1281 people or organisations.

Of the 3942:

- 457 (11.6%) were made via the on-line portal
- 2037 (51.7%) made by email
- 1448 (36.48) by paper

Of the 3942:

- 504 (12.8%) Supported
- 2459 (62.4%) Objected
- 979 (24.8%) Commented

Table 1: Representation Breakdown: Whole Document

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|--|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Whole Plan | 504 (12.8%) | 2459 (62.4%) | 979 (24.8%) | 3942 |
| Chapter 1 Totals: | 33 | 137 | 18 | 191 |
| Chapter 2 Totals: | 5 | 91 | 112 | 208 |
| Chapter 3 Totals: | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| Chapter 4 Totals: | 18 | 25 | 20 | 63 |
| Chapter 5 Totals: | 103 | 387 | 152 | 642 |
| Chapter 6 Totals: | 25 | 25 | 51 | 106 |
| Chapter 7 Totals | 135 | 1616 | 349 | 2098 |
| Chapter 8 Totals | 28 | 50 | 92 | 170 |
| Chapter 9 Totals | 92 | 73 | 61 | 219 |
| Chapter 10 Totals | 37 | 41 | 110 | 194 |
| Appendix 1: Retail Hierarchy | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Appendix 2: Proposed Housing Delivery | 18 | 3 | 10 | 31 |
| Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| Appendix 4: Policy changes since Preferred Options (2013) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Appendix 5: Glossary | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Appendices Total | 22 | 8 | 14 | 44 |

Table 2: Representation Breakdown: Housing Sites

| Chapter 7 Housing | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|---------|--------|---------|------------|
| 003 Wates Way | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| 005 Essex County Fire Brigade | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 013B Warley Training Centre, Essex Way, Warley | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 020,021 & 152 West Horndon Industrial Estates, Childerditch Lane and Station Road, West Horndon, [mixed use with a range of supporting local services], | 5 | 32 | 8 | 45 |
| 039, Westbury Road Car Park, Westbury Road, Brentwood, [could retain parking as part of redevelopment] | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 040 Chatham Way/ Crown Street Car Park, Brentwood, [could retain parking as part of redevelopment] | 0 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| 041 Land at Hunter House, Western Road, Brentwood | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 042 Land at Bell Mead, Ingatestone | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 044 & 178, Land at Priests Lane, Brentwood (including Petitions). | 3 | 375 | 10 | 388 |
| 081 Council Depot, The Drive, Warley, CM13 3BH | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 098, Ingleton House, Stock Lane, Ingatestone | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 099, Victoria Court, Victoria Road, Brentwood, [redevelopment to include replacement of lost sheltered housing] | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 100, Baytree Centre, [residential units provided above retail redevelopment] 200 Dwellings | 1 | 7 | 12 | 20 |
| 010 Sow and Grow Nursery, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch | 39 | 2 | 4 | 45 |

| | | | | |
|---|----|-----|----|-----|
| | | | | |
| 128 Ingatestone Garden Centre, Roman Road, Ingatestone | 0 | 39 | 9 | 48 |
| Strategic Sites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 200 Dunton Hills Garden Village | 10 | 111 | 21 | 142 |
| Greenfield Green Belt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 022 Land at Honeypot Lane, Brentwood, CM14 | 2 | 566 | 7 | 575 |

Table 3: Representation Breakdown: Employment Sites

| Chapter 8 Employment | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|---------|--------|---------|---------------|
| 079C Land adjacent to Ingatestone By-Pass | 1 | 6 | 3 | 10 |
| 101A Brentwood Enterprise Park (M25 junction 29) | 1 | 14 | 1 | 16 |
| 101B Brentwood Enterprise Park (Land at Codham Hall) | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 112 Childerditch Industrial Estate | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 117 Ford Offices, Eagle Way, Brentwood | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 12D Childerditch Industrial Estate (the Range) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 200 Dunton Hills Garden Village strategic allocation (Employment) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

5. Garden Village Update

- 5.1 Garden Suburb to Garden Village: The Dunton Garden Suburb joint work with Basildon Borough Council did not continue as a joint project. Brentwood Borough has since put forward a proposal within the Draft Local Plan for a standalone Garden Village, Dunton Hills Garden Village. The premise of a strategic allocation was core to the Draft Local Plan.
- 5.2 Many representations considered this option had not the evidence or detail that was required for a new village. Information on infrastructure and on impact was highlighted particularly by residents and statutory consultees. The Council has worked to gather and assess this and this is to be reflected in the drafting the Local Plan.
- 5.3 Work is now progressing to deliver a new garden village, which is important to the Local Plan strategy. In addition to the above resource and support, the Homes & Communities Agency are helping to add value to the project in terms of expertise and specialist knowledge. Design Council CABA has also been providing facilitation support to help stakeholders/partners work together and identify key outputs for the project.
- 5.4 A separate Project Board has been created involving key stakeholders, including Essex CC. This will help to accelerate the project and provides the necessary governance at these initial stages.
- 5.5 Funding for this project is assisted by the grant awarded by the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Homes and Communities Agency. A further application was made for additional capacity funding this summer. The Council has recently received confirmation that this application was successful with a further £230,000 of funding to be added to the monies received to date. These funding awards will assist the programme to fund the necessary resources to deliver agreed outcomes over the next year and beyond. Further dedicated resources and time will need to be allocated to this project during the early development stages.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 The Council has carefully considered all the key issues, objections and support made and points raised from the consultation process. These representations have been considered in full by the Council and the Councils considered response is made available in Appendix 1: Public Participation Report, 6.2: The Summary of Responses (by Chapter), and Appendix 2: Sites only public participation report.
- 6.2 All these points have been used to inform the Draft Local Plan: Preferred Site Allocations 2018 document.
- 6.3 Please note that within the Draft Local Plan public participation report, the section on 'Figure 7.2: Housing Land Allocations' contains the abbreviation 'tbc' denoting 'to be considered'. The consideration of these representations is detailed in Appendix 2: Public Participation Report Sites.

7. Next Steps

- 7.1 Brentwood Borough Council has proposed to carry out a further Regulation 18 consultation early in 2018 which will give an update on the assessment and selection of sites, with a more detailed commentary on this process. This will be followed by a Regulation 19 Submission consultation in the late summer of 2018 once the consultation representations have been fully considered.

Appendix 1: Public Participation Report.

(Summary of Representations by Chapter).

Please refer to separate document. Please note this is 421 pages long and 3.6MB.

Appendix 2: Site Representation Summaries.

(Received from the 2016 Draft Local Plan Consultation. Proposed Housing Sites).

Please refer to separate document.

Appendix 3: Consulted Organisations

Emails or letters were sent to all those on the consultation database which includes all those who had made comments on any of the previous Local Plan consultations.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| A.G.J. Planning Consultancy | Brentwood Weekly News | Ministry of Housing, |
| Action Group for the Homeless | Brentwood Youth Council | Communities and Local |
| Adagio School of Dance | British Horse Society Eastern | Government |
| Adam Holmes Associates | Region | Department for Education |
| Advisory Council for the | British Telecom | Development Securities PLC |
| Education of Romany and | BT Plc | DHA Planning |
| other Travellers (ACERT) | Bushcade Limited | Dialogue Communication |
| Affinity Water (formerly Veolia | Businesses and Retailers | Planning |
| Water) | C2C Rail & National Express | Diocese of Brentwood |
| Age Concern | East Anglia | Doddington Parish Council |
| Alan Pipe & Partners | Cadena Holdings Limited | Dominic Lawson |
| Alan Wiperman & Co. | Campaign for Real Ale | Dove Jeffrey Homes |
| Property and Town Planning | (CAMRA) | DPDS Consulting Group |
| Anderson Group | Campaign for the Protection of | DPP LLP |
| Andrew Martin Associates | Rural England (CPRE) | Drivers Jonas |
| Anglia Ruskin University | Carter Jonas | DTZ |
| Anglian Water | Castle Point Borough Council | EA Strategic Land LLP |
| Anglo European School | CBRE Planning | Eagle Public House, The |
| Asphaltic Developments Ltd | CHBC Architects | East of England Ambulance |
| Banner Homes Central Ltd | Chelmsford City Council | Service |
| Barratt Homes | Chelmsford Diocesan Board of | East of England Business |
| Barton Willmore | Finance | Group |
| Barwood Land and Estates Ltd | Childerditch Properties | Eastbrook |
| Basildon and Brentwood | Chilmark Consulting Limited | Eclipse Online Solutions |
| Clinical Commissioning Group | City Electrical Factors Limited | EJW Planning Ltd |
| Basildon Borough Council | Civil Aviation Authority | English Heritage |
| Baytree Centre | Clearbrook Group Plc | Environment Agency |
| BBC Essex | Clever Clogs Day Nursery | Epping Forest District Council |
| Beachcroft LLP | CLM Ltd | EPS Real Estate |
| Beazer Strategic Land | Cluttons | Equal Opportunities |
| Beazer Strategic Land | Cluttons, planning & | Commission |
| Bellview Developments | regeneration | Essex and Suffolk Water |
| Bellway Estates | Coldon Engineering Co Ltd | Essex Chambers of Commerce |
| Bell Cornwell Partnership | Colliers CRE | Essex County Council |
| Bell Cornwell Partnership | Colliers International | Essex County Fire & Rescue |
| Beresfords | Collins Coward | Essex County Football |
| Bidwells | Confederation of British | Association |
| Billericay Town Council | Industry | Essex Disabled Peoples |
| Bird Luckin Ltd | Country Land and Business | Association Ltd |
| Blackmore Parish Council, | Association Countryside | Essex Police |
| Blackmore Village Hall | Properties | Essex Race Equality Council |
| Blue Sky Planning | Courtley Consultants Ltd | Essex Race Equality Council |
| Bolson's Limited | CPR Essex | Essex Society for Archaeology |
| BOSP (Brighter Opportunities | CqMS | & History |
| through Supported Play) | Crest Nicholson Eastern | Essex Voluntary Association |
| Boyer Planning | Croll Group | for the Blind |
| Brentwood Access Group | Cross London Rail Links Ltd | Essex Wildlife Trust |
| Brentwood Arts Council | Cross London Rail Links Ltd | Everdene House |
| Brentwood Branch Campaign | Crossrail | Farming and Rural |
| to Protect Rural Essex | Croudace Strategic Ltd | Conservancy Agency |
| Brentwood Chamber of | Crown Street Café | Federation of Small |
| Commerce | Cushman & Wakefield | Businesses (Essex Region) |
| Brentwood Community | Cushman & Wakefield, Healey | Fields in Trust |
| Transport | & Baker | First City Limited |
| Brentwood Council for | Daily Express | Firstplan |
| Voluntary Services | DAS Rural Property Services | Flagship Housing |
| Brentwood Gypsy and Traveller | David Russell Associates | Ford UK |
| Support Group | Denis Tyson Associates | Forestry Commission |
| Brentwood Housing Trust Ltd | Denis Tyson Associates | Forestry Commission |
| Brentwood Recorder | | |
| Brentwood School | | |

Friends, Families and Travellers and Traveller Law
 Fusion Online Ltd
 G K Engineering & Design LLP
 General Aviation Awareness Council
 George Wimpey
 Gerald Eve LLP
 GL Hearn
 Gladman Developments
 Go Planning Ltd
 Great Burstead and South Green Village Council
 Great Warley Conservation Society
 Great Warley Conservation Society
 Greater London Authority
 Green Party Member
 Greogory Gray Associates
 Groundwork
 Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform Coalition
 Hallam Land Management Ltd
 Hans House Group
 Hansteen Holdings Plc
 Harris Lamb Limited
 Hartwood Conservation Group
 Havering College
 Healey & Baker DAC
 Health and Safety Executive
 Helix Architects
 Hermes Fund Managers
 Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council
 High Quest Properties
 High Quest Properties
 Highcross
 Highways Agency
 Hilbery Chaplin
 Hill Partnerships
 Hill Street Holdings Ltd.
 Hindu Dharma Society
 Home Builder's Federation
 Homes and Communities Agency
 Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council
 Blue Sky Planning
 BNP Paribas Real Estate
 Humphreys & Sons Ltd
 Hutton Mount Association
 Hutton Mount Ltd
 Hutton Poplars Conservation Society
 Hutton Preservation Society
 Icen Projects Ltd
 Ignis Asset Management
 Imperial Engineering
 Indigo Planning
 Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council
 Ingatestone Garden Centre Ltd.
 Ingleton Wood LLP
 Ingatestone & Fryerning Community Association

Inspire Consultancy
 Inter Church Action Group for the Homeless
 Invest Essex
 itizens Advice Bureau
 Ixion Holdings
 J and M Interiors Limited
 J. Hancock & Associates
 Jack and Jill's Pre-School
 Januarys Consultant Surveyors Ltd.
 JB Planning Associates Ltd.
 John Bishop Partnership
 John Daldry Partnership
 John Finch Partnership
 John H. Bayliss & Co
 Joy Fook Restaurant
 J's Hospice
 JTS Partnership LLP
 Kelvedon Hatch Parish Council
 Kelvedon Hatch Village Society
 Kirkwells
 Laindon Holdings Ltd
 Laing Homes Ltd
 Lambert Smith Hampton
 Land Commercial Surveyors Ltd
 Landmark Information Group
 Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd
 Levvel Ltd
 Little Burstead Parish Council
 Lombard
 London Borough of Havering
 London Borough of Newham
 London Green Belt Council
 London Planning Practice Ltd
 Lovell Johns
 LSR Solicitors & Planning Consultants
 Lyndsays Farm Livery
 Maldon District Council
 Marguerite Livingstone Associates
 Marine Management Organisation
 Mark Jackson Planning
 Marks and Spencer
 Martin Grant Homes
 Martin McColl Ltd
 Mass and Co
 McCarthy Stone Retirement and Lifestyle Ltd
 McGough Planning Consultants
 Melville Dunbar Associates
 Metropolitan Police
 Michael Aves Planning Consultant
 MIND (Brentwood)
 MK Planning
 Mobile Operators Association
 Mono Consultants Limited
 Mountnessing Parish Council
 Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
 National Association of Health Workers

National Association of Teachers of Travellers
 National Farmers Union
 National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
 National Grid UK
 National Rail
 National Travellers Action Group Natural England
 National Trust
 Navestock Parish Council
 Network Rail
 NFU East Anglia
 NHS England
 NHS North East London
 NHS Property Services
 NHS South West Essex
 Nicholas Grahame Associates Ltd.
 Oaktree Gallery
 oal Authority
 OCE
 Office of Rail Regulation
 Oldfield King Planning
 Oldfield King Planning
 One Property Group Ltd
 One Railway
 Ongar Parish Council
 P A Scott Associates
 Paul Hales Associates
 Paul Hales Associates
 Peacock & Smith
 Pegusus Group
 Persimmon Homes
 Persimmon Homes Essex
 Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd
 Planning Bureau Limited
 Planning Inspectorate
 Planning Perspectives
 Planning Potential
 Planware Ltd.
 Power Networks
 Pradera
 PRC Fewster
 Rapleys LLP
 Renewables East
 Richard Tattersall Chartered Surveyor & Land Management Consultant
 Robert Savage & Associates
 Robinson Escott Planning
 Roomes Stores Ltd.
 Royal Mail Group
 Royal Town Planning Institute
 Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI)
 RPS Planning & Development
 RSPB
 RSPB
 Rural Community Council of Essex
 S & J Padfield and Partners
 S J & C M Norris
 S Walsh and Sons Ltd
 Sainsbury's
 Sans Souci Enterprises Limited

Savills IK
Savills UK
Scott Properties
Shades (Shenfield) Ltd.
Shelter (Eastern Counties)
Simpson's Mirrors
SJK Planning
Smart Planning Ltd
Smith, Stuart & Reynolds
SNAP
Social Welfare Commission
South East LEP
South Essex Partnership
University NHS Trust
South West Essex Primary
Care Trust
Sow & Grow Nursery
Spectrum Planning
Sport England
St Helen's Infant School
St Marys C of E Primary school
St Thomas of Canterbury
CEVA Infant School
St. Georges Church
St. Thomas Church

Stanford Rivers Parish Council
Stewart Ross Associates
Stondon Massey Parish
Council
Strategic Land and Planning
Consultants
Strategic Perspective
Strutt and Parker
Sunbury Homes
Sworders
Taylor Wimpey
Tetlow King Planning
Thames Chase Trust
Thames Water
Thorndon Guardians
Thorndon Hall Management
Company
Thorndon Park Golf Club
Threadneedle Property
Investments Ltd
Thriftwood Scout Campsite &
Activity Centre
Thurrock Borough Council
Together – SUNRISE
Transport for London

Traveller Law Reform Project
UK
Traveller Movement (formerly
the Irish Traveller Movement in
Britain)
University of Essex
Ursuline School
Ursuline Sisters
Visit East Anglia
Visit Essex
Waitrose Ltd
West Horndon Parish Council
Westbrook Properties
Whirlledge & Nott
Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd
Wilkes, Head and Eve
Wingfield Planning
Consultancy
Woodland Trust
Woodside School
Workman FM
WS Atkins
Young Peoples Counselling
Service
Zada Capital

Appendix 4: Adverts, Press Release, Web Information and Consultation Events

Advert Text

Brentwood Borough Council
Draft Local Plan Consultation

Regulations 18 and 35 of the
Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Public Notice Inviting Representations

On 27 January 2016, the Council formally approved the Brentwood Draft Local Plan document for public consultation under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The Draft Local Plan Consultation provides the opportunity to consider the borough's strategic vision, land allocations for development and planning policies to guide decision making.

The Draft Local Plan document will be available for public consultation for six weeks commencing Wednesday 10 February 2016 and ending Wednesday 23 March 2016. During this time any person or organisation may make comments on the document. Those wishing to submit responses are encouraged to use the Council's web-based consultation system. This can be accessed from the Council's homepage (www.brentwood.gov.uk).

Alternatively, comment forms are available on request and can be downloaded from the Council website or obtained at the deposit points (listed below). Please send completed forms to the following address:

Planning Policy Team, Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8AY
Email: planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk

The Draft Local Plan document and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Report can be viewed on the Council's website (www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan). Hard copies of the consultation document will be made available for public inspection during normal opening hours at the following deposit points until 23 March 2016:

Brentwood Council Offices (Town Hall, Ingrave Road, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8AY)
Brentwood Library (New Road, Brentwood, CM14 4BP)
Shenfield Library (Hutton Road, Shenfield, Brentwood, CM15 8NJ)
Ingatestone Library (High Street, Ingatestone, CM4 9EU)

All comments must be received by the Council by Wednesday 23 March.

Publicity

Radio

A radio advert was produced and played on Brentwood *Phoenix FM*.

Web Text

General

The Council is currently consulting on a stage of Local Plan preparation. The Brentwood Draft Local Plan is available for public comment between Wednesday 10 February and Wednesday 23 March 2016. The Draft Plan sets out the proposed vision, objectives, strategy, planning policies and sites to meet development needs over the next 15 years. Responding online is the quickest and easiest way to comment. You can view the Draft Plan and respond to proposed policies by using the Consultation Portal link below.
Local Plan Consultation Portal

You can also view a [PDF version](#) of the Draft Plan document.

An Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) accompanying the Draft Plan is also available to view and comment on. For more information please see our [Sustainability Appraisal](#) webpage.

Alternatively, you can respond by completing a comment form either available from the Town Hall or downloaded in [PDF](#) or [Word](#) format and returned to us by:

Email: planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk, or

Post: Planning Policy Team, Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8AY

Hard copies of the documents are available to view during normal opening hours at the Town Hall or local libraries (Brentwood, Shenfield and Ingatestone).

Sustainability Appraisal

Current Consultation – Draft Local Plan Interim SA

The Draft Plan Interim SA Report has been produced with the intention of informing the consultation and subsequent preparation of the Draft Proposed Submission Plan. This is now available for public comment for six weeks ending Wednesday 23 March 2016.

- Interim SA

How to comment

You can submit your comments in the following ways:

Email: planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk, or

Post: Planning Policy Team, Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Ingrave Road, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8AY

Newspaper Adverts (Enquirer and Gazette)



BRENTWOOD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

-----[2013 - 2033]-----

Have your say on the latest stage of Local Plan consultation. The Brentwood Draft Local Plan sets out a proposed strategy and planning policies to meet the Borough's development needs over the next 15+ years

PUBLIC CONSULTATION: 10 FEBRUARY - 23 MARCH 2016

Come to a drop-in information event near you:

| | |
|---|--|
| Brentwood Town Hall (1): Thu 18 Feb, 4pm-7pm Ingrave Road, Brentwood, CM15 8AY | Tipps Cross Remembrance Hall: Wed 2 Mar, 6pm-8pm Blackmore Road, Hook End, CM15 0DX |
| Ingatestone Community Centre: Mon 22 Feb, 4pm-7pm 7 High Street, Ingatestone, CM4 9ED | South Weald Parish Hall: Thu 3 Mar, 1pm-4pm 85 London Road, Brentwood, CM14 4NP |
| Shenfield St Marys Parish Hall: Wed 24 Feb, 7pm-9pm 60 Hutton Road, Shenfield, CM15 8LB | West Horndon St Francis Church: Mon 7 Mar, 4pm-8pm Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon, CM13 3TR |
| Pilgrims Hatch Bishops Park Hall: Mon 29 Feb, 5pm-9pm Elizabeth Road, Brentwood, CM15 9NP | Brentwood Town Hall (3): Wed 9 Mar, 4pm-7pm Ingrave Road, Brentwood, CM15 8AY |
| Brentwood Town Hall (2): Tue 1 Mar, 4pm-7pm Ingrave Road, Brentwood, CM15 8AY | |

Each event will display background information and staff will be available to answer questions. All events will display the same information, and so if you cannot attend your local event you are welcome to come along to another.

Find out more at www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan



BRENTWOOD
BOROUGH COUNCIL



BRENTWOOD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

-----[2013 - 2033]-----

Have your say on the latest stage of Local Plan consultation. The Brentwood Draft Local Plan sets out a proposed strategy and planning policies to meet the Borough's development needs over the next 15+ years

www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan

There is still time to comment, consultation ends on 23 March 2016

- Find out more about the Draft Plan and respond directly on the Council's website at www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan
- Email us at: planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk
- Write to us at:
Planning Policy Team,
Brentwood Borough Council,
Town Hall, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8AY



BRENTWOOD
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Event Poster

BRENTWOOD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

-----{ 2013 - 2033 }-----

Have your say on the latest stage of Local Plan consultation. The Brentwood Draft Local Plan sets out a proposed strategy and planning policies to meet the Borough's development needs over the next 15+ years

Public Consultation: 10 February to 23 March 2016

Come to a drop-in information event near you:

Brentwood Town Hall (1): Thu 18 Feb, 4pm-7pm
Ingrave Road, Brentwood, CM15 8AY

Ingatstone Community Centre: Mon 22 Feb, 4pm-7pm
7 High Street, Ingatstone, CM8 9ED

Shenfield St Marys Parish Hall: Wed 24 Feb, 7pm-9pm
60 Hutton Road, Shenfield, CM15 8LB

Pilgrims Hatch Bishops Park Hall: Mon 29 Feb, 5pm-9pm
Elizabeth Road, Brentwood, CM15 9BP

Brentwood Town Hall (2): Tue 1 Mar, 4pm-7pm
Ingrave Road, Brentwood, CM15 8AY


Tipps Cross Remembrance Hall: Wed 2 Mar, 6pm-8pm
Backmore Road, Hook End, CM15 8DN

South Weald Parish Hall: Thu 3 Mar, 1pm-4pm
85 London Road, Brentwood, CM15 4BP


West Horndon St Francis Church: Mon 7 Mar, 4pm-8pm
Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon, CM15 5TD

Brentwood Town Hall (3): Wed 9 Mar, 4pm-7pm
Ingrave Road, Brentwood, CM15 8AY

Each event will display background information and staff will be available to answer questions. All events will display the same information, and so if you cannot attend your local event you are welcome to come along to another.



Find out more at www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan





General Poster

BRENTWOOD DRAFT LOCAL PLAN


-----{ 2013 - 2033 }-----

Have your say on the latest stage of Local Plan consultation. The Brentwood Draft Local Plan sets out a proposed strategy and planning policies to meet the Borough's development needs over the next 15+ years


Public Consultation: 10 February to 23 March 2016

-  Find out more about the Draft Plan and respond directly at www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan
-  Email us at planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk
-  Write to us at:
Planning Policy Team,
Brentwood Borough Council,
Town Hall, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 8AY

The Draft Plan aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs



Find out more at www.brentwood.gov.uk/localplan



Consultation Events 2016

1. Parish and key community consultees, Town Hall. Tuesday 16 February
2. Town Hall Drop-In Event One, 18 February 4.00-7.00.
3. Ingatestone & Fryerning Community Centre Drop-In Event, Monday 22 February 4.00-7.00
4. Shenfield St Marys Parish Hall Drop-In Event, Wed 24 February 7.00-9.00
5. Pilgrims Hatch Bishops Park Hall Drop-In Event, Mon 29 February 5.00-08.00
6. Town Hall Drop-In Event Two, Tuesday 1 March 4.00-7.00
7. Tipps Cross Remembrance Hall Drop-In Event, Wed 2 March 6.00-8.00
8. South Weald Parish Hall Drop-In Event, Thursday 3 March 1.00 – 4.00
9. West Horndon St Francis Church Hall Drop-In Event, Monday 7 March 4.00-8.00
10. Town Hall Drop-In Event Three, 9 March 4-7
11. Duty to Co-operate and Part 2 SHMA event - Merrymeade House, Brentwood, 15 March 10am-4pm

Photographs from the 2016 Drop-In Events

West Horndon



West Horndon



Town Hall



Town Hall



Town Hall



Bishops Park Hall



Tipps Cross Remembrance Hall



South Weald Parish Hall



South Weald Parish Hall



Appendix 5: Table of Numbers of Representations Received, by Section.

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|-------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| Whole Plan | 1281 | 504 (12.8%) | 2459 (62.4%) | 979 (24.8%) | 3942 |
| Chapter 1 | | | | | |
| 01 Introduction | | 21 | 71 | 8 | 103 |
| Preparing the Plan | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Previous Consultation | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Document Structure | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Life of the Plan | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Regulation 18 Consultation | | 6 | 62 | 7 | 75 |
| How to Comment | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Chapter 1 Totals: | 190 | 33 | 137 | 18 | 191 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|-------------|---------|--------|---------|------------|
| Chapter 2 | | | | | |
| 02 Context | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Supporting Documents | | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| Pattern Book and Other Documents | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Evidence Base | | 0 | 49 | 60 | 109 |
| Sustainability Appraisal | | 0 | 17 | 13 | 30 |
| Habitats Regulation Assessment | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Duty to Cooperate 45-48 | | 0 | 10 | 17 | 27 |
| Key Borough Characteristics | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Population and Housing | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Economy and Employment | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Health and Wellbeing | | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Education and Schools | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Transport and Travel | | 1 | 5 | 3 | 9 |
| Utilities, Telecoms and Media | | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Environment, Heritage and Resources | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Green Belt | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Chapter 2 Totals: | 108 | 5 | 91 | 112 | 208 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|-------------|---------|--------|---------|------------|
| Chapter 3 | | | | | |
| 03 Vision | | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| Chapter 3 Totals: | 8 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|-------------|---------|--------|---------|------------|
| Chapter 4 | | | | | |
| 04 Strategic Objectives | | 4 | 3 | 5 | 12 |
| SO1 | | 3 | 2 | 4 | 9 |
| SO2 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| SO3 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| SO4 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| SO5 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SO6 | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SO7 | | 2 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| SO8 | | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| SO9 | | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| SO10 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| SO11 | | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| SO12 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| SO13 | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Chapter 4 Totals: | 59 | 18 | 25 | 20 | 63 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|-------------|---------|--------|---------|------------|
| Chapter 5 | | | | | |
| 05 Spatial Strategy | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| What is a Spatial Strategy? | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Evolution of the Spatial Strategy | | 2 | 6 | 1 | 9 |
| Draft Plan Spatial Strategy | | 8 | 41 | 10 | 59 |
| Sequential Land Use | | 17 | 5 | 18 | 40 |
| Figure 5.4 Sequential Selection of Sites | | 2 | 2 | 15 | 19 |
| Policy 5.1: Spatial Strategy pp -104 | | 30 | 139 | 26 | 195 |
| Key Diagram | | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Figure 5.6 A12 Corridor: Shenfield | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Figure 5.7 A12 Corridor: Mountnessing | | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Figure 5.8 A12 Corridor: Ingatestone | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Figure 5.9 A127 Corridor | | 2 | 28 | 3 | 33 |
| Hierarchy of Place | | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Settlement Category 1: Main Town | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Settlement Category 2: Village Service | | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|-------------|---------|--------|---------|------------|
| Chapter 5 Continued | | | | | |
| Settlement Category 3: Larger Villages | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Settlement Category 4: Smaller Villages | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| New Homes | | 15 | 118 | 29 | 20 |
| Policy 5.2: Housing Growth | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 162 |
| Housing Trajectory | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| Figure 5.11 Housing Trajectory | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Urban Areas | | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Brownfield Green Belt (Urban Extensions) | | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
| Strategic Sites (Green Belt) | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Greenfield Green Belt (Urban Extensions) | | | | | |
| Windfall | | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| New Jobs | | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Policy 5.3: Job Growth and Employment Land | | 6 | 3 | 15 | 24 |
| Figure 5.12: M25 Junction 29 Employment Cluster | | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| New Retail and Commercial Leisure Growth | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| Figure 5.13: Employment Land Need | | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Policy 5.4: Retail and Commercial Leisure Growth | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Figure 5.14: Brentwood Axonometric Diagram | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Chapter 5 Totals: | 475 | 103 | 387 | 152 | 642 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|-------------|---------|--------|---------|------------|
| Chapter 6 | | | | | |
| 06 Managing Growth | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sustainable Development | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Policy 6.1: Sustainable Development | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Managing Development Growth | | 0 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| Policy 6.2: Managing Growth | | 5 | 4 | 8 | 17 |
| General Development Planning | | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| Policy 6.3: General Development Criteria | | 3 | 8 | 11 | 22 |
| Policy 6.4: Effective Site Planning | | 3 | 0 | 6 | 9 |
| Policy 6.5: Key Gateways | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| Strategic Sites | | | | | |
| Policy 6.6: Strategic Sites | | 3 | 5 | 10 | 18 |
| Figure 6.1: Key Gateways | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Changes Since Preferred Options | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Chapter 6 Totals: | 99 | 25 | 25 | 51 | 106 |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|--|--------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Chapter 7 | | | | | |
| 07 Sustainable Communities | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Strategic Housing-Led Development | | 2 | 15 | 7 | 24 |
| Policy 7.1: Dunton Hills Garden Village | | 18 | 229 | 35 | 282 |
| Housing Type, Mix, Size and Tenure p193 | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Policy 7.2 Housing Type, Mix, Size and Tenure | | 6 | 8 | 20 | 34 |
| Figure 7.1: Housing Delivery by Tenure / Size | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Residential Density | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Policy 7.3: Residential Density | | 7 | 0 | 6 | 13 |
| Housing Allocations | | 0 | 10 | 18 | 28 |
| Policy 7.4: Housing Land Allocations | | 5 | 30 | 36 | 71 |
| Site Selection | | 2 | 15 | 4 | 21 |
| Figure 7.2 Housing Land Allocations | | 8 | 12 | 43 | 63 |
| 003 Wates Way | | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 |
| 005 Essex County Fire Brigade | | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 013B Warley Training Centre, Essex Way, Warley | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 020,021 & 152 West Horndon Industrial Estates, Childerditch Lane and Station Road, West Horndon, [mixed use with a range of supporting local services], | | 5 | 32 | 8 | 45 |
| 039, Westbury Road Car Park, Westbury Road, Brentwood, [could retain parking as part of redevelopment] | | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| 040 Chatham Way/ Crown Street Car Park, Brentwood, [could retain parking as part of redevelopment] | | 0 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| 041 Land at Hunter House, Western Road, Brentwood | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 042 Land at Bell Mead, Ingatestone | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 044 & 178, Land at Priests Lane, Brentwood (including Petitions). | | 3 | 375 | 10 | 388 |
| 081 Council Depot, The Drive, Warley, CM13 3BH | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 098, Ingleton House, Stock Lane, Ingatestone | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 099, Victoria Court, Victoria Road, Brentwood, [redevelopment to include replacement of lost sheltered housing] | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|--------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| 100, Baytree Centre, [residential units provided above retail redevelopment] 200 Dwellings | | 1 | 7 | 12 | 20 |
| Chapter 7 continued | | | | | |
| 010 Sow and Grow Nursery, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch | | 39 | 2 | 4 | 45 |
| 128 Ingatestone Garden Centre, Roman Road, Ingatestone | | 0 | 39 | 9 | 48 |
| Strategic Sites | | | | | 7 |
| 200 Dunton Hills Garden Village | | 10 | 111 | 21 | 142 |
| Greenfield Green Belt | | | | | |
| 022 Land at Honeypot Lane, Brentwood, CM14 | | 2 | 566 | 7 | 575 |
| 023 Land off Doddington Road, either side of A12, Brentwood | | 2 | 64 | 15 | 381 |
| 032 Land East of Nags Head Lane, Brentwood | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| 034, 087 & 235 Officer's Meadow, Shenfield | | 6 | 8 | 5 | 19 |
| 079A Land adjacent to Ingatestone by-pass (part bounded by Roman Road) | | 1 | 15 | 7 | 23 |
| Estimated Capacity | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Affordable Housing | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 20 |
| Policy 7.5: Affordable Housing | | 3 | 6 | 11 | 20 |
| Justification | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Policy 7.6: Affordable Housing in the Green Belt | | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
| Specialist Housing | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Policy 7.7: Specialist Housing | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Policy 7.8: Housing Space Standards | | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Policy 7.9: Mixed Use Development | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Gypsy and Travellers | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 8 |
| Policy 7.10: Gypsy and Traveller Provision | | 3 | 32 | 16 | 51 |
| Figure 7.5: Gypsy & Traveller Sites with Temporary Permission | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Chapter 7 Totals | 1525 | 135 | 1616 | 349 | 2098 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|--|-------------|---------|--------|---------|------------|
| Chapter 8 | | | | | |
| 08 Economic Prosperity | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No comments received on this section. | | | | | |
| Brentwood Economy | | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Policy 8.1: Strong and Competitive Economy | | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 |
| Figure 8.1: Economic and Transport Links | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Policy 8.2: Brentwood Enterprise Park | | 3 | 8 | 27 | 38 |
| Figure 8.2: Brentwood Enterprise Park | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Employment Development and Allocation | | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Policy 8.3: Employment Development Criteria | | 3 | 0 | 5 | 8 |
| Policy 8.4: Employment Land Allocations | | 2 | 2 | 7 | 11 |
| Figure 8.3: Employment Land Allocations | | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 |
| 079C Land adjacent to Ingatestone By-Pass | | 1 | 6 | 3 | 10 |
| 101A Brentwood Enterprise Park (M25 junction 29) | | 1 | 14 | 1 | 16 |
| 101B Brentwood Enterprise Park (Land at Codham Hall) | | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 112 Childerditch Industrial Estate | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 117 Ford Offices, Eagle Way, Brentwood | | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 12D Childerditch Industrial Estate (the Range) | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 200 Dunton Hills Garden Village strategic allocation | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Policy 8.5: Supporting the Rural Economy | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Borough Centres | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Policy 8.6: Brentwood Town Centre | | 1 | 5 | 11 | 17 |
| Figure 8.4 Brentwood Town Centre Links | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Policy 8.7: Local Centres | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| Retail Development | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Policy 8.8: New Retail and Commercial Leisure Development | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| Figure 8.5: Retail Land Allocations | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Policy 8.9: Non-Retail Use | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Chapter 8 Totals | 131 | 28 | 50 | 92 | 170 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|---|--------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Chapter 9 | | | | | |
| 09 Environmental Protection and Enhancement | 219 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Environment, Landscape, Wildlife and Conservation | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Policy 9.1: Historic and Natural Environment Landscape Characteristics | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Landscape | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Historical and Archaeological Heritage | | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Policy 9.2: Wildlife and Nature Conservation | | 3 | 6 | 2 | 11 |
| Figure 9.1: Environment and Biodiversity | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Policy 9.3 Landscape Protection and Woodland Management | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| Policy 9.4: Thames Chase Community Forest | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Built Heritage | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Policy 9.5: Listed Buildings | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Policy 9.6: Conservation Areas | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Archaeological Heritage | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Green Belt | | 4 | 10 | 5 | 19 |
| Figure 9.2: Green Belt in Brentwood | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Policy 9.7: Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Remains | | | | | 0 |
| Policy 9.8 Green Belt | | 3 | 13 | 9 | 25 |
| Policy 9.9: New Development, Extension and Replacement of | | 1 | 12 | 7 | 20 |
| All Development | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Policy 9.10: Established Areas of Development in the Green Belt | | 0 | 5 | 8 | 13 |
| Policy 9.11: Previously Developed Land in the Green Belt | | 36 | 5 | 1 | 42 |
| Policy 9.12: Site Allocations in the Green Belt | | 36 | 4 | 9 | 49 |
| Policy 9.13: Agricultural Workers Dwellings | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Policy 9.14: Re-use and Residential Conversion of Rural Buildings | | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Chapter 9 Totals | 197 | 92 | 73 | 61 | 219 |

| DLP Consultation Summary of Representations (Reps). | Respondents | Support | Object | Comment | Total Reps |
|--|--------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Chapter 10 | | | | | |
| 10 Quality of Life & Community Infrastructure | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sustainable Transport | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| Policy 10.1: Sustainable Transport | | 9 | 5 | 24 | 2 |
| Figure 10.1 Sustainable Travel Route | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Figure 10.2: Crossrail Park and Walk Option | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Policy 10.3 Sustainable Construction and Energy | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| Climate Change and Emissions | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Renewable Energy and Low Carbon development | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Water Conservation | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Policy 10.4: Design | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Policy 10.5: Public Realm | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Policy 10.6: High Quality Design Principles | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Infrastructure and Community Facilities | | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10 |
| Policy 10.7: Infrastructure and Community Facilities | | 2 | 5 | 20 | 27 |
| Environmental Wellbeing | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Policy 10.8: Open Space in New Development | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| Policy 10.9: Open Space, Community, Sport and Recreational Facilities | | 0 | 12 | 6 | 17 |
| Figure 10.4: Fields in Trust Children's Play Standards | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Policy 10.10: Green Infrastructure | | 2 | 1 | 10 | 13 |
| Policy 10.11: Air Quality | | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Policy 10.12: Floodlighting and Illumination | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Policy 10.13: Flood Risk | | 2 | 4 | 8 | 14 |
| Policy 10.14: Sustainable Drainage | | 5 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| Policy 10.15: Contaminated Land and Hazardous Substances | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Institutional Buildings | | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Policy 10.16: Buildings for Institutional Purposes | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Policy 10.17: Communications Infrastructure | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chapter 10 Totals | 145 | 37 | 41 | 110 | 194 |

| Consultation Appendices | | | | | |
|--|----|----|---|----|----|
| Appendix 1: Retail Hierarchy | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Appendix 2: Proposed Housing Delivery | | 18 | 3 | 10 | 31 |
| Appendix 3: Housing Trajectory | | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| Appendix 4: Policy changes since Preferred Options (2013) | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Appendix 5: Glossary | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Appendices Total | 37 | 22 | 8 | 14 | 44 |

Draft Local Plan

Public Participation Report

Chapter 1. Introduction

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Chapter 1. Introduction | | | | |
| Chapter 1. Introduction | | | | |
| 16020 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | The site being put forward for consideration is a smaller part of the site ref GO92 in the 2011 SHLAA. A map detailing the boundary has been submitted, in Hutton Conservation Area and is in Green Belt. The sustainability and suitability for development are addressed within Section 4 of this submission. | Submission noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 14889 - Kingsley Dent [6015] | Comment | 1. With a plan of such magnitude, we should be bold and imaginative as we look to develop an environment that will enhance the town's character. 2. Whilst we cherish the idea of the Green Belt, we need to be realistic about the small areas between existing developments that hold little or no community benefit. These should be used for development where possible and where the current infrastructure allows. 3. Something like the Dunton Garden Suburb is necessary. We should be bold in this and ensure that a new area is developed that can have all the amenities, infrastructure and potential for community. 4. The need for affordable/social housing is vital if the town is to continue with its mix of retail, business, commerce, manufacturing etc. This style of housing is a political problem but our proximity to London is continuing to make house prices accelerate even more. | Supportive comments noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14314 - Mrs Valerie Wells [4877] | Comment | I was impressed with the information at the open consultation event at Tipps Cross. All very helpful and clear. | Noted | No action |
| 14980 - Miss Susan Maclean [4252] | Comment | I would be interested to learn the plans for Street lighting in Brentwood. Particularly given that the ordinary person struggles though pitch black roads and pavements while the police station's "stadium lighting" blinds residents of my road. | Noted. Essex County Council own and look after most of the street lights in Essex, other than the small number owned and looked after by District and Borough Councils and Parish/Town Councils. New development is required to consider street lighting in line with the Draft Local Plan policies 10.4 Design and 10.5 Public Realm 10.12 and 10.12 Floodlighting and Illumination. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|---|
| 15882 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | West Horndon Parish Council have submitted 8 documents which are: Introductory letter; Representations, SA Executive summary; SA report; Appendices 1-4 for the SA. Representations have been submitted on the Brentwood Draft Local Plan and as WHP is a designated Neighbourhood Plan area, they have commissioned a Sustainability Appraisal of various Growth Scenarios for West Horndon. These scenarios are: 1. No growth; 2. Controlled growth; 3 proportional growth; 4. Controlled growth along with 1 strategic site; and 5. Expansive growth. | The submission of comments on the draft local plan are noted and considered in other responses. The West Horndon Parish Council sustainability appraisal of five growth scenarios are noted. However, these are not in line with the proposed alternatives for growth being considered as options within the Draft Local Plan and are not considered to be consistent with Government ambitions for sustainable development to meet the borough identified needs. This assessment work ignores the Councils' current proposal for a strategic site in the Dunton Hills area of the borough of 2,500 new homes, as well as consideration of an alternative option of strategic development of a similar scale immediately around West Horndon. The Council is concerned that this work would lead to a draft Neighbourhood Plan that would be inconsistent with the borough Local Plan and so could fail under independent scrutiny. | Consider with ongoing work and the Duty to Cooperate with WHPC. |
| 16339 - Miss Elaine Heaps [6189] 16516 - Ms Patricia Smith [6215] | Comment | Have mixed feelings about the Draft Local Plan. | Noted | No action |
| 14312 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock still considers the Brentwood Local Plan and supporting evidence will require further revision and consultation with an ongoing duty to cooperate with adjoining local authorities. Thurrock Council objects to the spatial strategy as currently proposed with emphasis on the A127 corridor, the impact on the strategic role of the Green Belt and in particular the identification of a free standing Green Belt settlement of Dunton Hills Garden village. | Noted. Brentwood Council will work with Thurrock Borough Council under the Duty to Cooperate to consider these comments. | Consider accordingly |
| 16364 - Brooke Williams [6193] | Object | Object to the Draft Plan. Where will all the wildlife find homes if you take away all the green belt. | Noted. Biodiversity policy is developed in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Government legislation. Less than 1% of Brentwood Borough Green Belt is being considered for new homes. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13551 - Bulphan Community Forum (Mr David Gilbane) [5626] | Object | In summary this local plan in my mind is just a PLAN A. There is no PLAN B. Therefore there is no choice. Only the option to comment or object. And if enough people object what then? If the country votes to leave the EU then in theory there should be less need for so many houses because the population will not grow so fast. | Noted. The Objectively Assessed Need identifies a need for homes and will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. There is already a shortage of homes for people in the UK and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15289 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | At present, the Draft Local Plan is considered to be not sound. - Not positively prepared: strategy for growth including the proposed housing target is not based on a national policy compliant calculation of OAN. To become sound, the proposed housing target must increase and additional land for housing must be allocated to deliver the strategy. - Not justified: strategy is not appropriate and it cannot be delivered. To become sound, additional land for housing must be allocated to deliver the strategy. - Not effective because the plan is not deliverable. The identified source and supply of housing sites will not be delivered over the plan period and will not achieve the proposed housing target. In addition the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply, and there is a lack of evidence of joint-working with neighbouring authorities through the duty-to-cooperate. To become sound, additional deliverable and suitable sites for housing be identified to come forward in the first five years; and, - Not consistent with national policy: the proposed housing target has not been prepared in accordance with the NPPF or NPPG. | Disagree. The Draft Local Plan is considered to be in line with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan will reflect updates to the evidence base accordingly in accordance with the NPPF and the NPPG. | Objection noted. |
| 15969 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] | Object | A full Parish Council voted unanimously to support this motion, to protect the 2005 Local Plan Green Belt, as did the 150 local members of the public in the full to capacity church. In view of this public mandate and unanimous vote by Parish Councillors Herongate & Ingrave Parish Council object to the 2016 'Draft Local Plan for Brentwood Borough'. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 14144 - Mrs Victoria Parkison [5822] 14156 - Mr Stephen Day [5833] 14171 - Mr Jaxon Robinson [5842] 14173 - Mr Max Robinson [5845] 14174 - Mr Callum Robinson [5846] 14178 - Mrs Joanne Robinson [5849] 14182 - Mr Ian Robinson [5851] 16279 - Margaret Noonan [6186] 16345 - Mrs R Nash [6190] 16351 - Mrs B.I. Staerck [6191] 16371 - Ethan Williams [6194] 16379 - Mr William Shine [6195] 16387 - Sandra Halliday [6196] 16395 - Gary Howard [6197] 16401 - Mrs Winifred Wigington [6198] 16408 - Mr Christopher Saxon [6199] 16414 - Mr D Nash [6203] 16415 - Mrs A L Hobbs [6200] 16425 - Mr AC Hobbs [6201] 16430 - Mrs Rose Cuff [6202] 16431 - David Halliday [6204] 16444 - Mrs W Colhoun [6205] 16451 - Mrs Christine St Pier [6206] 16456 - Jean Williams [6211] 16466 - Mr William White [6213] 16475 - Sandra Carpenter [6214] 16483 - Mrs M Rimes [6207] 16492 - Mr James Noonan [6208] 16497 - Ms Michelle Hacks [6209] 16503 - Mr Anthony Smith [6210] 16521 - Mr Pitman [6216] 16526 - Mrs Pitman [6217] 16536 - Mr Peter Broom [5952] 16541 - Mrs Sheron Broom [5965] 16547 - Mrs Diane Hilton [6221] 16552 - Mrs P Moore [6222] 16577 - Mr and Mrs Murrey [6227] 16582 - Mr Roy St Piere [6228] 16587 - Mr Barry Floyd [6229] 16629 - Ms Eileen Riley [6263] 16634 - Mr Colin Wordley [6264] | Object | Object to the Draft Local Plan | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 16639 - Mr John Haly [6265] 16644 - Ms Judith Haly [6266] 16649 - Mr Charles Smith [6267] 16654 - Ms Margaret Smith [6268] 16659 - Ms Susan King [6269] 16663 - Ms Andrea Llewellyn [6270] 16668 - Ms S Sutton [6271] 16673 - Mr S Sutton [6272] 16678 - Mr Ronald Mansfield [6273] 16683 - Ms P Mansfield [6274] 16688 - Mr Charles Williams [6276] 16693 - Mr Alan Webb [6275] 16698 - Mr Alan Carpenter [6277] 16711 - Mrs Irene Miles [6280] 16716 - Ms Carol Brown [6281] 16725 - Mr David Bedford [6283] 16742 - Mr R Calvey [6285] 16758 - Mr C Bowers [6289] 16765 - Mr C Wheeler [6291] 16774 - Ms Brenda Scates [6293] 16782 - Mr Dennis Scates [6295] 16792 - Mrs Catherine Maguire [6218] | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 16964 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] | Object | The original consultation was flawed and should have been null and void as residents completely uninformed. | Noted. Public consultation as the Draft Local Plan has developed has been considered appropriate: there has been an issues and options consultation in 2009, a preferred options consultation in 2013, a strategic growth options consultation in 2015 as well as this consultation on the Draft Local Plan (2016). Each stage has been widely advertised inline with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and have public reports on each consultation summarising comments made along with the Councils response. There will be a further public consultation on the next draft of the Local Plan at the beginning of 2017 where there will be opportunity to comment further. Each person previously commenting will be notified of this, unless they have notified the Council otherwise. | No further action |
| 13923 - Mr Adrian Baldock [5777] | Object | I object to The Development Plan, there is only a housing shortage due to People moving into Brentwood and the already overcrowded south East. The solution is for the government to address the North south divide, not to encourage it by building more properties in the south east. To build properties on Green belt Land is Fundamentally wrong! | Noted. The Objectively Assessed Need identifies a need for homes and will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. There is already a shortage of homes for people in the UK and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. The proposed land release for homes in Brentwood is 1% of the area of Green Belt. Addressing the north-south divide is beyond the remit of this document. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14524 - Ms Myra Harman [5927] | Object | I object to this plan on the grounds that - The infrastructure to support this plan does not appear to be adequate. Health care and schools will be overwhelmed. Traffic will be gridlocked. Quality of life in Brentwood will plummet due to overcrowding and inadequate services. Unrest could occur and our police services would be unable to deal with it due to undermanning. A future living under this plan is alarming. | Noted. The Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of both exiting and new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. In addition Essex-wide evidence is to be published soon, which the Council has been involved in preparing. | Consider accordingly |
| 13780 - Mrs Hazel Town [4993] 14140 - Mrs Rosemarie Nelson [4529] 14153 - Mrs Margaret Woodward [5830] 14421 - Keith Godbee [4942] | Support | Sensible to propose areas where there is already good transport and road links. Prioritising brownfield sites is a priority. Support selection of Green Belt site that is already serviced by two train stations and with access to the A127 and A13. Scale of development will facilitate required expenditure on infrastructure, schools and doctors making it self sustaining. The impact of this is preferable to many smaller sites which would not bring the infrastructure benefits of the larger development. | Support noted | No action |
| 13969 - Cllr Roger Hirst [4386] | Support | In general I support the key policies as outlined in the Draft Local Plan, and in particular appreciate the efforts to keep the Green Belt as far as possible intact. Also, the designation of specific Strategic Development Sites, in areas aimed to provide as little disruption to existing communities as possible, is to be commended, with the proviso that the provision of the necessary infrastructure, in roads and transport, education, employment, health, drainage and sanitation is ensured through the plan, and that the financing structure, largely from the windfall profits from Green Belt re-designation to Development Land, is negotiated and contractually secured in advance. In particular, the strategic site at Dunton Hills should not be recommended for inclusion until this financing is secured. | Support and financial comment noted. Work is continuing on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and this will elaborate on the delivery of infrastructure associated with the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 14404 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Support | The Parish Council considers that the proposed document and its supporting material, the Site Allocation and Pattern Maps, are well-constructed and contain well thought through and comprehensive policies that the Parish Council supports overall. The Parish Council would like to congratulate the Borough Planning team working on this project for their hard work in producing this Draft Document for consultation. | Support noted | No action |
| 13393 - Mrs. M. A. Montgomery [1772] | Support | I totally support the Draft Local Plan for these reasons: 1. The Bedroom Tax tried to force many families to downsize, but there is nowhere for them to go, 2. There are 53 homeless families in temporary bed and breakfast accommodation waiting for a home, in Brentwood, 3. Many elderly people wish to downsize to small properties, again none available, 4. There are over 1000 people on Brentwood housing waiting lists, 5. The time has come when more homes are desperately needed to be built. I appreciate how many homeowners in rural Brentwood purchased their homes many years ago at very reasonable cost, for the benefits of green open spaces, safe for children to grow and breathe good clean air. But times are changing for everyone. People need homes, it's time for the selfish NIMBY to consider the right of many and be prepared to share a bit more of their much cherished space. | Support welcomed | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|---|
| 15741 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | ECC acknowledges and supports the production of a new Local Plan by BBC ensuring an up-to-date Local Plan. This can facilitate new job opportunities, attract investment in new and improved infrastructure, protect the environment and ensure new homes meet the needs of a growing population, which are sustainably located, and achieve the right standards of quality and design. | Support welcomed | No action |
| 13407 - Mrs Jennifer Dodd [5498] 13777 - Mr Alan Dormer [5717] 13782 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970] 14187 - Mr Graham Hesketh [2608] 14195 - Mrs Elizabeth Thompson [5016] 14197 - Mr Raymond Thompson [4840] 14534 - Mr John Hills [4090] 14578 - Kathleen Frost [5940] 14628 - Mr Thomas Lennon [747] 14869 - Mrs Jane Marr [6006] 14904 - Mr&Mrs Peter and Jill Mason [6021] 14987 - Mrs N. Blake [1602] 16557 - Ms M Holloran [6223] 16562 - Ms Jennifer Holloran [6224] 16567 - Mr Patrick Holloran [6225] 16572 - Ms Daniella Holloran [6226] | Support | Support the Draft Local Plan | Support noted | No action |
| Preparing the Plan | | | | |
| 15591 - Runnymede Council (Planning Policy) [4180] | Comment | Please be advised that the Council has no comment to make on the content of the documentation at this time. | Noted | Amend consultation database accordingly |
| Previous Consultation | | | | |
| 15254 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Comment | Welcome opportunity to comment on the Draft Local Plan, the comments made build on the previous comments to the Strategic Growth Options and Dunton Garden Suburb consultations in 2015. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|------------|
| 14543 - A. Burton [1628] 15065 - Ms RS Cross [6048] | Object | Consultation last time was poorly run and managed. Requirement to respond online limits engagement with some residents. The documentation is vague with no clear plan or image of what it may look like. Re-arrangements regarding Brentwood and Basildon have been made without notification making the outcomes erroneous in law. Changing major decisions half way through already flawed process. | Noted. Public consultation as the Draft Local Plan has developed is considered appropriate: there has been an issues and options consultation in 2009, a preferred options consultation in 2013, a strategic growth options consultation in 2015 as well as this consultation on the Draft Local Plan (2016). These are summarised on the Brentwood Council website with public reports on each consultation summarising comments made and the development of the Plan. Throughout this process hardcopies were available in libraries and the Council offices and during all drop-in sessions. Comments were accepted both digitally or on paper. There will be a further public consultation on the next draft of the Local Plan at the beginning of 2017 where there will be opportunity to comment further. Each person previously commenting will be notified of this, unless they have notified the Council otherwise. | No action. |
| 13104 - Mr John Hills [4090] | Support | Support | Noted | No action |

Document Structure

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|--|---|-----------|
| 13397 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Assuming the sequence of your 5 key structures indicates importance the I consider them to be in the wrong order. I think the first should be: a) Quality of Life & Community Infrastructure; and then b) Environmental Protection & Enhancement with the other categories following later | Noted. The chapters are not in an order of priority and all sections apply without weighting. | No action |
| 13105 - Mr John Hills [4090] | Support | Support | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Life of the Plan | | | | |
| 15406 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Support | We support the approach as stated in paragraph 1.17 of the DLP, in that the Plan will cover at least a 15-year period from likely adoption, as well as previous years' development shortfall since 2013. It should be noted that there are a number of discrepancies in the DLP with regards to the Plan period. As noted above, the proposed Plan period is 20-years however reference is made to a 15-year Plan period within a number of DLP paragraphs, including 1.1, 5.43 and 10.2. | Typographic error noted. The Plan Period is from 2013 to 2033 and the plan will be amended to clarify this. | Amend accordingly |
| 13106 - Mr John Hills [4090] | Support | Support | Noted | No action |
| Monitoring and Implementation | | | | |
| 13103 - Mr John Hills [4090] 13107 - Mr John Hills [4090] | Support | Support | Noted | No action |
| Regulation 18 Consultation | | | | |
| 13395 - Mr. Baldwin [917] | Comment | I personally thought the whole show of plans showing many separate areas on our maps were very confusing. On the maps, no roads name, and major roads had been labelled. I suggest the maps when next shown are marked clearly with local road. | The Council will work on improving the legibility of the Local Plan mapping. | Consider accordingly |
| 16591 - Mr Barry Floyd [6229] 16682 - Mr Ronald Mansfield [6273] | Comment | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council's plans take account of the particular circumstances of those living in a mobile home. The great majority of Dunton Wayletts inhabitants live on Dunton Park. | Noted. Dunton Wayletts is located within Basildon borough and therefore planning policy specific to Dunton Wayletts mobile homes would be considered by Basildon borough. Brentwood Borough is working with Basildon Borough within the Duty to Cooperate process to consider the wider impact of proposed Brentwood development. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16756 - Mr R Calvey [6285] 16768 - Mr M Hilton [6290] 16777 - Mrs A Hilton [6292] | Comment | Unsure about the way in which Brentwood Borough Council's plans take account of the particular circumstances of those living in a mobile home. The great majority of Dunton Wayletts inhabitants live on Dunton Park. | Noted. Dunton Wayletts is located within Basildon borough and therefore planning policy specific to Dunton Wayletts mobile homes would be considered by Basildon borough. Brentwood Borough is working with Basildon Borough within the Duty to Cooperate process to consider the wider impact of proposed Brentwood development. | Consider accordingly |
| 13398 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | I consider this method of commenting on the local plan just too unwieldy. To start with the link I was sent didn't work and when I searched for the correct page it took a few minutes to realise the link to the plan looked like a heading and not a link. To see the hundreds of sections I've now got to go through is very daunting. If I had a cynical mind I could assume it has been designed this way to demotivate people from completing the consultation. | Noted. The Brentwood planning consultation portal is only one way of reviewing and commenting on the Draft Local Plan. It saves paper by reducing printing and speeds up the consultation analysis process. The Council ensure that hard copies of the Draft Local Plan were made available in libraries and at the Town Hall for anyone who wished to see it. Consultation responses were accepted by email and on paper. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 16284 - Margaret Noonan [6186] 16343 - Miss Elaine Heaps [6189] 16349 - Mrs R Nash [6190] 16369 - Brooke Williams [6193] 16376 - Ethan Williams [6194] 16383 - Mr William Shine [6195] 16391 - Sandra Halliday [6196] 16399 - Gary Howard [6197] 16413 - Mr Christopher Saxon [6199] 16423 - Mr D Nash [6203] 16429 - Mr AC Hobbs [6201] 16437 - David Halliday [6204] 16443 - Mrs Rose Cuff [6202] 16448 - Mrs W Colhoun [6205] 16463 - Jean Williams [6211] 16471 - Mr William White [6213] 16479 - Sandra Carpenter [6214] 16487 - Mrs M Rimes [6207] 16496 - Mr James Noonan [6208] 16501 - Ms Michelle Hacks [6209] 16535 - Mrs H Bron [6220] 16540 - Mr Peter Broom [5952] 16545 - Mrs Sheron Broom [5965] 16551 - Mrs Diane Hilton [6221] 16556 - Mrs P Moore [6222] 16633 - Ms Eileen Riley [6263] 16643 - Mr John Haly [6265] 16648 - Ms Judith Haly [6266] 16653 - Mr Charles Smith [6267] 16658 - Ms Margaret Smith [6268] 16667 - Ms Andrea Llewellyn [6270] 16672 - Ms S Sutton [6271] 16677 - Mr S Sutton [6272] 16687 - Ms P Mansfield [6274] 16692 - Mr Charles Williams [6276] 16697 - Mr Alan Webb [6275] 16702 - Mr Alan Carpenter [6277] 16706 - Mr Brian Spicer [6278] 16710 - Mrs Linda Spicer [6279] 16715 - Mrs Irene Miles [6280] 16721 - Ms Carol Brown [6281] 16724 - Mr John Turner [6282] 16733 - Clive Bellingham [6284] 16737 - Mrs Maureen Bellingham [6286] | Object | Very dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council's plans take account of the particular circumstances of those living in a mobile home. The great majority of Dunton Wayletts inhabitants live on Dunton Park. | Noted. Dunton Wayletts is located within Basildon borough and therefore planning policy specific to Dunton Wayletts mobile homes would be considered by Basildon borough. Brentwood Borough is working with Basildon Borough within the Duty to Cooperate process to consider the wider impact of proposed Brentwood development. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 16741 - Jackie Diffey [6287] 16750 - Ms Emma Diffey [6288] 16762 - Mr C Bowers [6289] 16771 - Mr C Wheeler [6291] 16780 - Ms Brenda Scates [6293] 16787 - Mr Dennis Scates [6295] 16791 - Mrs Catherine Maguire [6218] | | | | |
| 16407 - Mrs Winifred Wigington [6198] 16421 - Mrs A L Hobbs [6200] 16455 - Mrs Christine St Pier [6206] 16507 - Mr Anthony Smith [6210] 16520 - Ms Patricia Smith [6215] 16525 - Mr Pitman [6216] 16530 - Mrs Pitman [6217] 16581 - Mr and Mrs Murrey [6227] 16586 - Mr Roy St Piere [6228] 16638 - Mr Colin Wordley [6264] 16729 - Mr David Bedford [6283] | Object | Dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council's plans take account of the particular circumstances of those living in a mobile home. The great majority of Dunton Wayletts inhabitants live on Dunton Park. | Noted. Dunton Wayletts is located within Basildon borough and therefore planning policy specific to Dunton Wayletts mobile homes would be considered by Basildon borough. Brentwood Borough is working with Basildon Borough within the Duty to Cooperate process to consider the wider impact of proposed Brentwood development. | Consider accordingly |
| 16561 - Ms M Holloran [6223] 16566 - Ms Jennifer Holloran [6224] 16571 - Mr Patrick Holloran [6225] 16576 - Ms Daniella Holloran [6226] 16757 - Mr. Barrie Stone [1745] | Support | Very satisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council's plans take account of the particular circumstances of those living in a mobile home. The great majority of Dunton Wayletts inhabitants live on Dunton Park. | Noted. Dunton Wayletts is located within Basildon borough and therefore planning policy specific to Dunton Wayletts mobile homes would be considered by Basildon borough. Brentwood Borough is working with Basildon Borough within the Duty to Cooperate process to consider the wider impact of proposed Brentwood development. | Consider accordingly |
| 13108 - Mr John Hills [4090] | Support | Support | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| How to Comment | | | | |
| 14913 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] | Comment | The Plan and the attachments and appendices are voluminous (hundreds of pages). Reviewing the documents had to be done on line as printing was impractical. The volume, copious use of abbreviations and jargon made reviewing it extremely difficult particularly when it came to cross referencing. I had hoped that visiting the drop in display at the Town Hall would have been of help. For example, I was unable to find details in the Plan on the future population and demographics of Brentwood. On approaching a council representative I was advised this was in an attachment however they were unable to find it. It has not been an easy task reviewing the Plan. | Noted. The Brentwood planning consultation portal is only one way of reviewing and commenting on the Draft Local Plan. The Council ensure that hard copies of the Draft Local Plan were made available in libraries and at the Town Hall for anyone who wished to see it. Computers were available in the planning department for public use and assistance was available from planning staff to help with finding and viewing documents. The Council will attempt to advertise this opportunity to view better for the next consultations. | Consider accordingly |
| 15083 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | Object | The portal is confusing to find the online form and only allows 100 words. | The portal does limit each comment to 100 words, however it is possible to make as many comments as needed via the portal. The Council also accepted email responses and hard copies. The use of the portal improves both the speed and accuracy of receiving and processing comments. | Noted. No action. |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|

Chapter 2. Context

Planning Policy Context

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|-----------|
| 13399 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | This section a Neighbourhood Plan. Well myself and my neighbours in Havering's Grove might have wanted an input to one of those - but never been asked. | Noted. Neighbourhood planning is an initiative the Government has introduced through the Localism Act 2011 which grants communities powers to draw up Neighbourhood Plans, Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders. Currently there are neighbourhood plans being drafted in Doddinghurst and West Horndon parishes only in Brentwood Borough. | No action |
| 15739 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | ECC welcomes and supports paragraph 2.22 of the consultation document regarding the need for BBC to cooperate with ECC, local authorities and other statutory bodies (including Highways England) in the preparation of the Local Plan. In accordance with the provisions of the Localism Act 2011 ECC offers to contribute cooperatively with BBC in the preparation of the emerging Local Plan through to examination. | Noted | No Action |

Supporting Documents

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13147 - Alexandra Hammond [5372] | Comment | I think it would be useful for residents to have a summarised version as at over 200 pages long it is more than most people are going to be willing to peruse. | Noted. The nature and use of the final local plan does mean a long, detailed document is necessary, particularly with much explanatory text that may not be necessary in the final document. The Council acknowledge that this can be difficult to absorb and are available to help residents understand the key issues during the consultation drop-in events to aid a better understanding of the overall plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15806 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The Local Plan should refer to ECC's role as the Waste Planning Authority and to the emerging Waste Local Plan. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|-----------|
| 14868 - Mr Gerald Smith [4433] | Comment | Reference Site Allocation Maps: concerned at the list of non-allocated sites including several in Doddinghurst village. Concerned that if Dunton fails to materialise and provide the bulk of the required housing then this list might be used to provide the shortfall. Whereas the LDP proposes limited development in the northern villages, this list has what are largely opportunistic and highly invasive sites proposed. | Concerns noted. The Council will be assessing further sites which have come forward during this plan consultation. These will inform the next iteration of the Plan, its allocations and policies. | No action |
| 15577 - Castle Point Borough Council (Steve Rogers) [4643] | Comment | The Plan is based on evidence suggesting that it is an independent Strategic Housing Market Area, but the relationship of the periphery of the borough to both Thurrock and Basildon does not suggest that this may be a robust assumption. | Disagree. Development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these area. The strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA until such a time that completion of homes is identified to have changed current behaviours. | No action |
| 16321 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Para 2.4, 2.7, 9.1, 9.14 state that additional planning documents should only be used when justified however they also state that various strategies have been produced by Essex County Council which will be taken into account and that BBC will designate and keep under review Conservation Areas. We believe that the Borough would be justified in using both the Parish Council Village's Design Statement and the three Conservation Area Appraisals that the ECC carried out on behalf of the BBC and that they should be used to inform the planning process. Their use at this stage should be incorporated into the LDP. | When drafting policies, the Council does consider the Conservation Area Appraisals as drawn up by ECC. These appraisals take parish council design statements into account. BBC will continue to work with Parish Councils on assessment of heritage assets and local listings. | Noted |
| 15292 - Brentwood School [2575] 15303 - Thorndon Park Golf Club Ltd. [157] 15403 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | The Green Belt boundary review has not yet been published in its final form. It is titled "working draft" and a number of assessments can be criticised. The results in any event do not appear to have informed policy. It is therefore necessary that BBC undertake a full review of the Borough's Green Belt in order for the approach to be deemed comprehensive and fair, and to also satisfy themselves (and an Inspector) that the Green Belt is capable of enduring for the Plan period. | Noted. There is no requirement for Local Authorities to undertake full Green Belt reviews; however the Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Pattern Book & Other Documents | | | | |
| 14406 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | Mapping of the Parish Council boundaries is in the Pattern book on Page 18 it isn't referenced anywhere in the LDP, but knowledge of the Parish Council boundaries would help better inform the reader and make some of the statements easier to understand. Parish Councils are referred to on page 16 of the LDP para 2.40, so perhaps a reference to the mapping of the Parish Council areas could be included here? | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Evidence Base | | | | |
| 15844 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Urban extensions: The most significant urban extension involves 500 dwellings at Shenfield close to the A12 junction. A further 250 dwellings are expected near Doddinghurst Road in North Brentwood. There is no easy access to the A12 from the sites in North Brentwood. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15783 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Junction capacity assessments of the Strategic Road Network have not been presented within the Modelling Report, despite experiencing significant increases in trips at the junction as a result of development. It is recommended these are undertaken to determine the predicted operation of the junctions following LP development and to determine what measures may be required to mitigate the impact. Consideration may also need to be given to undertaking merge/diverge assessments at various locations to determine whether changes are required to support the LP development. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14316 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14317 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | Remarkably, considering the emphasis in the Plan for considerable development at West Horndon in all option (But particularly Options 1 and 2), the junction of Station Road with the A128 has not been modelled. On this basis alone the PBA report is not fit for the purpose of identifying impacts of traffic at junctions throughout the Borough. Even more remarkable is the fact that Station Road, A128 and this junction are very heavily trafficked with queues commonly building up in Station Road and consequent dangerous driver behaviour. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15749 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will need to be prepared and ECC is keen to assist BBC in the preparation of the IDP. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will need to be prepared to support the emerging Brentwood Local Plan, and identify infrastructure required. The Local Plan should make clear, for at least the first five years, what infrastructure is required, who is going to fund and provide it, and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development. For the later stages of the plan period less detail may be provided. As a provider of key services and subject to statutory responsibilities ECC is keen to assist the Borough Council in the preparation of the IDP. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council in preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan under the Duty to Cooperate. | Consider accordingly |
| 15267 - Bellway Homes Essex [6075] | Comment | The Council has commissioned an Objectively Assessed Housing Needs for Brentwood Report (2015) which states that the OAN is 360 dwellings per annum. However, this is based on the 2012 population projections and it is considered that this should be updated to reflect the most up to date projections. | The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs Assessment published in February 2015 is considered to be the most up to date evidence and is NPPF compliant. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 15874 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Additional issues. Appear to be mistakes in reporting. Some through trips on the motorway appear to be designated as development trips. This is clear from the plots in Appendix D where there are more trips on the M25 passing northbound through Junction 29 than leave at the exit at Junction 28. Hence, there must be some trips which pass through both junctions with neither trip end in the Brentwood area. It is not clear whether this has any significance for the assessment. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15872 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | An assessment of the operation of the SRN junctions has not been undertaken within the Highway Modelling Report. Therefore it is not possible for AECOM to speculate on the potential operation of these junctions following Local Plan development. Junction 17 (A1023 / Mascalls Lane / Spital Lane) and Junction 19/20 (A127 / B186) are located close to M25 Junctions 28 and 29 respectively and AECOM consider that any queuing back from these junctions towards the motorway could compromise the effective operation of these junctions. AECOM have primarily considered the operation of the junctions for Option 1, as this is the preferred option that has been taken forward for implementation in the LP. At Junction 17 the A1023 approach to the junction (the approach of concern to HE) is predicted to operate over capacity in the AM peak, with Mean Max Queues (MMQ) expected to reach approximately 300m back from the junction. Whilst M25 Junction 28 is approximately 500m away, as the approach is over capacity it is likely that the full extent of the queue will be approximately 600m at the end of the peak hour. This could reach back to, and through, M25 Junction 28 and could therefore affect the operation of the junction and the M25 offslips. At Junction 19 the A127 Eastbound offslip is predicted to operate significantly over-capacity in the AM peak, with queues predicted to reach approximately 1km, which could stretch back to M25 Junction 29. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15864 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Strategic option - East of running waters This site is at a greater distance from the major roads than the other alternative options considered. Trips disperse via the A128, The Avenue and Running Waters. The choice of road used to travel to and from the A127 in the AM and PM peak differs. The choice of route makes a significant difference to the junctions used. In reality, there is likely to be a split with some relief for the most congested junctions but increases at less congested junctions. Despite the distance of the strategic site option four from the SRN, there is predicted to be an increase in trips at both M25 Junction 28 and 29, the extent of which is outlined within the table below. The development is located in closer proximity to the A12 than Strategic Options 1 and 2 and is therefore likely to have a greater impact at Junction 12, while the impact at M25 Junction 29 may be less than Options 1 and 2. It should be noted that due to a lack of clarity on the flow diagrams in Appendix C, it has not been possible to calculate the increase at A12 Junction 12. It is recommended that this information is provided by BBC. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15852 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Assignment: It was recognised that this method of assigning development trips would result in one route being used between each zone pair. In addition, there should be no reassignment of existing trips to avoid increasing congestion resulting from the assignment of development trips. PBA considered that this would represent a worst case for congestion. This could be the case for the junctions on routes used by development traffic. It could underestimate traffic at junctions which would be affected by reassigning traffic and junctions on other routes which would be expected to be used between certain zone pairs. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15824 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Technical note provided by Highways England, written by AECOM to document a review of the Brentwood Draft Local Plan evidence base (in the form of spreadsheet modelling). The technical note should be read in conjunction with the separate technical note entitled 'TN_Draft Brentwood Local Plan Review_v4' (dated March 2016). | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14880 - Mr Danny Lovey [6010] 15377 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15396 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15425 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15592 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15909 - Kitewood [6116] 16182 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16219 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Comment | It is evident that some Green Belt land will have to be released in order to meet the objectively assessed target. As a result, it is recommended that a detailed review of Green Belt boundaries is undertaken. Over the years a number of anomalies have been created by inept drawing of the Green Belt boundaries. There are quite a few examples, for instance, of the Green Belt boundary cutting across the middle of a residential curtilage or wrapping around a single site. This makes no sense at all, and should be corrected. | Noted. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 14321 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14322 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | The effect of traffic generation will have an effect well beyond the boundaries of Brentwood Borough. This is particularly true for Option 1 which is located in the south east corner of the Borough. Clearly there will be effects on roads in Thurrock and Basildon from this. Option 1 would also be contiguous with a major allocation in Basildon and therefore the impacts of this overall area of development would be exacerbated. A joint traffic study should be carried out with Basildon. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15838 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | According to the modelling report the expected developments in the LP can be placed into three categories: Committed housing developments for all options (brownfield sites and urban extensions); Committed employment developments; and Various options for strategic housing developments. | Noted | No action |
| 15839 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Committed Sites: Most of the committed housing sites (shown as yellow dots in Figure 1) are relatively small and will not have significant trip generation. There are a few places where sites (or combinations of sites) will have a significant impact. Three sites in West Horndon (south of the A127) are expected to include about 500 dwellings. A site close to the High Street in Brentwood is expected to include 200 dwellings. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15861 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | North of Brentwood strategic option. Whilst AECOM recognise that the assignment of trips via the M25 rather than the A128 may underestimate the number of trips on the local highway network, AECOM consider that by assigning a significant proportion of traffic via the M25, this should result in a robust assessment of the impact of options three on Junction 28. However, if traffic routed via A1023, for access to the SRN for trips travelling along the A12 to / from the east the first point of contact could be at A12 Junction 12. Therefore, by assigning the majority of these trips via M25 Junction 28 the modelling could be underestimating the impact of turning movements at A12 Junction 12. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15877 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Additional issues. Consequences of the adopted process. As discussed earlier in this note, no assessment is made of M25 junctions. The increase in the number of trips at M25 Junctions 28 and 29 is higher than at any of the junctions modelled. AECOM recommend that capacity tests are undertaken to determine the resultant operation performance at these junctions. This type of assessment could have used a full highway assignment model had one been available. The assignment from such a model would differ in several important ways: The extent of increasing junction delays would affect route choice. (This has two consequences: Several routes will be used by development trips between zone pairs; and existing trips may change route as a result of congestion caused by development trips). Increasing congestion may result in interference (blocking back) between junctions. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England under the duty to cooperate on these issues. | Consider accordingly |
| 15534 - Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093] | Comment | The Council's most recent evidence is focusing on the tightly defined area of the Borough despite significant interrelationships with its neighbours including London. These are demonstrated in particular through the significant proportion of commuting into the capital (almost 15,000 per day). This underscores the importance of collaboration and the Duty to Co-operate. | Development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these areas (and strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA). | No action |
| 15770 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | We understand that modelling is currently being undertaken to determine what the impact of development could be on the highway network and therefore what measures may be required to mitigate these impacts. It is therefore unclear at this stage whether it will be possible to sufficiently mitigate the impact of the allocated development locations or whether the impact will be too great to feasibly ensure that the network operates within capacity at the end of the plan period. | Noted. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence on impact of the Plan. Initial results have been published. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Mitigation options will be considered as appropriate. Updates to this will be published alongside the next version of Local Plan consultation and kept under review as the plan-making process progresses. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15342 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | PPG directs that OAN should be adjusted to reflect economic forecasts and market signals. The OAN for Brentwood should take account of: Economic Led Need: level of job growth underpinning PBA's conclusion on economic-led need is constrained by a housing provision target. This is considered in conflict with the PPG which advises that plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need. Market Signals: Brentwood affordability ratio is significantly higher than Essex and national averages. The PBA assessment identifies that the affordability in Brentwood has not worsened compared to national and regional indicators and therefore an additional uplift is not required. As a result of this, BBC's housing target would simply allow the issue of affordability to continue and would not assist in addressing such a trend. Greater London - Brentwood borders the Greater London Authorities (GLA) and there is strong evidence to suggest that LPAs outside the GLA will need to accommodate London's housing shortfall. | Objectively Assessed Need will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. The development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these areas (and strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA). | Consider accordingly |
| 15827 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | As there is no validated traffic model for Brentwood, PBA have adopted an alternative approach using available information. OmniTRANS has been used to build a simplified model of Brentwood Borough. The defined zoning system and an Integrated Transport Network (ITN) layer were imported. Additional zones were created to represent the proposed areas for major development sites. The mean link speeds from TrafficMaster (including junction delays) were added to the links. This model allowed skim times and distances to be calculated for each zone pair. A base year assignment was undertaken on the basis of census data and a synthetic distribution based on the trip lengths and the relative attractiveness (land use) of various zones. This was judged to be approximately correct but did not undergo any formal validation process. These time and distance skims were used to determine the distribution of development trips and also the assignment of those trips. In all of the assessed scenarios, the total level of trip growth resulting from planned developments was greater than the growth implied by TEMPro. Hence, there was no requirement to allow for additional developments. Indeed, the overall growth assessed was higher than that implied by national forecasts. The assigned turning movements of the development traffic at the assessed junctions were added to the observed turning movements. To calculate future year scenarios. Hence, the future year assessments were not reliant on the base year assigned traffic flows. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15966 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The 'Brentwood Borough Local Plan Development Options - Highway Modelling' has been published in draft form. It is acknowledged that the draft Report has not yet been fully considered by Highways England or ECC as local highway authority. This work will be further developed in partnership with highways authorities, under 'duty to co-operate', before a final version is published. Highway modelling will need to consider the impact of the growth in the preferred strategy, and the identification of necessary mitigation; the cumulative impact of growth; and the impact of wider planned growth. In addition, consideration will need to be given to the modelling undertaken to support the emerging Basildon Local Plan. | The Council will continue to work with ECC as the Highways Authority, under duty to cooperate, with regard to highways modelling and potential for mitigation in relation to proposed development. | Consider accordingly |
| 15850 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Trip generation: The residents per household and person trip rates were from acceptable sources although trip rates appeared to be "quite low". Noted that TRICS will give trip rates for a typical not an average day, in terms of junction assessments, "a typical day may be more appropriate". | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 15773 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | PBA, on behalf of Brentwood Borough Council, have prepared an evidence base to support the development proposals within the LP. The intention of this modelling is to determine how many additional vehicles will be generated on the network as a result of the LP and where improvements may be required to ensure the network continues to operate effectively throughout the plan period. AECOM on behalf of Highways England have prepared a separate technical note detailing a review of this section of the evidence base. | Noted. The technical note prepared by AECOM on behalf of Highway England will be reviewed accordingly | Consider accordingly |
| 15880 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Conclusion (2). In summary AECOM consider that the trip generation and distribution assumed by PBA can be considered reasonable. Some concerns have been raised regarding the assignment of trips across the network, primarily the decision to assign all trips between two zones to the same route, whereas in reality AECOM consider that a number of different routes may be used, particularly if routes become congested and users change to an alternative route to avoid the congestion. However, AECOM consider that the current methodology could result in a robust impact at the strategic road network and therefore may be reasonable to take forward. If, however, the local highway authority plans to deter drivers from making use of certain routes or congestion hotspots cause a significant change in route choice, the total development trips on the strategic road network could alter from that presented within the Highway Modelling Report. The assessment undertaken suggests very high impacts to the SRN. Junction capacity assessments of the strategic road network have not been presented within the Modelling Report, despite experiencing significant increases in trips at the junction as a result of development. It is recommended these are undertaken to determine the predicted operation of the junctions following Local Plan development and to determine what measures may be required to mitigate the impact. Consideration may also need to be given to undertaking merge/diverge assessments at various locations to determine whether changes are required to support the Local Plan development. | Noted. As part of the plan review we will consider the issue. | Consider accordingly |
| 14521 - Home Builder's Federation [144] | Comment | The OAN report is not a SHMA. It does not include an assessment of the affordable housing need. We would expect to see an updated assessment of the OAN, including the need for affordable housing, through a SHMA. Evidence of a high need for affordable homes is evidence of strain in the local housing market. In turn this would suggest the need for an increase in supply above the trend. It is questionable whether the trend-derived figure of 362 dpa does represent the full OAN and whether it would provide the 'significant boost' to supply that is sought by the Government through the NPPF. | Noted. The Objectively Assessed Need identifies a need for homes and will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. A stage 2 OAN which considers affordable housing need is being published. | Consider accordingly |
| 15873 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Additional issues: Appear to be mistakes in the reporting. In Tables 11-1 and 11-2, the description of junction 15 (Priority left-in left-out) is not consistent with the description in Table 2-1 (double mini-roundabout). Further descriptions that the operation of this junction is very much influenced by the level of mainline traffic suggests that this is not the junction described as Junction 15 in Section 2. Hence, it is unclear whether the reported values are meaningful. Some investigation is required as to what has been modelled as Junction 15. Junction 21 is labelled as not applicable (N/A) for options 2 and 3. While this is correct for option 2 as the junction would be closed, there should be a value for option 3. The appropriate values should be inserted into Tables 11-1 and 11-2. | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will consider the issue. | Consider and amend accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15771 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | The Local Plan does not provide any details of infrastructure funding, which may be unknown at this stage if the specific infrastructure schemes that are required have not yet been identified. It is important that once the schemes are identified that the funding method for each is outlined, including any Central Government or Local Government funding that is available, the amount that could be collected from developers and any shortfall that could occur. It is recommended that an IDP is prepared to provide further details regarding the infrastructure provision and funding. | Further work is being carried out on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will be published as soon as possible. This will provide a details on funding levels and source as well as identifying shortfalls and therefore the Councils' priorities for expenditure. | Consider accordingly |
| 14919 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] | Comment | Financial. Where are the financial figures that support this Plan? How can a plan be issued proposing such massive changes without some supporting financials e.g. infrastructure investment costs, impact on the tax payer. | Concerns noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail in the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 16123 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Comment | Whilst the draft Plan makes various general references to supporting evidence, there is very little reference to specific evidence base documents relied upon. Additionally, as we understand at paragraph 2.16 of the draft Plan, there is further evidence "being undertaken to inform policies as they are being developed". It stands to reason that the Plan, prepared as it has, in the absence of this evidence will fail to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF. | Noted. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15846 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Employment. The most significant employment site (shown as a purple dot in the south west of Figure 1) is Site 101A at Cobham Hall to the east of M25 Junction 29. The only access and egress is via Junction 29. The location of this site in the extreme south west of the borough and its proximity to the motorway means that many of the trips will originate from outside of the borough. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15878 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | While the methodology used would show a worst case at some junctions, allowing for reassignment of trips may indicate a worst case at other junctions. Ultimately, this may depend on the level of mitigation. If full mitigation is provided, then the routes assigned may be used by all traffic. In reality, it is unlikely that full mitigation will be possible at these junctions with consequence reassignment to sub optimal routes. This may require mitigation measures at other junctions. It is probable that the optimum strategy for Brentwood Borough Council would be to install some mitigation measures at the junctions assessed as being most congested but accept that it is not possible to achieve nil detriment by this method alone. Actions to reduce congestion on other routes could result in a reassignment of traffic away from the more congested routes which may be a more cost effective strategy depending on the relative costs and constraints of improvements. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15957 - Collins & Coward Ltd (Mr Brown) [6119] | Comment | Survey sheet for site 249 there are a number of errors. Firstly, on the boundary type the whole site is contained within tall evergreen trees not hedges. There are no views into or out of the site. There is no clear separation of the site from Blackmore village as it is surrounded by residential development on the north, east and west sides. There is a private access from the site into the village of Blackmore which can be opened up if the site is allocated for housing making all facilities within walking distance. The site is highly sustainable. The site has medium tranquillity as it lies next to the main Ingatestone Road. | Noted. As part of the plan review we will consider raised issue. | Consider accordingly |
| 15876 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Additional issues. Consequences of the adopted process. There are some zone pairs where there are at least two alternative routes. The choice of route will affect the junctions through which development traffic passes. Small changes in the assignment assumptions may result in significant differences in junction loading. The distribution and assignment has been based on certain assumptions for the values of time and distance. Some of the routes used by development trips in the model may not be considered to be suitable by the local highway authority. In these cases, they may take action to prohibit or deter the movement. This would have the consequence of increasing the loading on the junctions of alternative routes. In some cases, this may result in other junctions being assessed as critical. Sensitivity tests could be undertaken which apply a penalty to unsuitable routes thereby encouraging development trips onto more major roads. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15879 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Conclusion This technical note has been prepared to review the Highway Modelling approach used to support the preparation of the Brentwood Local Plan. The review was intended to establish whether PBA's (Brentwood BC's consultants) approach to transport modelling will reasonably reflect the potential impact the Local Plan development could have on the strategic road network over the plan period. AECOM has made a number of comments and recommendations throughout the note. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15849 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | A total of 23 junctions have been modelled. None of the Strategic Road Network junctions have been modelled. Base year turning counts have been undertaken at these junctions. Although modelling has not been undertaken at either of the motorway junctions, the forecast increase in traffic at these junctions is higher than at any other junction. With the exception of the motorway junctions, nearly all of the significant junctions which are affected by forecast development flows are included. Notable exceptions are the two left-in left-out junctions located between junctions 14 and 19/20 on the A127. Roundabouts and priority junctions have been modelled using JUNCTIONS 8 software. LINSIG has been used for modelling signalised junctions. With the exception of Junctions 15 and 16, which are treated as a double mini-roundabout, no consideration is taken of potential interference between the junctions. This is only likely to be an issue for those closely-spaced junctions in the centre of Brentwood. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15853 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Strategic Housing Developments. Dunton Hills Garden Village. Plots are shown of flows from four development options in Appendices C and D of the PBA report. It is stated that these are exclusive of the baseline traffic flows. However, the plots appear to show more traffic on the M25 than that coming from the developments. The mechanism for excluding this traffic is not known. Hence, there is some doubt that the plots are entirely accurate. AECOM therefore consider that the assessment of the impact of Option 1 on the M25 junctions could be considered broadly robust. However, if a higher proportion of trips travelling to destinations east on the A12 travelled through the town centre and accessed the A12 at Junction 12, there could be a greater number of turning movements at that junction than is predicted by PBA. | Further work on transport modelling is being carried out, in line with discussion with ECC and Highways England under the Duty to Cooperate. Mitigation needs and options will be considered in line with this work. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 15875 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Additional issues. Appear to be mistakes in reporting. It is reported that there seems to be some traffic reassignment within the option tests when the development traffic is added to the baseline traffic. According to the described methodology, this should not happen. The only reason why this may happen is if routes are closed as in Thorndon Avenue in Option 2. Some investigation is recommended as to why this happens. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15618 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Comment | Brentwood Borough intends to meet its objectively assessed housing need (OAN) inline with the 2014 OAN document within the Brentwood Borough boundary. We support this approach to housing growth. However, the OAN report was produced prior to the release of the 2012 sub national population projections (2012 SNPP), or the more recently published 2012 based CLG Household Projections. The Planning Practice Guidance is clear that these more recent projections should form the starting point for calculating the OAN for housing in an area. Additionally, the calculations of OAN has not given consideration to changing patterns of out-migration from London, which could reasonably be expected to be considered in any sensitivity testing of demographic forecasts, in those areas surrounding London. Changing migration patterns could seriously impact on the need for housing within Brentwood Borough going forward. Brentwood Borough Council should carry out further work to re-assess the OAN to include these projections, and should the need for housing change in light of this, Brentwood Borough Council should seek to revise the target accordingly and to continue to fully meet their OAN. | The objectively assessed housing needs assessment published in December 2014 is considered to be the most up to date evidence and is NPPF compliant. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date and this will be reflected in the local plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15910 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Consider the phasing of development and funding of infrastructure will be crucial for effective delivery and this will need to be reflected in the evidence base as Local Plan preparation progresses, and its supporting IDP. Any proposed strategy is of particular importance to ECC as it will need to be satisfied that the impact of any planned scale and distribution of growth can be accommodated by ECC areas of responsibility, or identify what additional facilities or mitigation is required to make the strategy sustainable in social, economic and environmental grounds. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15702 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] | Comment | The Assessment of Sites in the Green Belt report prepared by Crestwood Environmental has now been published by the Council. This report, however, was not available at the start of the consultation period. We welcome the findings that the towns would not coalesce if site was developed and that the site presently has limited or no countryside function. The land at Codham Hall appears to have been considered within two parts. This does not reflect the current area for allocation as proposed in Figure 8.2 or the 'Site Allocations Maps'. There is presently inconsistency in these areas and it is essential that changes are made to accurately reflect the area of existing uses on site. | Noted. Further work on site assessment will be carried out by the Council. | Consider site details accordingly |
| 15848 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Strategic housing: 2500 dwellings at Dunton Hills Garden Village (shown as a red dot in the extreme south east of Figure 1); 2500 dwellings at sites in West Horndon (shown as blue dots in the south of Figure 1); 1170 dwellings at sites in North Brentwood (shown as green dots in the north of Figure 1); or 1000 dwellings at Running Waters (shown as an orange dot in the centre of Figure 1). The strategic sites involve significantly more concentrated development than the brownfield sites and are generally larger than the urban extensions. AECOM understand that Option 1 has been taken forward for inclusion within the LP. | Noted. The impact of increased trip generation is being modelled as the plan develops and will be reflected in mitigation proposed. Ongoing duty to cooperate discussions with the Highways Authority and Highways England will consider this in detail. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14920 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] | Comment | Little demographic information is provided on who the new comers are and what their needs will be in addition to housing. It is hard to determine what benefit, if any, this expansion will have to present residents. The draft plan is describes the proposed location of houses and the build schedule however I have major concerns over the need to upgrade Brentwood's infrastructure. My fear is the investment will not be forthcoming and policies relating to 'sustainability' will not be achieved. If that happens Brentwood will be a poorer place to live and work. | Concerns noted. Detailed studies on demographic context and projection informed the Draft Plan's policies on housing provision are set out in Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | No action |
| 14916 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] | Comment | Ongar Road. No major structural improvements to accommodate this increased volume save for the installation of mini roundabouts and bollard. Similarly, throughout Brentwood borough the Highway Modelling exercise undertaken by PBA confirms that Brentwood roads have insufficient capacity to handle today's traffic volumes. (See section 11 Summary of Junction Outputs) I believe this modelling exercise understates the true size of the problem. Two periods were analysed, 0800 to 0900 and 1700 to 1800, no account has been taken of the effect of the school term when students exit between 1500 and 1600. Why not? During that time traffic in Brentwood centre comes to a stand still, even the paths have insufficient capacity to handle pedestrians. I also note no analysis was undertaken of the M25 junction 28. The plan fails to identify any significant initiatives regarding highway infrastructure which address problems associated with traffic congestion and pollution, cycling or walking. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and there will be updates to highways modelling which will be published alongside the next version of Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15626 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Comment | Past windfall trends for Brentwood Borough Council has accounted for 77 homes pa. Brentwood Borough Council have stated within their Draft Local Plan that this level of supply will continue into the future providing 928 homes over the plan period. However, there is no evidence that supports the ongoing supply of homes at this rate from windfall sites. In line with Government guidance, Brentwood Borough Council must provide compelling evidence that such windfall sites have consistently become available in the local area, and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens. Supply from windfall sites should also be split down into categories to identify where the provision could arise from. | The Council will publish technical evidence in relation to windfall trends when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15729 - Highways England (Ms Janice Burgess) [6105] | Comment | As you know, in 2014 we were consulted by you and made comments on your suggested approach to the transport assessment for your Local Plan at that time. We have not heard further to this time any more details of an assessment but assume that you will still be undertaking such an assessment. We look forward to receiving your full Local Plan transport assessment in due course. Should you require further advice on transport related issues please do not hesitate to contact us. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England on transport related issues under the Duty to Cooperate. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15782 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | We consider that the trip generation and distribution assumed by PBA is broadly reasonable. Some concerns have been raised regarding the assignment of trips across the network, primarily the decision to assign all trips between two zones to the same route, whereas in reality we consider that a number of different routes may be used, particularly if routes become congested and users change to an alternative route to avoid the congestion. However, we consider that the current methodology could result in a robust impact on the Strategic Road Network and therefore may be reasonable to take forward. If, however, the local highway authority plans to deter drivers from making use of certain routes or congestion hotspots cause a significant change in route choice, the total development trips on the strategic road network could alter from that presented within the Highway Modelling Report. The assessment undertaken suggests very high impacts to the Strategic Road Network. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15842 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Committed Sites: Most of the committed housing sites (shown as yellow dots in Figure 1) are relatively small and will not have significant trip generation. There are a few places where sites (or combinations of sites) will have a significant impact. Three sites in West Horndon (south of the A127) are expected to include about 500 dwellings. A site close to the High Street in Brentwood is expected to include 200 dwellings. | Noted. The impact of increased trip generation is being modelled as the plan develops and will be reflected in mitigation proposed. Ongoing duty to cooperate discussions with the Highways Authority and Highways England will consider this in detail. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14915 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] | Comment | Population Growth and Demographics. This whole plan is has been drafted to show how Brentwood District Council intends to cater for a 15% rise in population over an 18 year period to 2030. The population growth primarily arises through inward migration, much of which will be from London. The Plan states that the Brentwood's present population is over 73,500 with a significant level of retirees - an ageing population trend projected to continue. There are over 32000 properties 76% owner occupied, 63% being detached or semi detached; 58% being 3 or 4 bedroomed, 25% 2 bedroomed. The only forecast I could find regarding population increases were in PBA Objectively Assessed Housing Needs, Appendix B SNPP 2012 Migration. This stated ' ---- the population of Brentwood is projected to increase from 74.0k in 2012 to 85.2k in 2030'. This is an increase of 15% (11,200 people), however 7200 dwellings are to be built giving an average occupancy rate of 1.6 people per dwelling. If this correct how does this reconcile with Figure 7.1 in the Plan? Of the projected 7200 dwellings to be built figure 7.1, states that 65% will be 1 or 2 bedroomed. Clearly this implies a dramatic change in Brentwood's environment and demographic mix however the Plan is silent on the implications for infrastructure (e. g. highways, schools, surgeries). As stated in AECOM Sustainability report, some of these are already at capacity. The plan is also silent on the social and economic effects of this population growth on existing and 'new' residents. | Noted. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community. With regards to this requirement, Figure 7.1 was proposed to respond to Brentwood's need, this was informed by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2013. Regarding the implications for infrastructure, the Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of both existing and new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. The social and economic effects of different options are detailed in the Sustainability Appraisal. The SA process works alongside the Local Plan process, and as such both inform one another. Further site assessment and testing will be undertaken. | Consider accordingly |
| 14318 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14319 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | The evidence to support the Plan on highway grounds is very much lacking with the PBA Highway Modelling Report only dealing with the effects of the various growth options on junction capacity. Clearly any growth will have an effect on an already busy road network and the work should analyse impacts that the various options will bring on flows, speeds, queuing, accidents and pollution. This is particularly true as all of the options have a degree of concentrated growth but particularly option 1 Concentrated growth will bring very significant local effects and these need to be presented to inform whether large strategic options are the right way forward and if so where these should be located. Studying traffic more generally will also help to inform other policies, the CIL scheme and master plans. | Noted. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence on impact of the Plan. Initial results have been published. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Mitigation options will be considered as appropriate. Updates to this will be published alongside the next version of Local Plan consultation and kept under review as the plan-making process progresses. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15851 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Trip distribution: For work trips, a matrix of weights was calculated using distance weights derived from Census journey to work data. In principle, this is reasonable. Education trips used a matrix of weights using schools as attractors. This is considered to be acceptable. | Noted | No action |
| 15232 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | The Council's evidence base on OAN is spread across a number of studies undertaken by different organisations. There is a lack of a clear narrative about how the various components of the evidence have been brought together to derive OAN for 362 dwellings per annum identified in the Draft Local Plan. The PBA Study shows that housing delivery has exceeded past housing targets, and based on analysis of a range of indicators suggested that there was not automatically a basis for making an upward adjustment to figures to respond to market signals. We suggest that this is inconsistent with the evidence [see full rep for detail]. | The Objectively Assessed Housing Need assessment published in December 2014 is considered to be the most up to date evidence and is NPPF compliant. It is considered that the need for 360 homes per annum can be sustainably accommodated in the Borough, albeit not all on brownfield land given the finite capacity of available sites and 89% of the Borough being Green Belt. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15648 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Given that Brentwood Borough Council are looking to focus development around the key transport routes, including the A127 which runs through Basildon, it is important to understand the resulting effect any development along the A127 corridor would have on the Basildon Borough. Further work by Brentwood Borough Council needs to be undertaken to assess this. | Noted. The Council agree that the A127 should be considered across local authority boundaries to consider wider development impacts on capacity. The cumulative impacts of development are being considered through the Duty to Cooperate and evidence base including identification of necessary mitigation. | Consider accordingly |
| 15768 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Object | Whilst we broadly agree with the approach to funding transport infrastructure outlined within the LP, through the pooling of contributions secured through Planning Obligations and, once adopted, the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (CIL), further details of the specific infrastructure schemes that may be required to support development across the Borough are not provided within the LP at this stage. Furthermore, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has not been prepared to accompany the LP and without this I can see the plan being challenged. | Noted. The Council will publish these documents when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15653 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Given that Brentwood Borough Council are proposing development adjacent the Basildon Borough Boundary, and considering some existing services are already shared, e.g. hospital and schools, it is considered essential for Brentwood Borough Council to work with Basildon Borough Council to determine the impacts such development proposals may have on infrastructure and services in the Basildon Borough and how development options of this nature may need to support the upgrade of services and facilities in Basildon Borough should the Council continue to favour them through the Local Plan. At this time, Basildon Borough Council does not feel that enough work has been carried out to determine the relevant infrastructure requirements for the Brentwood Borough growth. | The Council will continue to work with Basildon Borough Council on infrastructure related issues as such under the Duty to Cooperate. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|------------------------------|
| 14569 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | With regards to the entire Plan, it is not evident from the evidence base that the Dunton Garden Village proposals are deliverable. | Noted. The site assessment is ongoing and sites will be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. | No action |
| 15203 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | Object to the fact that the Green Belt Assessment (Crestwood March 2016) assessed sites 024a and 024b as two separate parcels as since the start of 2015 the site has been promoted to the Council as a single parcel. The results of the two parcel assessment are therefore inaccurate and do not fully reflect its true contribution towards the Green Belt purposes. Recommended that the site is assessed as a single site in the Local Plan evidence base (not as two separate land parcels). Based on this assessment the overall contribution of the site to Green Belt purposes should be changed to be "low" or "low / moderate". | Comment noted | Consider suggested amendment |
| 15659 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Brentwood Borough Council should also identify and consider reasonable alternatives when developing the Local Plan's spatial strategy, growth options, specific sites and policies to ensure compliance with national policy and Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation. At examination the Council would need to show that the Local Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, and other legal and procedural requirements, and that it complies with the test of soundness. As stipulated in paragraph 182 of the NPPF, for a Local Plan to be found "sound" it should have been positively prepared, be effective including the plan's deliverability, be consistent with national policy and be justified insofar as being the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. It is not currently clear from the published evidence how Brentwood Borough Council can demonstrate this. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15243 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | Limited reference of Crossrail to inform the OAN. This provides a clear local driver which can be expected to enhance demand for housing relative to trend. This warrants further careful evaluation as the plan is developed. | Crossrail replaces the existing metro service rather than providing an entirely new service and whilst the Council acknowledge that there will be an improved service with greater connections across London, this is not the only housing driver being considered. Furthermore, constraints are being considered in the selection of sites for new housing. | Consider accordingly |
| 14570 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | The proposals in the Plan are not supported by clear evidence that there is a reasonable prospect of infrastructure being delivered. It is not clear that the district-wide costs are understood for the plan. It is therefore prudent for the Council to allocate homes in the Larger Villages, where new strategic infrastructure is not required to support the schemes, providing greater certainty of delivery of homes throughout the plan period. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16116 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The government places a strong emphasis on the importance of infrastructure planning. It is therefore unacceptable that the Local plan has been prepared in the absence of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Proposed land allocations for strategic growth have been identified in the absence of a proper understanding of the level and distribution of existing infrastructure and where new provision is required. | The Council are developing an IDP which is being used to assess infrastructure and identify infrastructure needs. This will be published alongside the next iteration of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15953 - Collins & Coward Ltd (Mr Brown) [6119] | Object | It is important to interrogate the Council's Green Belt assessment. This study is not wholly reflective or representative of the NPPF. Paragraph 84 requires Council's when reviewing Green Belt boundaries to take account of sustainable patterns of development. The Council's Green Belt study does not take account of the NPPF paragraphs 84 or 85 and is therefore fundamentally flawed. Nor does it consider permitted development rights and locations where development would not be inappropriate (paragraphs 89 and 90). On this basis the Green Belt work is simply no more than a landscape assessment. | Noted. There is no requirement for Local Authorities to undertake full Green Belt reviews; however the Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | No action |
| 15647 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Brentwood Borough Council has produced a draft Development Options - Highway Modelling. This was done by independent transport consultants and it is not clear how Essex County Council, as the local highways authority was engaged in the modelling process. Consequently, Basildon Borough Council has concerns with regards to the way in which the modelling takes into account planned growth in neighbouring authorities, or planned improvements/changes to the current highway network. Furthermore, whilst the document looks at the changes in junction capacity arising from the four development options tested, it does not look at ways to mitigate the impacts of the development proposed in the Draft Local Plan. | Noted. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence on impact of the Plan. Initial results have been published. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Mitigation options will be considered as appropriate. Updates to this will be published alongside the next version of Local Plan consultation and kept under review as the plan-making process progresses. | Consider accordingly |
| 15200 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Object | The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs for Brentwood Report (2015) prepared by PBA, states that the OAN based on 2011 population projections. The 2012 population projections have since been published and although PBA state that these were likely to be similar to those published in 2011, it is noted that the Council has not updated this figure or published an assessment of the OAN following the publication of the 2012 household projections. It is therefore considered that the Council should set out the OAN based on the 2012 projections and without doing so, it cannot be considered appropriate for the Council to rely on the current figure, as it is not the most up to date needs figure. | The Objectively Assessed Housing Need assessment published in February 2015 is NPPF compliant. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15643 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Basildon Borough Council are generally supportive of the approach Brentwood has taken to identifying its employment land and job requirements. However, it is noted that the evidence only looks to 2030. Consideration should be given, at the least to annualising the employment requirement for the remainder of the plan period, or else looking to update the evidence base regarding employment and retail needs to cover the remainder of the plan period. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13640 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | Up-to-date evidence is important, which is why the Council should spend more time updating its policies. Eg: assumptions about appropriate housing density are based on a report dated October 2011. Since then, the market has changed, such as higher-density development would be perfectly tenable, and flats would be perfectly reasonable beyond town centres. I therefore call upon the Council to spend a bit of time reassessing this issue, since it is evident that a higher density of housing is appropriate and expedient, and would obviate the need to destroy even one square metre of green belt. | Noted. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 16063 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Summary of Objections : OBJECT TO THE LOCAL PLAN ON THE BASIS THAT IT IS UNSOUND AS CURRENTLY DRAFTED DUE TO THE ABSENCE OF AN APPROPRIATE, COMPREHENSIVE AND UPTO-DATE EVIDENCE BASE. THE ABSENCE OF AN ADEQUATE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE RELEVANT EU DIRECTIVE AND REGULATIONS MADE TO IMPLEMENT IT. NOTWITHSTANDING THE ABOVE SUBMISSION THAT THE PLAN AS A WHOLE IS UNSOUND, OBJECT TO POLICIES: 5.1 SPATIAL STRATEGY; 5.2 HOUSING GROWTH; 6.1 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT; 6.2 MANAGING GROWTH; 6.6 STRATEGIC SITES; 7.1 DUNTON HILLS GARDEN VILLAGE; and 7.4 HOUSING LAND ALLOCATIONS. Please note that 15 documents were submitted for this representation. | Noted. The Council will publish and/or update technical evidence when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15624 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | The recently published evidence (Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt and their Relative Contribution to the Purposes of the Green Belt Designation - March 2016) states that 'An update to the 2014 SHMA is currently being undertaken by the Council in light of subsequent amendments in national policy guidance'. This suggests that Brentwood Borough Council recognise the deficiencies in their evidence regarding the objectively assessed need for housing in their borough, and it is therefore expected that the matters raised above will be resolved prior to the Brentwood Local Plan being progressed to submission. Basildon Borough Council would be pleased to be engaged and kept informed of the progress with this work as it is progressed. | Noted. The Council will publish technical evidence when available and this together with updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15769 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Object | Disagree with the SHMA's conclusion that Brentwood Borough can be considered a self-contained housing market area. Brentwood is within easy access to London and the M25 making it a popular place for commuters, especially with the coming of Crossrail. This should be considered in determining housing needs in the borough. With London not being able to meet its housing needs, the surrounding area will be required to make up this shortfall. Brentwood Council need to consider the implication of the projected shortfall in housing delivery in the GLA. The inclusion of reserved sites can assist in case the OANs change or the Council cannot demonstrate the 5year housing land supply. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15961 - Simply Planning (Mrs holly Mitchell) [5416] | Object | The Council's Green Belt Assessment of the site 104 assessed a larger site of 8.3 ha and identifies that the site currently has a low visual amenity, low tranquillity and is a mix of uses. The assessment finds that the site is not contained as the site lies away from the village of Stondon Massey and has no defined boundaries. We object to this description as the boundaries of the site are the current industrial and storage uses which are clearly defined. Whilst separate from the settlement of Stondon Massey it is within easy reach and currently provides a heavily used industrial/sui generis site. The Green Belt Assessment accepts that development of the site would not cause surrounding towns to coalesce. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15651 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | It would appear from the information given within the Brentwood Borough Council Draft Local Plan that consultations with the NHS into healthcare facilities were carried out prior to detailed locations of development being identified. Therefore consideration to the proximity to the Basildon Borough and the shared facilities has not been fully considered and would need to be if development were to go ahead at Dunton Hills Garden Village. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. The site assessment is ongoing and sites will be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15627 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | In relation to identified housing land supply, it would appear from the evidence base that Brentwood Borough Council has not carried out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) since 2011. Basildon Borough Council made it clear in its response to Brentwood Borough Council regarding the Brentwood Borough's Local Plan Strategic Growth Options in early 2015 that it would expect the SHLAA to be updated before a Local Plan for Brentwood is progressed. Brentwood Borough Council should update its SHLAA by undertaking land availability assessments to help inform the emerging Local Plan, and review this on an annual basis. These assessments must review whether sites are suitable, available and achievable in both planning and viability terms, otherwise they cannot be relied upon to make up Brentwood's development land supply. It is not clear how any of the proposed housing sites included in the Draft Local Plan have been put forward and how the sites are justified as suitable without crucial supporting evidence which is missing including recent landscaping, ecology and open space evidence. | The assessment is ongoing and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15334 - Ford Motor Company [3768] | Object | Paragraph 2.16 - Ford raises concerns regarding this approach in light of the requirements of Paragraph 158 of the NPPF which requires a local plan to be based upon up-to-date data and relevant evidence. Without key evidence base documents, the Plan will fall short of the requirements of the NPPF, and will be considered 'unsound'. Ford also questions how future employment and housing targets have been established within the consultation document in the absence of a comprehensive, up-to-date evidence base. | Noted. A range of economic evidence has informed employment land and job growth need, such as the Brentwood Economic Futures report (2014). Proposed job growth is also informed by the Borough's objectively assessed housing need. These work and studies point towards a figure of 5,000 additional jobs to be provided in the Borough over the period 2013-2033. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15074 - Mr Ivan Armstrong [2909] 15077 - Mr and Mrs Jeremy and Emma Ellis [6049] | Object | The Strategic Housing Market Assessment lacks the credibility to determine such an important aspect of housing policy, namely that 65% of future dwellings should be 1 or 2 bedroom flats, for the following reasons: a) It is based on responses from only 3% of all properties in Brentwood. b) It is based on an old survey in June 2013 where people were asked, among other things, whether they wanted to move and when. c) Much of the demand for flats comes from "Concealed Householders" i.e. those living with parents/family at present. Their main reasons for wanting to buy a flat in the borough were either that they wanted to live near family and friends, or that they have always lived in the area. | Noted. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|--|
| 14722 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | The Local Plan as currently drafted contains no reference to, and no provision for showmen's yards. It appears the Council has not considered this group. Whilst the GTAA (2014) indicates there is no need for specific provision in Brentwood for travelling showpeople; however the report discusses the Buckles Lane showpeople's site located in Thurrock, where there is significant under provision. We are unaware from the evidence base of the Council that the Council has considered approaching the Guild or other local showpeople, whether in the Borough or near to it, regarding their need. In the absence of such discussions, we consider that our client's request as sufficient evidence (a 'market signal'), alongside the need to co-operate with Thurrock, that there is a need for a limited number of plots, and the subject site will go some way to addressing the need noted above. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Issue is being considered as the Plan progresses |
| 15625 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Work on the South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment has included a re-assessment of the South Essex Housing Market Area to ensure it is still appropriately defined. In defining Brentwood as a single housing market area, the current Brentwood SHMA does state that 'data suggests that Brentwood shares a housing market area with Chelmsford and Basildon and to a smaller extent Epping'. It therefore recognises that overlaps with surrounding housing market areas exist. As the proposals within the Brentwood Draft Local Plan propose a strategic housing site for 2,500 homes within close proximity of the Borough boundary shared with Basildon Borough Council, there may be implications for the future definitions of the Brentwood and South Essex housing market areas, which need to be given further consideration as the Brentwood Local Plan is progressed towards submission. Basildon Borough Council would be pleased to be engaged in such work in order to understand the implications this proposal would have for both the Brentwood and South Essex housing markets, and the extent to which development in this location would meet the needs arising from both housing market areas. | Development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these areas (and strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA). Evidence will be updated as necessary | Consider accordingly |
| 16153 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | In the DLP there is reference to an evidence base document entitled Green Infrastructure Strategy and published in September 2015. We submit that this report fails to draw any overriding conclusions but defers instead to additional work. A note is attached to this report that states that the GIS will require review and update upon receipt of Open Space and Sport Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity and Landscape Capacity Study, commissioned by the Council and due Spring 2016. The broad findings of the report are at odds with the latest interim SA. The report lends some support to Dunton for strategic growth but the results appear contrived. In dealing with Dunton the report also refers to "or another current new development site". | The Council will publish technical evidence relating to the Green Infrastructure Strategy when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|--|
| 15193 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Object | Paragraph 5.5 that "Consultation responses suggested a preference for options 1 & 2. This was supported by technical evidence as the most sustainable strategy for future growth". We have not been able find any technical evidence to support this statement within the evidence base and we request that the Council provides a robust justification to why option 1 and 2 was preferred. | The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. This was informed by evidence including the Sustainability Appraisal, the Landscape Character Assessment, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, among others. In addition, a strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Issues is being considered as the plan progresses. |
| 14262 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock consider the following require new or updated evidence, and therefore consultation, for the reasons given: Objectively Assessed Need: population projections used are out of date. Figures were published in 2015 and the 2014 set of sub-national population projections (SNPP) in May 2016. Economic Futures Report: as with the OAN, demographic forecasts and household projections based on EPOA Phase 6 study scenarios or earlier information is out of date. SHMA requires updating as based on 2011/2012 demographic figures. Also disagree that Brentwood has a high level of self containment. Dunton Masterplan - including deliverability and phasing; Green Belt Review: Strong failure of Brentwood for failing to undertake a formal comprehensive Green Belt review to date. As Brentwood can only accommodate some of the objectively assessed housing need on brownfield land in the urban area it is considered this represents the exceptional circumstances for Brentwood to undertake a Green Belt review. Park and Walk scheme referred to but no strategy or policies relate to this. Viability Assessment, particularly of strategic proposals Road Capacity, Impact and transport evidence - including any proposed mitigation; Landscape Impact Employment Provision at Brentwood Enterprise Park; Concern that evidence not made available for respondents to make a full and informed review. Unclear how evidence has been used to develop Strategic Growth Options 2015 and Preferred Options 2013. Impact on Thurrock Housing Market; Infrastructure and Public Expenditure Funding. | Noted. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 16142 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | The Council's SHMA is dated July 2014. Whilst October 2011 is the date the SHLAA was published, the assessment itself took place between October 2009 and May 2010 (see Executive Summary). In the absence of any up to date evidence from the SHMA or the SHLAA, the sustainability appraisal fails to adequately update the assessment of sites in terms of any sequential analysis required to inform their deliverability and suitability for development. There is therefore a complete lack of an up-to-date evidence base on housing numbers and allocations. | Noted. Further updates to the housing assessment work is being carried out and this will be reflected in the next iteration of the local plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|---|--|
| 15652 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | The detail given in relation to schools also appears to be general and does not specifically detail the future requirements based on the development locations proposed. This would need to be evidenced further. Public transport requirements and discussions with Essex County Council are also stated as ongoing. | Noted. Brentwood Borough Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to determine what additional education facilities will be needed as a result of planned future development, as well as other infrastructure issues. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. The Council will publish technical evidence when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15195 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Object | Paragraph 5.17 - We disagree that the Council has carefully considered evidence on all matters. The Council has not provided a settlement hierarchy paper to determine suitable villages for development or an urban capacity study to determine potential number of units at those villages. As such we question the validity of the Council's Spatial Strategy. | The settlement hierarchy was set out in Chapter 5 of the Draft Plan. The Spatial Strategy for the Borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | No action. Issues are being considered as the Plan progresses. |
| 16069 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Documents described as 'forthcoming': Green Belt Review. Infrastructure Delivery Plan. New economic evidence including the impact of Crossrail. Documents requiring an Update/Further Assessment: A Green Infrastructure Study. Transport Assessment. Objectively Assessed Housing Needs. Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The Plan is therefore supported by a limited evidence base, which by the Council's own admission is "emerging and ongoing" (DLP, paragraph 1.22). Paragraph 2.16 confirms: "several pieces of evidence are being undertaken alongside Local Plan preparation to inform policies as they are being developed and ensure the Council is able to produce a Plan as quickly as possible". | Noted. The Council will publish technical evidence when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15661 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Basildon Borough Council are disappointed that there is still a significant evidence base gap which has not been addressed following our last consultation response. The lack of evidence is felt to be a fundamental flaw to the Brentwood Borough Draft Local Plan. Basildon Borough Council therefore considers that the Brentwood Borough Draft Local Plan requires further work and that it is premature of a clear appreciation and understanding of the baseline context in the Brentwood Borough and the wider Essex area. It is difficult to see how the Draft Local Plan can be taken forward without the necessary evidence base having informed its development. | Noted. The Council will publish technical evidence when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 16143 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The overwhelming conclusion to draw on the DLP is that in all topic areas it has not been influenced by an appropriate and proportionate evidence base. There is no background assessment to support or justify the policies of the Plan. It is flawed in terms of evidence on housing, business, infrastructure, the environment, and in terms of viability and deliverability to list but a few. There has been a complete lack of evidence to inform what is in the plan and the Council is hastily collating and publishing this retrospectively. Some documents that are only now being published were commissioned three years ago. These are now seen to be contradicting the policies of the plan. Without an evidence base there can be no SA. The effects of the options and the plans policies must have been appraised in relation to the baseline situation. The absence of an evidence base and SA mean that the plan cannot be found sound. It is questionable whether this situation can be corrected in due course and we call for the Council to address the matter now and undertake the work required. | Noted. The Council will publish technical evidence when available, this together with updated evidence will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15360 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15380 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15408 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15469 - Mr Martin Morecroft [6091] 15485 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15563 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15609 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16160 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16187 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | Publication of Green Belt Assessment on the Council's website noted. Whilst a number of sites are assessed, it is evident that the Council have not taken into account the results of this assessment when preparing their Draft Local Plan. In particular, it is noted that the Council has allocated a number of sites, which have a 'moderate' impact to the Green Belt, rather than the smaller, but 'Low to Moderate' risk sites. No justification within either the Assessment or the Draft Local Plan, as to the reason why those 'low-moderate' sites have not been allocated. Failure to explain why the Evidence Base does not influence the housing strategy makes the Plan, at present, unsound. | A number of constraints are considered when identifying potential new sites and not just impact on Green Belt. Comments noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 16130 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | The Council commissioned Crestwood Environmental to undertake an independent assessment of Housing Sites within the Green Belt and their relative contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt designation. The assessment is not a parcel based analysis nor does it take into consideration the results of the Council's Mid Essex Landscape Character Assessment 2006. The principal weakness is that it does not consider the role and function of the Green Belt in Brentwood and beyond to determine the best Green Belt sites to release. | Noted. There is no requirement for Local Authorities to undertake full Green Belt reviews; however the Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14185 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] | Object | The Council has failed to carry out landscape assessment and so its decision to remove the Dunton area from the Green Belt has no validity. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. The site assessment is ongoing and the Dunton Hill Garden Village will be assessed for its availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 16170 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Appendix 1 to the report of OM provides a critique of the modelling work by PBA. This finds fundamental issues with the depth of the work carried out, the data presented and conclusions drawn from that data. Critically the work has not been reviewed by the Highways Authority, Essex County Council and Highways England. The methodology used is not clear and the modelling tool is unreliable. For example it does not appear to take account of existing and proposed major development including infrastructure. It lacks depth and serious technical analysis. No real conclusions on the various strategic options for growth can be drawn from it. | Noted. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence on impact of the Plan. Initial results have been published. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Mitigation options will be considered as appropriate. Updates to this will be published alongside the next version of Local Plan consultation and kept under review as the plan-making process progresses. | Consider accordingly |
| 14193 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] | Object | The landscape assessment of the fenland area south of the A127 that concludes the Fenland is "moderately sensitive to change" displays a lack of historical insight and familiarity with the area and is at odds with Basildon Council's assessment of the same landscape, which assessed it as "highly sensitive to change". | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15902 - Kitewood [6116] | Object | The SHMAA considers the housing market for Brentwood is self-contained. Brentwood Borough has strong inter-connectivity with London and Essex and therefore could not be considered a self-contained Borough. There appears to be strong commuting flows with Basildon and Chelmsford, and the construction of Crossrail (strategic objective S07) will only increase this connectivity with London and Essex. On that basis, we consider that Brentwood should consider a joint-SHMA with Basildon, Chelmsford and Epping Forest to establish the overall OAN for the HMA and how the overall OAN can be collectively met. It is not clear from the draft Local Plan and the supporting evidence base whether or not the Council has fully considered London migration and this is therefore contrary to NPPF. | There are a number of SHMA being assessed within North and East London as well as within Essex. It is not considered that Brentwood Borough Council is fully part of these. The assessment of housing area and housing need takes movement into account and therefore reflects the correctly the current Brentwood Borough Housing Market Area. | No action. |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| Sustainability Appraisal | | | | |
| 16051 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | The SA considers all reasonable alternatives. We would draw the Council's attention to judgments in respect of <i>Heard v Broadland District Council</i> , <i>South Norfolk District Council</i> , <i>Norwich City Council</i> [2012] and <i>Save Historic Newmarket Ltd v. Forest Heath District Council</i> [2011]. The judgments in these cases confirm inter alia the need for the public to be presented with an accurate picture of the reasonable alternatives at an early stage; for these alternatives to be subject to appraisal; and for reasons for their rejection / selection to be explained within the Environmental Report. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14892 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | Comment | The report indicates that a Health Facility is between 800m and 1.5km, using classification "Performs Poorly". Again using the initial point and, this time the Brambles Surgery off Greenwich Avenue, the distance is over 1.6km if using the unlit pedestrian path opposite the Weald Road exit of Honeypot Lane, or in excess of 1.9km if using roads. Using the SA criteria this should therefore be reclassified as "Performs Particularly Poorly". | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15812 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The (Pre-) Submission SA will need to explore those spatial strategy options that were considered by the Council in 2009-2011 as part of their work towards a Core Strategy DPD (2009) and as stated in the Draft Local Plan 2016, paragraph 5.4, or at least offer some explanation as to why these alternatives are now not considered 'reasonable' if indeed this is considered the case. This could be explored (or re-explored) as part of a comprehensive audit trail of alternatives that have been considered and subject to SA throughout the plan-making process and should detail the reasons for rejecting and progressing alternatives at each stage. In addition, the cumulative assessment of the 'givens' (paras 6.3.5 - 6.3.7 of the Interim SA) for the purposes of satisfying the requirements of SA should be presented, alongside the cumulative impacts of these with the preferred strategic option. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14893 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | Comment | The report indicates an Educational Establishment less than 800m using classification "Performs Particularly Well". Again using the initial point and St Peter's School in Wigley Bush Lane, the distance is over 1.6km. I would also highlight that this is the most direct route using Weald Road which has no pedestrian path for the majority of the route. This should also be reclassified as "Performs Particularly Poorly". | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15811 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC acknowledges that the SA of the 6 reasonable options / alternatives identified, offer a very thorough and useful assessment of those options, and that the options selected for this part of the spatial strategy are comprehensive. However, it is noted that the SA seeks to develop 'reasonable alternatives' for strategic level growth arising from the Strategic Growth Options/Dunton Garden Village consultations, rather than the overall SA process. Consequently, it is unclear what options have been considered regarding the level of proportionate growth in rural areas with regards scale of growth, as the Draft Plan does not allocate growth in rural areas. The council will need to ensure that it has considered such options moving forward. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14891 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | Comment | With regard to my distance measurements I have used as an initial point 47, Honeypot Lane, the nearest property where site 022 could have road access, and Google Maps as a measurement tool. I could not find any specific measurement points or tools within the Sustainability Appraisal. Bus Stop The report indicates that the nearest bus stop is within 400m, using classification "Performs Well". Using the initial point, and the nearest bus stop, being between Honeypot Lane and South Weald Road travelling to Brentwood, the walking distance is a minimum of 475m. According to the SA criteria, this should be reclassified as "Performs Poorly". | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14894 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | Comment | Community Facilities: In the SA Community Facilities does not appear to be very well defined. I am using shops and Brentwood Station. The report indicates Community Facilities less than 800m using classification "Performs Poorly". The walking distance to Brentwood Station is 1.6km, Brook St sub Post Office is over 1.4km and Brentwood Sainsbury's is also 1.6km. Following the SA criteria I believe this should also be reclassified as "Performs Particularly Poorly". With regard to distances from Brentwood Station, Figure 5.5 on page 36 of the Brentwood Draft Local Plan, implies that all of the Honeypot Lane site 022 is within a 15 minute walk of Brentwood Station. I would point out that the measuring tool used in Fig 5.5 is "as the crow flies" and therefore walking using roads and paths, from my measuring point of 47 Honeypot Lane, which would be the nearest point to the Station from site 022, is in excess of a 20 minutes walk, at a swift walking speed of nearly 5k per hour. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14899 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | Comment | Having reviewed the 2013 consultation responses, I see that the proposer for the Honeypot Lane site is Barwell Land and Estates Ltd. AECOM, who I assume are the successors to PBA who produced the 2013 Sustainability Appraisal, have produced the Sustainability Appraisal for Brentwood Council which has several inaccuracies (see 4th March email). In the previous consultation response by Barwell Land they highlight aspects such as public transport being easily accessible by foot, which is not necessarily the case. In reviewing the website of Barwell Land and Estates Ltd it seems that in other projects they are acting together with AECOM. Has this conflict of interest by AECOM been advised? | Issues noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15237 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Comment | We have therefore examined the Draft Local Plan and Interim Sustainability Appraisal in the light of the concerns expressed in our previous response, dated 16 February 2015, at the Strategic Growth Options stage. Both the Draft Local Plan and the Interim Sustainability Appraisal now include several references to the three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within the district and to the potential threats to them arising from increased recreational pressure. We also note that there is now an explicit reference to the need for the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan to include consideration of the potential impact of the Plan's policies on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) as a result of increased road traffic and the associated air pollution. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14895 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | Comment | If my findings are correct, and I have only reviewed site 022 Honeypot Lane then I would suggest that it brings into question the many aspects of the Appraisal Findings. No doubt you will be able to confirm that these will be reviewed and Appendix II will be re-issued and circulated. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15555 - Rochford District Council (Natalie Hayward) [6094] | Comment | The Council has no observations to make. | Noted | No action |
| 16053 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | We have concerns with the current approach to SA in respect of both how the proposed total housing figure has been considered; and specific individual sites have been assessed. In respect of the total housing target for inclusion in the Local Plan, we note the Interim SA published alongside the DLP assumes the Local Plan will plan for the delivery of 7,240 new homes over the plan period (2013 - 2033). As set out within this representation, the provision of a greater number of new homes is clearly a reasonable alternative that merits consideration. However, there appears to be no assessment of the sustainability of a higher level of growth. | Noted. The Local Plan seeks to balance economic, environmental and social objectives to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 15533 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | Within the Climate Change Mitigation topic, an objective could be included on ensuring that people and wildlife can adapt better to climate change. For example, using blue and green infrastructure to protect green corridors and help to reduce the urban heat island effect. | Noted | Consider and amend accordingly |
| 14700 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Object | Have submitted our letter of Feb 2015 commenting on those draft SAs at that time. It is clear the detailed comments on previous SAs have not been addressed. Given that, and the previous comments appear to be largely still relevant, our client is content to let their comments to the previous SAs stand as their representation to the current SA. Our client is concerned about specific inaccuracies within the current SA's assessments for site's ref. 021 and 152 [see supporting document]. These are inaccuracies are not insignificant factors and they were found on just one allocation in the draft Local Plan. These should be rectified before proceeding further. However, our client is concerned that if these inaccuracies are repeated in the assessments of other allocations considered within the SA, it must undermine the whole document. | Site information submission noted. Update to evidence will be kept under review as the plan making process progresses. | Consider accordingly |
| 14641 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14816 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | Scenario 5 looks at expansive growth, defined as being greater than that anticipated by the first four scenarios. Such a level of growth has been put forwards by BBC in the latest draft of its LDP. It would involve a much larger development on open Green Belt land such that the Parish would increase from around 700 dwellings to around 3,700. The village itself would increase from around 700 dwellings to around 1,300. Given the location of West Horndon at a distance from larger centres, and the current strain on services and facilities, such a scenario scores poorly in respect of social, environmental and economic dimensions. Out of the 11 elements of the sustainability framework it scores 5 reds, 6 ambers and no greens. It would be disproportionate and unsustainable. | Development will be brought forward in locations and in ways which respect the character of villages. The Council has set out its intentions that the local community will play a central role, alongside others, in determining the eventual form of development. | Consider accordingly |
| 15191 - Punch Taverns [6067] | Object | The Sustainability Appraisal made a critical error area in respect to the flood risk of the site 035A, where it states that more than 10% of the site intersects a flood risk zone. This conclusion is wrong. A FRA report is attached to show 91% of the site is in Flood zone 1, within which all uses of land are appropriate according to the NPPF. The site boundary could be redrawn to only include the developable area within Flood Zone 1 and still leave a developable area of 0.2 ha and a potential capacity of 10-22 dwellings. Site 035A should be reconsidered as a residential allocation. | As part of the Plan review we will consider the issue. | Consider accordingly |
| 14568 - Mr C Loneragan [5926] | Object | We have concerns with the current approach to SA in respect of both how the proposed total housing figure has been considered and specific individual sites have been assessed. The Interim SA published alongside the DLP assumes the Local Plan will plan for the delivery of 7,240 new homes over the plan period. The provision of a greater number of new homes is clearly a reasonable alternative that merits consideration. However, there appears to be no assessment of the sustainability of a higher level of growth. | Disagree. The provision of a greater number of new homes is not a reasonable alternative where the urban areas are fully surrounded by the constraint to development of Green Belt. The OAN being proposed is not the lower end and therefore is considered reasonable in line with the evidence. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14639 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14815 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | Key conclusions of the sustainability appraisal: Looking at the two ends of a growth spectrum, it is clear that Scenario 1 (no growth) would be beneficial in terms of protecting Green Belt and preventing coalescence. It would also maintain the existing village character and its setting. However it would not provide for any real development of community spirit and investment in infrastructure and facilities. | Disagree. There is already a shortage of homes for people and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the Borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No further action |
| 14382 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | It is suggested that some of the scoring for the options in the SA has been based on assumptions that may not be correct or realistic and should be reconsidered. It is unclear that the options and sites have been comprehensively appraised in terms of access and sustainable transport. It is uncertain whether the benefits of improved accessibility brought about by Crossrail and longer term the A12 widening are taken into account. It is consider the housing appraisal skews the findings towards meeting the OAN but undermines the location of the housing. It is not considered that Housing along the A127 corridor would meet housing needs (p34) in Brentwood/Shenfield as well as housing located along A12. It is not considered that a new strategic settlement at Dunton Hills would be a self - sustaining community. The scoring of the development options in relation to community and well-being tends to overstate the benefits for new strategic developments in the south without evidence being provided. Conversely the SA under-states the ability of existing locations to gain improved and additional capacity in infrastructure. | Disagree that the SA interim strategic report is flawed. The Council will continue to publish evidence as and when it is complete. The Council will continue to work with Thurrock Council under the Duty to Cooperate in the development of the Brentwood Draft Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 14381 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council considers the approach set out in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is flawed and that a number of assumptions on the way that options have been scored is not supported by the available evidence. The Interim SA does not adequately include or reflect in paragraph 6.2.9, Thurrock Council's concerns about development focused on the A127 corridor and impact on Green Belt and Landscape. Paragraphs 6.2.11 to 6.2.12 also do not include a reference to Thurrock Council's fundamental concerns about the deliverability, viability and impact on Green Belt and Landscape of the Dunton Garden Suburb. The SA appraises and scores six options for the location of development with the assumption that most development would be located in one of the locations and with a strategic scale of development. Whilst this may be useful as an initial approach it is considered that actual development may result in a hybrid of such options with development in several key locations but not necessarily the dispersed option or one strategic location. A hybrid option may well moderate the scoring and impact of development in these locations therefore giving more positive scores rather than a large scale concentration of development. It is noted that further assessment needs to be undertaken of urban extensions around Brentwood. A new option should be considered including development north and east south east of Brentwood/Shenfield. Again this may result in different scores for a Brentwood Town based option. Such an option is likely to give different scores than presented in the report. | Disagree that the SA interim strategic report is flawed. The Council will continue to publish evidence as and when it is complete. The Council will continue to work with Thurrock Council under the Duty to Cooperate in the development of the Brentwood Draft Local Plan. | Consider accordngly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14643 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14817 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | Scenario 2 is described as "controlled growth". It suggests an additional 400 houses for the village and scores well against most sustainability objectives. It is important to note however that some of the positive scores, say in respect of residential amenity, or in the provision for education and healthcare, are dependent on a commensurate level of new infrastructure. Without the infrastructure in place, such growth cannot be described as "controlled" or in accordance to The Vision. It would not therefore be sustainable. | The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 16140 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | In considering the proposals for the Dunton Hills Garden Suburb, the SA stated that: "Considerable assumptions [have been made] regarding how options would be implemented 'on the ground' and what the effect on particular receptors would be.... In many instances, given reasonable assumptions, it is not possible to predict likely significant effects, but it is possible to comment on the merits of an option in more general terms." There is a complete lack of a detailed analysis of the likely significant effects on the proposed development at Dunton Hills as well as evidence to support these proposals as a sustainable development. There is no evidence as to where the figure of 2,500 homes has come from. | Noted. Estimates of how many dwellings each site should accommodate has been made by adopting a density and developable area based on location, area characteristics and site circumstances. The proposed figure of 2,500 at Dunton Hills was informed by comprehensive assessment. Site assessment at Dunton Hills is ongoing and like other sites it will be assessed for availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. Further technical evidence will be published when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 16080 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | As a minimum, consultation is required on the scope of the SA and the SA report accompanying the Draft Plan. It is best practice for consultation to take place on SA during the plan preparation process for example through the production of interim SA Report and other means such as workshops and working groups. The testing of the options and reasonable alternatives within the SA is required, however the evidence base is not complete nor up to date. The land to the east of West Horndon performs better in the SA than the proposed Dunton Hills Garden Village. | Noted. The SA process works alongside the Local Plan process, and as such both inform one another. Further site assessment and testing will be undertaken. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 14563 - Ms Chloë Sanders [5937] | Object | The only Sustainability Appraisal that has been found is that produced in January 2015. It reviewed a number of sites in detail, but the Priests Lane sites (044 and 178) were not mentioned or identified. | Noted. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal produced in February 2016 was made available for public comment before the start of the consultation period. This can be found on the Council's website: http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=1219 . Sites 044&178 were included in this version. | No further action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 16056 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | In terms of our client's land at Rayleigh Road, Hutton the site appears to have been appraised as Site ID 219 within Table C of the SA, though this may in fact relate to the larger site in which the submitted site sits and which was assessed as part of the SHLAA 2011. We note that the text which accompanies Table C of the SA states that it presents an appraisal of all site options in terms of all the appraisal criteria set out previously within the SA. However, it also states the following: "To reiterate, this table is presented for completeness. It is recognised that only limited understanding can be gained from strict GIS analysis; and equally it is recognised that presenting appraisal findings for all site options in tabular format is in practice of limited assistance to those interested in the spatial strategy". We note, for example, that Site ID 219 has been assessed as performing "particularly poorly" against the Conservation Criteria, simply by virtue of being in the Conservation Area. We would question the robustness of such an approach. We have been unable to identify the justification within the SA for the failure to include land adjacent to Rayleigh Road, Hutton as site for residential development in the DLP. The site is considered to be a sustainable location for development and the SA should reflect this in its assessment of the site. | Comment noted. Further consideration of comments will take place and be reflected in the development of the Draft Local Plan and the SA. | Consider accordingly |
| 16071 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Land at West Horndon has been rejected for strategic growth in favour of an allocation at Dunton and the only justification given for rejecting this location is because of its impacts on the existing village. This rejection is not supported by sustainability assessment. Indeed the limited assessment that has been undertaken gives more support to West Horndon as a strategic site for growth, based on landscape impact. The latest SA Interim report of February 2016 states: "The appraisal finds that the Draft Plan is set to result in significant positive effects in terms of housing and economy/employment objectives, but significant negative effects in terms of landscape objectives." Specifically in respect of Dunton: "at the current time it remains appropriate to 'flag' the potential for significant negative effects given the uncertainty that remains regarding Dunton Hills Garden Village". | Noted. The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. As part of the plan review we will consider the issue. | Consider accordingly |
| 14756 - Geoff Sanders [1215] | Object | The only Sustainability Appraisal that has been found is that produced in January 2015. It reviewed a number of sites in detail, but the Priests Lane sites (044 and 178) were not mentioned or identified. | Noted. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal produced in February 2016 was made available for public comment before the start of the consultation period. This can be found on the Council's website: http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=1219 . Sites 044&178 were included in this version. | No further action |

Habitats Regulation Assessment

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13641 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | If the results are still pending, why is the council in such a hurry to proceed with destroying the green belt? It seems that the Council is not waiting for sufficient evidence before proposing dangerous precedents which would turn Brentwood into an unseemly urban sprawl. | Concerns noted. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
|----------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|--|
| Duty to Cooperate | | | | |
| 16126 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Comment | The Council does not appear to have taken the representations to the 2015 consultation conscientiously into account as identified in the Statement of consultation 2016 and, in particular, failed to consider the legitimate criticisms of the way in which strategic Green Belt sites have been evaluated and chosen. The Council has failed to take into account the concerns raised by neighbouring authorities in this regard. | Disagree. Comments received from previous consultations have been taken into account as the Plan progresses in line with Regulation 18. The Plan has been prepared in light of emerging and ongoing technical evidence. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt. Development options will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 17836 - Southend on Sea Council (Mr Matthew Thomas) [6097] | Comment | The duty to cooperate provides a mechanism for strategic matters to be addressed to ensure that development needs are planned for on a wider than local basis. Moreover it enables local authorities that are confronted by particular environmental and geographic constraints to address their development needs, inline with Paragraph 182 of the NPPF. In summary, national policy and guidance is clear that a local plan should: prepare a SHMA to assess full housing needs; provide a delivery strategy that is clear in terms of where, when and how housing need will be delivered over the full plan period; meet full, objectively assessed housing need for market and affordable housing; meet the legal duty to cooperate and incorporate allowances for unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so; and boost significantly the supply of housing and ensure a deliverable five year housing land supply with an appropriate buffer can be maintained at all times. | Comment noted. The Council will work with other Local Planning Authorities on strategic matters under the Duty to Cooperate. | Continue local planning authority duty to cooperate processes. |
| 14515 - Home Builder's Federation [144] | Comment | It is unclear from the local plan and supporting documentation how the Council has engaged with the Mayor of London and the London boroughs on the matter of migration. The inspector for the London Plan, in his report (dated 18 November 2014), does refer to this effect. He notes that the Mayor's SHMA "includes assumptions relating to migration...likely to be material to the preparation of local plans outside London." Paragraph 2.10 of the OAN report does acknowledge the potential problem of London but states that it is unable to assess the implications of the Mayor's new plan until this adopted. The report therefore implies that the OAN figure of 360 dpa is very much a provisional one. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Basildon Borough Council and the adjoining local authorities on cross boundary as well as relevant issues in the development of the Local Plan. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. Development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these areas (and strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA). | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15340 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | It is important that BBC takes record of all discussions and undertakings in order to be able to demonstrate that the Duty to Cooperate has been complied with. This should include details of actions to secure effective cooperation, respond constructively to requests for cooperation and also highlight the outcomes of cooperation. | Noted. The Council will work with the adjoining local authorities and partner organisations under the Duty to Cooperate in the development of the Local Plan. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. | No action |
| 14514 - Home Builder's Federation [144] | Comment | The Dunton Garden Village proposal is strategic issue of cross-boundary significance therefore cross boundary discussions should be undertaken with Basildon Borough Council in the context of both the proposed allocations at Dunton and also in respect of strategic matters. However information published in respect of how Brentwood Borough Council and Basildon Borough Council are working together on Dunton Hill Garden Village is limited. Basildon Council states that: "Brentwood Borough Council has not provided sufficient information, at this time, to show it is the best location for new housing provision in the Brentwood borough". Therefore question is raised at how effectively the Duty to Cooperate has been met in respect of the Draft Plan and Dunton Hills Garden Village. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Basildon Borough Council and the adjoining local authorities on cross boundary as well as relevant issues in the development of the local plan. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15236 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Comment | Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Due to pressure of other work, Natural England has not been able to examine in detail the entire Draft Local Plan and its accompanying Interim Sustainability Appraisal. We also note that the Plan has been informed by the Brentwood Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015) and recognises the need, as highlighted therein, to better link formal and informal open spaces in the Borough to improve their wider use and value. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Natural England on natural environment related issues under the Duty to Cooperate. | No action |
| 16022 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | Reliance is being placed on the Dunton Hills Garden Village for significant numbers of the housing provision over the life of the plan. There is no published evidence that the Duty to Cooperate with Basildon is being fulfilled to progress plans and firm up proposals. Basildon states that "Brentwood Borough Council has not provided sufficient information, at this time, to show it is the best location for new housing provision in the Brentwood borough". Information on engagement with London and London boroughs is also lacking. Therefore it is not clear to what extent authorities with whom Brentwood Borough has a connection have been engaged and are agreeable to such an approach. This issue is particularly pertinent given the strong relationship between Brentwood and London, and the latter's acute housing need. We question whether the approach currently being taken in the preparation of the Local Plan meets the Duty to Cooperate. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Basildon Borough Council and the adjoining local authorities on cross boundary issues in the development of the local plan. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13489 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 14556 - Mr C Loneragan [5926] 15328 - Catesby Property Group [6081] 15341 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15610 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] 15654 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] 15655 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] 15918 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | The Dunton Garden Village proposal is strategic issue of cross-boundary significance therefore cross boundary discussions should be undertaken with Basildon Borough Council in the context of both the proposed allocations at Dunton and also in respect of strategic matters. However information published in respect of how Brentwood Borough Council and Basildon Borough Council are working together on Dunton Hill Garden Village is limited. Basildon Council states that: "Brentwood Borough Council has not provided sufficient information, at this time, to show it is the best location for new housing provision in the Brentwood borough". Therefore question is raised at how effectively the Duty to Cooperate has been met in respect of the Draft Plan and Dunton Hills Garden Village. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Basildon Borough Council and the adjoining local authorities on cross boundary as well as relevant issues in the development of the Local Plan. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 14237 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Brentwood Council has not thoroughly tested all the available options to accommodate the housing requirement within Brentwood. The National Planning Policy Guidance and earlier advice from the Planning Advisory Service recommend that local authorities should be required to thoroughly test all reasonable options before requiring other authorities to accommodate some of their need. | Noted. Reasonable options to accommodate Brentwoods dwelling requirements are being tested by the process of the development of the Local Plan. Evidence is being considered and further site assessment will reflect this. It is acknowledged that Brentwood is seeking to meet its own currently identified OAN. | Consider accordingly |
| 15329 - Catesby Property Group [6081] | Object | Cross-boundary issues relevant to Local Plan are not limited to the proposals in respect of Dunton Hills Garden Village, it is not clear to how Brentwood Borough Council have engaged with London Boroughs or the Mayor of London in the preparation of the Draft Plan. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with the adjoining local authorities on cross boundary as well as relevant issues in the development of the Local Plan. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 14247 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 15554 - Rochford District Council (Natalie Hayward) [6094] 15560 - Epping Forest District Council (Mr Ken Bean) [6095] 15649 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] 15656 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] 15742 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] 15745 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] 15919 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Further engagement should be undertaken in relation to engagement with neighbouring authorities, the local highways authority, relevant agencies and transport providers in order to ensure that the highways modelling takes into account growth arising from other areas. | Engagement with other bodies is on-going and is being used to inform and develop the Local Plan. | Continue Duty to Cooperate |
| 14703 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | National Planning Guidance states plot targets should be set, working collaboratively with neighbouring LPAs. We consider there is a need to ensure the provision of travelling showpeoples yards in neighbouring areas to Thurrock, where no specifically known need has ever been identified but actually exists and is under reported. Consider that suitable sites for showmen's yards, such as our clients [Land at Chequers Public House, Chequers Road, South Weald], should be discussed as part of the Duty to Cooperate bearing in mind that at present, Thurrock is expected to provide for over 90% of the future need for such yards to the period 2033, but this is contrary to the desires of the actual community. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of Gypsy and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople, further update of the evidence of need is being sort. | Consider accordingly |
| 14313 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Duty to cooperate. There has not been significant engagement between the two authorities since the Preferred Options consultation stage. Thurrock has not been invited to any discussions on the Brentwood Local Plan on strategic matters such as Green Belt or transport. Thurrock would welcome the opportunity to progress a more formal approach to Duty to Cooperate. Thurrock has begun to prepare a new local plan and supporting evidence base and will continue to engage and consult with adjoining authorities on the plan. | The Council will work with Thurrock Borough Council under the Duty to Cooperate in the development of both boroughs' local plans. | Consider accordingly |
| Population and Housing | | | | |
| 13763 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [4967] | Comment | The Plan seems designed to encourage new people to move to Brentwood, rather than provide suitable housing for those who already live in the area. | Concerns noted. The Plan is seeking to meet its own currently identified Objectively Assessed Need. The Objectively Assessed Need identifies a need for homes and will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13643 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | House prices are high because Brentwood is near London, and precisely BECAUSE there is a shortage of terraced houses and flats. This supports the view that the best way to render housing more affordable is to opt for high-density housing, not an unseemly sprawl in the green belt. | Noted. The Council acknowledge that a mixture of housing is needed in the borough in terms of size and tenure. | Consider accordingly |
| 14682 - Mr Trevor Richmond [5969] | Object | While I appreciate housing is required into the future, the scale and size proposed in my opinion is too great. As a rough figure it looks like eight hundred and fifty population increase each year. An increase the area will be unable to cope with or adapt too. | Noted. The Objectively Assessed Need identifies a need for homes and will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. It is considered that the need for 360 homes per annum can be sustainably accommodated in the Borough. | No action |
| Economy and Employment | | | | |
| 16322 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Economy and Employment Para 2.35: With a limited amount of employment land, efforts to convert this for housing should be resisted. | The Local Plan needs to provide for all future development need, the Council proposes to allocate new employment land in addition to existing sites that may be allocated. | |
| Health and Wellbeing | | | | |
| 13645 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | One reason for good health in the borough is the green belt, offering an accessible location for recreation WITHOUT the need to drive anywhere. In my childhood, without a car in the family, the ability to go walking and cycling locally had a positive impact on my health and attitudes towards exercise. | Noted | No action |
| 13553 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | Not enough GPs as it is; Hospitals outside borough are already over stretched; Brentwood is already too crowded - we don't have room for any more people! More people will impact on the mental wellbeing of Brentwood's current residents. | Concerns noted. The NHS will continue to be consulted throughout the Local Plan process and considered where proposed development would have an effect on the provision of healthcare facilities as well as to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | No action |
| 13400 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | I am with Mount Surgery and getting to see a GP is a real problem. If you were desperate there used to be a walk-in service to see the duty doctor. That has been withdrawn and now you have to ring the surgery - when you can get through - and then wait for a doctor to ring you if the receptionist decides it's appropriate. We no longer have a GP service in my opinion. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13972 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] | Object | Little consideration has been given to providing sufficient new schools, health services or the emergency services. Basildon hospital cannot cope with the current population and I understand that there are no plans to provide additional funding or to expand the current facilities. There is real danger to lives now as the hospital cannot cope. A continued population increase and a growing elderly population will put incredible strain on services. GP appointments are currently standing at 10-14 days. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | No action |
| Education and Schools | | | | |
| 13401 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Parking around or near schools is a real danger to other road/pavement users. Schools should have to provide drop off / pick up space or they don't get planning. Similarly traffic wardens need to do regular and frequent trips round all the schools in the borough. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15274 - Brentwood School [2575] | Support | Support the aim to ensure adequate education provision is available to existing and future local residents. | Noted | No action |
| Transport and Travel | | | | |
| 14775 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] | Comment | Confirmation of high level of car ownership recognised in the Plan. Agree that need to control car parking and maintain parking standards. Need to clarify what is happening with parking in Brentwood Town. Noted the lack of electric car charging points in the borough, welcome recognition in Plan of importance of such facilities. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15291 - Transport for London (Mr Oscar Wong) [6078] | Comment | As highlighted in the draft plan, there is a close relationship between the borough and Greater London areas in terms of strategic transport and movement of people, notably the Great Eastern mainline (GEML) and the A12 and A127, which form part of the TfL road network (TLRN) within London. A TfL-operated bus route also serves Brentwood. Therefore consideration of transport implications beyond the borough boundary is welcomed. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15300 - Transport for London (Mr Oscar Wong) [6078] | Comment | TfL supports the principle of Network Rail-led improvements to the GEML between London and Norwich, enhanced rail linkages between London and the greater south east area being a key objective of the Mayor's Transport Strategy. We would therefore welcome policy support in the Brentwood Local Plan, as has been forthcoming in neighbouring draft local plans. Many of the enhancements proposed in the Anglia Route study to achieve better connections and journey times from London to Shenfield / Norwich would benefit Elizabeth line services also. Due to these potential further enhancements, possible Elizabeth line capacity issues later in the plan period should not be seen as a future constraint on development potential in the borough, and the plan's proposed policy framework that focuses higher density development on the A12/GEML corridor in particular seems appropriate. This will maximise the benefits of the Elizabeth line, and is in line with the current and emerging NPPF policy which seeks to direct development to places that offer a range of alternatives for travel and densify development around commuter hubs. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15147 - Mr. Frank Power [2505] | Object | Don't normally protest but this is usual short term planning, most traffic travelling through Kent & Essex have no business in either Kent or Essex. We need a complete new road that links from M2 directly with M11, A1M, M1 etc, without access from any A roads as this prevents local traffic using it as a rat run. This would reduce fuel consumption, pollution, accidents and ensure the current M25 would be fit for purpose for this and next generation. Even if this current work goes through you will have to address another road at some point in the future so why not allocate the funds towards it now and possibly run it through the A130. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to work with Highways England in promoting the importance of improvements to the M25/A12 junction. Any potential impacts of additional development in the Borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. | Consider accordingly |
| 13402 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | I live on the main road between Billericay and Shenfield - so not in a rural location - and we have an infrequent bus that doesn't even go to Shenfield station. | Noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. | Consider accordingly |
| 13973 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] | Object | The C2C line has seen a progressive increase in passengers over the past few years resulting in the disastrous new timetable being implemented. There is talk of providing more trains in 2019 but there are only two lines in/out of London so there is a limit to the capacity. | Noted. Consultation with rail operators is taking place as part of plan preparation and in line with the Duty to Cooperate. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|--|
| 13662 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | Crossrail is largely irrelevant to the infrastructure in Brentwood, since, notwithstanding its directness and higher frequency, the fastest route into central London will still be to get a fast train from Shenfield (this applies even if starting a journey at Brentwood station) and change at Stratford/Liverpool Street. Therefore, Crossrail should be disregarded from consideration in respect of the local plan, and cannot be used as a pretext for developing greenfield sites in the vicinity of Shenfield. | Noted. Brentwood Borough Council and Essex County Council are working together to gain more knowledge of the impacts Crossrail will have on the Borough once fully operational. The projections for how many people will use the new service from Brentwood or Shenfield vary greatly. Transport for London is reviewing the Crossrail patronage forecasts and these numbers and the underlying assumptions behind them should provide greater insight on possible wider impacts. Until these revised numbers are published it is difficult to assess any specific local economic impact and so this position remains under review. | Issue will be considered as part of new consultation |
| 14683 - Mr Trevor Richmond [5969] | Object | The main transport hubs are M25, A12 & A127. And while the plan recognises the problems and capacity limits on these networks, but does not appear to have any plans for improvements. These routes and access points need urgent attention now, without any future population increases. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to work with Highways England in promoting the importance of improvements to the M25/A12 junction. Any potential impacts of additional development in the Borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. | Consider accordingly |
| 14652 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Para 2.51 - West Horndon is unique in that it is a small village with its own rail station giving access to good rail services, which are comparable to much larger towns along the line e.g. Basildon. Our client supports the message set out in this paragraph, which is a simple statement of fact about access to rail stations across the borough, notably the service and resource at West Horndon. | Noted | No action |
| Utilities, Telecoms and Media | | | | |
| 14048 - National Grid UK (Mr Robert Deanwood) [4616] | Comment | Gas distribution apparatus include: High Pressure: 2438 Hainalt to Ashingdon; 0001 Doddington Branch 4"; 2406 Shoulder hall to Southend Arterial 18"; 051a Inlet to Mountnessing Stn 314/315 8"; 2428 Mardyke Stn 58 to Stock stn 274 12" 2405 Horndon to Abridge 18" | Noted | Consider locations accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14046 - National Grid UK (Mr Robert Deanwood) [4616] | Comment | Gas transmission: National Grid has three high pressure gas transmission pipelines within Brentwood Borough. FM18 Stapleford Tawney to Tilbury Thames North. FM05 Braintree to Horndon; FM05 Roxwell to Abridge; Further map information at: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ Note: Gas pipeline diversions may take up to three years. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16065 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Paragraph 2.55 - Welcomed, ECC considers this is important in unlocking new development and contributing to a prosperous economy in attracting new businesses and jobs, and ensuring the connectivity of residents to key services. | Noted | No action |
| 14043 - National Grid UK (Mr Robert Deanwood) [4616] | Comment | National Grid owns and operated the high voltage electricity system in England and Wales; and owns and operated the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at highpressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until finally delivered to customers. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14044 - National Grid UK (Mr Robert Deanwood) [4616] | Comment | Electricity transmission: one high voltage overhead line within Brentwood. Map details are available at: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13403 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | This implies that rural suffers poor broadband yet urban is fine. Not true. I live on the main road between Billericay and Shenfield. We do not have fibre and are at the end of the line for the copper. It's atrocious at all times - when it rains forget it!! This is 2016 and we live on a main road so this service should be 1000's % better. | Noted. Essex County Council has committed to a broadband infrastructure upgrade with telecom partners. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| Environment, Heritage and Resources | | | | |
| 13404 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Green Belt and historic landscapes must be preserved. No new builds, renewable energy etc should be allowed on anything other than brown field until every scrap of brown field has been used. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering development options which will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 13602 - Historic England (Mr Michael Stubbs) [5648] | Support | Historic England previously submitted comments on the Brentwood Strategic Growth Options Consultation (dated 10th February 2015) and the Dunton Garden Suburb Consultation (dated 10th February 2015). Brentwood Borough Council has a rich historic environment with 13 conservation areas, 518 listed buildings, 3 historic parks and gardens (registered landscapes) and 12 scheduled monuments across the Authority | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Green Belt | | | | |
| 13663 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | The green belt is more than just a "valuable" asset -- it is indispensable, and I would like my local Council to prioritise its preservation above all else. The constraints to "development opportunities" are eminently a price worth paying. Genuine "development needs" can be met through regulated use of brownfield sites in town centres -- the Council must not acquiesce to developers' desire for the greater profits arising from greenfield development. The whole point of the green belt is for it to be permanent and open; not chipped away gradually and insidiously in every planning cycle. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 14692 - Mr Trevor Richmond [5969] | Object | 2.61 Green Belt: The plan states the need to protect the asset of the Green Belt, which I support fully, yet proposes building on this. In particular the areas along the A12 corridor where there are protected species of wildlife living. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 13405 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Support | Green Belt isn't just the wide open fields but the little pockets between existing houses. No infill should be allowed until every scrap of brown field has been used. The developers obviously find greenfield easier to develop than brown. They must be prevented from using greenfield. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Chapter 3. Vision | | | | |
| Chapter 3. Vision | | | | |
| 13665 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | There is more to the wonderful green spaces of Brentwood than merely the two country parks cited. The openness of the green belt, the forests, fields, and unstructured wild spaces (such as Officer's Meadow) are all integral to the pleasant environment of Brentwood. This must be recognised and defended to the death, even if it means taking up a legal battle with the Planning Inspectorate (although I doubt they would attempt to overrule the genuine and deeply held wishes of local residents to preserve their green belt; I consider the Council to be scaremongering on this matter). | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. Policies within the Draft Local Plan address the consideration of woodlands and biodiversity. | Consider accordingly |
| 15509 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | We are supportive of the plan's vision to grow the Borough sustainably, protecting its environment and realising opportunities to enhance the quality and provision of facilities and minimising the negative impacts of development. It is important to recognise that planning can not only protect existing natural assets, but can also provide opportunities to achieve environmental gains. The vision could be strengthened by changing 'minimising negative impacts' to 'preventing negative impacts'. | Noted. Proposed amendment to strengthen the vision from minimising negative impacts to preventing negative impacts will be fully considered. | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 14091 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Comment | The Vision statement should be applauded but the Council's decision to develop a site at Dunton will not benefit the Borough's residents, will not benefit the Town Centre, is not responsive to local needs and does not take advantage of Crossrail. Basildon will benefit most from any development at Dunton. To meet the demands of the Vision the Plan should be looking to allocate throughout the Borough and recognising that developing small areas of Green Belt adjoin or in close proximity of existing settlement will have less of an impact on the Green Belt. The Council do not answer why building over 5,000 homes in total at Dunton will continue to make the Borough a destination of choice. | Disagree. The Spatial Policy considers these issues and will deliver the strategic spatial objectives for the Borough over the period of the Plan. Impact upon Green Belt is not the only constraint considered by the Plan. The impact of development on existing infrastructure and the ability of small scale development to contribute to this is also considered, for example. | No action |
| 13406 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Availability of facilities such as Cross Rail, sports and Leisure etc. is only feasible if we have transport infrastructure that easily allows us to get to them. We have no practical public transport here on the road between Billericay and Shenfield so we have to drive. This would require a massive investment in car parking to become a feasible option. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13155 - Woodland Trust (Ms Ellie Henderson) [2463] | Object | Mention the importance of trees and woodlands in the vision. [An important publication from the Forestry Commission, The Case for Trees in development and the urban environment, lists the benefits as - Climate change contributions ; Environment advantages; Economic dividends; Social benefits.] | Noted. The importance of woodlands is specifically addressed by policy. Larger development will need to consider the addition of trees in the shared spaces, private and public. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|-----------|
| 13556 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | You cannot improve current residents' quality of life by cramming more people into the town. | Noted. The Vision and Local Plan aims to address the need for new homes within the Borough as well as other strategic issues, including infrastructure. Improvement to the local environment can be facilitated by new development. | No action |
| 15895 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | ECC welcomes the inclusion of a clear and concise vision and strategic objectives within the Local Plan. It is recognised that BBC is seeking to ensure the strategic objectives are consistent with the national guidance. The strategic objectives clearly send the message that the purpose of the new plan will be to align key infrastructure with sustainable growth, the development and resilience of health and wellbeing, creating a prosperous economy, whilst protecting the environment. ECC welcomes the anticipated benefits of this approach. Many of these aspects are consistent with the current vision and priorities in the Vision for Essex (2013 - 2017) and Corporate Outcomes Framework. | Support welcomed. The Council considers the Local Plan to be consistent with the aims of the Vision for Essex 2013-2017. | No action |
| 15275 - Brentwood School [2575] | Support | Support the vision set out in the Draft Plan. | Noted. Support welcomed. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| Chapter 4. Strategic Objectives | | | | |
| Chapter 4. Strategic Objectives | | | | |
| 13558 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] | Comment | Although I agree with the key objectives I believe the infrastructure has been omitted to support the increased population residing in the new houses. Where is the consideration for extra capacity for schooling, extras demands on the NHS together with parks and recreation. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15490 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | Assuming the recommendations are incorporated wholly within the future LDP then NHS England would not wish to raise an objection to the Brentwood Borough Local Plan. NHS England has identified shortfalls in capacity at existing premises covered by the LDP. Provision needs to be made within the emerging LDP to address the impacts of development on health infrastructure and to ensure timely cost-effective delivery of necessary infrastructure improvements, in the interests of pursuing sustainable development. The recommendations set out above are those that NHS England deem appropriate having regard to the projected needs arising from the Brentwood Borough Local Plan. However, if the recommendations are not implemented then NHS England reserve the right to make representations about the soundness of the plan at relevant junctures during the adoption process. | The Council welcome the NHS England comments and will work further on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, working proactively with health service providers on future health infrastructure provision. | Consider accordingly |
| 15781 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | In acknowledgment of Strategic Objectives S01, S02 & S013; ECC, as highway authority is reviewing the draft highway modelling report. In progressing the report, joint working will be established between relevant partners to identify necessary mitigation at relevant junctions; consider the cumulative impact of growth within the Borough; and consider the impact of wider planned growth (i.e. A127 Corridor authorities) on the local and strategic route network. Regular meetings are to be established between ECC, HE, BBC, and Peter Brett Associates (its highway consultants) to ensure this work is progressed to inform the Pre Submission Local Plan and inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP will need to identify the mitigation required, their costings, priorities and timescales for delivery, and phasing in relation to housing delivery. | Noted. The need for linkages between the highways modelling and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15573 - Castle Point Borough Council (Steve Rogers) [4643] | Comment | In general terms the preparation of the Draft Local Plan is to be welcomed. The strategy to be pursued appears to support sustainable development and growth, by ensuring that it is closely related to existing infrastructure and facilities. Furthermore the recognition in the Plan of the strategic role of Brentwood town centre and the significant influence of Crossrail is welcomed. | Comment welcomed | No action |
| 13408 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | S02 and S03 - the current infrastructure doesn't support the current residents here in Havering Grove so NO new development can be allowed in our area. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13984 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | S09 and S10 - Do not allow any development on greenbelt at all. | Noted. The Objectively Assessed Need identifies a need for homes and will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. There is already a shortage of homes for people in the UK and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering additional development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 13741 - Mrs Judith Wood [4852] 15053 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | The proposed plan fails to spread economic prosperity across the Borough and in particular in the north of the Borough. SO4, S05, S06, S07 promoting Economic Prosperity in the Borough (p25) focus on Brentwood and new development in the south of the Borough. There is no evidence that this plan seeks to implement SO8 (Promote and support a prosperous rural economy) in the north of the Borough because no GB development is planned, despite there being no brownfield opportunities. With regard to SO11, S012, S13 re the Quality of Life & Community Infrastructure, rural villages to the north of the Borough have been largely overlooked. | The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 13472 - Mr N McCarthy [5581] 14177 - Bill Ratcliffe [3796] | Support | Support SO4 that continues to protect the Green Belt. | Support noted | No action |
| 13592 - Mr William Ratcliffe [4874] 16114 - Countryside Properties [250] | Support | Support in principle to 13 strategic objectives, in particular concentrating growth on transport corridors where either existing infrastructure can sustain the development and/or where additional infrastructure will be put in place to meet local needs. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| SO1 | | | | |
| 15737 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 15743 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 15744 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 15751 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Highways England do not consider it appropriate to state our support or objection to particular proposals, therefore instead these comments clarifies our views on a number of aspects of the Local Plan primarily focused on the potential impacts of all sites on the Strategic Road Network and highlights junctions which may experience significant increases in traffic. The evidence base used to understand the impact of development and the potential funding of any infrastructure schemes that are required are also considered. In the local area Highways England has responsibility for the M25 and A12. Highways England is aware of the relationship between development planning and the transport network, and we are mindful of the effects that planning decisions may have on the operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and associated junctions. We cannot be expected to cater for unconstrained traffic growth generated by new developments, and we therefore encourage policies and proposals which incorporate measures to reduce traffic generation at source and encourage more sustainable travel behaviour. We wish to draw your attention to Highways England's document 'The Strategic Road Network, Planning for the Future: A guide to working with Highways England on planning matters' (September 2015). This document sets out how Highways England intends to work with local planning authorities and developers to support the preparation of sound documents which enable the delivery of sustainable development. The document indicates that Highways England will review and provide comments on any amendments to local plans proposed by local planning authorities that have the potential to affect any part of the Strategic Road Network. | Comments and supporting documentation welcomed. The Council will continue to work with Highways England regarding the potential impact on the highways network. | Consider impact accordingly |
| 15050 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | SO's 1 & 2 (pg 25) prejudice development growth to existing or proposed infrastructure to the centre and south of the Borough. The Council has a duty of care to ensure the entire Borough's needs are met to 2033 and the draft plan only meets the needs of part of the Borough. | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | No action |
| 14238 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council at this stage does not consider that all reasonable options to accommodate Brentwood's dwelling requirement within Brentwood have been fully examined by the Council and tested in accordance with government policy and guidance. Therefore the approach to preparation of the local plan is unsound. | Disagree. The Council consider that the Spatial Strategy considers reasonable options and is inline with Government policy and guidance. The Council consider that the issue raised should be further discussed as part of the on-going duty to cooperate process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14672 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] 15210 - Spire Hartswood Hospital [6074] 15949 - CALA Homes [5237] | Support | Support the objective of directing growth to the Borough's transport corridors. | Noted | No action |
| SO2 | | | | |
| 15051 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | SO's 1 & 2 (pg 25) prejudice development growth to existing or proposed infrastructure to the centre and south of the Borough. The Council has a duty of care to ensure the entire Borough's needs are met to 2033 and the draft plan only meets the needs of part of the Borough | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting new development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 14673 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Support. | Noted | No action |
| SO3 | | | | |
| 15920 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Given the scale of development proposed within West Horndon village, SO3 is essential for our community. Any development needs to provide a range and balance of different housing types, that complement the existing village and help create a dynamic and stable community. Simply providing houses/flats for commuters would not achieve this - whilst this type of housing might help balance out Brentwood Borough as a whole, it would create an unsustainable and unbalanced community within West Horndon. A good mix of housing types will be required. | Noted. A mixture of housing types in line with those identified in the Councils evidence base would result in a sustainable community. The Council are continuing to work with West Horndon Parish Council with the Duty to Cooperate and the Neighbourhood planning process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15052 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | S03 is not being met in the north of the Borough. Existing villages, like Blackmore, need some development to retain their working population which will ensure that services such as local shops, leisure amenities, primary schools, GP practices and public transport services are sustained. | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting new development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| SO4 | | | | |
| 13982 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Comment | S04 - we have 2 churches, a garden centre, a dance school and a pub. What can you do to make them more prosperous, vibrant and diverse? | Comment noted | No action |
| 15276 - Brentwood School [2575] | Support | Brentwood School and Brentwood Preparatory school support strategic objective SO4 in the context of its own growth aspirations. | Noted | No action |
| SO5 | | | | |
| 15277 - Brentwood School [2575] | Support | Brentwood School and Brentwood Preparatory School support strategic objective SO5 in the context of its own growth aspirations. | Noted | No action |
| SO6 | | | | |
| 15278 - Brentwood School [2575] | Support | Brentwood School and Brentwood Preparatory School support strategic objective SO6 in the context of its own growth aspirations. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|---------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| SO7 | | | | |
| 13668 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | SO7: Crossrail is almost irrelevant to Brentwood | The Council acknowledge that Crossrail will replace an existing service rather than create a new one. However, proximity to a station and other transport issues are important to consider with regard to new sustainable development. There will be an increase in the frequency in the stopping "metro" service between Shenfield and Liverpool Street and there will be a considerable improvement to cross-London travel. Therefore consideration of the potential of impact from and to Brentwood Borough via Crossrail is significant. | No action |
| 13983 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | SO7 - We don't have access to crossrail as we don't even have frequent buses so this doesn't help us | The Council acknowledge that Crossrail will replace an existing service rather than create a new one. However, proximity to a station and other transport issues are important to consider with regard to new sustainable development. There will be an increase in the frequency in the stopping "metro" service between Shenfield and Liverpool Street and there will be a considerable improvement to cross-London travel. The Council are also working to improve station access and the street scene around the stations to enable better disabled access to rail services as well as working with local bus services to improve linkages to the stations. | Retain strategic objective. |
| 13491 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Dunton area: SO7 - Housing equals half Borough requirements, yet won't benefit socially or economically from Crossrail. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 13828 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13841 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13851 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] | Object | Claim to 'Optimise the social and economic benefits that arise from Crossrail for the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors to the Borough', yet you dump most of housing needs that would benefit from Crossrail south of the A127, where there are numerous problems with the C2C line. Development at Dunton would not be near a station anyway, as the A128 would create a barrier which requires residents to drive and park at either Laindon or West Horndon. The 2,500 houses planned for Dunton, and the 500 houses planned for West Horndon would be cut off from good transport needs. | Sites for new homes are also located within and adjoining to Brentwood and Shenfield urban areas therefore consideration of the significance of potential impacts of Crossrail is important in terms of new homes and employment opportunities for residents of Brentwood. | Retain strategic objective. |
| 15211 - Spire Hartswood Hospital [6074] 15279 - Brentwood School [2575] | Support | Support SO7 as it seeks to make the most of the benefits that will be brought to the Borough by Crossrail. | Noted | No action |
| SO8 | | | | |
| 13830 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13842 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13852 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] 13989 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Claim will 'Promote and support a prosperous rural economy' yet you propose to build half of your housing allocation on Green Belt agricultural land, South of the A127. | The Council will continue to consider the economic needs of the rural economy with the need for new homes in Brentwood. New homes and new employment locations can also bring further opportunity for economic improvement. | Retain Strategic Objective. |
| 15896 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | SO8 is welcomed in relation to providing new homes and businesses with telecommunications, including superfast broadband, as set out in the NPPF. This is important in unlocking new development and contributing to a prosperous economy in attracting new businesses and jobs, and ensuring the connectivity of residents to key services. | Noted | No action |
| SO9 | | | | |
| 13981 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | By definition, for the green belt to be effective, ANY development thereon must be deemed 'inappropriate' /ipso facto/, and exceptions granted only very rarely, if at all, and only after going through full Council. I am perturbed that the wording of SO9 as it stands is providing too much leeway, since it does not unequivocally enshrine a presumption that any development would be 'inappropriate'. | Disagree. Strategic Objective SO9 has been drafted inline with the National Planning Policy Framework. The definition of "inappropriate development" is given within this national framework. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15937 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Question whether the BBC stated need to meet objectively assessed housing needs justifies using green belt land for housing development. This is a question raised at each round of consultation on the LDP and underpinning evidence. To date, no satisfactory answer has been provided | Noted. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No action |
| 13831 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13843 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13853 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] 15054 - Christine Blythe [4718] 15280 - Brentwood School [2575] | Object | Claim to 'Safeguard the Green Belt from inappropriate development', yet you propose a massive inappropriate development of the very limited supply of Green Belt South of the A127. NPPF states that Green Belt is there to check unrestricted sprawl, and to prevent neighbouring towns from merging. The limited supply of Green Belt land in the area between Brentwood and Basildon South of the A127 is very limited, and both councils propose building up to the boundaries, thereby creating unrestricted sprawl, as well as merging neighbouring towns. On a Supply and Demand basis, the Green Belt has a far higher value South of the A127 because of its rarity. A 10% increase in existing villages for the next 20 years is "inappropriate" but the creation of a new garden village of 2,500 houses is "appropriate"? | Noted. The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance | Consider accordingly |
| 13991 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Unrestricted sprawl means that South of the A127 there will be virtually no Green Belt from Havering to Southend, while plenty remains around A12 corridor, making the Southern Green Belt of greater value to setting and character of villages nearby. | Noted. The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| S010 | | | | |
| 15060 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Comment | With regard to S010 (Protect & enhance valuable landscape & the natural and historic environment), Figure 9.1 Environment and Biodiversity (p126) indicates that the proposed development sites to the south of the Borough are in areas of a high concentration of both local wildlife sites and sites of special scientific interest, compared to those in the north of the Borough which have a much lower concentration of these sites | Noted. Policies proposed consider the potential impact of development on wildlife and designated wildlife sites. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15944 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | SO10 states that BBC will "protect and enhance valuable landscapes and the natural and historic environment". WHPC represent that the scale and concentration of the proposed development within the A127 Corridor will irrevocably harm the landscape and environment within this area. | Noted. Potential site locations have been identified after consideration of a number of constraints and opportunities in line with evidence. The Spatial Strategy summarises this strategic, borough-wide process. Strategic development also offers the opportunity for improvement to both landscape and environment with high quality design. | Consider accordingly |
| 16100 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | To assist in reviewing the policies, please find in full representation ECC Place Services latest revised version of "Model Policies for Local Plans". | Reference to the ECC Place Services latest revised version of "Model Policies for Local Plans" is welcomed. Brentwood acknowledge that these may be of use with regard to the review process of the locally specific plans as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. | Consider accordingly |
| SO11 | | | | |
| 15437 - North East London NHS Foundation Trust [6087] | Comment | NELFT supports SO11 and recognizes the need to provide sufficient social infrastructure including health care facilities to support the forecast growth of 7,240 new residential dwellings (362 dwellings per annum) in policy 5.2 during the period up to 2033 | Support noted | No action |
| 13529 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] 15714 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | We note that the Council wishes to protect recreational assets such as the Borough's Country Parks to promote 'social inclusion, health and wellbeing'. We would like to see an emphasis on these assets being made available to all users - pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13985 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Comment | S11 - Parking to be free and plentiful with lots of disabled access | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15923 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | Support to protect and enhance Thorndon Country Park as both a leisure and environmental area. Should development east of the A128 take place, be it in the form of the proposed Dunton Hills Garden Village, or an alternative development, an environmental buffer is created between the A128, any new development, reaching up to Thorndon Country Park. This would have the dual benefit of i) preventing urban sprawl which would be inevitable should no buffer be created given proximity of West Horndon to the A128, and ii) improving an existing leisure and environmental resource. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13204 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Support | Support SO11 which protects and nurtures existing sport, leisure facilities and recreational assets to promote and enhance social inclusion and health and well-being. | Noted | No action |
| SO12 | | | | |
| 15061 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Comment | SO12 Improving public transport, cycle and walking facilities and encourage sustainable transport choices should be implemented throughout the Borough. Villages such as Blackmore need to maintain a demand for a bus service for it to be economically viable. The existing road network needs to be maintained to 2033 to enable rural villages to reach existing and new services/amenities available in the Brentwood area. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15921 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | SO12 states that BBC will "improve public transport, cycling and walking facilities and encourage sustainable transport choices". This will be absolutely essential for West Horndon village should sites 020 and 021 be developed, however no details regarding delivery are included in the Draft Local Plan. It is unclear how this goal would be enforced on to any development within the village. | Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will consider issues including transport. The Council welcome input from neighbourhoods into prioritisation of need with this process. | Consider accordingly |
| SO13 | | | | |
| 15063 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | SO13 benefits the centre and south of the Borough alone if the plan allows for no development to take place in the rural north. It seems that the population of the Borough is intended to be concentrated in a confined geographic area. It must be possible to protect and enjoy the GB in the Borough while at the same time permitting a more equitable dispersal of the population in the area available. | Noted. The Spatial Strategy describes the context for managing change and shaping how the area develops in the future setting out the level and location of development and the sequential land use provides the land use the Council considers appropriate in line with guidance and best practice. | No action |
| 14099 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Support | Support is also offered for the strategic objective (SO13) relating to delivering essential infrastructure including community facilities in order to support new development growth as this recognises the importance of sport and recreation facilities (which would form part of community facilities) in creating sustainable communities in new developments. | Noted. Support welcomed | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|

Chapter 5. Spatial Strategy

What is a Spatial Strategy?

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16963 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] | Object | OUR SERVICES ARE UNDER STRAIN & FULL TO BURSTING=SCHOOLS -GP SURGERIES-HOSPITALS=BLACK ALERT. NO EVIDENCE OF NEEDING THIS HOUSING. EMPTY PROPERTIES ALREADY WHY BUILD MORE NO NEED FOR LDP [PROOF?] | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The Objectively Assessed Need identifies a need for homes and will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. There is already a shortage of homes for people in the UK and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No action |
| 14758 - Mr David Harman [4494] | Object | No account is being taken of infrastructural requirements that such huge growth implies. Health care, in hospital, care home or at home, are at present inadequate; they would collapse if such an increase in loading were applied. Public transport throughout the Borough is vestigial at best, it could not be grown to even begin to address the enormous growth envisaged. There is no provision for (nor any recognition of) other than primary education for our children. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | No action |
| 14759 - Mr David Harman [4494] | Object | There is no apparent recognition that the projected growth in housing and industrial premises south of the A127 would present a huge north to south shift in the balance of population of the Borough. The A128 would provide the only significant link between north and south. At present this road is overwhelmed during both morning and evening "rush hours". The additional load would cause permanent gridlock. | Noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Evolution of the Spatial Strategy | | | | |
| 14254 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Comment | Thurrock Council considers that the most appropriate spatial strategy would be a variation of the previous preferred options strategy (Option 2) with growth including Green Belt release concentrated in the A12 Brentwood/Shenfield corridor but with some limited potential for Green Belt release at West Horndon. | The A12 acts as a by-pass for Brentwood, access to and from the A12 and Brentwood is limited to locations at the east and west. This means improvement to vehicle movement in central areas of Brentwood is severely restricted by existing development. However a balance is required to accommodate new development, which is how the Draft Local Plan spatial strategy aims to spread development proportionately to sustainable locations more able to accommodate growth in consideration of all constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 15915 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Para 5.9 of the Draft Local Plan states that, in the Council's Preferred options consultation (2013) "Proportionately more growth at West Horndon was proposed because of the comparative capacity for growth in that location, and less growth in Ingatestone because of capacity and land constraints. The strategy also considered lack of capacity in the Brentwood urban area and north of the Borough in terms of infrastructure such as roads (due to congestion), primary schools, GP facilities and a higher landscape value". Whilst this is a historic comment, WHPC note that any development at or around West Horndon faces the same problems, and this is a point that remains relevant to this current consultation. New primary schools, GP facilities and local roads would need to be constructed, and major upgrades to the A127 and potentially A128 would also be required. We also continue to challenge the lower landscape value. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council's proposed allocations will be informed by professional assessments based on robust methodology. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15914 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Throughout the development of the Draft Local Plan, BBC have consistently ignored potentially viable alternative sites, focusing primarily on the A127 Corridor despite the concerns expressed by WHPC. WHPC believe that BBC's 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 and hard evidence. Given the scale of development proposed, the original "problems" identified by BBC including the need for new infrastructure, are relevant wherever the development is sited. Greater diversification of the identified housing need will assist in improving deliverability, feasibility, and the impact on local transport networks. In particular it is noted that the A12 is in the process of being upgraded to 3 lanes (funded allocated), with the A12 Corridor also benefiting from Crossrail. Neither of these upgrades are proposed or indeed, currently feasible, within the A127 Corridor with the A127, and the C2C rail line. | Noted. It is acknowledged that road infrastructure capacity is a great challenge in Essex and the South East. Unfortunately these constraints alone are not sufficient for the Council to not meet local development needs. Whilst new development will inevitably add pressure to existing networks it can also be a means to receive financial contributions towards required mitigation for improvement works. In terms of the A127, evidence suggests there is greater capacity within Brentwood than the A12, particularly where both roads meet the M25 (junction 29 compared with junction 28). There is also an opportunity for widening and mitigation work, such as junction improvement. Work is ongoing with Essex County Council and adjoining authorities in South Essex to identify needs and mitigation solutions. By comparison the A12 acts as a by-pass for Brentwood, access to and from the A12 and Brentwood is limited to locations at the east and west. This means improvement to vehicle movement in central areas of Brentwood is severely restricted by existing development. However a balance is required to accommodate new development, which is how the Draft Local Plan spatial strategy aims to spread development proportionately to sustainable locations more able to accommodate growth. No option is easy, but difficult decisions are required if development needs are to be met. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| | | | Delivery Plan. | |
| 13409 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Development COULD be met on brownfield should read MUST ONLY be met. I do not consider there to be 'suitable' green field sites. Brown field only. Never release greenfield sites for development. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 14757 - Mr David Harman [4494] | Object | The housing need, forming the basis of the Plan, vastly exceeds Brentwood's actual requirement. | Noted. The Draft Plan has been informed by the Objectively Assessed Need which identifies a need for homes and will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. There is already a shortage of homes for people in the UK and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. | No action |
| 13120 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Object | Option 1 centre led growth should be avoided as the existing road infrastructure especially around the High St, Ongar Rd, Wilsons Corner, Western Ave is not fit for capacity at existing traffic levels. Option 2 corridor led growth is preferential. However A12 corridor led growth will not work without improving access to this corridors namely at Brook St and Mountnessing. Access to the A12 corridor via Brentwood Town Centre is unworkable therefore sites at Pilgrims Hatch and Doddinghurst rd should not be considered without a new A12 junction at this location. | Noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|-----------|
| 13670 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | I object to the Council's imposing an arbitrarily and unnecessarily high target. The 'objective' level may have been overestimated, and, in any case, the NPPF (paragraph 34 of the Planning Practice Guidance especially) makes clear that the green belt is a higher priority, and an admissible defence for setting a significantly lower target than the 'objective' level would suggest. I therefore call upon the Council to stick with the old regional target, which, in the circumstances, is unlikely to be deemed 'unsound' -- even if it were, I would want my Council to stand up and fight for its residents. | Noted. National Guidance sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs. The old regional plan target had been abolished leaving the requirement to plan for Objectively Assessed Needs. This will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No action |
| 14654 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Para 5.8 & 5.9 - Our client agrees it is imperative that the draft plan's housing requirement is based up on an up to date assessment of objectively assessed need and that it sets out how in full this will be met. Our client also considers West Horndon continues to present the best option for sustainable growth outside of Brentwood itself - precisely because it has access to existing education and health facilities and, with the existing the old industrial estates, previously developed land adjacent to the village centre and rail station/existing bus services. | Support noted | No action |
| 14653 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Para 5.7 - This refers to the Council's Preferred Options consultation in 2013, the proposed spatial strategy that was derived from transport-led growth (option 2). This focused growth in Brentwood, Shenfield and West Horndon, along with suitable developed sites in the Green Belt and brownfield development in other villages. Our client supported this at the time and still considers the draft plan reflects the broad thrust of this option. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Draft Plan Spatial Strategy | | | | |
| 14903 - Haynes Development (Nick Lambourne) [4250] | Comment | Infilling is the way forward for large villages such as Doddinghurst, it may not solve the long term housing dilemma, but will help contribute in the short term. | Noted. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 16021 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | Consider Plan will be found unsound due to duty to cooperate; objectively assessed housing need; Brentwood's housing growth strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal. The following needs to be done to make the plan sound: Review the current proposed number of homes to be provided 2013-2033 having regard to market signals and unmet housing need within areas with which the Borough is connected, to be determined through further working under the Duty to Cooperate with relevant Authorities. Ensure that the Local Plan does not rely on the delivery of Dunton Garden Hills Village or windfall to meet housing needs, due to considerable uncertainty regarding their potential to deliver housing. Reduce reliance on large strategic sites that will not be delivered in the short- term, and seek to address the current, urgent housing need through the identification of a range of smaller, deliverable sites in sustainable locations; and ensure the provision of a five-year housing land supply. Apply a more sophisticated and transparent approach to site selection (and Sustainability Appraisal of potential sites) that considers the sustainability and deliverability of sites, along with their potential to relate to a spatial strategy for development linked to the settlement hierarchy | Noted. The Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. An updated SHLAA will be published alongside the Councils Infrastructure Development Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 13559 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | Although I strongly believe that we DO NOT need any more houses built (there are literally THOUSANDS of empty properties throughout the country), if they "have" to be built anywhere, I strongly believe that they should be built on top of existing urban areas - build on top of schools, shops etc, anywhere that ISN'T green belt/forests/fields etc. What about building on the West Horndon abattoir land instead??? | Noted. Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 15294 - Transport for London (Mr Oscar Wong) [6078] | Comment | Given the Local Plan covers the period to 2033, forecasts shows that there might be capacity issues on the Elizabeth line between Stratford and Central London in the 2030's, primarily due to expected high levels of growth in inner east London. Therefore, TfL is working on the East London Transport Option Study assessing various further transport options to relieve forecast capacity issues in this period. Further interventions could include lengthening Elizabeth line trains and/or frequency enhancements; however these are not yet committed and funded. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 16031 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] 16040 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | The intrinsic economic benefit of housing development should be recognised and jobs relating to the supply chain. Housing development also engenders local economic benefits relating to additional local expenditure. There are clearly factors that suggest the Brentwood Local Plan should seek to deliver a greater number of homes than proposed in the DLP. At the very least the provision of a greater number of dwellings is a reasonable option that should be explored. Figure 5.10 of the DLP shows that the current housing delivery rate is well below that required to meet what the Council consider to be the Borough's need. Furthermore, it is projected to remain below this level in the short-term. There is clearly a current, urgent housing need in the Borough. The DLP should not seek to rely on large strategic sites to deliver housing, as these cannot meet housing need in the short- term and enable the Borough to retain a five-year housing land supply, as required by the NPPF (para 47). To ensure the plan is capable of addressing the current urgent housing need and ensuring a five-year housing land supply a range of sites should be identified, including smaller sites that are deliverable in the short-term. | Noted. The Draft Plan aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 14324 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 15293 - Transport for London (Mr Oscar Wong) [6078] | Object | The role and potential economic and housing benefits of Crossrail in particular with regard to development at Shenfield have not been fully assessed and incorporated into the emerging Brentwood Local Plan, either as part of the current stage or previous consultations. The NPPF states that in preparing their plans local authorities should support opportunities for growth. The housing and economic impact of Crossrail within Brentwood needs to be considered and assessed in detail. The improvements to the existing rail lines and increased frequency of services are likely to make Brentwood and Shenfield in particular a favourable location to live and work and stimulate economic growth. | Brentwood Borough Council and Essex County Council are part of a wider working group focusing upon opportunities to invest in and improve the surroundings of Brentwood and Shenfield Stations. The work of the group is currently focusing upon updating information, including spatial visions and priorities, patronage mapping and potential user forecasts. Specific detailed issues relating to local economic impacts and opportunities are likely to be discussed through this working group, together with any additional technical evidence material. | Consider accordingly |
| 16405 - Mrs Winifred Wigington [6198] | Object | Dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council has taken care to protect the village of Dunton Wayletts. In the Draft Plan the Council states it wants to protect the Green Belt around its villages, however Dunton Hills Garden Village combined with the development planned by Basildon Council would remove all the Green Belt land around Dunton Wayletts. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13474 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] 13502 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 14938 - Mr Robert Boad [6032] 14975 - Miss Susan Maclean [4252] 15975 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] 15976 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] | Object | The local services can't handle the existing numbers of residents. Tell us how much extra capacity you plan for the local transport links. There needs to be more detail and information on infrastructure and services that will be planned. The Plan fails to show A127 corridor impact on Herongate. A127 has excessive congestion. C2C line called the Misery Line. Natural barriers created by A127 and A128 means Dunton area residents rely on Basildon services. Prospect of site being underneath a huge flyover if Lower Thames Crossing goes ahead, creating massive health and environment problems. | Concerns noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 16027 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | Noted that the Council are using the 362 dpA identified by the 2013 SHMA. Also noted that the OAHN considers the delivery of 411 dpA as a feasible target for Brentwood Borough. It is unclear on what basis this level of growth was rejected. The borough should have regard to market signals and with the borough's expensive housing cost, comparable to London prices, the figure should be revised upwards from the household projections. It is not clear from the DLP how unmet needs in neighbouring areas have been considered. On the contrary, the DLP indicates at paragraph 5.36 that only housing needs within the Brentwood Borough boundary have been addressed. The DLP recognises how well connected the Borough is with neighbouring areas and London. It follows that the Borough may be suitably placed to accommodate some of the unmet needs of such areas, and this should be explored through the Local Plan process if it is to avoid being unsound. | Noted. In terms of the boundary of Brentwood Strategic Housing Market Area, development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these areas (and strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA). | Consider accordingly |
| 15935 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | 5.20 of the Draft Local Plan states that a new village centre will be created for West Horndon, with supporting services and facilities close to the village rail station. No evidence is provided as to how this would be funded and provided, and indeed hence if this is a realistic assumption based on the other changes needed at sites 020 and 021 in order to make them suitable for large scale residential redevelopment. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15093 - Graham Palmer [4725] | Object | Brentwood cannot fulfil housing targets due to greenbelt constraints and should not consider re-designating greenbelt land as viable for development as it has done with land where the A127 meets the M25, this was supposed to be used temporarily and returned to greenbelt. Castle Point council has refused to consider building on their greenbelt and our councillors should also refuse to build on greenbelt as it is vital to keep us from becoming an extension of London, the London Borough of Brentwood, It is also vital environmentally to help keep our air clean, the pollution in the air is already dangerously close to illegal levels. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14253 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Object to the spatial strategy and the various elements as proposed. It is unclear why a sequential approach (figure 5.14) and the spatial strategy advocate a free-standing greenfield settlement in the Green Belt and that 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 and closer to existing transport and other existing infrastructure and services. This sequential approach also appears to be supported in Policies 6.2 (Development of Management) and 7.2 (Site allocations). | Noted. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council have considered all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt and other identified constraints as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 13812 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] 14103 - Mr Anthony Crowley [3147] 14251 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 16034 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To allocate 35% of the Council's OAN to the Dunton area does not represent proper and thoughtful planning. - The plan failed to distribute the loss of Green Belt evenly throughout the Borough, this combined with the absence of Green Belt assessments suggests that the Council has failed to consider the matter in the careful manner expected of a planning authority. - The Council has cynically offloaded its housing and other needs to an edge of the Borough where a neighbouring borough will shoulder the infrastructure burden, in a fashion incompatible with the Duty to Co-operate. | The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services to minimise the impact on existing services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities on cross boundary related issues under the Duty to Cooperate. | Consider accordingly |
| 13703 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13832 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13854 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] | Object | Fail to show a true picture of Herongate being directly affected by the A127 because of its very close proximity. C2C line does not have the capacity for any additional customers at West Horndon. National Rail had already confirmed last year that they had no intention of adding an extra station in any new development, so all residents of developments around the Dunton area would be solely reliant on their cars on the heavily congested A127. If the proposed Option C Route 4 gets the go ahead Brentwood residents would be completely reliant on their Basildon neighbour's facilities, which are already stretched beyond capacity. The A127 and South of the Borough suffers severely from congestion, lack of services GPs and Schools. Development here would put a strain on surrounding areas, particularly Basildon. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council and the NHS as the plan progresses to determine the future educational and healthcare needs of the Borough. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|--|---|
| 13410 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Does this not change drastically now that the Thames crossing access routes are going through the southern areas. | The preferred route impacts are being considered in the transport modelling. The impacts of the route will be considered in further detail once the route is confirmed. | Issue is being considered in the Plan making process. |
| 14235 - Miss Angela Cox [5868] 14320 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 14323 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 14328 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | There is further significant potential to provide housing and other development in the A12 Corridor Broad Area, including the potential for urban edge expansion of settlements. The western edge is subject to a number of environmental constraints however areas to the north, east and south east of Shenfield and Pilgrims Hatch and south of Hutton should be subject to further consideration for edge of settlement expansion as part of a Green Belt review. With less environmental constraints and lower sensitivity to impact on landscape due to their close proximity to urban adge. A number of these locations also have boundaries that can provide a suitable new edge to the Green Belt for example the A12. It is considered due to the size and extent of the Green Belt in these locations that a limited number of urban expansions are less likely to have a significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt than locations in other broad areas. The widening of the A12 from the M25 to Chelmsford has allocated government funding and represent an increase in road capacity and the opportunity to improve road junctions and accessibility to Brentwood and the A12 Broad Location Area generally during later period of the plan. This will make the A12 Corridor broad area more suitable for development opportunities. | Noted. It is acknowledged that road infrastructure is a great challenge in Essex and the South East, the evidence is such that there is greater opportunity for widening and mitigation work such as junction improvement to more of the A127 than the A12. The A12 acts as a by-pass for Brentwood and access to and from the A12 and Brentwood is limited to locations at the east and west, leaving central areas of Brentwood severely restricted by existing development. | Consider accordingly |
| 16035 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | The DLP strategy relies on windfall to deliver 928 dwellings - 12% of the proposed total. By definition, there is considerable uncertainty as to how much of a contribution windfall will be able to make towards delivery housing. It is far from clear that it will be able to make the level of contribution which the DLP assumes. Brentwood should not rely on windfall, as per para 47 of NPPF. | The Council will publish technical evidence relating to windfall when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 13272 - Mr Colin Downey [4243] 14092 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Object | There has been a general reluctance to embrace the need for new development throughout the Borough and to look at ways that any development can benefit the Borough as a whole. Overdeveloping West Horndon was met with fierce local opposition so instead of looking at the Borough as a whole the Council moved slightly further down the A127 to Dunton where any opposition would be limited as it is sparsely populated. The same argument apply as they did to West Horndon. | Concerns noted. The Council seeks to meet full Objectively Assessed Housing Need in light of National Guidance and evidence. The Draft Plan spatial strategy aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. | Consider accordingly |
| 14850 - Mrs Kate Davies [4577] 15198 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Object | As a result of the lack of development over recent years, the services within Blackmore village are under threat, which is evidenced by the closure of The Bull Public House. Without the residential development to sustain local business and services, they will close and the quality and sustainability of the village will come under pressure. There is a need for some houses for people who wish to move into Blackmore. | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14901 - Ms Nicola Gardner [6020] | Object | I wish to express my opposition to the gross over development with the proposal of three new developments of flats in Brentwood. Local residents already have to put up with Brentwood being grid lock either end of the day and that's before these new flats. Since the council chose to put bollards in crown st there is now only one way in and out and we share this with huge delivery lorries to B and M and Wilkos. Parking on the single yellow line means access to and from regency court is difficult. Add all these new developments will only make things worse and cause grid lock. A better solution would be to build on brown field sites such as Essex way the old adult college site. It lies empty. It is less densely populated in Warley and would enhance that area. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 15038 - Christine Blythe [4718] 15043 - Christine Blythe [4718] 15056 - Christine Blythe [4718] 15192 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] 15194 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] 15196 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] 15305 - Thorndon Park Golf Club Ltd. [157] | Object | The draft Spatial Strategy fails to consider the local needs of the more rural areas within the Borough and is contrary to the views of the Council in the Strategic Growth Options consultation document (2015) in which it stated that "it is important to consider allowing villages to grow in order to provide for local need". There remains a need to do this for a number of reasons: to address local issues of affordability, to retain the working age population within villages, to ensure the viability and vitality of local shops and to ensure the sustainability of local services, including schools. There should be some development land allocated in villages through Green Belt release, including Blackmore. | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 15971 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] 15972 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] 15974 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] 15977 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] 15978 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] | Object | There is no local housing need to build on Brentwoods 2005 Green Belt. Mr Eric Pickles stated "If local authority's cannot meet their housing targets because of the Green Belt, that is NO reason to use the Green Belt". The proposed LDP is particularly damaging and excessive in its proposed housing targets and there is absolutely no need for any re-designation of Green Belt for development. | Noted. There is a need for homes as identified in the Objectively Assessed Need which will be updated according to projected population figures and other data. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15973 - Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [375] | Object | Do local planning authorities have to meet in full housing needs identified in needs assessments? Local authorities should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs. However, assessing need is just the first stage in developing a Local Plan. Once need has been assessed, the local planning authority should prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period, and in so doing take account of any constraints such as Green Belt, which indicate that development should be restricted and which may restrain the ability of an authority to meet its need. Revision date: 06 10 2014. Clearly Brentwoods Green Belt does 'restrain the ability of an authority to meet its need'. | Noted. The assessment is ongoing, the SHLAA is being updated and will be published when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development which may not facilitate associated infrastructure, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | Consider accordingly |
| 15671 - Southend on Sea Council (Mr Matthew Thomas) [6097] | Object | With regard to additional housing development and infrastructure, Southend Borough Council notes that the A127, alongside the A130 and A13, forms a key route into Southend and this route is very important for business and residents within Southend and the wider area. As such it is vital that any development proposed in proximity to the strategic transport network provides the necessary infrastructure improvements and mitigation to support the additional growth; and to not have a negative impact on the strategic highway network. In addition, measures that promote the use of public transport and alternatives to the car should also be considered as part of these new developments and incorporated into policy. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. Modal change away from car use are also being considered. | Consider accordingly |
| 14786 - Mr Jon Bright [5993] | Support | Support the provision of more genuinely affordable housing for the Borough in general and Ingatestone in particular. The sites earmarked within Ingatestone seem to me to be good & appropriate options. Somewhere like Ingatestone needs an increase in affordable housing provision. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13396 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828] 14215 - Blackmore Village Hall/Parish Council (Roger Keeble) [301] 14784 - Mr & Mrs Gary & Elisabeth Taylor [2918] 14785 - Mr and Mrs Brian and Lesley Moss [2905] 14866 - Mr Gerald Smith [4433] 14930 - Mr Martin Clark [2456] 14992 - Mr and Mrs Simon and Jeanie Hughes [4739] | Support | Support the current planning strategy because: 1- It protects existing villages. The character of the village nature and social cohesion would be lost if further development was permitted. 2- All future development should happen where enough existing infrastructure is already in place to sustain the development. Maximising the use of available brownfield sites and protection of the greenbelt is also important. | Noted | No action |
| Sequential Land Use | | | | |
| 15733 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] | Comment | All previously developed lands are sequentially preferable to greenfield Green Belt sites on the edge of a settlement and it is requested that the proposed sequential hierarchy (Policy 5.1) be amended to reflect this. | Disagree. It is considered that the proposed sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites appropriately and the impact of development on the Green Belt and other sustainability issues are also considered. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No amendment. |
| 15540 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15732 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] | Comment | Further clarity should be given to the status of brownfield sites which are not located on the edge of existing settlements. It should be noted that: A range of development types, as included within the sequential approach, should be utilised in meeting Brentwood Borough's growth requirements. This should be based on an overarching vision of sustainable development, as underpinned by National planning policy. For example, larger Green Belt sites may be in a more sustainable location than brownfield sites, and/or able to provide a number of benefits that smaller brownfield sites cannot; The sequential test was appropriately undertaken to the identification of sites but should not be stringently applied to the subsequent delivery of sites/the housing trajectory. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16045 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | In terms of site reference GO92 and its assessment in the SHLAA 2011, the SHLAA 2011 found the site GO92 to be available and achievable, but stated that it was not suitable. The justification for this set out within the SHLAA was as follows: "The site lies within the Hutton Village conservation area and development on this scale would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the conservation area. Development would also have a detrimental impact on the visual and landscape quality of the area." The above concerns have been addressed through subsequent submissions to the Council. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 16048 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | Submissions were made in relation to a smaller area of land that forms part of site GO92 in response to the Council's consultation on Strategic Growth Options and Dunton Garden Suburb Local Plan Consultation in February 2015. This submission was accompanied by extensive supporting technical work, comprising: Site Opportunities and Constraints plan prepared by Go Planning Ltd; Site Master planning prepared by Go Planning Ltd; Site Context Sheets 1 & 2; Site Landscape Assessment prepared by Lockhart Garratt; Tree Constraints and Opportunities Report prepared by Lockhart Garratt; Ecological Constraints and Opportunities Report prepared by Lockhart Garratt; Access Appraisal prepared by Journey Transport Planning. Submission also addressed concerns raised by the SHLAA in respect of the larger area of land in which the site sits. | Site information submission noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13673 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | Before going on to the third stage ('reluctantly' developing on the green belt), a feedback loop to the first stage must be added, mandating a higher density of buildings on non-green-belt sites. Only after covering every non-green-belt brownfield site with 100-storey skyscrapers should the Council countenance releasing a single square metre of green belt. In practice, this means adding an explicit presumption against low-density housing being permitted at all (in other words, all new housing must be terraced or flats, and preference must be given to tall buildings -- the green belt is far, far more important than the skyline). | Disagree. The Council consider densities for potential sites and this is relates to site specific constraints and opportunities and impact on existing communities. The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of transport corridors and the Green Belt. | No action |
| 15001 - Stephen Hill [612] | Comment | I believe that something needs to be done to address the diminishing housing stock. I firmly believed that the best way forward was to develop brown fill areas such as the one local to me on the Highwood hospital site which was very well done by the developers. However even this development, after completion has caused issue such as increased pressure on GPs and increased traffic. Therefore I have come to recognise that the best solution for overcoming the housing shortage would be to build new towns well away from existing built up areas. | Comment noted | No action |
| 15359 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15379 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15407 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15466 - Mr Martin Morecroft [6091] 15484 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15562 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15608 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16159 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16186 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Comment | The Council should follow a hierarchical approach to identifying land to meet residential need, along the following lines: 1. Existing urban areas; 2. Existing developed sites in Green Belt; 3. Review of Green Belt boundaries to ensure consistency with para 84 and 85 NPPG guidance. Boundaries to follow clear, recognisable, physical features and Green Belt not to include land which is unnecessary to keep open (such as land surrounded by development or which is part of a settlement). 4. Release of sites on the edge of existing settlements. 5. New settlements (Dunton Hills Garden Suburb). It is only by following a hierarchical approach, and analysing the impact on the Green Belt at each stage, that the Council can assure itself that the overall impact of the Green Belt will be minimised. | Noted. The Council are considering the potential impacts from development on the Green Belt as well as other impacts and constraints to identify sustainable development opportunities, in line with the NPPF and government guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 15506 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | It is suggested that the DLP is amended to make it clear that the "strategic sites" identified is also Green Belt (i.e. bullet No 4 above). In doing so, BBC should also confirm that the potential for non-green belt Greenfield sites have been considered, but no such site are available/suitable. (DLP Page 32). | Agree that this addition would clarify that as the borough is 89% Green Belt that any strategic site would be within the Green Belt. | Amend accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------------|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14914 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] | Comment | I particularly value the open countryside (Green Belt) and strongly support its protection. I regularly walk both Weald and Thorndon Park and use the extensive public right of ways which cross the district. Although I walk into town it is not a particularly pleasant experience due to the high volume of traffic which generate high levels of noise and pollutants. Until recently I frequently cycled, however the dangerous state of the roads (e. g pot holes) and the high volume of traffic, which is often unsympathetic to the cyclist, has restricted this activity. As a motorist I experience the usual lengthy traffic jams and hold ups which clog up Brentwood during peak times and school term. The bus service to and from town is good however it is often late due to adverse traffic conditions. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 16042 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | We note that sites have been selected based on a "sequential approach to sustainable land use" (paragraph 7.29 of the DLP). This appears to result in any site within an existing settlement boundary being automatically considered more sustainable than brownfield sites in the Green Belt, which in turn are considered inherently more sustainable than any greenfield site in the Green Belt. We question the soundness of such a simplistic approach to the consideration of sustainability, and whether this approach will result in the most sustainable strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. Furthermore, it is unclear whether a Green Belt review has been undertaken prior to this filtering process to determine whether all land currently allocated as such meets the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, as set out in the NPPF. | Disagree. The sequential land use serves to prioritise urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt; sites will still be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF in a separate assessment process. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 15059 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | These "Brownfield redevelopment opportunities" (para 5.33) do not exist in the GB villages to the north of the Borough. The case has been made in this draft plan that larger villages in the rural north of the Borough have limited services/amenities and therefore development should not take place here. A limited amount of development needs to take place here to ensure the future vitality and viability of villages like Blackmore. I strongly disagree with the statement para 5.41 "the Council has reluctantly considered appropriate and sustainable locations within Green Belt". | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 16043 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | Five greenfield Green Belt site are proposed for allocation for housing development in the DLP. The justification for the identification of the five greenfield Green Belt sites is unclear, as is the justification for the rejection of land adjacent to Rayleigh Road, Hutton. | An update on the SHLAA and further evidence regarding site selection is to be published. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14106 - Mr Anthony Crowley [3147] 14107 - Mr Anthony Crowley [3147] | Object | I note that certain locations/areas of the Borough have requested some controlled development but this is being ignored. Why? | Limited development, including infilling where appropriate will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 14340 - Mr Venon Thomas [5875] 14348 - Mr Zak Harvey [5877] 14358 - Mr Andrew Watson [5878] 14413 - Mr Stanley Jopson [5890] 14424 - Mrs Rosa Dwyer [5891] 14433 - MBE Roy Dyer [5894] 14437 - Mr Robert Grey [5895] 14443 - Mr Mital Patel [5896] 14450 - Miss Lois Whitehead [5897] 14451 - Mr Stephen Bunton [5899] 14456 - Mrs Judith Wright [5901] 14465 - Mr Jason Paisley [5902] 14474 - Miss Deana Adansi [5905] 14483 - Mr Chris Edwards [5907] 16225 - Landmere Carwash (Administrator) [6173] 16239 - Mr Paul Day [6181] 16253 - Time 4 pets (Administrator Time 4 Pets) [6183] | Support | Page 47 Use of Brownfield land in the Green Belt supported. | Noted | No action |

Figure 5.4. Sequential Selection of Sites

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|-------|----------------------|
| 14306 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14307 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | Figure 5.4 'Strategic Sites' box. I disagree with this placing of 'Strategic Sites' in the hierarchy and even more so with the explanation 'Larger scale development...' Firstly strategic means much more than large scale and in its broader sense it could be a subset of each of the spatial categories 'Urban areas', 'Brownfield sites in Green Belt' and 'Greenfield sites in Green Belt' rather than a self standing category in the hierarchy. The hierarchy could be improved so that it is clear what is meant by strategic and how this would play out within the tree main boxes. In a sense this process has already been started for the latter box. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
|--|---------|---|-------|----------------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|---------------------------|
| 14296 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14297 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | Figure 5.4 'Windfall' box. Similarly windfall development doesn't work very well in the hierarchy. By definition the location and circumstances surrounding these sites are unknown therefore these can't be assigned a place in hierarchy, they may vary from top to bottom of the hierarchy depending on their merits in meeting the borough's strategic objectives. | Disagree. The Council consider it appropriate to consider that windfall both has a place in consideration of housing supply and that it is last in the hierarchy. However, the explanatory text can be amended to improve clarification. | Consider accordingly |
| 14294 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14295 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | As mentioned above I believed that a separate hierarchy should be developed for Job Growth and Employment as some of the concepts, such as intensified and infill development, are not particularly appropriate. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14308 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14309 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] | Comment | Figure 5.4 Urban area box. Within the 'Urban Area' box the concept of increasing the density of development needs to be raised and subsequently developed in the Plan through policies. It is readily apparent that this concept can help fulfill most of the Borough's vision by growing existing local economies and improving existing communities whilst maintaining the context of existing green spaces. It is this that will contribute most to protecting and nurturing its existing high quality environment. This concept finds expression to various degrees in contributing to all Strategic Objectives other than perhaps S07. To avoid misunderstanding of the word urban and to maximize growth in this way this should apply to all areas of existing development e.g. town, suburb village. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14310 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14311 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | Figure 5.4. Whilst I appreciate the aim of keeping figure 5.4 simple, since this is the root of supporting text and policies in Section 5 and further on in the Plan, the need for clarity is very important and this figure needs to be expanded and refined to draw out a few more items and concepts that are combined in the figure as currently drawn up. I think the table is trying to do three things: (a) combine all types of development (b) explain the totality of sources of development and (c) create a hierarchy for decision making. The table would greatly benefit by separating these strands. I believe that it could much better reflect the different drivers for development if say 'Housing' and 'Job Growth and Employment strands' were separated. | Disagree. The Council consider it appropriate to consider both housing and employment land within Figure 5.4. However, the explanatory text can be amended to improve clarification. | Consider text accordingly |
| 14462 - Asphaltic Developments Ltd [2664] | Comment | We support this approach in principle, as it promotes the sustainable patterns of development to accommodate growth/development needs without encroaching onto Greenfield land. However we consider that brownfield sites in Green Belt that are connected to, or close to, urban areas are sustainable urban extensions, and as such they should be released to meet the housing requirements of the Borough before releasing Greenfield sites. As such, we consider that the definition of "Brownfield Sites in Green Belt" is not appropriate, and should be amended as "previously developed sites connected to or close to existing urban areas." | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14300 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14303 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] | Comment | Figure 5.4 'Greenfield sites in Green Belt' box. The Greenfield sites in Green Belt box could look something like: - Intensified density of development; - Infill development; - Urban extensions within reach of services; and - Urban extensions not in reach of services and infrastructure. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14301 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14304 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | Figure 5.4 'Greenfield sites in Green Belt' box. The Greenfield sites in Green Belt box could look something like: - Intensified density of development; - Infill development; - Urban extensions within reach of services; and - Urban extensions not in reach of services and infrastructure. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16128 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | In order to meet full objectively assessed needs in a short space of time requires the Council to be realistic about the likelihood of sites coming forward and the Plan states that "more evidence will be required to prove this moving forward to the next stage of the plan making process". Full objectively assessed needs in a short space of time". This requires the Council to be realistic about the likelihood of sites coming forward and the Plan states that "more evidence will be required to prove this moving forward to the next stage of the plan making process". | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13411 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | No. Brownfield only and Re-use of brownfield. No green belt to be relinquished for development. | Disagree. The National Guidance sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 14024 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] 15286 - Brentwood School [2575] | Support | Support the sequential land use approach which prioritise Brownfield sites within existing urban areas and to consider all appropriate land within existing urban areas (paragraph 5.16 and figure 5.4). | Noted | No action |

Policy 5.1: Spatial Strategy

| | | | | |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15227 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Comment | Support the spatial strategy in general and recommend Site at Sawyers Hall Lane is allocated as it meets the requirements of Policy 5.1, being located in the A12 Corridor and the demonstrating characteristics which are necessary to justify Green Belt release for housing. Recommended that due to Crossrail, strategic infrastructure investment, that deliverable and suitable potential housing sites around Brentwood town are identified for development in the Local Plan e.g. Sawyers Hall Lane. It must be noted that the effect of Crossrail enhances the Site at Sawyers Hall Lane's credentials as an accessible location and suitable site for growth. | Site information noted. The Local Plan has been prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. The Council has sought opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development in the consideration of site assessment in line with the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15904 - Kitewood [6116] 15958 - Collins & Coward Ltd (Mr Brown) [6119] | Comment | Generally support elements of the spatial strategy however do not support the reliance on a new settlement to deliver a significant proportion of the Borough's needs and the decision not to release any Green Belt sites adjacent to Larger Villages in the A12 corridor. | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors and in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14439 - Chelmsford City Council (Claire Stuckey) [4541] | Comment | Crossrail should be thoroughly investigated and its potential role to accommodate further growth over the period of the local plan and beyond. The implications of the potential to accommodate more growth and associated infrastructure requirements need to be considered with some weight as a way of meeting the undersupply of housing requirement currently identified in the Brentwood Local Plan options and supporting evidence. | Noted. The Council acknowledge that Crossrail will replace an existing service rather than create a new one and that proximity to a station and other transport issues are important to consider with regard to new sustainable development. There will be an increase in the frequency in the stopping "metro" service between Shenfield and Liverpool Street and there will be a considerable improvement to cross-London travel. The Spatial Strategy reflects this. | Consider accordingly |
| 16023 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | The Plan overly relies on its Dunton allocation in the A127 corridor, which is not the most sustainable locations for growth, given that transport links, access to jobs and services and town centre facilities are more limited. Brentwood, Hutton and Shenfield are sequentially preferable locations, the Council should recognise this in the policy and examine whether there are any additional sites in the Brentwood/ Shenfield/ Hutton area that could be brought forward. | Noted. The assessment of sites is an on-going process and this will inform the next iteration of the plan, its allocations and policies. | Consider accordingly |
| 15756 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | As some notable development is located in close proximity to the A12, we would like Brentwood Borough Council to be mindful of the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) proposals announced and the potential for the widening of the A12, as well as strategic re-routing that could potentially occur as a result of large schemes in the RIS such as the Lower Thames Crossing, which was recently out to consultation. Additionally cross-border impacts will need to be considered from adjacent local authorities' local plans, including how these impacts will be mitigated. I would also draw your attention to the potential for noise and air quality problems and recommend suitable consideration is given to ensure new occupants are not adversely affected. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England and adjoining local authorities under the Duty to Cooperate in the development of the local plan. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 13580 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Comment | Support elements of the spatial strategy but not the reliance on a new settlement to deliver a significant proportion of the Borough's needs and the decision not to release any Green Belt sites adjacent to Larger Villages in the A12 corridor. | Noted. The assessment of sites is an on-going process. There are a number of constraints to development along the A12 corridor which are taken into account when considering sites for allocation. A number of sites along the A12 corridor are already being put forward in the draft Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15240 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Comment | We have also looked at, and are generally supportive of, the Strategic Objectives, Spatial Strategy, General Development Criteria, and the various policies covering the environment, Green Infrastructure, air quality, lighting, flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage. | General support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 16323 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Sitting of new development in the Ingatestone area will place strain on medical, education, sewage disposal and parking all of which is currently under pressure. We also concern the potential increase in traffic at the Mounthessing roundabout junction. The problem is of access to the proposed commercial site adjacent to the A12, its slip road and the B1002. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 14658 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Comment | Para 5.20 - Whilst there is still some doubt about the deliverability of Dunton Hills Garden Village, the reference to "brownfield opportunities" is welcomed. However, it is unclear what the local plan's amended focus is given the emphasise that housing delivery on these sites will be taken to effectively meet local needs. Our client is concerned that this may be used to stymie the redevelopment of the Horndon Estate and request further information in the context of the capacity of the sites to deliver new homes. Our client welcomes the reference to "a residential led mixed use redevelopment of existing industrial land in West Horndon, creating a new village centre with supporting services and facilities close to the village rail station". | Noted. The site assessment is ongoing and sites will be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. The Brentwood spatial strategy and sequential land use refers to prioritisation of brownfield sites in the urban areas that do not lie within the Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 16094 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Comment | We do not consider the Council has fully assessed the impact on the Green Belt by absence of an independent and objective assessment, nor has the Council assessed the feasibility of the strategic sites put forward in their ability to be delivered in the plan period. Furthermore, the sustainability of settlements with underutilised public transport services should have been assessed. In this regard the policy is not justified or consistent with national policy. | Noted. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt. Further site assessment and testing will be undertaken. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15780 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Brentwood Council will need to be satisfied that it has identified its preferred spatial strategy, which includes significant Green Belt release, based on a range of proportionate evidence. In so doing, BBC will need to be able to demonstrate that it has considered all reasonable locations for future growth against the criteria outlined in Policy 9.8 Green Belt, and demonstrate the most appropriate sites have been identified for allocation. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15505 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | The growth strategy for the Borough should include a proportion of development within each of the broad areas, namely the 'A12 Corridor', 'A127 Corridor', 'Rural North' and the 'Rural South', in line with the sustainability credentials of each of the settlements, informed by evidence base documents and strategic priorities for the Borough. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15545 - Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093] | Comment | The Mayor welcomes the Council's corridor-based approach and the consideration of transport implications beyond its boundaries. The arrival of the Elizabeth Line in 2019 at Brentwood and Shenfield will improve the existing metro service and connectivity to Stratford as well as Central London, although the potential longer-term capacity is still under consideration. Within this context, the Councils may wish to look at growth options close to these train stations and their catchment areas. The Mayor also supports the principle of improvements to the Greater Eastern Mainline between London and Norwich through Brentwood and would welcome policy support for it. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15754 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | It is noted that some development sites are located in close proximity to the M25 and A12 corridors and therefore consider that these could potentially have a notable impact on the number of trips at the junctions. It is considered that the proposed development locations could have a notable impact on the Strategic Road Network, particularly on M25 Junction 28 and Junction 29, as well as A12 Junction 12. The flow diagrams provided within the Local Plan appendices demonstrate that approximately 500 and 1,200 additional vehicles per hour could route via Junction 28 and 29 respectively as a result of LP development. Furthermore, there is predicted to be a material impact at A12 Junction 12, although the flow diagrams were not clear enough to calculate an accurate total. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England in promoting the importance of improvements to those junctions. Any potential impacts of additional development in the Borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. | Consider accordingly |
| 15983 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Specific reference should be made to the "A127 A Corridor for Growth: an Economic Plan" (2014), which recognises the importance of the A127 to support economic growth both within Brentwood and as a strategic corridor for South Essex, and proposes a range of improvements including the safeguarding of the A127 corridor. A major aim of ECC is to improve journey time reliability along this route. There is significant growth planned along the A127 Corridor in adopted and emerging Local Development Plans along its entire route, which will need to be considered in any highway modelling in terms of capacity, key junctions and access from direct and access to side roads, if necessary. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England and Essex County Council in promoting the importance of improvements to the A127 Corridor and key junctions. Any potential impacts of additional development in the Borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. | Consider accordingly |
| 16336 - London Borough of Havering [85] | Comment | Havering remained concerned about the cumulative transport implications of further development in the A12 corridor, with a potential adverse impact on Havering's section of the A12, the A127 and the rest of Havering's road network, especially proposed development sites will add to the existing congestion and road safety problems at the Gallows Comer Intersection of the A12, A127 and Main Road (A118). | Concerns noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England and Havering Council in promoting the importance of improvements to the transport corridors in the borough (A12, A127, M25) and key junctions as well as cross border related issues. Any potential impacts of additional development in the Borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. | Consider accordingly |
| 15982 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | National infrastructure projects of relevance have been realised in the Governments Road Building Strategy which includes commitments to the A12, which seek to improve its long term reliability and capacity. Other national infrastructure projects of relevance include the Lower Thames Crossing following which a range of potential Implications / Opportunities need to be assessed and factored in to the further modelling in support of the Brentwood Local Plan, regardless of the LTC route. In respect of modelling Highways England, acknowledge within their consultation that further modelling is required, and this is strongly supported by ECC. ECC strongly agrees with the proposal for a new Crossing at Location C, east of Gravesend and Tilbury. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13119 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Comment | The two main terminus points of our two main transport corridors (A12 & A127) namely A12 junction w M25 (Brook Street) and A127 junction w M25 are used to capacity, especially Brook Street. We should not be adding more development (and thereby traffic growth) to Brentwood without improving traffic flows at Brook Street. The bottle neck already exists at peak hours. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England and Essex County Council in promoting the importance of improvements to the transport corridors and key junctions. Any potential impacts of additional development in the Borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. | Consider accordingly |
| 15761 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Acknowledged that the Draft Local Plan is an emerging document and that on-going commissioning and publication of evidence base is necessary to inform the next iteration of the Plan. The Council will need to be satisfied that the Local Plan is supported by a proportionate evidence base and that all reasonable alternatives have been considered. As part of 'duty to cooperate' ECC would seek further clarification needed on a number of issues with the Spatial Strategy: How the A127 corridor provides more opportunities for growth than the A12 corridor; Identification of any cross border implications of the spatial strategy given its role as highway, education, minerals and waste authority; and Identification of what infrastructure is necessary to deliver the spatial strategy, strategic and individual site allocations. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council on adjoining local authorities to identify where existing infrastructure may be affected and where new provision is needed as well as crossborder implications. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be published in greater detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15984 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Proposed Amendment to Policy 5.1, criterion b - ECC supports reference to development having no significant impact on transport, but this should be widened to refer to impact on: '.....transport (highway safety, capacity and congestion)' | Agree | Amend accordingly |
| 15929 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | 5.20 of the Draft Local Plan states that "Significant improvements to infrastructure and services will be required to support growth within the A127 Corridor". SO13 states that BBC will "secure the delivery of essential infrastructure, including transportation schemes and community facilities in order to support new development growth throughout its delivery". However WHPC note that there is no detail as to what this would entail, how it would be paid for and how it would be delivered. Given the high concentration of proposed development, this is an area which requires far greater evidence than that provided. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15546 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | The policy test of "no significant impact" on the aspects listed does not comply with National policy. The NPPF directs that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in "exceptional circumstances". To require "no significant impact" on the Green Belt is therefore considered over prescriptive and beyond the wording of the NPPF. It is considered appropriate that reference is made to the 5 Green Belt purposes. For visual amenity/environmental quality - Unless the NPPF directs that development should be restricted, for both plan-making and decision-taking, development should be positively sought unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. For Transport - The NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused whether the residual cumulative impact of development are severe. For Heritage -The test to be considered in the NPPF is whether such development would lead to substantial harm to/total loss of a heritage asset's significance, or less than substantial harm. | The requirements of the NPPF are noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 14287 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14288 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Object | Preservation of the Green Belt: The siting of this proposed large allocation would be especially detrimental to the Green Belt. The A127 corridor where both the large allocations are being proposed (the A127/M25 junction together with the Dunton Hills Garden Village plus contiguous development in Basildon) would come close to being a developed/semi development wedge through London's Green Belt. The Plan talks about retaining infrastructure to create 'defensible boundaries' to development but in fact the greatest defensible boundary there is to sprawl is a continuous and substantial Green Belt- the very designation that would be eroded by the Plan. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 13425 - D Westfall [5310] 14342 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Any assessment of development proposals at Dunton Hill Garden Village or West Horndon will need to take account of the any decision on the Lower Thames crossing. The most northern and easterly route path for a route for option C depending on the location may have implications for development proposals in terms of land - take south of the A127 and west of the A128. Has the possible impact of the proposed new Thames Crossing been considered at all? Can provision (height/width restrictions for example) be put in place to stop articulated lorries from using the A128 through Brentwood? | The Local Plan considers allocation in line with the preferred option. The Local Plan will continue to work with Essex County Council to consider the highways modelling in terms of mitigation options from this work. | Consider accordingly |
| 14351 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | The Brentwood section of the Mid Essex Landscape Character Assessment does not assess different scales of development. Furthermore the Mid Essex Landscape Character Assessment Sep 2006: Chris Blandford Associates Section 4 Character of Brentwood Borough description of open views to the south of Horndon Fenland, suggest the negative influence of "proximity of the area to a landscape which is more influenced by human activity around Thurrock and the Thames Gateway". This description does not properly reflect the character of the extensive fenland which is described in Thurrock Landscape Capacity: March 2005 Chris Blandford Associates as in having a " Rural character" and "Sense of tranquillity due to absence of major roads and built developed". | The Brentwood landscape evidence base is being updated and will be published and considered. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16029 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The Council should take account of previous under-delivery in identifying sufficient sites to meet housing requirements and also a 20% buffer in accordance with the NPPF. The significant housing allocations at Dunton Hill Garden Village and West Horndon will contribute to the Basildon's housing market area to a greater extent than the Brentwood housing market area due to the location of these sites relative to the main urban areas. Sites on the edge of Brentwood and Shenfield can make a greater contribution towards meeting local need for housing within the Brentwood housing market area. Additional sites on the periphery of the principal urban area of Brentwood and Shenfield should be allocated. | Noted. Plan will be informed by the OAN evidence and OAN updates and this includes consideration of previous shortfall. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. | Consider accordingly |
| 16087 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | West Horndon as a settlement capable of absorbing significant growth, has been strongly supported in the emerging Local Plan for Brentwood. A significant amount of growth can be focused on the settlement because it is relatively unconstrained by landscape and visual effects, and offers opportunities to mitigate the impacts of development by integrating them into the existing landscape. Green Belt releases are inevitable in the Borough in order to meet OAHN. In a Borough where 89% lies within the Green Belt, land at West Horndon, that has been the subject of years of intensive farming, represents one of the least attractive and lowest amenity parts of the Green Belt that could be released to meet housing and employment needs. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13674 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | I do not consider ANY release of green belt necessary. As previously described, a policy of requiring all new developments to be high-density, and not imposing a needlessly high target (the NPPF makes clear that the green belt is adequate defence against meeting an 'objectively assessed' target), would obviate the need for a single square metre of green belt to be lost. For example, building a few skyscrapers on top of the car parks at Shenfield station would go a long way towards meeting development needs, and would not unreasonably overload infrastructure, given the exceptionally good connections from Shenfield station. | Objection to development on Green Belt sites is noted. In considering new sites the Council will have regard to, among other things, settlement hierarchy and the role of key settlements, essential infrastructure requirements and impacts on existing residents. | Consider accordingly |
| 14283 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14284 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] | Object | Transport. The ability of existing transport corridors to accommodate growth needs careful and transparent examination rather than just being stated. Whether they can absorb focused growth any better than local roads could accommodate a more dispersed growth in traffic or need for other infrastructure is unsupported. The A127 and A128 often exceed capacity. Additional traffic will require road widening on the A127 and A128 and junction improvements. Whatever the situation this remains unsupported in the evidence base to the Plan. The location of the Dunton Hills Garden Village is adjacent to the boundary with Thurrock and very dependent of the A128 for connections to the south, but there is no evidence of cooperation with Thurrock. | Noted. Transport modelling will assess the potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough and informs the overall site assessment work. The Council will continue to work with Thurrock Council on cross border issues under the Duty to Cooperate. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14331 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | A127 corridor. The Brentwood Plan and supporting evidence identifies the requirement for additional employment land. However it is unclear why the employment sites (Policy 8.2) are proposed in the draft 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. | Noted. Employment growth is being encouraged in the existing main centres as well as other suitable locations. The transport corridors are identified as their use would reduce the transport impacts on unsuitable roads or within environmentally sensitive areas. The potential impact of future development on the road network and options for modal change within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. | Consider accordingly |
| 16083 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Representations made in 2013 include an SA of the land to the east of West Horndon out by consultants on behalf of Countryside Properties to address the absence of such assessment by the Council. This considers the issues of transport and access, landscape and design, and delivery and viability. Appendix 1 to the 2013 representations comprises a report by Rummey Design that explores a landscape-led urban extension to West Horndon. Representations submitted in 2015 provided further justification for growth at West Horndon and include a critique of other strategic growth options being considered by the Council, such as Dunton. The appendices to the 2015 representations include comprehensive assessment of a number of issues including transport, landscape and Green Belt Assessment, archaeology and ecology, to demonstrate that there are no overriding constraints to strategic growth at West Horndon. | Site information submission noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13702 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13704 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13855 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] | Object | There is not enough evidence put forward to show why over 1/3 of the Borough's allowance should be dumped where it goes against the rules of Green Belt, preventing Urban Sprawl, etc. Developing there, and the 500 homes planned for West Horndon, together with the unspecified number of traveller sites, etc, means that there will be virtually no Green Belt left between the London Borough of Havering and Southend. The case has not been shown that adequate facilities would be put in place for any development, prior to people living there, so they would rely heavily on the neighbouring borough of Basildon. It is the A12 that has the distinct possibility for growth, as that is where the improved A12 and Crossrail are, so that is where people want to live and work. | Noted. The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 16282 - Margaret Noonan [6186] 16341 - Miss Elaine Heaps [6189] 16347 - Mrs R Nash [6190] 16353 - Mrs B.I. Staerck [6191] 16366 - Brooke Williams [6193] 16374 - Ethan Williams [6194] 16381 - Mr William Shine [6195] 16389 - Sandra Halliday [6196] 16397 - Gary Howard [6197] 16404 - Mrs Winifred Wigington [6198] 16410 - Mr Christopher Saxon [6199] 16418 - Mrs A L Hobbs [6200] 16419 - Mr D Nash [6203] 16427 - Mr AC Hobbs [6201] 16434 - David Halliday [6204] 16441 - Mrs Rose Cuff [6202] 16446 - Mrs W Colhoun [6205] 16453 - Mrs Christine St Pier [6206] 16458 - Jean Williams [6211] 16468 - Mr William White [6213] 16477 - Sandra Carpenter [6214] 16491 - Mrs M Rimes [6207] 16494 - Mr James Noonan [6208] 16499 - Ms Michelle Hacks [6209] 16505 - Mr Anthony Smith [6210] 16518 - Ms Patricia Smith [6215] 16523 - Mr Pitman [6216] 16527 - Mrs Pitman [6217] 16528 - Mrs Pitman [6217] 16533 - Mrs H Bron [6220] 16538 - Mr Peter Broom [5952] 16543 - Mrs Sheron Broom [5965] 16549 - Mrs Diane Hilton [6221] 16554 - Mrs P Moore [6222] 16579 - Mr and Mrs Murrey [6227] 16584 - Mr Roy St Piere [6228] 16588 - Mr Barry Floyd [6229] 16631 - Ms Eileen Riley [6263] 16641 - Mr John Haly [6265] 16646 - Ms Judith Haly [6266] 16651 - Mr Charles Smith [6267] 16656 - Ms Margaret Smith [6268] 16661 - Ms Susan King [6269] 16665 - Ms Andrea Llewellyn [6270] | Object | <p>Very dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council is protecting the Green Belt and observing its aims. Added to the development plans of Basildon Council, the housing and industrial developments proposed would create an almost unbroken strip of development in the Green Belt along the A127, effectively joining Basildon to Upminster. Very dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council has taken care to protect the village of Dunton Wayletts. In the Draft Plan the Council states it wants to protect the Green Belt around its villages, however Dunton Hills Garden Village combined with the development planned by Basildon Council would remove all the Green Belt land around Dunton Wayletts.</p> | <p>Noted. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process.</p> <p>The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites however the capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance.</p> | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 16670 - Ms S Sutton [6271] 16675 - Mr S Sutton [6272] 16680 - Mr Ronald Mansfield [6273] 16685 - Ms P Mansfield [6274] 16690 - Mr Charles Williams [6276] 16695 - Mr Alan Webb [6275] 16700 - Mr Alan Carpenter [6277] 16704 - Mr Brian Spicer [6278] 16708 - Mrs Linda Spicer [6279] 16713 - Mrs Irene Miles [6280] 16718 - Ms Carol Brown [6281] 16722 - Mr John Turner [6282] 16727 - Mr David Bedford [6283] 16731 - Clive Bellingham [6284] 16735 - Mrs Maureen Bellingham [6286] 16739 - Jackie Diffey [6287] 16748 - Ms Emma Diffey [6288] 16751 - Mr R Calvey [6285] 16760 - Mr C Bowers [6289] 16764 - Mr M Hilton [6290] 16769 - Mr C Wheeler [6291] 16773 - Mrs A Hilton [6292] 16778 - Ms Brenda Scates [6293] 16785 - Mr Dennis Scates [6295] 16789 - Mrs Catherine Maguire [6218] | | | | |
| 14242 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council requests that more detail is provided as to how alternative locations have been considered before a further draft Local Plan consultation. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14281 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14282 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Object | Equity of approach. The most obvious location for growth is in Ingatestone to the south east of the railway line because the village has a railways station, good road connections, is already a small centre in its own right with retail and would benefit from further investment. Another opportunity is for increased growth in the north Brentwood area the investment from which could help provide an additional junction at the A12/A128. Such a junction would also have considerable benefit in relieving traffic problems in central Brentwood, Shenfield and Brook Street. | Noted. The Councils proposed allocations are informed by professional assessments based on robust methodology. The Council will be assessing further sites which have come forward during this plan consultation. These will inform the next iteration of the plan, its allocations and policies. The Council is working with both ECC as the Highways Authority and Highways England regarding transport issues. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15938 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Para 87 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") states that "inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in special circumstances." WHPC state that housing need alone does not necessarily represent special circumstances. | Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No action |
| 16442 - Mrs Rose Cuff [6202] | Object | Dissatisfied in relation to the likelihood / capability for the local road network to be improved sufficiently to handle the increased traffic. The new homes and industrial premises will add thousands more vehicles to the roads, on top of the traffic generated by Basildon's Plan. Roads such as the A127 already suffer regular congestion. Very dissatisfied in relation to the likelihood / capability of railway capacity to be increased sufficiently to accommodate the growth in passenger numbers. New homes proposed by Brentwood and Basildon Council will greatly increase the local population. The local railway service is currently overloaded at peak times. Very dissatisfied in relation to the ability for local medical services to sufficiently cope with the increased capacity generated by the additional residents. Very dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council have considered the impact that its plans would have on Dunton Wayletts, which is an important historical village. Very dissatisfied with the thought given to the risks associated with locating large housing development and schools in the Dunton area, which has extremely high levels of air pollution and is close to a major Accident Hazard Pipeline. | Noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council as well as other partner organisations to identify future needs of the borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 14104 - Mr Anthony Crowley [3147] 14466 - Asphaltic Developments Ltd [2664] | Object | The reuse/recycling of brownfield sites in Green Belt is identified as sequentially preferable sites than strategic sites or greenfield sites in Green Belt, the Local Plan's Spatial Strategy under Policy 5.1 does not reflect this sequential approach to meeting local needs (for which no definition is given and appears to be contrary to the NPPF referring to 'local needs' relative to the housing needs in rural areas). We therefore consider that Policy 5.1 should be amended, which is also necessary in order to ensure the effectiveness of Policy 9.11. | Disagree. The sequential approach is to prioritise urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt. Proposed sites will still be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. | No action |
| 13933 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | Para 5.19 - States " recently permitted development nearby to the village [Mountnessing] making a significant contribution to the Borough's needs", we object to the reliance on these sites; they do not make a "significant" contribution to the Borough's needs and they do not serve the needs of Mountnessing due to their physical separation from the settlement and lack of affordable housing provision. The Borough's housing need for the Plan period is 7,240 dwellings. At only 2.4% of the Borough needs, 172 homes cannot be said to be a "significant" contribution. | Disagree. The current OAN is 360 homes, 172 homes is therefore a significant portion of this annual target. The spatial strategy aims to meet the OAN annually and over the plan period. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15581 - Castle Point Borough Council (Steve Rogers) [4643] | Object | In terms of objectively assessed housing need, whilst a plan that will meet its needs is supported, there are concerns regarding the appropriateness of the locations of the strategic housing sites selected, for the reasons set out below. A significant proportion of the new housing sites are planned for locations outside the current urban areas of the borough. It is a laudable aim of the Plan is to protect the character of the suburban areas and villages; however, by directing new developments outside of these areas it is likely to give rise to issues concerned with sustainability. Travel and transport become significant issues, and there are no proposals within the plan for significant improvements in transport capacity to support dispersed growth, which in turn could have implications for the accessibility of neighbouring areas. | Noted. The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 14290 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14291 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] | Object | Preservation of the Green Belt: The first reason is that I believe that effective preservation of the principle and character of the Green Belt should be foremost in thinking. This is supported in 5.21 where it is stated that growth in the rural north and south will be limited to retain their rural character. I believe that a very large allocation would have a far greater effect on the Green Belt than more dispersed developments and particularly if those many smaller releases of the Green Belt were contiguous with existing development. | Noted. The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14279 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14280 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Object | Equity of approach: Believe the Dunton Hills Garden Village allocation would make the Plan inwardly inconsistent for the following reasons: It would not achieve the right balance in conserving the Borough's character (5.17); It would not meet National Planning Policy on the Green Belt (inferred in Policy 6.1); It provides an inequitable Plan for the people and the area of Brentwood Borough; It would not meet the objectives of the policy on managing growth (Policy 6.2); It would not meet the objectives of the policy on general criteria (Policy 6.3); It would likely overload the local road system. Many of the statements in 5.17 and 5.18 are unsubstantiated. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough does not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance. Development locations will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned, the results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. The Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of both existing and new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing provision of greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. | Consider accordingly |
| 14327 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 15333 - Ford Motor Company [3768] | Object | Crossrail should be thoroughly investigated for its potential role to accommodate further growth over the period of the local plan and beyond. The implications of the potential to accommodate more growth and associated infrastructure requirements need to be considered with some weight as a way of meeting the undersupply of housing requirement currently identified in the Brentwood Local Plan options and supporting evidence. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16033 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | The Brentwood Local Plan should seek to deliver a greater number of new homes than the DLP proposes. However, we would question the deliverability of even the reduced quantum based on the strategy currently proposed by the DLP. Of particular concern is the reliance placed on Dunton Hills Garden Village and on windfall to help meet housing needs | Noted. The Council will consider the issues raised in relation to meeting full Objectively Assessed Housing Need in light of National Guidance and evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| 15939 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | 5.22 in the Draft Local Plan notes that loss of just 1% of Green Belt "means development needs can be sustainably met in the Borough whilst Green Belt would still make up 88% of the total area". WHPC challenge that a small loss of Green Belt implies that development needs can be met sustainably - there are far greater elements of sustainability than simply considering what proportion of Green Belt is lost. WHPC also note that whilst the Borough as a whole would lose only 1% of its Green Belt, the local impact on West Horndon Parish and indeed the south of the Borough is far more material. | Noted. The Council acknowledge that impact on Green Belt is only one factor of considering sustainability. The on-going sustainability assessment work considers different sustainability facets for different development options. | Noted |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16179 - Anderson Group [2597] | Object | Object. The spatial strategy relates specifically the following: - Arbitrary blanket restraint to growth in the villages including Blackmore - The totality of development proposed in the Dunton Hills Garden Suburb. The Draft Plan's supporting material provides no evidence to support its stance that rural growth restraint would retain local character. The Landscape Character Assessment makes no such assertion that development would be detrimental in the rural area around Blackmore. The Retail and Commercial Leisure Study identifies the range of shops and facilities in Blackmore Village Centre as "providing an in-demand service" the Draft Plan acknowledges the role of the village local centres such as Blackmore as playing a "vital role in providing day to day services". But the Draft Plan's blanket restriction on growth assumes that such development would have negative consequences without evidence to back up the assertion. | Noted. The Draft Plan aims to achieve the balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 14567 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | Policy 5.1 could be suitable to deliver appropriate development within larger villages only if additional sites were allocated for housing in these locations within the local plan. The current proposals, which limit development in otherwise suitable locations due to the current Green Belt boundaries, are considered to be too restrictive and inflexible to help meet the housing needs of the Borough and restrict the ability of larger villages to grow to meet their population requirements. Land such as land at Salmonds Farm, Ingrave, [Site Ref. 067A & B], should be allocated as a suitable site for development, which is able to fulfil the policy expectations set out in Policy 5.1. In combination with the reliance on Windfall sites and the Dunton Garden Village, it is perverse that the Council has not allocated larger villages for a greater quantum of development where sites have been assessed as being suitable, available and achievable. | Noted. The Draft Plan aims to achieve abalance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self-sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. This site is not considered to fulfil the requirements of the Brentwood spatial strategy. | Consider accordingly |
| 14277 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14278 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] | Object | An alternative approach: A more dispersed growth model can be used to efficiently use existing infrastructure capacity possibly with little intervention whereas large development will inevitably require greater use of investment in needing to solve problems created by the development. With a revised hierarchy of development (Figure 5.4) as suggested above together with a strategic aim to provide growth in transport corridors, this would favour a Strategic policy based on: Increased and intensified development in existing developed areas; Development of brownfield sites in Green Belt adjoining existing urban areas and within reach of services; Extensions of existing development into Green field sites based on their appropriateness to services facilities transport and other infrastructure; Medium scale allocations at the place with railway stations: Ingatestone, Shenfield and West Horndon. | Disagree. The Council's Spatial Strategy is set out in the Draft Local Plan and aims to balance local character and meet housing needs in consideration of existing and potential infrastructure. | No action. |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15226 - Billericay Action Group (Mr Alasdair Daw) [4284] | Object | Billericay Action Group objects to Brentwood Borough Council meeting its Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). The Council is not obliged to remove any land from Green Belt, and the Appendix is included to reinforce that point. Brentwood can build around 2500 homes without Green Belt loss and this is the minimum Brentwood are obliged to build. This is far more than the borough's local needs (Natural Change\Growth) of 1200-1560 homes over the Plan period, so if the AN is met a large majority of homes would be for incomers. We would prefer Brentwood to use Green Belt as a constraint to meeting OAN and so produce a sub-OAN Housing target of 2500. Meeting the OAN effects SE Essex in a number of undesirable ways, including the unnecessary creation of Dunton Garden Suburb on the edge of Basildon. (Detailed appendix attached). | Disagree. National Guidance sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No action |
| 15040 - Lisa Atkinson [2991] | Object | Sustainable development in the West Horndon area should be limited to less than 500 new homes, these would still need infrastructure expenditure. Redevelopment of West Horndon industrial estates would reduce the HGV traffic. However, it would still double the homes in West Horndon. 500 or more additional cars would also have an impact. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 16101 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | As referenced at paragraph 5.20, we do not consider the Dunton Hills garden Village Suburb would achieve the Council's Spatial Strategy in that the plan lacks evidence confirming the timescales for key developments through infrastructure delivery and lack confirmation from relevant stakeholders that the delivery can be accomplished. We therefore consider the policy is not effective on cross-boundary strategic priorities. | Noted. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 13110 - Mr B Horrocks [4058] 13484 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 14243 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 14269 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] 14599 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 14710 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 15840 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] 16289 - Dunton Community Association [6184] | Object | The A127 has very little social infrastructure and there are no plans for secondary schools near the A127 in Brentwood. It is highly unlikely that any improvements in capacity for the A127 or the nearby rail tracks can be funded for completion within the timescale of this local plan. The emerging local plans of Basildon will already place enormous extra strain on the infrastructure along the A127. The A12 corridor has more potential to accommodate further growth over the period of the local plan with almost all health care facilities and secondary schools located along it, it also received the benefit of transport infrastructure investment e.g. Crossrail and A12 widening. | Disagree. Much of the borough infrastructure has reached capacity. The existing provision and therefore the need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is developing and consulting on a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 13932 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | Strongly object to the strategy to rely on a new settlement to deliver such a large proportion of growth. Smaller allocations increase the flexibility that is in supply, attract smaller house building companies who will not be present upon larger strategic sites, ensure that there is variation in the timescales over which sites can be delivered. 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 less complex issues to address at planning application stage. Object to the decision not to allocate any sites surrounding Larger Villages, specifically at Mountnessing. Strong opinion that being a sustainable settlement in the A12 corridor Mountnessing should be treated in the same way as Ingatestone and West Horndon and allocations for a modest level of development should be made. | Noted. The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. | Consider accordingly |
| 16180 - Anderson Group [2597] | Object | All of the available evidence points to the acceptability of rural housing in line with national policy and practice guidance. But the Plan disregards all of this in favour of a strategy proposing rural restraint which is not led by any evidence. This approach is likely to have serious unintended negative consequences for wider sustainability objectives in the rural but this goes unappreciated by the Draft Local Plan because it has not been drafted with an understanding of such issues. The proposed policy of rural restraint is therefore unsound because it is not consistent with national policy, not based on adequate evidence and is unjustified, contrary to paragraph 183 of the Framework. | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14350 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | The A127 corridor sits within an important large fenland landscape character area, which extends across part of Brentwood, Havering and Thurrock authorities. The character assessments undertaken for Mid Essex including the Brentwood section do not reflect the importance of this open landscape. This fenland has been recognised by the Thames Chase Heritage Lottery Fund as a 'distinctive landscape character worth conservation' and has been identified by the CPRE as a nationally significant area of tranquillity in the metropolitan greenbelt. The urban edges of Brentwood and Basildon are set back from the steeper slopes and screened with woodlands from views across the fenland. The settlements of Upminster and South Ockendon are identifiable in distant views to the east and south-east. There are built features within the open fenland character which do not significantly impact the value of the area but may lower the quality or condition of smaller local character area and field by field character assessments. It is highly likely from the outcomes of landscape capacity studies that any development greater than discreet infill plots would significantly harm the landscape character. | Noted. Consideration of landscape is only one constraint used in considering development proposals. The Draft Plan spatial strategy is based on a combination of evidence which allows a more comprehensive picture of the most sustainable places for growth. Brentwood Borough Council will continue to work with Thurrock Borough Council on cross boundary issues. | Consider accordingly |
| 14285 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14286 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] | Object | * Competitiion to Brentwood Town Centre. Dunton Hill Garden Village would create a new urban centre which would divert use of facilities and reduce footfall in Brentwood and hence be detrimental to the economic sustainability of Brentwood Town Centre. | Disagree. The scale of the village centre at Dunton Hills Garden Village will not be comparable to Brentwood Town Centre. However the Council will consider the development at these sites is complementary rather than competing. | Consider accordingly |
| 14352 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | West Horndon Village retains a rural settlement character in the open landscape despite the relatively modern style of residential buildings and rural-urban fringe clutter that is disproportionate to the scale of the settlement. The east of the village, particularly the north- east, has a more intact and important rural landscape character. The larger fenland landscape character area would be affected by any further development. It is considered that development of the scale of the Dunton Hill Garden Village or Garden Suburb or an extension east of West Horndon will significantly harm the open rural character of the broad fenland and the setting of rolling farmland and wooded hills of Thurrock. | Development will be brought forward in locations and in ways which respect the character of West Horndon village. The Council has set out its intentions that the local community will play a central role, alongside others, in determining the eventual form of development. Brentwood Borough Council will continue to work with Thurrock Borough Council on cross boundary issues. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15358 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15378 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15399 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15463 - Mr Martin Morecroft [6091] 15483 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15561 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15607 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16158 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16185 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | Generally support spatial strategy but concerned that proposed housing allocations will not deliver the vision or the quantum of dwellings required to meet OAN. Allocations inconsistent with the 'evidence base' that the Council has failed to undertake a comprehensive review of Green Belt boundaries. As such, the Council cannot demonstrate that the proposed strategy and housing allocations minimise the impact on the Green Belt. Consider the Local Plan unsound. The Council's working draft Green Belt Assessment does not appear to have informed policy. The Policy also states that limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas; however this is not evident within the Draft Local Plan allocations as published for consultation. | Noted. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt. Policy 5.1 Spatial Strategy considers infilling. | Consider accordingly |
| 14544 - Mr Richard Swift [1747] | Object | Object to spatial strategy, villages in the north need growth, support a semi-dispersed model and incremental growth to enable sustainable communities. The borough has not considered the A414/M11 corridor which is to the north of Brentwood Borough. | Noted. The Draft Plan aims to achieve the balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 14241 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council requests that more detail is provided as to how such Green Belt release is to be undertaken before a further draft Local Plan consultation. | Noted. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt, and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Noted accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14292 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14293 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Object | The Spatial Strategy is dependent on two seriously flawed ideas that (especially 7.6) and is therefore flawed itself: The idea that eroding Green Belt by virtue of an urban development protects it. A well planned designed and executed development is better than one that is not but it doesn't contribute to the Green Belt purpose of restricting urban sprawl. The idea that infrastructure routes such as the A12, A127, A128 and railway being defensible boundaries to unrestricted urban sprawl. One of the main purpose of the Plan is to decide where development will or will not be permitted to occur, therefore it is entirely in Brentwood Borough's gift as to how much land on the currently undeveloped site of a road or railway should be released. It is abundantly clear that roads, railway lines, etc are not inherent defences. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance, this will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned, the results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. Site allocation should be made based on location, area characteristics and site circumstances, as informed by evidence and in line with the NPPF. The site assessment is an iterative process and sites will be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability inline with evidence as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 14332 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 14333 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 14334 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 14341 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 14349 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | A127 corridor: Large strategic Green Belt development such at Dunton Hill Garden Village or the Dunton Garden Suburb or at West Horndon or in combination will have significant harm to the openness and function of the Metropolitan Green Belt as it meets the purposes of the Green Belt, particularly in combination with the West Basildon Urban extension and the Brentwood Enterprise Park) at Junction 29. The A127 is at capacity and does not represent a better road transport alternative to the A12. Any larger development is going to require additional road infrastructure investment to improve access. There is limited public information currently available in order to consider highway capacity impacts at this stage. | Noted. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. The cumulative impacts of development are being considered and evidence base including identification of necessary mitigation. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough is being considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. | Consider accordingly |
| 13563 - Anne Clark [4973] 13565 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | ANY impact on green belt land is significant for the wildlife in that area. 1% is still a lot of green belt land to destroy. What about the wildlife that live in that 1%? | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 14388 - Mr Alan Shaw [4564] 15186 - Punch Taverns [6067] 15557 - Epping Forest District Council (Mr Ken Bean) [6095] | Support | Support proposals, sensible strategy. Proposal to develop in areas where transport systems and good roads are already in existence and able to handle extra housing is paramount, given that much of the rural areas are not well served with these facilities. Prioritising brownfield development is essential and we would thoroughly support. As our borough is 89% green belt any area that has been developed before are now available for development must be an absolute priority. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|-----------|
| 13518 - Ms Patricia Taylor [2288] 13603 - Historic England (Mr Michael Stubbs) [5648] 13723 - Mr. and Mrs. T.E. Smith [1619] 14011 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] 14023 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] 14360 - Mrs Sandra Keeble [5033] 14391 - Mr Alan Shaw [4564] 14586 - Childerditch Properties [2642] 14656 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] 14965 - Ursuline Sisters [28] 15142 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] 15212 - Spire Hartswood Hospital [6074] 15343 - Countryside Properties [250] 15510 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] 15547 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15692 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 15755 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] 15934 - CALA Homes [5237] 15964 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] 16070 - Martin Grant Homes [2691] 16152 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] 16200 - South Essex Partnership University NHS Trust [2555] 16559 - Ms M Holloran [6223] 16564 - Ms Jennifer Holloran [6224] 16569 - Mr Patrick Holloran [6225] 16574 - Ms Daniella Holloran [6226] 16753 - Mr. Barrie Stone [1745] | Support | Support the Council's approach. The council has recognised the need to provide housing on a range of sites, both within urban areas, where possible and in appropriate and sustainable locations within the Green Belt. We support the clear and integrated approach of selecting a range of sites which link back to the evidenced and justified spatial strategy in policy 5.1. This is noted in paragraph 5.41. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Key Diagram | | | | |
| 13148 - Alexandra Hammond [5372] | Comment | With the exception of the land off Doddinghurst Road on either side of the A12, I agree to the proposals for the building of more properties. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13384 - Mrs Helen Gillings [5559] | Object | Please note that new development must provide appropriate social facilities (schools and GPs). Please include at appropriate point in the plan how the Brentwood District Authority will monitor and ensure these facilities are developed in line with proposed residential developments. With reference to the plot of land parallel to the A12 designated "and new jobs", this must be described with clear specificity to prevent inappropriate filing of development plans and ensure any development meets with the requirement laid out in Section 9+10 of the Local Plan. With reference to Ingatestone Garden Centre, the landscape buffer needs to be both sides of Roman Road, and not just alongside the A12. A general comment: not sufficiently specific in plans wording - leading to problems in the future. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to work with partner organisations to identify the future needs for the borough such as educational and health care facilities. Planning applications for proposed development would need to demonstrate that there would be no unacceptable effect on health, the environment or amenity. | Consider accordingly |
| 14249 - Mrs Jill Saddington [2549] | Object | LDP remains too focused on the A127 corridor and Brentwood council needs to reconsider A12 corridor and North of the Borough. Shenfield has 4 track railway with the coming of Crossrail, West Horndon has 2 track railway and no room for more tracks there. Transport network will not support proposed development of Dunton Garden Village. A127 already at full capacity, A12 being upgraded to three lanes. Proposed Dunton Garden Village will link London to Basildon and create ribbon development. Loss of Green Belt. We must protect Brentwood villages. Very low support for development at Dunton but the Council continues to ignore this. There are other potential sites such as the fields opposite Running Waters, spread the allocation around the Borough, not just this area. | Noted. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13485 - Mrs Hannah Parish [5590] | Object | Pollution resulting in poorer health in the area; Road clogged with cars and lorries leading to more pollution; Infrastructure cannot take anymore housing; and Brentwood schools cannot take that amount of children. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council as Local Education Authority to determine what additional education facilities will be needed as a result of planned future development. | Consider accordingly |

Figure 5.6. A12 Corridor: Shenfield

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14762 - Mr. Stuart Giles [2625] | Comment | A particular site that could sustain some housing development could be the Industrial Estate at Wash Road, Hutton which could help alleviate the burden on the A127 corridor. | Noted. The Council will be assessing further sites which have come forward during this Plan consultation. These will inform the next iteration of the plan, its allocations and policies. | Consider accordingly |
|---------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------------|

Figure 5.7. A12 Corridor: Mountnessing

| | | | | |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15988 - Mountnessing Parish Council (Mr Andrew Stephenson) [5632] | Comment | In total, if all developments suggested (including those recently given outline permissions) go ahead then the Parish size will increase substantially, perhaps by as much as 50% or more. MPC consider that before embarking on further developments an infrastructure review is needed to ensure that services (water, sewage, electricity, gas and communications) are fit for purpose. Furthermore, the Mountnessing primary school is currently near capacity and there is no doctor's surgery in the village. | Noted. Further work is being done on the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan to inform the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15992 - Mountnessing Parish Council (Mr Andrew Stephenson) [5632] | Comment | Overall, the key message from Parish Council is the need to view the totality of current and future proposals (as many as 250 additional properties added to an existing housing stock of around 500) and to locally review infrastructure provision. The overlap to Ingatestone probably warrants that this be done jointly. It is important that Brentwood BC recognise the relative impact of cumulative community expansions and look at these holistically rather than individually as they arise. | Noted. Further work is being done on the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan to inform the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15989 - Mountnessing Parish Council (Mr Andrew Stephenson) [5632] | Comment | It is acknowledged that much of the LDP developments proposed, although within the MPC boundaries, fall on the Ingatestone side of the A12 and will impact Ingatestone probably more than Mountnessing. Nevertheless there will be knock on to other Mountnessing residents through the additional pressure on Ingatestone facilities. It is noted that the LDP does not take much account of the circa 170 properties planned between Thoby Prior and the Old Scrapyard site which are clearly within Mountnessing. | Noted. Impacts of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15987 - Mountnessing Parish Council (Mr Andrew Stephenson) [5632] | Comment | Mountnessing village values its status within the greenbelt and it is important that this is maintained whilst accepting the need for housing growth in the locality. Any further convergence with Shenfield and Ingatestone should be avoided There is close proximity to Brentwood although for many services e.g. doctors, shops, and telephone exchange the village taps into the resources in Ingatestone. Historically the size of the village was not of sufficient critical mass to warrant certain provision. However, with proposals within the LDP and other plans currently in hand to build estates of houses within the Parish boundaries this status needs proper review. | Noted. Further work is being done on the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan to inform the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15990 - Mountnessing Parish Council (Mr Andrew Stephenson) [5632] | Comment | MPC are keen that planners ensure that developments put forward provide a range of housing types as there is a dearth of smaller affordable properties which will allow local first time buyers or older residents to continue to inhabit the village. The ability to be residentially mobile within the village is contributory to retaining a community 'feel' and identity. Another contributor to this sense is the ability for locals to be employed where they live. Most developments planned seem to be on former commercially used land thereby reducing opportunities. The temptation to allow developers to build high density estates should also be avoided . | Noted. Policies in the Draft Local Plan aim to support quality housing of a mix of types, sizes, and tenure, which will and meet the identified Brentwood need. | Consider accordingly |
| 15991 - Mountnessing Parish Council (Mr Andrew Stephenson) [5632] | Comment | Other local considerations include traffic and parking. The B1002 (Roman Road) is a key relief route for the A12 with traffic levels also up whenever rail work takes place on the East Anglia line. Parking facility is generally inadequate within the village and this coupled with the heavy traffic has been contributory to many collisions. | Noted. Issue is being considered as the Plan progresses. | Consider accordingly |

Figure 5.8. A12 Corridor: Ingatestone

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14496 - Lynda Goddard [687] | Object | 42 New homes will have an adverse effect and employment land adjoining will make it worse. Traffic and traffic safety will get worse. Where will access be? A12 isnt suitable for access. The employment use could bring lorries or a fast food outlet which would mean more congestion, noise and litter. Roman Road is used when the A12 is busy or diverted, concerned congestion will get worse. | Noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. | Consider accordingly |
| 13146 - Mrs Jean Sleep [5373] | Object | Ingatestone is a village, it was always intended to be a village, and not become a linear town connecting Brentwood through to Chelmsford, making it a 'ribbon development' on the A12 corridor! | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13804 - Mrs Christine Parker [5510] | Object | Overall you the planner are gradually turning this village into a town, which I strongly object to. The plan makes no comment on developing support services ie. schools, dentists, doctors etc which are already operating at full capacity. Using every green or unused piece of land means that the wild life we see now will be gone. On top of this the places for parking are shrinking eg the back of the Crown where people park to go to the Post Office + where the URC Nursery. | Noted. Development will be brought forward in locations and in ways which respect the character of villages. The Council has set out its intentions that the local community will play a central role, alongside others, in determining the eventual form of development. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| Figure 5.9. A127 Corridor | | | | |
| 15553 - Rochford District Council (Natalie Hayward) [6094] | Comment | A127, A130 and A13 forms part of the strategic road network for South Essex. Any development proposed in proximity to these corridors should be accompanied by adequate mitigation measures. Two strategic development sites are proposed within the vicinity of the A127 corridor to the south east and south west of the Borough. Unclear from the Draft Local Plan what mitigation measures would be required to accompany significant development in this location. Strongly recommended that any future iterations of the Local Plan are clearly accompanied by appropriate mitigation measures. This will ensure proposals would not detrimentally impact the A127. | Noted. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence on impact of the Plan. Initial results have been published. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Mitigation options will be considered as appropriate. Updates to this will be published alongside the next version of Local Plan consultation and kept under review as the plan-making process progresses. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15930 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | Policy 6.3c states that "Proposals for development will be expected to meet all of the following criteria - ensure the transport network can satisfactorily accommodate the travel demand generated and traffic generation would not give rise to adverse highway conditions or highway safety concerns or unacceptable loss of amenity by reason of number or size of vehicles". The size and scale of development proposed for the A127 corridor at present, would not be supported by existing infrastructure in particular, transport infrastructure. The A127 is already severely congested, as is the A128 at rush hour. Additionally, any development east of the A128 would not be readily served by a train station and indeed, the C2C trains at West Horndon are already above capacity. All in local transport south of the Borough is severely strained, and whilst investment may help alleviate some of this problem it is hard to see how i) the train capacity could be upgraded sufficiently noting wider development along this line, and ii) the A128 could be expanded to support intra-Borough car journeys. We also re-iterate that Highways England and Essex County Council have not supported an A127 widening scheme in relation to development alone. | It is acknowledged that road infrastructure capacity is a great challenge in Essex and the South East. Unfortunately these constraints alone are not sufficient for the Council to not meet local development needs. Whilst new development will inevitably add pressure to existing networks it can also be a means to receive financial contributions towards required mitigation for improvement works. In terms of the A127, evidence suggests there is greater capacity within Brentwood than the A12, particularly where both roads meet the M25 (junction 29 compared with junction 28). There is also an opportunity for widening and mitigation work, such as junction improvement. Work is ongoing with Essex County Council and adjoining authorities in South Essex to identify needs and mitigation solutions. By comparison the A12 acts as a by-pass for Brentwood, access to and from the A12 and Brentwood is limited to locations at the east and west. This means improvement to vehicle movement in central areas of Brentwood is severely restricted by existing development. However a balance is required to accommodate new development, which is how the Draft Local Plan spatial strategy aims to spread development proportionately to sustainable locations more able to accommodate growth. No option is easy, but difficult decisions are required if development needs are to be met. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13978 - Bulphan Community Forum (Mr David Gilbane) [5626] | Object | Local Plan not very local when of the proposed 5000 new homes 3000 are to be located in just 2 developments at the extreme edges of the borough. People in them will not see themselves as part of Brentwood. They will gravitate towards other areas or centres. These developments along with the proposed Enterprise areas in the A127 corridor will put too much strain on the junction of the A127 and the M25. There is no provision for improvement whereas the A12 is being improved. | The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. There is greater option for widening and mitigation to the A127 than the A12, where existing development severely restricts flexibility. Draft Local Plan spatial strategy aims to spread development proportionately to sustainable locations more able to accommodate growth. | Consider accordingly |
| 14637 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14813 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | With regards to infrastructure, it was noted that the consultation ignored the A128 which is the key link between the A127 Corridor and Brentwood. Additionally, concentrated development within the A127 Corridor would simply exacerbate expected further strain on the Shoeburyness to Fenchurch Street rail line, with authorities all the way up this line expected to build extensively around it. | Comment noted. Work is ongoing with Essex County Council and C2C regarding transport in the A127 corridor. | Consider accordingly |
| 15047 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] | Object | Sustainable development in the West Horndon area should be limited to less than 500 new homes, these would still need infrastructure expenditure. Redevelopment of West Horndon industrial estates would reduce the HGV traffic. However, it would still double the homes in West Horndon. 500 or more additional cars would also have an impact. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | No action |
| 14761 - Mr. Stuart Giles [2625] 14794 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540] 15041 - Lisa Atkinson [2991] 15048 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] | Object | The Draft Local Plan has consistently ignored potentially viable alternative sites focusing primarily on the A127 Corridor. The road and rail set up is already running at near capacity. The A12 corridor should be considered for housing as some of the infrastructure required to support additional housing is already being put in place such as the A12 being upgraded to 3 lanes, with the A12 Corridor also benefiting from Crossrail. | Sites need to be viable, available and deliverable. The impact of development and constraints are considered by the Council. There is greater opportunity for widening and mitigation work, such as junction improvement along the A127 than the A12. Work is ongoing with Essex County Council and adjoining authorities in South Essex to identify needs and mitigation solutions. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14657 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] | Object | Question whether the BBC stated need to meet objectively assessed housing needs justifies using green belt land for housing development. Whilst the Borough as a whole would lose only 1% of its Green Belt, the local impact on West Horndon Parish and indeed the south of the Borough is far more material. The policies proposed within the Draft Local Plan will actually contribute to urban sprawl and ribbon development along the A127. | The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 14823 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] 15039 - Lisa Atkinson [2991] | Object | Question whether the BBC stated need to meet objectively assessed housing needs justifies using green belt land for housing development. Whilst the Borough as a whole would lose only 1% of its Green Belt, the local impact on West Horndon Parish and indeed the south of the Borough is far more material. The policies proposed within the Draft Local Plan will actually contribute to urban sprawl and ribbon development along the A127. | Noted. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt and this will further inform the future stages of the plan making process. Development options will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 14632 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14809 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] 15044 - Lisa Atkinson [2991] 15049 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] | Object | Flood risk had not been addressed for any of the sites. It is clearly a major problem for the A127 Corridor. | The risk of flood and mitigation are being considered by the Plan in line with evidence. Flood risk has been and will continue to be taken into account in selecting sites and bringing forward development in a way which mitigates the risk. | Consider accordingly |
| 15042 - Lisa Atkinson [2991] 15942 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Unclear whether all available and suitable brownfield sites have been considered eg the Childerditch Industrial Estate has not been considered despite it being brownfield land in what is BBC's stated preferred transport corridor for development. | The Local Plan has to consider economic development as well as new homes and the Childerditch Industrial Estate is considered suitable for consolidating employment use, particularly as part of the employment grouping in the vicinity of the Enterprise Park. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13739 - Mr M. Saddington [1273] 14399 - Mrs D Middleton [5639] 14631 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14808 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] 15037 - Lisa Atkinson [2991] 15302 - Transport for London (Mr Oscar Wong) [6078] | Object | The A127 corridor is also earmarked for a degree of development in the draft plan; however it is obvious this corridor does not enjoy the same level of public transport connectivity as the A12/GEML corridor. As such there is a concern that, without improvements to public transport and given high car ownership levels in the borough, growth here may increase car commuting and add to congestion on the TRLN. Therefore development should fund the necessary improvements to public transport, walking and cycling to ensure the objectives of the NPPF, in terms of choice of modes of travel, are met. Limiting development elsewhere in the borough where it is unlikely to be viable to serve by public transport will also help in this respect. | It is acknowledged that road infrastructure capacity is a great challenge in Essex and the South East. Whilst new development will inevitably add pressure to exiting networks it can also be a means to receive financial contributions towards required mitigation for improvement works. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. This is drafted in consultation with infrastructure providers. | Consider accordingly |
| 14797 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540] | Object | The biggest flaw to this plan is route 4 Lower Thames Crossing. How the draft plan came about without consulting Highways England is gross incompetence. This route cannot be dismissed. It is a viable option. A plan B is much needed. Urgently. | The Draft Plan was prepared in consideration of the preferred option of Lower Thames Crossing consultation. Should this option not be put forward the Plan would be revised in light of the new route. This will be kept under review as the plan-making process progresses. | No action |
| 15046 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 15940 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | The area of land making up the A127 Corridor is a small strip of land sandwiched between Upminster (London) and Laindon (Basildon). The proposed extensive development of the A127 Corridor would essentially create a ribbon development linking London and Basildon and be very detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt at this location. | Noted. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt and this will further inform the future stages of the plan making process. Development options will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 14256 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] 14398 - Mrs D Middleton [5639] 15045 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] | Object | Impact of development will be significant and will adversely the Green Belt and existing services. The A127 is a pinch point for traffic and running at capacity new development here will exacerbate the problem. If significant work is required to improve services how is the proposed sustainable? | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence on impact of the Plan. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Mitigation options will be considered as appropriate. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|-----------|
| 13228 - Mr Colin Downey [4243] 14604 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] | Support | * I support the concept of the J29 Employment Cluster. It will be particularly good for employment that requires significant HGV activity. * Need to ensure that there is sufficient public transport access to the site | Noted | No action |
| Hierarchy of Place | | | | |
| 15549 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Housing should be largely proportionate and appropriate to each settlement and greater in number for the larger settlements that would be able to accommodate, and provide for, sustainable growth. Therefore whilst we do not dispute that Hutton, Warley, Brook Street and Pilgrims Hatch are sustainable and can support new development, it should be recognised that Brentwood and Shenfield are the most sustainable locations and can accommodate higher levels of growth. It is therefore suggested that Brentwood and Shenfield are defined as Category 1A settlements and the remaining settlements as Category 1B to make this distinction and to also support the approach contained within the Policy 5.1 | Disagree. Identification of appropriate sites does not rely purely on Category of settlement but considers more diverse opportunities and constraints to ensure the sites are available, viable and deliverable. | No action |
| 16315 - Mr Adam Smith [6115] | Comment | With regard to the spatial strategy the significant contribution of 2,500 new homes cannot realistically be provided within settlement category 1, namely the main town of Brentwood, settlement category 2 namely the village service centres such as Ingatestone (noting that Dunton would be so categorised in due course) nor settlement 3 namely the larger villages or settlement category 4 namely the smaller villages. | Noted | No action |
| 16041 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | The inclusion of Hutton within Settlement Category 1 suggests it is an appropriate and sustainable location to direct a proportion of growth towards. However, it is unclear how the settlement hierarchy has informed the selection of sites for development within the DLP. | The settlement hierarchy serves to help suggest where might be best placed to accommodate growth in a sustainable manner. It does not ensure sustainability of sites. In selection and allocation process, sites will still be assessed for their availability, deliverability, viable and sustainability as required by the NPPF | No action |
| 15119 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Para 5.24 - Support the Council's approach to a hierarchy of place and using it to help suggest where might be best placed to accommodate growth in a sustainable manner. | Noted | No action |
| 15926 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Support | 5.32 of the Draft Local Plan states that "it will be important to retain the settlement (West Horndon) as a village and not over-develop in order to be consistent with the proposed spatial strategy. This is a statement WHPC fully agrees with | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|--|
| Settlement Category 1: Main Town | | | | |
| 15548 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Question the designation of Hutton, Warley, Brook Street and Pilgrim Hatch under the Main Town category. | These areas are part of the Brentwood Urban Area. This is defined in Local Replacement Plan 2005 as it was in Local Plan before this date. These areas are physically connected so it will be illogical to create artificial boundary between them. Whilst these areas are all individual communities, in planning terms they're physically linked and surrounded by Green Belt. | No action |
| 13413 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Do not use Green Belt. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt in line with the Council's Spatial Strategy. | Consider Green Belt options accordingly |
| Settlement Category 2: Village Service | | | | |
| 14660 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Comment | It is noted that the Council's aim is to allow West Horndon to be re-categorised as a Category 2 settlement. This will reflect its changing role as the redevelopment of the industrial estate for residential use comes forward. However, the reference to "later in the Plan period" gives some concern, not least because of the Council's new stance on precisely when the new housing should be phased. | Noted | Issue will be considered as part of new consultation |
| 14955 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | The draft Plan states that Dunton Hills Garden Village is likely to result in the new settlement being brought into category 2 of the settlement hierarchy. However a centre of the scale of Ingatestone will need to be considered in the context of the facilities and services also being proposed for the West Basildon Urban Extension (H10) to ensure new local centres within the A127 corridor are complementary. The masterplan exercise can begin to address topics of this nature but the Local Plan will need to set employment land and retail floorspace requirements. Policy 5.4 (Retail and Commercial Leisure Growth) states that new local retail provision will also accompany mixed-use development at Dunton Hills and para 5.77 recognises that new retail provision will need to complement rather than compete directly with the existing local shops. This principle should apply to planned and existing centres in Basildon also. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14662 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Para 5.30 - The references to the development of West Horndon within this paragraph are supported. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|--|
| 15138 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Para 5.30 - Support the council's intention to identify Dunton Hills Garden Village as a Category 2 Village Service Centre. The Garden Village will be developed with sustainability as a core principle of its planning and delivery. Creating a self-sustaining village with the provision of community facilities. The scale of the proposed development will enable the careful planning and delivery of space, facilities and links as an integral part of the new village. This approach compares favourably with the alternative of imposing large scale growth on existing settlements not designed to accommodate substantial extension. | Noted | No action |
| Settlement Category 3: Larger Villages | | | | |
| 14667 - Mrs Maureen Slimm [5042] | Comment | Blackmore has experienced significant development since the 1960s, which is evident through the continual expansion of the local primary school. Feel that the land that is left should be protected and not leave the surrounding area open to those wishing to build even more and become unsustainable. | The Local Plan spatial strategy has identified sites in the borough to meet the identified housing need. Development in villages to the north of the borough will be considered in line with this spatial strategy and will be limited to rural infill in line with the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15304 - Thorndon Park Golf Club Ltd. [157] | Object | In Paragraph 5.33 the Local Authority proposes no amendment to the Green Belt boundaries surrounding larger villages. However, it is quite clear that there are a few small sites which if promoted for development would not have any impact on the character of the Borough or its important larger villages and which could make an essential contribution to the longer term needs of the Borough. We suggest inserting the following words: "Where a small scale development is considered appropriate as logical rounding off without harm to the character of the village, any such site will be considered for development where it is brought forward early in the Plan Period". | Noted. The Draft Plan's spatial strategy aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider suggested amendment accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 14551 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] 15197 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Object | There should be recognition that some of the villages are more sustainable than others and therefore, warrant some development. The villages of Ingrave and Herongate as well as Mountnessing are the least sustainable of the larger villages: they have very limited services and are linear in nature so further development would disrupt the pattern of development. In Mountnessing village, the redevelopment of Thoby Priory is sufficient to sustain the village over the plan period. In terms of services and facilities, Blackmore, has significantly more services than the other villages identified within the same settlement hierarchy group. However, as a result of the lack of development over recent years, the services within the village are under threat. Without the residential development to sustain such services, they will close and the quality and sustainability of the village will come under pressure. In addition Blackmore has capacity to accommodate additional primary school places. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14663 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Support Para 5.32 [West Horndon] | Noted | No action |

Settlement Category 4: Smaller Villages

| | | | | |
|---|---------|--|-------|----------------------|
| 14408 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | Errors observed on Page 42 of the LDP. Hook End and Wyatts Green are not separate villages as implied in the "Cat 4 smaller villages" table but are wards of Blackmore Parish Council and are within the Blackmore Parish Council area. Stondon Massey and Navestock (which are separate parished areas) are missing altogether. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13414 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Support | I presume you include us at Havering's Grove in this section and will therefore allow NO development on greenbelt. We have poor transport links, rubbish broadband, no shops and no medical facilities. Do not allow any more building here. | Noted | No action |

New Homes

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15332 - Catesby Property Group [6081] | Comment | Strategic objectives of the Plan include to maintain high and stable levels of economic growth; and economic development is one of the overarching priorities. It should also be recognised that housing development has intrinsic economic benefits. This includes employment relating directly to the construction of the development, and jobs relating to the supply chain. Housing development also engenders local economic benefits relating to additional local expenditure. It is important that the economic growth aspirations of the Local Plan and the housing growth policy support, rather than contradict, one another. | Noted. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with economic benefits of housing development, is kept to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 14397 - MRS LESLEY LYNN [5591] | Comment | While we support the plan NOT to build on the site behind Hatch Road and adjacent to beads Hall Lane, we wish you to consider the following in future as to why building on this land will never be acceptable (see attachment for list). | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13135 - Mr David Charles [5361] | Comment | The borough already has too many houses and the addition of low cost housing and particularly flats is changing the structure of the borough and will increase the population to uncomfortable levels. I do not support the planned annual increase in housing. | Disagree. The Objectively Assessed Need identifies a need for new homes. The Council is required to meet the identified housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance. | No action |
| 16460 - Joint Owners of Land at Coxie Green Road Brentwood [6212] | Comment | There is a need for a higher proportion of two bedroom units. There is a substantial and continuing unmet need for low cost housing in the Brentwood area. Low cost housing is likely to be smaller one and two bedroom units. The delivery of these smaller units within the market sector will be important in addressing a more balanced type and size stock mix. | The need for a diverse housing supply is noted is supported by evidence | Consider accordingly |
| 14116 - Mr Paul Hawkins [2959] | Object | There will be insufficient infrastructure for the dramatic increase in population that you are proposing. No new hospitals or hospital expansions are budgeted for planned. No new secondary schools are budgeted for or planned. No major road improvements are budgeted for or planned. More people will mean more congestion, more pollution and a serious degradation of quality of life for Brentwood residents. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 15331 - Catesby Property Group [6081] 15901 - Kitewood [6116] | Object | The Council has determined the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough to be 362 dwellings per annum, informed by the SHMA 2013 and OAHN 2014. The OAHN for Brentwood, however, also considers the delivery of 411 dwellings per annum as a feasible housing target for the Borough. It is not clear on what basis this level of growth has subsequently been rejected by the Plan. This contradicts with the NPPF which states that Local Plans should have regard to market signals, that Local Planning Authorities should seek to significantly boost the supply of housing, and that they should seek to meet unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. | The Council will consider the issues raised in relation to Objectively Assessed Housing Need in light of National Guidance and evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| 14541 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | Para 5.44 - The Council is 'keen not to rely on windfall'. However, the approach adopted within the DLP appears to do just that. The expectation of a high level of windfall is not based on evidence and not reasonable to predict a high supply of unallocated development to be delivered in later years. The Council's reliance on windfall is inappropriate and would not accord with the NPPF. | Noted. As part of the plan review we will reconsider the issue with further consultation and in light of new evidence. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14517 - Home Builder's Federation [144] | Object | Para 5.37 - Un-persuaded by the argument that the ONS has built-in a higher migration propensity. There is no evidence to support this claim. We note that neighbouring Basildon Council is not advancing this claim. Instead it has increased its OAN above the 2012 SNPP. We consider that Brentwood should do likewise. Even if migration with London is accounted for by the latest projections, there is still the problem of London's unmet need. The paucity of supply in London relative to the need will mean that relatively more affluent households will move to Brentwood. As a consequence the local affordable housing need will probably increase more sharply than the SHMA evidence currently suggests. | Noted. Development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will be updated in line with population projections. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 13806 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612] | Object | Policy should be determined according to the views/opinions/wishes of the residents, if necessary by holding a legally binding democratic referendum, and not by Central Government dictate. The Draft Plan only addresses "supply" and ignores "demands". The overwhelming problem is over-population - neither the world as a whole, the UK, nor Brentwood Borough can absorb or accommodate ever increasing population. The genuine concerns of existing residents should at all times take priority over the vested interests of developers. | Noted. There is already an unmet need for homes for people in the UK as well as in Brentwood and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. All comments are considered in full as part of the Plan development and site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14513 - Home Builder's Federation [144] 15330 - Catesby Property Group [6081] | Object | The notion that Brentwood is a self-contained district really lacks credibility. The local plan and the OAN report attest to the district's strong inter-connectivity with London and Essex. We consider that Brentwood should be considering a joint-SHMA based on an HMA with Basildon, Chelmsford and Epping Forest. An HMA based on this area could use a SHMA that applies consistent assumptions relating to migration to and from London, reflecting the Mayor of London's demographic assumptions that have shaped the London Plan. The local plan must make allowance for above trend household formation in Brentwood as a consequence of the London Plan and London's acute housing need. | Noted. Development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these areas (and strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA). | No action |
| 16314 - Dunton Community Association [6184] | Object | The Plan allocates 35% of the Authority's OAN to the Dunton area. Such a proposal is clumsy in the extreme and does not represent proper and thoughtful planning. The Plan is unbalanced in that it fails to distribute the loss of Green Belt land evenly throughout the borough. The Authority allocates 63% of its Green Belt release at Dunton in the absence of Green Belt assessment. 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. Basildon Council, which the Authority sees fit to exploit, already faces insurmountable infrastructure problems. The landscape assessment of the area south of the A127 is misguided. | The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. The cumulative impacts of development are being considered through the Duty to Cooperate and evidence base including identification of necessary mitigation. Work is ongoing to consider these issues across administrative boundaries and with Essex County Council. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16141 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | The draft plan states that the 'objectively assessed housing need' of the Borough is 362 homes per year, although there is no specific evidence source for this, only a vague assertion within Policy SP2. The only conceivable evidence source in the Council's possession for this figure is the "Objectively Assessed Housing Need" document dated December 2014. This document states that it: "does not seek to promote a housing target for Brentwood [...] the housing target should be informed by a wider base of evidence than population, household and economic projections" and that "more work will be needed to confirm the final OAN once the 2012 CLG projections have been released and Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA) have completed the final round of Essex wide analysis (EPOA Phase 7 by Edge Analytics)." It does not appear that the additional work to form a final OAN has been undertaken. | Noted. The purpose of the OAN is not to promote a housing target, but to identify a NPPF compliant housing needs figure for Brentwood which helps the Council to set its housing target. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that considering housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | No action |
| 14516 - Home Builder's Federation [144] | Object | Para 5.37 - The OAN figure has been prepared without the benefit of the DCLG 2012 Household Projections and therefore the Council is likely to need to do more work on the OAN, taking into account more recent household projections as well as the implications of the London Plan. The 2012 SNPP does not provide adequate compensation for the Major's migration assumptions. Moreover, the projections are trend-based so there would still need to be an increase in supply above the trend level in Brentwood to compensate for potentially higher numbers of people moving to the borough as well as fewer people leaving to live in London. | Noted. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date to further inform the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 13677 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | The NPPF makes very clear that 'objectively assessed' need is not legally binding, and that green belt considerations take precedence (see particularly paragraph 34 of the Planning Practice Guidance). For this reason, I object to the simplistic and ruinous plan for 'New Homes' set out here. Greater consideration also needs to be given to having higher densities of housing (previous , and a presumption against allowing any developments of detached and semi-detached houses, since they are a very inefficient use of land. | Noted. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14115 - Mr Paul Hawkins [2959] | Object | The proposal, for housing, caters for 80% of people that do not reside on this borough. There is absolutely no need to build on greenbelt and greenbelt is a constraint for housing targets. The proposals are a full on assault on the greenbelt and creates a precedent for the greenbelt to be frittered away in subsequent LDP's over 10-15 years. Be like Castle Point Council, who have refused their proposed Local Development Plan, and fight for the wonderful environment current residents and I enjoy. | Noted. There is already an unmet needs for homes for people in the UK as well as in Brentwood and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No action |
| 14143 - Ms. Jean Dormer [2715] | Support | Agree would like to see the village primarily kept as a village, but would welcome something that would fit in IE perhaps some bungalows, an old peoples home or a small development. Also has the village got infrastructure? | Noted | No action |
| 13134 - Mr. Michael R. M. Newman [1823] 13232 - Mr Colin Downey [4243] | Support | Support the policy for the building of new homes. | Noted | No action |
| Policy 5.2: Housing Growth | | | | |
| 14520 - Home Builder's Federation [144] | Comment | The OAN Assessment 2014 considers that no adjustment for market signals is warranted because prices in Brentwood are no worse than the national and local indicators. We question the Council's decision not to adjust its supply to help counter issues of affordability in view of the observation in the draft plan about the problems of housing affordability. | Noted. The Council will ensure that evidence such as that dealing with housing needs will be kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. Plan will be informed by the OAN evidence and OAN updates. | Consider accordingly |
| 14944 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Our client supports the principle of development on land designated as a Strategic Site in Policy 7.1. Our client's site is capable of delivering approximately 200-250 new homes at a density of between 30-35 dwellings per hectare. Development on our client's site would represent almost 10% of supply for the entire Strategic Site. To deliver this level of growth over the plan period Policy 7.1 must be flexible and allocate sufficient land for the plan period. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15857 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756] | Comment | Policy states that provision will be made for 7,240 new homes to be built in the borough between 2013-2033. Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd welcome this proposed housing target which will help to address the borough's housing needs. | Support welcomed | No action |
| 15764 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Should refer to the ECC Independent Living programme and its role in housing delivery should be considered in progressing the Plan. | Noted | Amend accordingly |
| 14969 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Comment | The deliverability of the Strategic Site within the Plan Period is questioned. Included within this is Windfall Sites which are identified within Policy 5.2 as contributing 14%. The text (page 47) makes it clear that windfall makes an allowance for small scale development. Given the dwindling supply of brownfield land within the urban area and the inherent unpredictability of the availability of windfall sites, it is not necessarily appropriate to continue to predict the availability at historic rates of provision. Against the backdrop of a relatively high proportion of housing supply overall, greater emphasis should be placed within the Local Plan on the importance of all windfall sites, regardless of their size, acknowledging the cumulative effect that even the smallest of sites providing 1 or 2 units, will have on housing supply and achieving the growth set out within Policy 5.2. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14410 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | There are a large number of dwellings that are to be provided under the "windfall" allowance. Concerned that, when the 255 non allocated housing and employment sites are studied this could lead to a planning blight in those areas listed because all housing conveyance processes now ask for details of potential development in the area. The Parish Council recommend that the non allocated site list is refined, using the proposed LDP policies, to shortlist sites to meet the majority of "windfall" needs, rather than let a potential 10 year planning bun-fight start once the plan is adopted. | The Council will publish technical evidence relating to windfall allowance when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 14518 - Home Builder's Federation [144] | Comment | We agree that a figure of 330 hpa should be adopted as the starting point for Brentwood (as established in paragraph 5.30 of the OAN report). However, there is a possibility that the projection favoured by the Council is still just a trend-based projection, albeit one showing increased net internal migration, but one that would still require adjustment upwards to compensate for the Mayor of London's own demographic assumptions. It is not entirely clear from the OAN report how the Council alighted upon the figure of 362 dwellings per annum (dpa) as being representative of the OAN. | Noted. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. Plan will be informed by the OAN evidence and OAN updates. | Consider accordingly |
| 15753 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | It is considered that the provision of a number of strategic residential and employment locations in or close to the town centre could help to encourage sustainable travel and reduce the pressure on the highway network, which is welcomed. In particular, development located in close proximity to Brentwood Rail Station is welcomed as it could encourage long distance trips to shift away from private car use. The A12 highway corridor also runs alongside the railway corridor and therefore the railway provision could help reduce the reliance of new residents and employees on private vehicle use. | Noted. Consider comment in light of opportunities and constraints for development within the borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 15537 - Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093] | Comment | The Mayor welcomes the Borough's approach to meeting its housing need and agrees with its conclusion for further work related to London. The Council may also wish to assure itself that proposals for a garden village are congruent with national policy on Green Belt development. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14550 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | The starting point for Brentwood is to meet their lower OAN. Basildon Borough Council are also proposing to meet their lower OAN and may have unmet need over the plan period. The Plan should have a clear understanding of how housing need will be met within the SHMA area to ensure the plan is positively prepared in accordance with the NPPF. | Noted. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 14377 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | The SHMA also defines the housing market area for Brentwood as the borough based on evidence of a high level of self-containment. Government guidance states that SHMA areas are unlikely to reflect borough boundaries unless a high level of containment is demonstrated. Whilst Thurrock is not part of the same SHMA area it is considered the evidence provided for self-containment of the Brentwood SHMA is questionable as it relies on data from a limited period of house moves in the sub-region which may distort the level of self-containment. Also population migration and household data demonstrate significant flows into Brentwood over short and longer periods from London. It is considered the SHMA market area should be reviewed to assess its robustness and spatial geography. The SHMA is also based on the now out of date 2007 SHMA guidance. | Noted. Development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these areas (and strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA). The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 13950 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | It does not appear that any non-implementation allowance is included so in order to meet the objectively assessed need every single extant consent, allocation, permitted development and windfall allowance must come forward during the plan period in order to meet the minimum need requirement. Para 5.43 & 5.44 - suggests that the highest densities possible have been assumed in site allocations and the housing trajectory. If the Plan relies on the highest densities possible or appropriate being used for the allocated sites it cannot be a sound approach to include the potential for higher densities as the only contingency in housing numbers. | It's recognised the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply, given this, the Council is considering the availability of housing sites in Borough through the allocation and phasing of housing sites in the emerging Local Plan, in line with evidence. The Council will continue to monitor and update its five year supply position annually. | Consider accordingly |
| 15400 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | Para 5.9 states that: "it was proposed that the Borough [...] not meet the full objectively assessed housing need". BBC must be satisfied that it has identified the full OAN for the Borough, before considering its ability to meet such need in respect of the NPPF policy constraints. The Plan should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of its area. This is particularly important given that a number of surrounding authorities have confirmed, via representations to the previous iterations of the Local Plan, that they would not accept any shortfall from BBC within their own boundaries. In this regard, BBC should be striving for as high levels of growth as possible. | Noted. Para 5.9 discussed the Council's Preferred Options 2013 consultation as part of the evolution of the Spatial Strategy. Since then the Council aimed to meet full objectively assessed needs of 362 homes per year, in line with the NPPF. The target level of growth will be informed by the OAN evidence and OAN updates as well as other evidence, in ways to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15907 - Kitewood [6116] 16102 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | A strategy which seeks to deliver 19% of its overall housing requirement on Windfall sites cannot be considered sound, in line with NPPF paragraph 48 which states that 'compelling evidence' to justify its inclusion has been identified. The reliance on a strategic site at Dunton Hills Garden Village for 2,500 units should be approached with caution as it is highly unlikely this site will be delivered in the plan period and this is therefore not an effective policy. Housing growth provision is not based on up-to-date or reliable evidence. The Council should consider updating its SHMA and undertaking further work on the OAN in understanding further how the Council has arrived at this growth requirement. | Noted. The Council will publish technical evidence relating to windfall allowance when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. Regarding the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village, further site assessment and testing will be undertaken. | Consider accordingly |
| 15143 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Object | We would recommend that the policies relevant to housing in particular remain as flexible as possible and constantly under review. At the very least, policy 5.2 should be amended to ensure the provision of 7,240 new homes in the plan period and the annual average of 362 homes is recognised as a minimum. We suggest an amendment to the first paragraph as follows: "Provision is made for a minimum of 7,240 new residential dwellings (net) to be built in the borough over the plan period 2013-2033 at a minimum annual average rate of 362 dwellings per year as follows..." | Noted. The target level of growth will be informed by the OAN evidence and OAN updates as well as other evidence, so as to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. | Consider accordingly |
| 13949 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] 14974 - Ursuline Sisters [28] 14988 - Mrs N. Blake [1602] 15189 - Punch Taverns [6067] | Object | Object to the over reliance of windfall sites. The cited number of windfall sites is significant and has not been fully justified by the Council. It was based on the 'historic rate' that relies upon a period without an up to date local plan and where the housing target was suppressed. Instead of the over reliance upon windfall sites, the Council should include more Greenfield urban extensions in the Green Belt. Windfall Sites identified within Policy 5.2 as contributing 14%. Given the dwindling supply of brownfield land within the urban area and the inherent unpredictability of the availability of windfall sites, it is not necessarily appropriate to continue to predict the availability at historic rates of provision. Against the backdrop of a relatively high proportion of housing supply overall, greater emphasis should be placed within the Local Plan on the importance of all windfall sites, regardless of their size, acknowledging the cumulative effect that even the smallest of sites providing 1 or 2 units, will have on housing supply and achieving the growth set out within Policy 5.2. The deliverability of the Strategic Site within the Plan Period is questioned. | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will reconsider the issue with further consultation and in light of new evidence | Consider accordingly |
| 13567 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | 18% of new housing is going to be built on green belt land??? This is a ridiculous amount! On the one hand you say it will only be a little bit, but 18% is NOT a little bit! | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance therefore at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14519 - Home Builder's Federation [144] 14549 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | The proposed plan does not account for migration from London. The 2014 PBA OAN Study confirms that it does not consider migration from London in identifying the OAN but supports an OAN of 360dpa. The Council should consider whether this is consistent with the NPPF. | Noted. Development of housing market areas in the vicinity of Brentwood has confirmed the suitability of the Brentwood SHMA in relation to the NE London strategic housing area, the Thames Gateway South Essex area, the M11 sub-region and Chelmsford City. The Brentwood OAN will consider the movement between these areas (and strategic development in the south of the borough will be considered as part of the Brentwood SHMA). | No action |
| 14378 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Both the recently published Brentwood SHMA and Economic Future reports will need updating to reflect the new OAN based on 2012 (and 2014) published demographic data. This will especially be the case if the OAN is significantly different from the current assumptions about the level of dwellings required for Brentwood Borough over the plan period. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14376 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 14966 - Ursuline Sisters [28] 15361 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15381 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15409 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15473 - Mr Martin Morecroft [6091] 15486 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15564 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15611 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16028 - Countryside Properties [250] 16162 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16188 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | Support the approach to provide for the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) within Brentwood boundary. However it is considered that the current SHMA and evidence base for the OAN needs updating with new population projections as they and the OAN are likely to rise. It is also recognised that further work on the second stage of the SHMA is currently being undertaken to assess affordable housing and specialist housing needs requirements. Updates to both parts of the evidence base may alter the OAN and the overall housing requirement for the plan period and the level of affordable housing. Government should be publishing the 2014 set of sub national population projections (SNPP) in May 2016. It is acknowledged that the dwelling requirement will need to include any shortfall from previous years. The new OAN figure should form the basis upon which to take forward the draft local plan strategy, the policies and site allocations (and should be subject to further consultation). There is also a significant question mark over the deliverability of the Strategic Site at Dunton Hills and its ability to deliver within the Plan period. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13675 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | There is no need to encroach upon the green belt -- require new developments in the urban area to be high-density, and that would solve the problem. There would be no shortage of buyers. | Disagree. The capacity of urban sites do not meet the requirements indicated by national guidance therefore the Council are considering additional options. Types of homes and densities need to be appropriate to the location of the site. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16280 - Margaret Noonan [6186] 16340 - Miss Elaine Heaps [6189] 16346 - Mrs R Nash [6190] 16352 - Mrs B.I. Staerck [6191] 16365 - Brooke Williams [6193] 16372 - Ethan Williams [6194] 16380 - Mr William Shine [6195] 16388 - Sandra Halliday [6196] 16396 - Gary Howard [6197] 16402 - Mrs Winifred Wigington [6198] 16403 - Mrs Winifred Wigington [6198] 16409 - Mr Christopher Saxon [6199] 16416 - Mrs A L Hobbs [6200] 16417 - Mr D Nash [6203] 16426 - Mr AC Hobbs [6201] 16432 - Mrs Rose Cuff [6202] 16433 - David Halliday [6204] 16445 - Mrs W Colhoun [6205] 16449 - Mrs Christine St Pier [6206] 16457 - Jean Williams [6211] 16467 - Mr William White [6213] 16476 - Sandra Carpenter [6214] 16484 - Mrs M Rimes [6207] 16493 - Mr James Noonan [6208] 16498 - Ms Michelle Hacks [6209] 16504 - Mr Anthony Smith [6210] 16517 - Ms Patricia Smith [6215] 16522 - Mr Pitman [6216] 16531 - Mrs H Bron [6220] 16537 - Mr Peter Broom [5952] 16542 - Mrs Sheron Broom [5965] 16548 - Mrs Diane Hilton [6221] 16553 - Mrs P Moore [6222] 16578 - Mr and Mrs Murrey [6227] 16583 - Mr Roy St Piere [6228] 16589 - Mr Barry Floyd [6229] 16630 - Ms Eileen Riley [6263] 16635 - Mr Colin Wordley [6264] 16636 - Mr Colin Wordley [6264] 16640 - Mr John Haly [6265] 16645 - Ms Judith Haly [6266] 16650 - Mr Charles Smith [6267] 16655 - Ms Margaret Smith [6268] 16660 - Ms Susan King [6269] | Object | <p>Very dissatisfied that Brentwood Borough Council proposes to located over one third of its new housing on the edge of their border next to Basildon, with the effect that the burden (e.g. infrastructure) will fall on the Borough of Basildon. Very dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council are proposing to spread housing need across the Borough.</p> | <p>Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl.</p> | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16664 - Ms Andrea Llewellyn [6270] 16669 - Ms S Sutton [6271] 16674 - Mr S Sutton [6272] 16679 - Mr Ronald Mansfield [6273] 16684 - Ms P Mansfield [6274] 16689 - Mr Charles Williams [6276] 16694 - Mr Alan Webb [6275] 16699 - Mr Alan Carpenter [6277] 16703 - Mr Brian Spicer [6278] 16707 - Mrs Linda Spicer [6279] 16712 - Mrs Irene Miles [6280] 16717 - Ms Carol Brown [6281] 16720 - Mr John Turner [6282] 16726 - Mr David Bedford [6283] 16730 - Clive Bellingham [6284] 16734 - Mrs Maureen Bellingham [6286] 16738 - Jackie Diffey [6287] 16746 - Mr R Calvey [6285] 16747 - Ms Emma Diffey [6288] 16752 - Mr. Barrie Stone [1745] 16759 - Mr C Bowers [6289] 16763 - Mr M Hilton [6290] 16767 - Mr C Wheeler [6291] 16772 - Mrs A Hilton [6292] 16776 - Ms Brenda Scates [6293] 16783 - Mr Dennis Scates [6295] 16784 - Mr Dennis Scates [6295] 16788 - Mrs Catherine Maguire [6218] | | | | |
| 13800 - Mr. Baldwin [917] 13833 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13844 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13856 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] 14476 - Mr Steven Miller [5906] | Object | Object to Green Belt development, especially on Green Belt south of the A127 then they will exacerbate the breach of Green Belt rules, by increasing the urban sprawl from the London Borough of Havering to Southend. | The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance therefore the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15309 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Object | The housing completions have been below target since 2012 and are unlikely to meet the new target until 2018, a projection that we would regard at best as hopeful. We believe the problem stems partly from promotion of sites by the Council through the Local Plan process that either have little hope of being implemented or at least are subject to serious constraints. We believe the Local Plan as it stands runs a serious risk of being found unsound against national policy as set out in the NPPF's paragraphs 14 and more recent Central Government advice. | Disagree. Sites promoted through the draft Local Plan are considered available, viable and deliverable. Further information supporting this will be published for the next iteration of the Local Plan. | No action |
| 15757 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Object | The latest AMR identifies a shortfall of 460 dwellings over the 2 year period, the Draft Plan does not appear to make any allowance for this shortfall which is not compliant with the NPPF. | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will reconsider the issue with further consultation and in light of new evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| 15362 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15382 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15410 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15475 - Mr Martin Morecroft [6091] 15487 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15567 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15613 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16163 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16189 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | The Council's working draft Green Belt Assessment does not appear to have informed policy. No justification within either the Assessment or the Draft Local Plan, as to the reason why those 'low-moderate' sites have not been allocated and whilst it is appreciated that some of those 50 sites within the 'Low' or 'Low to Moderate' criteria are not appropriate for housing development, being either in employment use, or having already been developed, the Council's failure to explain why the Evidence Base does not influence the housing strategy makes the Plan, at present, unsound. | Noted. The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. In allocating sites the Council will have regard to: settlement hierarchy and the role of key settlements; the need to phase development; essential infrastructure requirements; and flood mitigation amongst other issues and constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 15251 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | Recommended that the supply of sites is re-considered because the sites set out in Policy 5.2 are not deliverable over the plan period and therefore would not achieve the housing target. This means that assuming there is no change to the housing target, sites to deliver an additional 1,500 new dwellings must be identified. ecommended that a 10% discount for non-delivery is applied to extant permissions, permitted development and windfall allowance. During the plan period only 50% of the strategic site can reasonably be expected to be delivered reducing supply from this source to 1,250 units. Therefore recommended that the site at Sawyers Hall Lane is added to the Greenfield Urban Extensions in Green Belt sites to help meet the housing target. The Draft Local Plan should be positively prepared and the housing sites set out in Policy 5.2 must be effective. | Noted. The Council will have regard to the need to phase development. The site assessment is ongoing and will confirm the availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15234 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | There are 3 areas which the Council should consider in more detail in order to provide an assessment of the OAN need for market and affordable housing as required by the Framework. These are: Market Signals. The PBA Study shows that housing delivery has exceeded past housing targets, and based on analysis of a range of indicators suggested that there was not automatically a basis for making an upward adjustment to figures to respond to market signals. We suggest that this is inconsistent with the evidence. Affordable Housing Need. Council's evidence indicates 234 affordable homes per year. PPG makes it clear an increase in the total housing figures included in the local plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes. There is limited evidence that the Council has considered this issue to prepare the Draft Local Plan. And impact of Crossrail. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 13571 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] | Object | I object this is greenbelt & no exceptional circumstances. A127 & A128 & Billericay road at standstill every morning & evening; no infrastructure in place; hospitals = Basildon black alert = GP surgeries & schools playgroups & pre schools oversubscribed; No need for this housing & no proof; and not affordable housing. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. Noted. The Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of both existing and new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. In addition Essex-wide evidence is to be published soon, which the Council has been involved in preparing. | Consider accordingly |
| 13694 - J A [5672] | Object | I object to development on green belt when previous consultation documents identified the increased population in Brentwood as migratory. By its very nature a migratory population can move to available housing anywhere. Therefore it is incorrect to identify a need to provide additional housing for such prospective residents as they can move to where supply exists rather than forcing unnecessary development of protected green belt spaces and fuelling sprawl. | Disagree. The Brentwood OAN considers the migratory movement to inform the plan making process. The Council is seeking to meet its OAN. | No action |
| 14392 - Mr and Ms J. Hicks and A. Maxwell [5911] | Object | LPA should seek to consolidate its strategic sites on a larger scale. If not the already over burdened services will suffer further. Government has made it clear, that lack of a Five Year Housing Land Supply is not reason enough to allow for development on the Green Belt. The expectation on the LPA is to work out their OAN and then see where it can be accommodated, if at all. To have Draft Plan Policy 5.2 suggest 18% of new housing will be urban extensions in the Green Belt is unacceptable. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance therefore the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. The Council will be assessing further sites which have come forward during this plan consultation. These will inform the next iteration of the plan, its allocations and policies. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|---|
| 13954 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] 15855 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Object | The housing trajectory does not demonstrate a five year supply. Assuming 2017-2021 is taken to be the relevant five year time period from adoption, those sites contained within the trajectory, plus extant permissions, class C2 completions, the permitted development allowance, and windfall allowance, total 1,737 dwellings. 200 of these deliveries would be from Dunton Hills Garden Village which we consider highly questionable. Furthermore, we question whether the trajectory is deliverable due to the reliance on deliveries from Dunton Hills Garden Village. According to the trajectory, Dunton Hills Garden village needs to start delivering housing in 2019, only two years after adoption of the Plan and deliver 200 dwellings in the first five years following adoption. The site has no existing services and facilities whilst supporting infrastructure will take long time to deliver. This site should therefore be excluded from the Plan or reliance on the delivery of this site should be reduced. | It's recognised the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply, given this, the Council is considering the availability of housing sites in Borough through the allocation and phasing of housing sites in the emerging Local Plan, in line with evidence. The Council will continue to monitor and update its five year supply position annually. | Consider accordingly |
| 13116 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] 13415 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | The proportion of the contribution from Brownfield land in the GB at 1% is woefully low. We have poor grade GB land that is typically sites of redundant for businesses such as construction yards, Civils yard and garden centres that could be developed and the council is currently overlooking or presuming against these. | Noted. The Council will be assessing further sites which have come forward during this plan consultation. These will inform the next iteration of the plan, its allocations and policies. | Consider accordingly |
| 16108 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | At a very late stage in the preparation of the plan DHGV resulted from a failed attempt at cross-boundary development with Basildon to create a large Garden Suburb. DHGV is not a realistic option for strategic growth. The site boundaries and details of the development proposed are not sufficiently distinct to identify the sustainability implications or allow meaningful comparison to be made with the alternatives for growth, such as land at West Horndon. | Noted. The proposed allocation at DHGV to provide new self-sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure has been informed by site assessment. Evidence is being considered and further site assessment and testing will be undertaken; the result of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other opportunities constraints. | Issue is being considered as part of new consultation |
| 13581 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] 15229 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] 16057 - Martin Grant Homes [2691] | Object | Object to the policy to deliver only the minimum objectively assessed need for the Borough. Firstly, the OAN should be a minimum requirement. Secondly, the policy should identify sufficient sites to not only meet, but exceed, this requirement. Finally, the housing trajectory supporting this policy demonstrates sufficient deliveries over either the first five years of the plan period or the entire plan period. This Policy is considered too restrictive and does not actively encourage housing growth as required by the NPPF. | Noted. The Draft Plan aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council will consider the issues raised in relation to meeting full Objectively Assessed Housing Need in light of National Guidance and evidence. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16965 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The DLP should include full and realistic targets for the growth of homes and jobs in line with the latest government guidance. The Council should proceed swiftly to ensure a plan is in place by 2017 if it wants to avoid intervention by the government. The Local Plan for Brentwood should consider full OAN for market and affordable housing, which now needs to reflect the government's latest initiative towards building 400,000 affordable homes, of which 50% should be starter homes. To cater for such initiatives and meet new 'delivery tests' that are proposed in further reforms, the Plan must look to higher targets than previously considered. It must include an up to date supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a rolling five-years worth of housing plus an additional buffer of 5% to 20%. (Those plans found sound at examination and referred to in the NLP report tended to show an extra 20% provision of new homes above the household projections) | Noted. The objectively assessed housing needs assessment published in December 2014 is considered to be the most up to date evidence and is NPPF compliant. It is considered that the need for 360 homes per annum can be sustainably accommodated in the Borough, albeit not all on brownfield land given the finite capacity of available sites and 89% of the Borough being Green Belt. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. | No action |
| 16125 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Providing jobs in line with the past long-term trends would generate a need for 411 dwellings per annum. This would represent a more appropriate OAN for Brentwood as it would align housing supply in accordance with the long term trends in the economy. | Noted. The Council will consider evidence to inform the Local Plan. The current evidence base does not support this level of development. | Consider accordingly |
| 13112 - Ms Julia Rogers [5346] 13554 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] | Object | What medical infrastructure is in place to support a further influx of residents? Since the Base complex was populated it now takes almost a month to get an appointment with a GP and the same for a local dentist. What about local NHS hospital services? There's only so much the Community Hospital can cope with. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 13993 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14066 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14094 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] 14257 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Object | Of the 7,240 new dwellings, some 2,500 will be built at Dunton, with a further 500 at West Horndon and over 900 seen as Windfall sites. This equates to over 40% of new dwellings being situated along the A127 and a further 14% not yet accounted for. The 14% figure is high, with the Council's stringent policy on building in the Green Belt it is difficult to see where the Windfall sites will come from. In the Appendices the Windfall allowance is heavily weighted to the latter years of the draft plan. No windfall allowance is shown from 2015-2021, how can a Draft Plan not allow for Windfall for 7 years? | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will reconsider the issue with further consultation and in light of new evidence | Consider accordingly |
| 15858 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Object | The Council should take account of previous under-delivery in identifying sufficient sites to meet housing requirements and also a 20% buffer in accordance with the NPPF. The significant housing allocations at Dunton Hill Garden Village and West Horndon will contribute to the Basildon's housing market area to a greater extent than the Brentwood housing market area due to the location of these sites relative to the main urban areas. Sites on the edge of Brentwood and Shenfield can make a greater contribution towards meeting local need for housing within the Brentwood housing market area. Additional sites on the periphery of the principal urban area of Brentwood and Shenfield should be allocated. | Noted. The Council are assessing sites which have come forward during the development of the plan. This considers opportunities and constraints in line with the requirements of availability, viability and deliverability of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|-----------|
| 14557 - Mr Danny Barry [4996] | Object | We don't have to build 5-6,000 houses on greenbelt and recent rulings reflect this. Brentwood cannot fulfill any alleged housing targets due to greenbelt constraints which are a material restriction as demonstrated in recent planning cases and, in January 2016, by Castle Point Council. 80% of Brentwood's growth, to 2033, is estimated to be from people moving into Brentwood Borough. Brentwood's Metropolitan greenbelt acts as a green lung to neighbouring London. London is a low density city able to withstand further growth | Disagree. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance therefore the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 13233 - Mr Colin Downey [4243] 14012 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] 14664 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] 15139 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] 15188 - Punch Taverns [6067] 15344 - Countryside Properties [250] 15559 - Epping Forest District Council (Mr Ken Bean) [6095] 15759 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] 15894 - Mr Adam Smith [6115] 15965 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] 16558 - Ms M Holloran [6223] 16563 - Ms Jennifer Holloran [6224] 16568 - Mr Patrick Holloran [6225] 16573 - Ms Daniella Holloran [6226] | Support | Support the Council's approach to identifying its objectively assessed housing requirements. It demonstrates the council's approach to positively preparing the DLP. The council has recognised the need to provide housing on a range of sites, both within urban areas, where possible and in appropriate and sustainable locations within the Green Belt. We support the clear and integrated approach of selecting a range of sites which link back to the evidenced and justified spatial strategy in policy 5.1. This is noted in paragraph 5.41. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| Housing Trajectory | | | | |
| 13761 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [4967] | Comment | Using brownfield sites to use as building land only to then move industry to the Green Belt seems counter intuitive. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 15261 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] 16059 - Martin Grant Homes [2691] | Object | The Council cannot demonstrate five year housing land supply. Our assessment [see full representation] concludes that Brentwood has less than 2.5 years housing land supply. There is a significant and serious shortfall in housing sites. It is imperative for a wide range of sites to be considered and included in the Plan. | Noted. As part of the plan review we will reconsider the issue with further consultation and in light of new evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| 14566 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | Para 5.46 - States a clear commitment to bringing forward land as quickly as possible to meet housing needs. It is apparent from the Council's reliance on the release of a strategic site in Dunton Garden Village and the reliance of permitted development conversions, that the Council is not planning to bring forward land as quickly as possible, when there are suitable, available and deliverable sites submitted to the SHLAA that are not being allocated for early release. | Noted. The Council will be assessing further sites which have come forward during this Plan consultation. These will inform the next iteration of the Plan, its allocations and policies. Regarding the proposed allocations which have been informed by site assessment work and relevant evidence, further site assessment and testing will be undertaken; the result of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 15141 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Support the aim of the Council to bring forward land as quickly as possible to meet housing needs swiftly. The detail contained in Appendix 2 of the expected rate at which new homes will be provided is supported. There is a realistic prospect of delivering new homes on the site within the first five years of the plan period. The requirement of policy 7.1 to produce a Masterplan to form part of the Brentwood Local Development Plan is an important element of early delivery. The preparation of a Masterplan and early submission of an application for outline planning permission during the Local Plan preparation process will enable the Promoter, the Council and relevant stakeholders to progress quickly sufficient detail of the scheme. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|--|
| Figure 5.11 Housing Trajectory | | | | |
| 15315 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Comment | Figure 5.11 covers the period 2016 to 2033, but it would have been more logical for it to cover the whole of the plan period, namely 2013 to 2033. Appendix 3 sets out projected housing completions on a year by year basis. However, Appendix 3 only includes 18 of the 22 allocated sites listed in Appendix 2. We assume that the Housing Trajectory shown at Figure 5.11 includes the four allocations missing from Appendix 3, and has allocated them on a year by year basis. | Noted. The period between 2013-2015 was covered in Figure 5.10 Housing Completion. The lack of sites in Appendix 3 in the Draft Plan is acknowledged, this was an typographic error and will be amended accordingly. The complete table is available online at our consultation portal: http://brentwood.jdi-consult.net/localplan/readdoc.php?docid=8&chapter=13&docelemid=d1112#d1112 | Amend Appendix 3 in the next publication of the Plan |
| Urban Areas | | | | |
| 13416 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] 13570 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | Yes, brownfield sites (and ONLY brownfield sites) should be used to build on. | Disagree. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 14665 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | "Prioritise brownfield sites wherever suitable and make efficient use of land in urban areas = 1,296 new homes" | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Brownfield Green Belt (Urban Extensions) | | | | |
| 14532 - Mr and Mrs Lighterness [2956] | Comment | I am concerned at the intention to build or allow planning permission on 'so called' "Brown Field Sites". The definition and its investigation that is the concern. Where site has been heavily used as Factories or Garden Centers, there is perhaps a good reason to develop "Tasteful Housing", although modern "Land Cramming Builds" does put even that thought into question. Where land has been used for Farming, Agriculture, Orchards or Grazing, 'Borrowing the Landscape', then a return to Nature is the preferred route, to sustain Wildlife at the very minimum or to re-introduce species as an ideal or just to maintain natural feature balance, minimum. A local attempt to develop has almost endangered Newt and Bat species, but the fight will continue. | Noted. The proposed allocations were based on site assessment and evidence, in ways that seek to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The site assessment is ongoing and sites will be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. Biodiversity policy is developed in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Government legislation. | Consider accordingly |
| 14157 - Mrs Elizabeth Jones [5693] 14361 - Miss Tilly O'Leary [5880] 14369 - Mr Dan Morrow [5881] 14370 - Mr Dan Morrow [5881] | Support | Use of brownfield land supported. | Noted | No action |
| Strategic Sites (Green Belt) | | | | |
| 13994 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] | Object | Have all brownfield sites been considered before planning greenbelt land? Why is greenbelt land now being considered for declassification in and around the Brentwood / Basildon area? The proposed land is used for arable farming. Is this land no longer needed for agriculture? These areas should be the last place considered for building new properties especially when there are so many brown field sites yet to be improved and are suitable for housing development. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance therefore the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 15092 - Graham Palmer [4725] | Object | I object to ANY proposals to build on greenbelt land including the planned dunton garden village, I feel the supposed need for 5000 to 6000 houses is not to cater for the existing residents in the Brentwood area but will be mostly for people coming in to the area from other places. We do not have the necessary infrastructure to support this many new residents, the roads, schools, doctors, hospitals are already struggling to cope with the needs of the existing locals | Noted. There is already a shortage of homes for people in Brentwood and this need has to be considered by the Local Plan. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance therefore the Council are considering all development options. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13109 - Mr B Horrocks [4058] | Object | This will jeopardise the green belt and deteriorate quality of life for Brentwood residents | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 13504 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Use of this area of Green Belt around Dunton is in breach of the NPPF rules on Green Belt. By building on it Brentwood will be encouraging urban sprawl and inappropriate development, as the Green Belt South of the A127 is in very short supply, therefore of higher value than the abundant Green Belt in other areas of the Borough. Building on it will mean that there is developments almost entirely from the London Borough of Havering to Southend, which is in direct contravention of Green Belt policy. | Noted. The Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt, further site assessment and testing will also be undertaken, the result of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints and impact on the Green Belt. The proposed allocation at DHGV to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure has been informed by site assessment and evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| Greenfield Green Belt (Urban Extensions) | | | | |
| 13417 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | NO, NO, NO greenfield development | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 13505 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | If these areas of Greenfield are within the Green Belt south of the A127 then they will exacerbate the breach of Green Belt rules, by increasing the urban sprawl from the London Borough of Havering to Southend. | Disagree. Current development proposal sites are such that considerable Green Belt would remain, ensuring separation of urban areas. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13572 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | If there are "clear and defensible boundaries" then how is the wildlife in those areas going to escape?? They will literally be running for their lives as you carve up their homes, and you are blocking them in! If you insist on destroying their precious homes, please at least leave them somewhere to escape to! Wildlife is just as important as human life!!! | Noted. Biodiversity policy is developed in line with the requirements of the National Planning Framework and Government legislation. | Consider accordingly |
| Windfall | | | | |
| 14469 - Mr Eric John Webb [1830] | Comment | I live in Blackmore and greatly appreciate that the current proposals do not have any significant development in this area - which (unsurprisingly) I would entirely support. I am conscious that there will be attempts to meet the total development numbers by some (as yet unidentified) infill and am happy to concede this [infill rather than boundary change] as a realistic if mildly unwelcome way forward. | Comment welcomed | Consider accordingly |
| 14540 - Mr C Loneragan [5926] 16127 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Object to the over reliance upon windfall development (14% of the net homes proposed). Windfall development relates to the five year supply and there should be compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. As 89% of Brentwood lies within the Green Belt, such a supply will be a declining source. The Council should aim to meet the full objectively assessed need. Windfall should provide a boost to housing supply and should not be relied upon for delivery when there are suitable, available and achievable sites identified in the SHLAA that would be able to meet the identified demand. | Noted. Consideration of the proportion of windfall development will be made in light of monitoring and will be reflected in the next iteration of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 13418 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Not if it's green belt. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| New Jobs | | | | |
| 14592 - Childerditch Properties [2642] | Comment | Emphasis the need to provide B2 and B8 Use Class Space. There are a limited number of locations in the Borough which could meet such requirements. Childerditch Industrial Park is an existing key employment location within the Borough and the allocation of The Range [Site Ref 112D] will further enhance the economic development potential of the area. The site will complement the Borough's intended employment site portfolio, providing a new employment site, which is available immediately for development to accommodate B2 and B8 uses. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14594 - Childerditch Properties [2642] | Comment | The development of The Range [Site Ref 112D] has the ability to provide a large number of jobs in a variety of employers in a location accessible to the local urban population. The development could generate between 83 and 138 jobs based on a B2 use of the 3,000 sq.m to 5,000 sq.m of floor space indicated. By bringing forward the site for development in the short to medium term it will be able to complement the offer at Childerditch Industrial Park which now has a restricted choice of new development opportunities. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14596 - Childerditch Properties [2642] | Comment | Para 5.56 - Sets out the strategic objectives to redevelop around 19 hectares of existing employment sites for new homes. If this is to happen, BBC must ensure that there is a good supply of immediate deliverable employment land available in the right location and capable of accommodating a range of different uses in the short term to cater for requirements. Childerditch Industrial Park and the Range North are well suited to assist meet businesses that will need to relocate as a result of the Draft Local Plan Strategy as acknowledged at Para 5.57 and the proposal to allocate The Range. | Noted. The Council will work with businesses to help them relocate to alternative locations within the Borough and to premises suitable for their business needs. The Local Plan needs to provide for all future development need. The site assessment is ongoing, the result of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 14668 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Para 5.56 - The references to the redevelopment of West Horndon Industrial Estates, which may include retained and/ or new employment uses. | Noted. Mixed development may be appropriate at these locations, however impact on future residents will need to be considered. | Consider accordingly |

Policy 5.3: Job Growth and Employment Land

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 13992 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14065 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | 5.54 states that 'Selection of sites for new employment land has been considered through the same sequential approach of land types as has been the case with housing development'. This is clearly not the case. If it were then the aim would be to preserve and maximize use of existing sites and prioritise new sites in the order of: Brownfield sites in Urban areas; All appropriate land within existing urban areas; Previously developed sites adjoining existing urban areas. The intention represented in this policy and allocations is clearly not internally consistent with this hierarchy otherwise there would not be the significant loss of existing employment land at the council depot Warley, West Horndon Industrial Park and 're-use displaced older employment premises suitable for housing-led development in central areas' (5.55) to preferred housing allocations. | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will consider the suggested amendment. | Consider accordingly |
| 15967 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | Consideration should also be given to the findings of the Economic Futures Study, even higher levels of employment land would be required in order to for jobs to meet needs within the plan period. We suggest that the final paragraph of Policy 5.3 is amended as follows: "Providing for this many jobs will require a total of 32.8 hectares of new employment land as a minimum". | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13678 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | It is questionable whether new Employment Land is required, given that so many plots and units are vacant. Furthermore, I object to proposals to move the W. Horndon Industrial Estate, which is well situated for locals and non-locals alike both by road and, more importantly, by public transport. The proposed site on J29 of the M25 is not a brownfield site (see earlier representation on the 'Trojan horse', and thus the illegality of relabeling this plot brownfield, given that its use as a works compound for M25 widening was explicitly stated as being temporary). | Noted. The employment land need of the borough was informed by economic evidence. The Council is required to determine its own locally-derived employment target and will work with businesses to help them relocate to alternative locations within the Borough and to premises suitable for their business needs. | Consider accordingly |
| 14587 - Childerditch Properties [2642] | Comment | As far as Childerditch Industrial Park is concerned, the new allocation of The Range will be an adjunct to the existing successful area, which can be easily supported by an extension of the existing infrastructure. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15335 - Ford Motor Company [3768] | Comment | Ford note that the Draft Plan seeks to make provision for 5,000 additional jobs to be provided in the Borough over the Plan period at an annual average rate of 250 jobs per annum. In order to provide for this number of new jobs, Policy 5.3 identifies the need for 32.8 hectares of new employment land within the Borough throughout the Plan period. Ford note that this capacity is met through the identification of a series of new employment land allocations. These allocations collectively provide 32.81 hectares of new employment land. | Noted | No action |
| 14129 - Charles Fox of Covent Garden (Mrs Ann Lee) [2902] | Comment | Para 5.56 is not clear if employment needs from the West Horndon Business Park will be lost entirely as part of redevelopment. The Council needs to clarify this and update the existing tenants/occupiers. | | Consider accordingly |
| 14271 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14272 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | I suggest that this hierarchy for Job Growth and Employment is opposite to the housing strategy and looks something like: Strategic sites; Greenfield sites in Green Belt; Brownfield sites in Green Belt; and Urban areas. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16209 - Bolson's Limited (Mr. J.J.A. Cowdry) [2695] | Comment | Policy 5.3 makes provision for 5000 additional jobs over plan periods, on new allocations supported by existing employment sites. Redeveloping existing employment land in West Horndon Industrial Estate means the loss of 19ha of employment land, it is not clear if employment needs will be lost entirely on these sites. Further work is needed to identify exact loss of employment and the extent to which this needs to be replaced. Please supply updated progress. | Noted. The Council will work with businesses to help them relocate to alternative locations within the Borough and to premises suitable for their business needs. The Local Plan needs to provide for all future development need. The Council proposes to allocate new employment land in addition to existing sites that may be partly redeveloped. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14273 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14274 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | I do not agree with this approach. Whilst for certain employment uses e.g. distribution centres there is a strong link between the proximity of infrastructure, for many employment types this is not particularly strong. Therefore many employment uses can be advantageous within or on the edge of existing developed areas for sustainability reasons and in creating a positive mixture of land uses and communities. I do not believe in a model that seeks to relocate this away from Urban areas (urban in this context including the West Horndon Industrial Park). Much more attention should be paid to the many facets of employment generation and location of land for that purpose. Future employment need should be met by considering the full range of planning matters including impacts on the landscape and the green environment. | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will consider the issue. The site assessment is ongoing and sites will be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as well as landscape and green environment, as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15238 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] 15249 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] 15752 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 15860 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Object | Policy 5.3 states that the Council will make provision for 5,000 additional jobs over the plan period. There is very little evidence to justify why the Council has adopted a figure which is less than the lowest job growth requirement identified in the NLP Report. There is some inconsistency between the proposed number of additional dwellings and the proposed number of additional jobs during the LP period. This could result in an increase in the amount of out-commuting by those people who live in the Borough. We therefore object to the identified number of jobs required as it is not robust and needs to be increased to reflect the highest economic growth scenario and population projections. | Noted. This employment land and job growth need has been informed by a range of economic evidence, such as the Brentwood Economic Futures report (2014). Proposed job growth is also informed by the Borough's objectively assessed housing need. The inconsistency is noted and will be reconsidered in the next version of Local Plan consultation. | Consider accordingly |
| 13419 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Please exclude green belt | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 13506 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | 5.57 Development at Dunton Hills Garden Village, and around West Horndon, will not be able to provide for new employment land, any more than housing, at building there is in strict contravention of the NPPF for Green Belt, as it would create urban sprawl spreading from the London Borough of Havering to Southend. The so called strategic highway network is the heavily congested A127, and poor C2C service, which hasn't had the investment like the A12 and Crossrail have had, so transport infrastructure for employment is better North of the Borough. | Employment growth will be encouraged in the existing main centres as well as other suitable locations which utilise brownfield land. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15411 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 16211 - S Walsh and Sons Ltd [2635] | Support | Support is given to the provision of new employment land to benefit the creation of new jobs within the Borough and to the allocation of existing employment sites within the Green Belt. Paragraph 5.56 acknowledges that there needs to be further work undertaken to "identify exact loss of employment and the extent to which this needs to be replaced" and it is considered that this work should have been undertaken prior to the publication of this Draft Local Plan. | Noted | No action |
| 14013 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] 15772 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Supports the proposed strategy of providing a range of employment and business development, through new employment land and existing employment sites, and their redevelopment where appropriate. | Noted | No action |
| 15693 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] | Support | Paragraph 5.58 states that existing employment sites will be formally allocated. This approach is strongly supported and is considered to be essential if these sites are to continue to provide for employment within the Borough and if the plan is to be justified and effective. Allocate of existing employment sites such as Codham Hall will help ensure the site continues to provide employment use as well as provide opportunities to support the development of existing businesses on the site. | Noted | No action |
| 15144 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Support the target for providing 5,000 additional jobs. The allocation of at least 5 hectares of employment land at Dunton Hills Garden Village will make a contribution towards this. Support the recognition that other business sectors will support job growth over the Plan period. Dunton Hills Garden Village as a self-sustaining community will provide a substantial number of additional jobs in the local retail, education and health facilities. It is estimated that Dunton Garden Village will itself create circa 5,000 jobs including approximately 1,200 construction jobs. | Noted | No action |
| Figure 5.12. M25 Junction 29 Employment Cluster | | | | |
| 14661 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] | Object | The scale and concentration of the proposed development within the A127 Corridor will irrevocably harm the landscape and environment within this area. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 16465 - CPREssex [210] | Object | The figure gives an impression all land within the oval forms part of the Employment Cluster. Request that this is redrawn with arrows pointing to each individual employment site. Emphatically request that the phrase "J29 Employment Zone" and the oval diagram are removed from all documents to prevent any misunderstanding, any planning blight or adverse impact on the value of homes within the depicted area. | Agree. Figure 5.12 serves as a conceptual diagram and should be read in conjunction with supporting documents such as the Site Allocation Maps for accurate site location and boundary. Diagram will be clarified in next iteration of the Plan. | Amend accordingly |
| 15694 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] | Support | Figures 5.12 sets out the intention to formally allocate all existing employment uses with in the Codham Hall area and in this regard is also supported. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| New Retail and Commercial Leisure | | | | |
| 15012 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | Paragraph 5.71 should be revised and expanded. The Town Centre includes Warley Hill and Brentwood Station. The Masterplan will be a non-statutory planning framework, and its key principles should be embedded in the Local Plan. The Town Centre includes the Conservation Area, which is not just the High Street. The Masterplan should cover key Issues in the co-ordinated development of key sites, design must include technology and also "smarter" property management, parking and traffic movement to avoid congestion. A design code for development in William Hunter Way, both rear of the High Street and in the major sites of the Council Car Park and Sainsbury's, should allow for smarter use of car parking as well as housing above retail, with a type of timeshare approach to the use of car parking spaces. | Noted. As part of plan review we will consider suggested amendment. The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Design Plan will set out the guiding principles to enable this. | Consider accordingly |
| 13681 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | 5.71: It would be better to use the William Hunter Way site for flats, since that is a demonstrable need. There is no evidence that a retail site would be effective use of the land, given how many prime units currently lie vacant on a long-term basis (cf. Baytree centre). 5.72: Insufficient evidence that a cinema would be viable. If it had been viable, a commercial provider would have rented an existing unit -- the fact that this has not happened for well over a decade is evidence enough that a cinema would be a 'white elephant'. | Noted. The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Design Plan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 13421 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | 5.64 - Access to/from Brentwood and parking facilities therein need radical improvement | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will consider the issue. | Consider accordingly |
| 14671 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Para 5.77 - Support the provision of new retail, professional and community uses broadly consistent with a new village centre for West Horndon, and agree with the statement: "Residential-led mixed use development at West Horndon will provide the opportunity to create an improved village centre near to the railway station. This will include new retail floor space to serve the village and local area. This will need to complement rather than compete directly with the existing local shops." | Noted | No action |
| Policy 5.4: Retail and Commercial Leisure Growth | | | | |
| 15010 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | High Street retail offers and delivery options are changing quickly nationally. Amazon customers will soon be able to have hundreds of fresh foods and frozen foods delivered through Morrisons wholesale supply service. Amazon has been testing and developing since December 2013 delivery of packages to customer doorsteps by "octocopter" mini-drones with a 30- minute delivery time. Sainsbury's has made a takeover offer for Argos which is justified by efficiencies in logistics. There is also a trend towards "smart cities", and in addition customers are using apps and internet for retail choice. This increasing use of technology by both retailers and customers should be reflected in the Local Plan: it is part of the core planning function of achieving land use efficiency; also, the Local Plan should facilitate retail marketing outlets from retailers to the public either to home delivery or other collection points, not necessarily in the Town Centre. | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will consider the suggested approach in detail. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15009 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | Policy 5.4 should allow for "click and collect" to support and possibly amend or reduce the net retail floorspace as "smart city" technology changes retailing patterns. There are recently introduced changes to Permitted Development rights but a scheme to allow co-ordination for the whole of town centre retail trends requires more flexible wording and scope. Collection may be replaced by delivery. | Comment noted. The Council have commissioned a town centre design document which may feed into further town centre planning documents. This could include SPD, Masterplan or Area Action Plan for the town centre. Innovative and forward thinking ideas to provide retail services such as this, will be considered as part of this process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15011 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | The Council has statutory powers to enable its computer facilities to be used by any person on such terms as the parties consider appropriate (Section 38 Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976) The Town Centre Renaissance Group should explore how a smart city approach can be promoted and co-ordinated. "Click and collect" and "smart city" technology may enable car parking spaces to be used efficiently to provide retail services to Crossrail passengers. Where traffic queues and car parking delays are evident or forecast a smart city approach should promote alternatives. The quantification of floorspace in the Town Centre should take account of technology trends to improve retailing in the Borough and allow for flexible alternatives in retail delivery. | Noted. The Council have commissioned a town centre design document which may feed into further town centre planning documents. This could include SPD, Masterplan or Area Action Plan for the town centre. Innovative and forward thinking ideas to provide retail services such as this, will be considered as part of this process. | Consider accordingly |
| 13423 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Without radical improvement in access/parking you can build 100% more shops but the customers won't come. Also there is no mention regarding what can be substituted to replace the TOWIE effect as this can reasonably be expected to fade over the period of this plan leaving Brentwood a dead town. | Noted. The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Design Plan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 13680 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | The Baytree Centre, despite its prime location, has never had full occupancy. Creating more retail floorspace in Brentwood town centre is, therefore, a futile waste of land in an area well served by public transport. A better use of the land would be for high-density housing (e.g. flats). | Noted. The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Design Plan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 13659 - R M Gaymer [5664] | Object | Insufficient provision is made for new retail floorspace at Ingatestone. The above market share of available convenience goods expenditure from the Ingatestone local area is very low and not characteristic of a district centre which serves a significant catchment beyond the immediate area. The result is an unsustainable pattern of main and bulk food shopping with predominately car based trips to large format out of centre food stores further afield. | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will consider the raised issue. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|-----------|
| 15145 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Supports the proposal to incorporate new local retail provision in the mixed development at Dunton Hills. The proposal for a new self-sustaining community affords a unique opportunity to provide a range of well-located retail facilities to serve the local requirements of residents. The Master Plan process will identify the most appropriate locations for such uses, properly integrated with the new community and able to help in creating a genuine sense of place and community. | Noted | No action |
| 14669 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | The provision of new retail, professional and community uses broadly consistent with a new village centre for West Horndon. | Noted | No action |

Figure 5.14. Brentwood Axonometric Diagram

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13121 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Comment | No idea what that means? | Noted. Axonometric projection is a type of parallel projection diagram used expand on the information provided by simple maps by illustrating this mapped information 3-dimensionally. In this instance the diagram is to clarify the key development opportunities within Brentwood Town. The Council will add text to further explain this illustration. | Add clarifying text. |
| 13424 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | To obtain footfall all year what will be done to combat the winter weather | Noted. The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Design Plan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|

Chapter 6. Managing Growth

Sustainable Development

| | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 13669 - Mr Stuart Wilks [5666] | Comment | It would be wise to explain the three aspects for clarity, and the importance of the hierarchy of development in relation to the golden thread. This is something that local councillors seem to be unclear on. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13507 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 13682 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | The NPPF mandates a presumption against development on the Green Belt. This has not been given due weight in this proposed Plan. The LDP doesn't prevent neighbouring towns merging with one another. | Disagree. The Council consider that due weight has been given in consideration of potential development and Green Belt, local authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |

Policy 6.1: Sustainable Development

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---------------|----------------------|
| 16103 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Support | The Council's policy on sustainable development is consistent with national policy and positively prepared to enable a flexible approach to delivery. In achieving the overall aim of this policy, the Council should consider updating its evidence base to effectively promote and optimise the delivery of sustainable development. | Support noted | No action |
| 15774 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | In order to maintain a 5 year housing land supply and protect the Borough from speculative application, the Council needs to ensure that applications are determined without delay so that adoption can be delivered within specified timeframes. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15146 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Support the presumption in favour of sustainable development. CEG welcomes the desire of the Council to: "always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area." | Noted | No action |
| 14014 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] 15287 - Brentwood School [2575] 15345 - Countryside Properties [250] 15566 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Support | The policy follows the thrust of the NPPF and is supported. Sustainable development is to be encouraged. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------------|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| Managing Development Growth | | | | |
| 13573 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | The only way to "safeguard the green belt" is not to build on it. You can't say you want to protect it and then build on it. | The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 13422 - Freda Downie [812] | Comment | How will the local roads and infrastructure cope. It seems at the moment every spare piece of land has flats built on it, losing some of the old properties that make the town! I realise some new housing has to be built, but there must be better sites available, without clogging up roads even more at rush hours. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. | No action |
| 14542 - A. Burton [1628] | Object | It is not proven that we need housing for this many people. | Disagree. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance. The objectively assessed housing needs assessment published in December 2014 is considered to be the most up to date evidence and is NPPF compliant. It is considered that the need for 360 homes per annum can be sustainably accommodated in the Borough | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|-----------|
| 13508 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 13835 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13846 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13858 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] | Object | It is disingenuous to say 'some' Green Belt land will be used, when you are proposing to build on virtually all the Green Belt in the Dunton area. Losing it will result in the merging of more than one town, almost entirely from the London Borough of Havering to Southend. Breaching NPPF Green Belt guidelines, without sufficient benefit, as the Dunton community will be isolated from the rest of Brentwood by the major road boundaries, and lack of connective public transport systems, together with the congested road and rail system in the area. | The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | No action |
| 14097 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Object | The Draft Plan fails to deliver what it proposes in section 6.4 by proposing to build over 40% of new homes away from the Shenfield and Brentwood areas, areas that are not readily accessible to Brentwood or Shenfield. The Draft Plan is ignoring the key areas of the Borough whilst concentrating housing in Dunton and West Horndon. The importance of Crossrail should not be underestimated, hence why there should be significant investment and development in the surrounding area of Shenfield and Hutton. Chelmsford Council, before becoming a City, recognised the importance of its rail station and constructed 2 park and ride sites to allow for commuters from both sides of the city. The Council should look at this and concentrate on Shenfield and Brentwood instead of outlying areas like Dunton. | Comment noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. Brentwood Borough Council and Essex County Council are working together to gain more knowledge of the impacts Crossrail will have on the Borough once fully operational. This includes work to invest in and improve the surroundings of Brentwood and Shenfield stations. However, the projections for how many people will use the new service from Brentwood or Shenfield vary greatly. Transport for London is reviewing the Crossrail patronage forecasts and these numbers and the underlying assumptions behind them should provide greater insight on possible wider impacts. Until these revised numbers are published it is difficult to assess any specific local economic impact and so this position remains under review. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Policy 6.2: Managing Growth | | | | |
| 14630 - Mr Thomas Lennon [747] | Comment | It is noted that there may be a time in certain areas of the parish [Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green] that it will be necessary for some development to be carried out and that it should not affect the surrounding areas. | Noted. The Draft Plan seeks to accommodate growth in a sustainable manner on sites within existing settlements hierarchy. The Council will continue to consider the potential for development in relation to meeting an up to date Objectively Assessed Housing Need, in light of National Guidance. | No action |
| 13990 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14064 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | It is not clear how the 'settlement hierarchy and role of key settlements' would operate. This is particularly important in the case of the delivery of the Dunton Hills Garden Village. This large concentrated development requires a great deal of planning and construction of infrastructure in order to be sustainable and the role of the settlement hierarchy is particularly uncertain. Para 6.13 states that 'an important role of this Plan is to indicate where and when sites are expected to come forward', however this phasing does not form part of the Plan. One advantage from dispersed growth model is that the phasing of growth is adaptable and can be reviewed in the light of changing circumstances in contrast to a major development proposal. The Plan is therefore contradictory with regards to Policy 6.2f and undefined with regards to Policies 6.2b,d. | The settlement hierarchy guides where the best place to accommodate growth in a sustainable manner. Within these key settlements the Plan seeks to consider appropriate land use sequentially in line with National Guidance and best practice. It is considered that development needs cannot be met by the capacity of suitable and available brownfield sites in the borough and thus the Council are considering all development options, including Dunton Hills Garden Village. The need for infrastructure and phasing of new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Opportunities and constraints are being considered for all potential development options, in line with available evidence and Government Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 15776 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Comment | The Council should actively work with developers, landowners and agents for the proposed allocation to ensure that this policy can be properly implemented and adhered to by both the Council and the developer and ensure that sites can be delivered within the specified timeframes to maintain a 5 year land supply. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14601 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] | Comment | Any development that takes place must be preceded or at the very least accompanied by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. Under no circumstance should infrastructure come after development. All developments must have appropriate levels of affordable housing. Where possible this should be prioritised for Brentwood residents. BBC will need to work out how to get/guarantee any rail infrastructure upgrades, these are not part of the same development plan and Network rail have a long history of delay and failure to implement necessary infrastructure improvements. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy 7.5 and 7.6 seeks to ensure delivery of sufficient high quality affordable homes to meet local needs. However recent amendments to National Planning Practice Guidance which reinstated the affordable housing thresholds and related financial requirements, as well as other proposals in the Housing and Planning Bill regarding Starter Homes may have a consequence on the content of Draft Policy 7.5 and 7.6. | Consider accordingly |
| 15583 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Policy 6.2 states, in respect of previously developed land (brownfield sites), that this supply of land should be prioritised. Although the sequential approach is appropriate for site identification, such an approach should not be stringently applied in relation to deliverability. It would be deemed inappropriate for BBC to delay the delivery of an allocated development site if, for example, other brownfield sites were yet to come forward. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14423 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | Is there anything that can be done in the LDP to close these loopholes that are regularly exploited? (i) The "Agricultural Business". Is for an individual/ company to purchase a large green belt field, or either have (or purchase) an area of land behind their property, and then to set up a small scale rural business such as, e.g. a stable. An application will be lodged for some form of building where a person can live in order to tend "The Farm" and then in due course for this to be followed by an application for a full scale residential development, the business soon seems to become unviable and ceases to trade, and the dwelling is sold for residential purposes. (ii) Large screens or fences are put up to camouflage the field behind which small dwellings are constructed and then after 10 years a certificate of lawfulness is requested to make the development legal. | Noted. The history of a development is taken into consideration in assessment of all applications, there is National Guidance on "hiding" development which has already led to case law where development is demolished. | No action. |
| 16121 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | In its Autumn Statement the government announced a package of measures to accelerate housebuilding over the next five years. This includes a new 'delivery' test to ensure that housing commitments set out in local plans can be delivered in a reasonable timeframe. This will act as a further threat for under-performing authorities, alongside the implications of failing to identify a five-year supply of deliverable land. The new Local Plan needs to bear this in mind and ensure that it concentrates on growth for the area and that it is focused on the delivery and the practicalities of housing the population. | Noted. In allocating sites the Council will have regard to the need to phase development. The site assessment is ongoing and sites will be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16112 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The DLP and SA to date both confirm the Council's uncertainty regarding the draft strategy for growth proposed and selection of land allocations to deliver this. In places these documents state that the Council remains open to considering matters further and that on-going commissioning and publication of evidence will inform a next iteration of the plan. The latest SA highlights the fact that although the Council appears to be settled on the A127 as the preferred location for strategic growth it is far from decided on a preferred allocation within the transport corridor. Land at West Horndon appears to be favoured when compared against the 'significant negative effects' anticipated as a result of development at Dunton. For this reason the latest SA states that "uncertainty remains regarding DHGV." | The DLP and SA consider and compare various options for development in the borough, considered in line with the Spatial Strategy which is led by transport corridors and considers opportunities and constraints, such as flooding, to enable site preferences at this stage of the plan, in line with the evidence base. | Consider accordingly |
| 13426 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | No building on green belt and/or no building where infrastructure is already fragile. | Noted. National Guidance sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | No action |
| 13801 - Mr. Baldwin [917] 14244 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | The implications of the potential to accommodate more growth and associated infrastructure requirements need to be considered with some weight as a way of meeting the housing requirement currently identified in the Brentwood Local Plan Growth Options and supporting evidence. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to consider the potential for development in relation to meeting an up to date Objectively Assessed Housing Need, in light of National Guidance. | No action |
| 16104 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Support | Support the Council's strategy to ensuring development allocations make the best use of land to meet local needs and therefore this policy can be considered justified and effective in promoting this delivery. | Noted | No action |
| 14015 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Support | Support. The sequential approach has correctly identified the most appropriate/ sustainable sites for development, minimising where possible Green Belt development. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 15215 - Spire Hartswood Hospital [6074] | Support | Support Policy 6.2 that acknowledges the importance that previously developed land and redundant uses within the settlement boundary can make to deliver the Council's overall Spatial Strategy. If relocated to the proposed site, the existing Spire Hartswood Hospital site in Brentwood represents an opportunity that will contribute to housing need within the Borough. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14674 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Support | Noted | No action |
| 15148 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | The focus of development on a strategic site such as Dunton Hills in a single ownership with no insurmountable infrastructure difficulties and where development can be master planned and phased easily affords the unique prospect of managing growth in an ordered way to achieve the highest quality and integrated community possible. Policy states the need to have regard to so much which can be achieved more easily with a single large development than with a larger number of smaller sites. | Noted | No action |

General Development Planning

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14553 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Comment | Para 6.14 states that this means directing development to locations that are "supported by effective transport, leisure, community and other services, while ...protecting the Green Belt." There is nothing about securing sustainable development that concerns protecting the Green Belt and that its inclusion in the approach to securing sustainable development is not necessary and may limit the Council's ability to deliver sustainable sites that otherwise provide suitable locations for residential or other development. Sites should not be considered unsustainable simply on the basis of the current Green Belt designation of land. It is recommended that the supporting text is altered to reflect that Green Belt should not be a consideration in whether development will be sustainable or otherwise. Green Belt policies are set out elsewhere in the Plan and should remain a separate matter. | Comment noted. It is considered that development on Green Belt sites is addressed throughout Draft Policy 7.6, 9.9, 9.11, 9.12. The Draft Plan seeks to accommodate growth in a sustainable manner on sites within existing settlements hierarchy as well as other suitable and deliverable development options. | No action |
| 14622 - Ms Christine Berner [5954] | Comment | The proposition of new affordable housing is welcome. My concern is with a lack of parking facilities and the impact that this will have on the side roads, not only for residents, particularly as there is currently a paucity of 'policing' parking 'out of hours', but also the effects that inconsiderate parking has on road users leading to dangerous driving conditions and traffic congestion 'Hot Spots'. | Noted. Draft Policy 10.2 aims to ensure an appropriate level and location of car parking provision. Issue is being considered as the Plan progresses. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15064 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Comment | Note Brentwood has capacity for secondary school places but limited capacity for primary school places. Building new villages and new schools takes a significant amount of time. Keeping primary schools open in rural villages is key to ensuring an "inclusive, balanced, sustainable" p. 25, S03 community. Primary school capacity currently exists within the village of Blackmore and perhaps within other villages. Do we need to create a new village or focus on maintaining the ones that currently exist? | Comment noted. Paragraph 5.21 considers development within current villages with brownfield opportunities to be encouraged where appropriate schemes meet local needs and where redevelopment of previously developed sites in Green Belt and infill whilst improving links to nearby villages will be supported. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Council will continue to work with Essex County Council as Local Education Authority to determine what additional education facilities will be needed as a result of planned future development. | Consider accordingly |
| 14997 - Mr and Mrs Simon and Jeanie Hughes [4739] 15002 - Stephen Hill [612] | Comment | There is a strong need for a infrastructure / services plan. Not convinced by the Draft local Plan that the residents of the Borough would not suffer adversely as a result of the proposed development. | Concerns noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | No action |
| 14789 - Mr Jon Bright [5993] | Support | As you state, any new development needs to be appropriate in scale and design for its location, have suitable infrastructure, protect Green Belt as much as possible, have suitable landscape buffers / definable boundaries etc (e.g. between Ingatestone & Mountnessing) and, where affordable housing is included with a scheme, to be well integrated. | Noted | No action |

Policy 6.3: General Development Criteria

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13922 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14063 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | The Dunton Hills Garden Village development would not meet the criteria of Policy 6.3 on nearly all accounts compared with alternative growth models. Concentration of development would give rise to the following effects: It would have a much larger effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; It would likely give rise to adverse highway implications; It would be more likely give rise to adverse health effects; and it would have a greater impact on designated heritage assets. | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16489 - CPREssex [210] | Comment | Policy should be modified to show that in addition, actual compensation should be paid to immediate neighbours who experience a loss of amenity or actual home value reduction, in the event the Council grant planning permission in these circumstances. | Disagree. Non material planning considerations such as reduction of home value are beyond the jurisdiction of the planning system. Material planning considerations will be taken into account in line with the National Planning Practice Guidance. | No action. |
| 13205 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Comment | Criterion (i) which requires new development to mitigate its impact on local services and community infrastructure is welcomed and considered justified. However, it would be helpful if the supporting text in paragraph 6.19 explains what is included within the term community facilities and services so that there is clarity when implementing the policy about what this covers e.g. are sport, leisure and recreation facilities included? | Noted. It is consider clarification has been made in Chapter 10 Section Infrastructure and Community Facilities. Paragraph 10.40 gives examples of what community infrastructures cover. Consider cross reference for clarity. | Consider accordingly |
| 16105 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Comment | This policy is sound, in line with paragraph 58 of the NPPF; however, in applying the policy the Council should ensure that each assessment is made on a case-by-case basis having regard to the local context. The Council should consider inserting this into the policy to ensure flexibility. | Disagree. The Council aims to follow a Spatial Strategy that benefits the borough and retains its current open, green, village-orientated character whilst addressing the need for new homes. | No action |
| 15728 - Highways England (Ms Janice Burgess) [6105] | Comment | We are pleased to see in Policy 6.3 C that you stipulate a requirement to consider safety as part of a transport assessment. Given the high speed nature of the M25 and A12 safety is a primary concern to Highways England and we would object to any safety implications of development, development traffic or highway mitigation. | Noted | No action |
| 15946 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | 6.18 of the Draft Local Plan states that "In order for a scheme to be acceptable development will be required to make satisfactory arrangements for vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access into the site and for parking and servicing within the site". At present, the sites are served by a small entrance placed in a hazardous location below a blind hill created by the railway bridge, opposite the station, and on a busy road. Traffic is already considered dangerous in this location. Any redevelopment of the sites will need to be able to show an improvement in road layout safety, together with appropriate access consideration (one entrance/exit will be insufficient for size of proposed development). This point is repeated in Policy 6.4a of the Draft Local Plan: "Development proposals will be favourably considered where the planning and design of buildings and spaces - arrange access points, routes within the site, public and private spaces, building forms and ancillary functions in an efficient, safe, workable, spatially coherent and attractive manner". | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|--|
| 15727 - Highways England (Ms Janice Burgess) [6105] | Comment | Policy 6.3 C covering general development criteria states that development proposals will need to be accompanied by transport assessments to ensure that the transport network can accommodate the generated traffic. We would caution against examining development impacts on a site by site basis only as this may overlook the impacts of Local Plan development as a whole. Looking at the Housing Land Allocations in Figure 7.2 there are numerous small sites that would have no impact upon the A12 or M25 although the aggregate impact for the smaller sites fully built out could add to queuing and delays on the two Strategic Road Network roads within the Borough. There should be a transport assessment of the overall Local Plan developments and the need for any mitigation identified. We would need to be assured by evidence that the overall Local Plan development has been considered if we are to support the Local Plan. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15985 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Criteria 6.3c supported. ECC proposes an amendment, which seeks to ensure the potential wider implications of the installation of new utility services in the vicinity of the highway network or proposed new highway network take account of the Highway Authority's land requirements, so as to not impede or add to the cost of the highway mitigation schemes. 'The location and route of new utility services in the vicinity of the highway network or proposed new highway network should take account of the Highway Authority's land requirements'. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15288 - Brentwood School [2575] | Comment | Policy 6.3 is generally supported however criteria h is unnecessary and the Council places too great a weight on it. It should either be removed or additional words added: "h) result in no net loss of residential units unless other material public and planning benefits outweigh such loss". The Local Authority's over emphasis of the need for the retention of residential at all costs. There may be many opportunities for greater community benefits to come forward where there is inconsequential loss of one or two units or where other Plan objectives can be met. | Disagree. The policy supports the identified need for development within the borough and the need for new homes. | No action |
| 15595 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | Policy 6.3 wording is not considered to be 'Consistent with national policy' as per the following: Part (d): wording fails to take account of the balance within the NPPF (para 109) in that both new and existing development should be prevented from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affect by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Part (f): The NPPF (para 118) directs the planning applications should be encouraged to seek opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments, and therefore it is considered inappropriate to state that proposals "should take full account" of biodiversity opportunities. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16133 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Policy requires proposals for development to meet all of nine specified criteria. These require a robust evidence base assessment of visual impact and landscape character, access and transport, health, noise impact, biodiversity, heritage, and impact on local services and community infrastructure. It is without question that the plan is not supported by a robust and complete assessment along these lines that would permit the identification of preferred allocations for growth and the rejection of alternatives. | Noted. The Councils proposed allocations are informed by professional assessments based on robust methodology. | Issues are being considered as the plan progresses |
| 15594 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | Policy 6.3 wording is not considered to be 'Consistent with national policy' as per the following: Part (a): This requirement is not contained within the NPPF. Instead, paragraph 58 directs that policies should ensure development responds to local character, reflect the local surroundings and is visually attractive, whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. Part (c): wording is inconsistent with the NPPF (para 32), which states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are "severe". | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13509 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 13836 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13847 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13859 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] | Object | Development of Dunton Hills Garden would not be consistent with almost all of the General Development Criteria. | Noted. The Councils proposed allocations are informed by professional assessments based on robust methodology. | No action |
| 15596 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | Policy 6.3 wording is not considered to be 'Consistent with national policy' as per the following: Part (g): This is considered to be largely in compliance with the NPPF (para 132), excluding the additional requirement to consider the assets enhancement. In addition, "greater" should be reworded to state "great" in accordance with paragraph 132. The test to be considered in the NPPF, when considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, is whether such development would lead to substantial harm to/total loss of a heritage asset's significance (Para 133), or less than substantial harm (Para 134). Part (i): This fails to take acknowledge the NPPF (para 204), in that planning obligations should only be sought where necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13117 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] 14016 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] 15241 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Support | Support policy | Noted | No action |
| 15150 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Support policy and note from evidence prepared so far on behalf of the Promoters that the development of Dunton Hills Garden Village will be in total compliance with its criteria. Compliance is easily achievable in the case of this single large strategic site with its existing characteristics and the development's ability to build in appropriate elements. | Noted | No action |

Policy 6.4: Effective Site Planning

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15715 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | We note in the narrative that the Council wishes to effectively plan for the nature and function of other spaces within developments and that it agrees that sites should be well connected. It would be helpful to be more specific within the Policy wording itself to emphasise the need for connectivity for all users by providing as far as practical multi-user paths within such developments. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways and multi-user paths, are considered an important part of Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 13530 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] | Comment | We note in the narrative that the Council wishes to effectively plan for the nature and function of other spaces within developments and that it agrees that sites should be well connected. It would be helpful to be more specific within the Policy wording itself to emphasise the need for connectivity for ALL users by providing as far as practical multi-user paths within such developments. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways, are considered an important part of Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15947 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | 6.18 of the Draft Local Plan states that "In order for a scheme to be acceptable development will be required to make satisfactory arrangements for vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access into the site and for parking and servicing within the site". At present, the sites are served by a small entrance placed in a hazardous location below a blind hill created by the railway bridge, opposite the station, and on a busy road. Traffic is already considered dangerous in this location. Any redevelopment of the sites will need to be able to show an improvement in road layout safety, together with appropriate access consideration (one entrance/exit will be insufficient for size of proposed development). This point is repeated in Policy 6.4a of the Draft Local Plan: "Development proposals will be favourably considered where the planning and design of buildings and spaces - arrange access points, routes within the site, public and private spaces, building forms and ancillary functions in an efficient, safe, workable, spatially coherent and attractive manner". | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13206 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Comment | In view of the importance attached to promoting and enhancing health and well-being in the plan's strategic objectives (SO11), the policy should be amended to include an additional criterion along the lines that the planning and design of buildings and spaces should promote active lifestyles (through encouraging physical activity). This would thereby contribute to delivering the wider health and well-being objective. | Noted, criterion to be considered in line with evidence base. | Consider accordingly |
| 15779 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Comment | These points should be principles of design and not effective planning. Para17 of NPPF encourages the effective use of land to meet housing needs, whilst this relates to brownfield sites, the same approach should be adopted for green field sites to maximise site full potential and minimise the need to release Green Belt sites. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15986 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Criterion a) is identified twice, but is intended to be a single criterion. Paragraph 6.18 - reference should be made to Transport Assessments being necessary for all major development proposals to assess the impact and identify mitigation of the proposals. | Typographical error noted and to be amended. Agree reference to Transport Assessment for all major development proposals to assess the impact and identify mitigation. | Amend accordingly |
| 15285 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Support | Support Policy and consider them to be relevant to the site at Sawyers Hall Lane. | Noted | No action |
| 15151 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | The evidence already prepared on behalf of the Council and the Promoters demonstrate the ability of the large single site at Dunton Hills to deliver effective site planning. The ability to deliver will be enhanced by the master planning process required by policy 7.1. | Noted | No action |
| 14017 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Support | Support. New development should be sensitive to the character and appearance of the surrounding properties. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Policy 6.5: Key Gateways | | | | |
| 15922 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | Policy 6.5 of the Draft Local Plan states that "Locations around rail stations should contribute to these aims through the delivery of higher density development to meet local needs in central sustainable locations". As noted above, the proposal for 500 houses near to West Horndon Station on sites 020 and 021 would close to double the size of the village. Any development needs to include a range of property types to create a sustainable and balanced community. It is also noted that at present, West Horndon village has a specific character which will need to be protected. Densities and styles will need to reflect and complement the existing village, to create a seamless transition between the "new" development and the "old" village. | Noted. Development will be brought forward in locations and in ways which consider the character of villages. The Council has set out its intentions that the local community will play a central role, alongside others, in determining the eventual form of development. | Consider accordingly |
| 13295 - Mrs Fiona Trott [2458] | Comment | Our family owned site lies at a key gateway to the Borough from the A12, one of the two key transport corridors which are to be the focus for sustainable growth. | Noted | No action |
| 15994 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Unclear what this policy is seeking to achieve with regards highway junctions and rail stations. The policy identifies the following 'aims', which need clarification. These aims are identified as 'enhance a positive impression'; 'understanding of the Borough's character' and distinctive and clear entry'. Highway Junctions - identifies that local area landscaping should be prioritised, but this should not be to the detriment of highway safety or capacity, especially if mitigation is required to accommodate the planned growth. | Noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 15859 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756] | Comment | Policy 6.5 identifies Key Gateways and states that development proposals in the vicinity of these areas will contribute to enhancing a positive impression of the Borough. It should be recognised that there is a limitation to the extent to which some developments can contribute to enhancing the local area due to their nature and function. | Disagree. All development should contribute positively to the locality. This is particularly important in key areas such as Brentwood Town Centre. The Council have commissioned work on a Brentwood Town Centre Design Plan in order to ensure this and will be working with key consultees to produce it. | Consider accordingly |
| 15290 - Brentwood School [2575] | Comment | Policy supported however under the subheading of Highway Junctions there is too great an emphasis on landscaping. Landscaping should mainly be referred to amongst other urban context features including quality of buildings, not treated as a priority in an urban context. Suggested alternative wording: "Within the urban area the emphasis will be to create buildings of high quality with landscaping where appropriate. Outside the urban areas and depending on character, landscaping will be encouraged to enhance the local area" | Disagree. The policy refers to key gateways and will need to reflect this in terms of landscaping. The requirements of highway junctions in terms of flow, safety etc are also to be considered. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13123 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Object | Appearance and character of the gateways is not as important as the capacity of the gateways to avoid bottlenecks and congestion. Brooks Street junction at M25/A12 is already over capacity and requires significant investment from Highways England/ECC. There needs to be direct slip road access from A12 to M25 not via the roundabout. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England in promoting the importance of improvements to the M25/A12 junction. Any potential impacts of additional development in the Borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. However, the appearance and character will also need to be considered as key gateway to the borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 15862 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Support | This policy, which recognises the important role gateways providing an opportunity to provide a positive impression of the Borough, is supported. The Brook Street Roundabout (M25/A12/A1023 interchange) is recognised as being a key gateway and the representation site can make a positive contribution towards enhancement of this gateway. It is a suitable size for large Head Quarter Operations and users that require a large footprint of building, which cannot typically be accommodated within town centres, due to the more limited size of available sites. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15214 - Spire Hartswood Hospital [6074] | Support | Support Policy 6.5 that aims to enhance a positive impression of the Borough, with development helping to create a distinctive and clear entry into Brentwood. In particular, the identification of the junction between the A12 and Road A1023 as a Key Gateway, as it represents a key entry point for vehicular traffic, travelling along the A12, and traffic entering the Borough to access Shenfield and Brentwood. Spire's proposals to provide a new state of the art hospital at relocated site will meet all the aims and objectives of the Key Gateway policy. The proposals will seek to provide a high quality building that marks a Gateway into Brentwood from the A12. | Noted | No action |
| 15155 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | The Dunton Hills Garden Village site lies directly adjacent to the key gateway of the A128/A127 road junction. The master planning process required as part of policy 7.1 together with the size of the single site affords the opportunity to deliver a positive approach to the borough. | Noted | No action |
| 16106 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Support | Rail stations are considered a key gateway to the Borough and therefore the utilisation of surrounding sites to deliver sustainable development throughout the plan period should be considered, alongside the opportunity to deliver higher density development in the short term. In line with paragraph 30 of the NPPF the Council should support a pattern of development which facilitates the sustainable modes of transport. The Council's proposed spatial strategy encourages this and therefore the policy can be considered positively prepared or justified as the most appropriate strategy. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16154 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Support | Support. The policy seeks contributions from development proposals in the vicinity of key gateways into the Borough in order to provide opportunities to enhance a positive impression of the Borough. Nag's Head Lane is within close proximity of the Brook Street junction (M25/A12) and development of this allocated site would provide an excellent opportunity for enhancements to be funded or included within the scheme. Details may be agreed at a later stage of the planning process. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| Strategic Sites | | | | |
| 14725 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Support | Paragraph 6.31 - Support the reference that nonstrategic allocations should be set out in Policy 7.10 instead of Policy 6.6 and request that the former Chequers Tavern Public House site is considered for the showmen's yard in this context. Paragraph 25 of the PPTS makes it clear that LPAs should be avoiding traveller site development outside of allocations of the Development Plan, particularly where a reasonable allocation is possible. | Noted. In line with Government recent policy changes, the Council is working to update the Gypsy Traveller and Travelling Showpeople evidence base in order to assess current need for pitches within the borough. | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 6.6: Strategic Sites | | | | |
| 13605 - Historic England (Mr Michael Stubbs) [5648] | Comment | Detailed consideration of setting will be a matter of material importance and such considerations are a constituent part of Local Plan policy 9.5 'Listed Buildings' and policy 6.3 (g) when considering the impact upon the significance of the asset. Historic England recommends that further investigation is required including characterisation work to inform the evidence base. This work will inform the historic environment evidence base consistent with paragraph 169 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Historic England has published guidance which deals with historic characterisation in local and neighbourhood plans. Historic England would conclude that the need for characterisation work will be fundamental to understanding the capacity of development in the Dunton Hills Garden Suburb. | Noted. The consideration of characterisation work to inform Plan development is considered important. | Consider accordingly |
| 15863 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] 16030 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | Reliance on the housing-led strategic site of Dunton Hills Garden Village in the Plan period should be reduced. | Disagree. The Council will consider the issue raised in relation to meeting full Objectively Assessed Housing Need in light of National Guidance and evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| 13920 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14062 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | A site should not be viewed as strategic just because it can become so with enough investment but because it has certain characteristics in its own right. Many locations can be made to become strategic particularly with regard to a Housing led site. The evidence supporting a Strategic housing allocation is not presented and there is no evidence to suggest that an investigation has been carried out to test whether the Dunton Hills Garden Village or any other location would be the best place to develop a strategic housing site. | Consideration of deliverability is only one constraint used in considering development proposals, evidence has been combined to build a picture of the most sustainable places for growth. Further site assessment is ongoing and sites will be assessed for their availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15899 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Acknowledges BBC's ambition to fully meet its 'objectively assessed need'. ECC agrees that the Local Plan will be critical for making sure Brentwood has the right infrastructure, at the right time, to accommodate the new jobs and homes needed in the future. ECC considers that large scale housing developments will need to include appropriate infrastructure such as schools, community facilities and improvements to the roads. Small scale development should also fund improvements to existing services and facilities. ECC note that infrastructure provision is likely to have a major impact on the phasing and deliverability of development. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13531 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] 15716 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] 15718 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | Dunton Hills Garden Village - We request therefore that these green links are accessible to all - pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians - rather than just pedestrians and cyclists. Brentwood Enterprise Park (Policies 101A and 101B) - we request that this park is planned appropriately so that the existing bridleway network in this vicinity is protected; the current enforcement issues with regard to the bridleways in this area are regularised, and a safe crossing of both the M25 and A127 is provided as part of this development, linking the bridleway networks either side of the M25. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15672 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Comment | Anglian Water has made an initial assessment of the impact of the proposed housing, employment retail and leisure allocation sites on existing water and water recycling infrastructure located within Anglian Water's area of responsibility. This will need to be revisited when planning applications are submitted to the District Council and we are approached by developers as part of the planning application process. A copy of the initial assessment made by Anglian Water is included with this consultation response. | Initial assessment noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14245 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council has a fundamental objection to a strategic Green Belt release at Dunton Hill Garden Village or at West Horndon due to the impact on the Green Belt. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 14246 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council has a fundamental objection to Dunton as little new or updated evidence has been made available to demonstrate the deliverability and viability of a strategic development such as this. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14330 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council is fundamentally opposed to any large scale Strategic Green Belt releases either at Dunton Hill Garden Village as put forward in the Brentwood Local Plan consultation or the previous option for the Dunton Garden Suburb. The assumption that the A127 has greater potential for growth is questioned. Thurrock Council highlights the key concerns in relation to the A127 Corridor strategic corridor below and in response to Policy 6.6 Strategic Sites: Significant impact and harm to the openness of the Green Belt; Coalescence of settlements; Detrimental impact on the Landscape; The lack of certainty regarding the deliverability of the development; Lack of detail on location and phasing of such a development; Lack of detail on the viability of such a proposal; Impact of the scale of development on adjoining housing markets and ability of Thurrock to deliver its housing; Infrastructure delivery and funding; Impact on strategic highway network - A127, A128, A13; Impact on the local highway network including within Thurrock; *Lack of transport modelling and mitigation measure; Impact of possible LTX crossing route on land and infrastructure capacity; Assumption and scoring in the SA/SEA. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. The Council agree that the A127 should be considered across local authority boundaries to consider wider development impacts on capacity. The cumulative impacts of development are being considered through the on-going Duty to Cooperate and evidence base, including identification of necessary mitigation. | Consider accordingly |
| 16107 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | Dunton Hills Garden Village - This policy is fundamentally unsound given the lack of evidence underpinning the Council's decision to allocate the site for development. The policy is not positively prepared in that the Council has not properly considered the infrastructure requirements to facilitate a development on this scale, nor is the policy justified due to a lack of credible and robust evidence base e.g. Green Belt Review, Landscape Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Strategy. We consider any development on this site will not be deliverable within the plan period and therefore cannot be considered effective and finally the allocation does not constitute sustainable development. | Disagree. Updated evidence will further inform the plan-making process. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The evidence base feeds into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | Consider accordingly |
| 13683 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | Dunton: is in the green belt, therefore should not be developed at all. Enterprise Park: not a brownfield site (see previous representations for more detail), so not suitable. William Hunter Way: insufficient case for retail-led development; high-rise flats would be a more appropriate development here. Baytree: has never had full occupancy, despite prime location, so there is no point creating other retail sites. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering all development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. Consideration of full or partial development of the Bay tree centre will consider the demand for suitably sized retail units. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|-----------|
| 15695 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 15968 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Support | The identification of the Brentwood Enterprise Park as a strategic site is strongly supported which recognises the critical importance of the sites to delivering the Plan's overall objectives. Strategic employment would be focused on the part of the site to the south of the A127. This provides the greatest opportunity for new employment development to meet strategic needs. The inclusion of an individual policy within the plan for each of the sites is supported and will assist with providing further certainty as to delivery and clarification when bringing forward outline or detailed planning applications on the site. | Support noted | No action |
| 15157 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Support the allocation of the strategic housing led site at Dunton Hills. Evidence prepared so far on behalf of the Council and the Promoters demonstrates that the site offers the most appropriate option for a large scale strategic development. | Support noted | No action |

Figure 6.1. Key Gateways

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15995 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Further clarification should be provided with regards the criteria for defining the locations as key gateways, and what role each location plays as a gateway to the borough. | Agreed. Figure 6.1 provides general illustration of various gateway locations, these need to be clarified. | Amend accordingly |
| 15868 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756] | Comment | Figure 6.1 identifies the location of these Key Gateways however it is of such a scale that it is not possible to clearly identify their boundaries. Each "Key Gateway" shown in this figure covers a wide area of land. A "Key Gateway" should be a specific defined entrance or link, not an extensive wider area. This figure should be amended accordingly. It appears that the SSL site forms part of one of the Key Gateways. Given it's function as a supermarket and car park, much of which is set back from William Hunter Way, SSL object to the store being included in the Key Gateway boundary and the boundary should be amended accordingly. | Disagree. The Council has commissioned a Town Centre Design Plan and these issues will be considered in greater detail. | Consider accordingly |
| 13127 - Mr William Trump [5351] | Support | Very supportive of this choice of sites | Support noted | No action |

Changes Since Preferred Options

| | | | | |
|---|---------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 14675 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Paragraph 6.32 - Support | Support noted | No action |
|---|---------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| Chapter 7. Sustainable Communities | | | | |
| Strategic Housing-led Development | | | | |
| 14677 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Comment | Paragraph 7.10 - References made to land around West Horndon village remaining a reasonable alternative are considered to be accurate, albeit clearly contentious. Even so, our client has consistently remained neutral in respect of this solution. Our client's position on this, and the alternative currently being explored, is to remain neutral until such time as one of the options has been agreed and the green belt and sustainability issues have been addressed. In any event, the delivery of development on the Horndon Estate can and should be allowed to proceed. | Noted | No action |
| 14959 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Paragraph 7.8 - Our client, and their appointed transport consultants, would welcome the opportunity to cooperate with the Borough and the Highways Authority on future modelling. | Noted | No action |
| 14952 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Paragraph 7.7 states that the final boundaries will be defined by a separate Masterplan to form part of the Brentwood Local Development Plan. It is unclear as to whether officers plan to remove land from the Green Belt at this stage or are reliant upon a future DPD to be informed by a Masterplanning exercise. Our client's view is that the Local Plan should inform the Masterplan and we would urge the Borough to remove land from the Green Belt via the Local Plan now including land that falls outside of the "development footprint" where it accords with NPPF policy in paragraph 85. Basildon plan to remove land from the Green Belt for development during the plan period (Site H10a) and safeguard additional land to the south of this allocation (Site H10b). The two Boroughs will need to liaise to ensure alterations are complementary and represent sustainable development. | Noted. Clarification of the process of development management within this area will be provided by the Council in line with the requirements of the NPPF. Appropriate work with Basildon Borough is continuing in line with the duty to cooperate. | Consider accordingly |
| 14947 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Paragraph 7.5 - We would urge the Borough to consider our client's site [Crest Nicholson's land interests within the allocation for Dunton Hills Garden Village] as an integral part of the redevelopment of this wider area within the A127 corridor. By including this site in the final allocation, in alignment with our clients land interests, greater flexibility will be built into the allocation and the plan as a whole. | Site specific comment noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 14951 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Paragraph 7.6 - Our client's [Crest Nicholson's land interests within the allocation for Dunton Hills Garden Village] site is well screened offering potential for a well contained development with the potential to be feathered into the wider landscape. Our clients land interest in the site does not serve a purpose for Green Belt and its function as Green Belt would be further diminished with development on H10a within Basildon. | Site specific comment noted. A general Green Belt review is being commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | No action |
| 14953 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Paragraph 7.7 - The Green Belt Assessment (March 2016) found that the whole site had received a High overall assessment rating, however, we would urge the Borough to break the site down into smaller assessment parcels to allow for a finer grain nuanced assessment of openness and performance against the five purposes of the Green Belt. The Masterplan can then utilise this evidence and help to inform strategic decisions on what constitutes 'sustainable patterns of development' for this area of the Borough. | Comment regarding assessment noted. A general Green Belt review is being commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other opportunities and constraints. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14948 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Paragraph 7.9 - It is not clear from publicly available materials produced by Brentwood or Basildon as to whether either Borough has been requested to meet any neighbouring Council's objectively assessed housing need (via the Dunton Hills Garden Village/West of Basildon sites). It is apparent that Dunton Hills Garden Village is being pursued separately as an independent settlement with the strategy focused on protecting the character of villages within Brentwood, but it is unclear how this approach will integrate with Basildon's plans for site H10. | Noted. The Council is working with Basildon Borough on strategic cross boundary issues as required by the Duty to Cooperate, which includes the proposed Garden Village. | Consider accordingly |
| 13883 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Paragraph 7.8 - It is the A12 that has the distinct possibility for growth, as that is where the improved A12 and Crossrail are, so that is where people want to live and work. The A127 has houses built up to its boundaries, not allowing for expansion, and the C2C line is already at capacity. Local roads, doctors, schools, etc, would not be in place until well into any construction period, and residents would be cut off from existing Brentwood services by the busy A127 and A128. | Comment noted. In allocating sites the Council will have regard to; settlement hierarchy and the role of key settlements; the need to phase development and essential infrastructure requirements. | Consider accordingly |
| 15916 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Paragraph 7.8 of the Draft Local Plan states that "The A127 Corridor provides an opportunity for growth in the Borough that brings along new services, facilities and infrastructure. These same opportunities are not possible in the A12 Corridor considering the higher impact on existing services and lack of contained land to provide for similar development numbers". WHPC strongly challenge this statement. The A127 Corridor is not, as noted within these representations, readily bound, with cross border authorities a material threat to urban sprawl. The scale of development proposed within the A127 Corridor is not supported by existing infrastructure, and the ability to upgrade it to support the proposed level of development is questionable. In particular, the A127 is bounded by housing along its duration, and is significantly closer to the Dartford Crossing and A13 which create regular traffic problems for the local area. WHPC also note that expansion of the A127/M25 in the context of the proposed development is not supported by Essex County Council or Highways England. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13876 - mrs zoe chambers [5634] 13881 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 14191 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] | Object | Paragraph 7.6 - This claim is false, development here encourages urban sprawl, particularly when taken alongside the development proposed on the Basildon Draft Local Plan. Development will remove virtually the only remaining Green Belt between the London Borough of Havering and Southend. Choosing to destroy the small remaining green space to the West of Basildon completely goes against Green Belt policy. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15201 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Object | There are concerns in respect of nearly a third of the housing supply coming from one source (Dunton Hill Garden Village) and it is highly questionable whether such a large scale concept can be relied upon to address the significant housing shortfall that currently exists. In order to deliver the required number of houses in the first five years of the plan, the Council should allocate smaller, more suitable and deliverable sites. | Concerns noted. In light of National Guidance and evidence, the evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. In accordance with the Spatial Strategy the Council will consider the issues raised in relation to meeting full Objectively Assessed Housing Need. | Consider accordingly |
| 13882 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Paragraph 7.7 - There can be no Green Belt boundaries created when the small patch of Green Belt in this area is all being proposed for development, by Brentwood and Basildon, and it will directly affect the urban sprawl, by making The London Borough of South Essex a distinct possibility for anyone living south of the A127. | The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 14715 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] | Object | Green Belt land should not be released unless it would be a huge benefit for the local community and hugely sought after by those residents. The proposed sites at West Horndon and Dunton are in Metropolitan Green Belt land. Housing demand alone does not warrant the exceptional circumstances to justify such loss. The LDP seems to conflict with National Planning Policy on Green Belt retention but actively seems to encourage more than just this "one-off" release of Green Belt with the Parish. Developers will have a powerful case to build more homes on adjacent Green Belt land once the precedent is set. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14647 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14820 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | 1. Challenge that the A127 corridor provides an opportunity for growth that brings new services, facilities and infrastructure. These are possible in the A12 corridor. Noting also that expansion of the A127/M25 in the context of the proposed development is not supported by Essex County Council or Highways England. 2. Flood risk around West Horndon village creates significant issues when considering larger scale development around the village. The flood issues are also clearly stated in the Draft Local Plan (10.68). Previous consultations also rightly highlighted increased deliverability challenges should development be focused on West Horndon village. The village is already assumed to support 500 houses. If all development is concentrated on the village these houses' deliverability becomes more challenging, and viability clearly reduces. | 1. The Council needs to make provision for additional homes where appropriate. Due to the different character and availability of land the capacity for growth in the A127 Corridor is potentially greater than elsewhere in the Borough. However, at this stage the Council are considering all development options. A potential allocation within the A127 Corridor represents an opportunity to accommodate additional homes in a sustainable location in accordance with national guidance and supported by evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal. It is acknowledged that the A127 suffers from congestion problems, as do all strategic roads in the wider area. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence required to inform whether development needs can be met. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Evidence is being undertaken alongside Plan preparation to ensure a Plan is delivered as soon as possible. This also includes an assessment of site landscape capacity and a site assessment of NPPF Green Belt tests. 2. In allocating sites the Council will have regard to; settlement hierarchy and the role of key settlements; the need to phase development; essential infrastructure requirements; and flood mitigation. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14718 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] | Object | I understand that Basildon Council are also considering developing up to the Brentwood Council border at Dunton. Should surrounding areas bordering West Horndon Parish, that are controlled by other authorities, be developed in this way, there could be urban sprawl all the way from London to Basildon or even beyond, something which the Metropolitan Green Belt was designed to protect against. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. The Council will continue to work with adjoining boroughs under the Duty to Cooperate. A record of this will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan | Consider accordingly |
| 13884 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Paragraph 7.9 - Completely contradicts Paragraph 7.7, as any Duty of Cooperation to build over the entire area of Green Belt at Dunton would remove any boundary to urban sprawl, guaranteeing that there would be a London Borough of South Essex. A small corridor of Green Belt, west of the Mardyke tributary on the land, would not constitute enough Green Belt as being possible to retain the title, and it could well be buried under concrete if the Lower Thames Crossing C4 goes ahead. | Noted. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self-sustaining communities with accompanying local services to minimise the impact on existing services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities on cross boundary related issues under the Duty to Cooperate. | Consider accordingly |
| 13649 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Paragraph 7.5 - Wrong to state that DHGV will be linked with Brentwood and other Borough Villages, as it will be divided from them by the A127 and the A128. Also, there is no physical route directly onto the A127, and if the Lower Thames Crossing Route C4 goes ahead this will be even worse. As the only available access will be going across Basildon land, this takes residents away from the Brentwood area, and places the burden on all of Basildon services. | Comment noted. To better link strategic allocations in the A127 Corridor Draft Policy 10.1 seeks to establish a Green Travel Route to link these areas to Brentwood Town Centre. As part of the Plan review we will continue to consider the issue with further consultation and in light of new evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| 13875 - mrs zoe chambers [5634] | Object | Paragraph 7.10 - I would like an explanation as to how Brentwood council are prepared to consider the Green belt surrounding West Horndon, but are in no way considering the larger impact on the tiny rural village of Dunton. By building right up to the Basildon border it leaves Basildon with no Green Belt. The burden and mental anguish of seeing our community change beyond recognition remains purely with West Basildon residents in Langdon Hills and Dunton. | The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. Brentwood Borough Council will work with the adjoining local authorities under the Duty to Cooperate in the development of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15917 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | <p>Para 7.10 of the Draft Local Plan states that "Land around West Horndon village remains a reasonable alternative because it can provide for similar development numbers forwards local needs". WHPC strongly challenge this statement. As set out above, it was recognised in prior consultations that the flood risk around West Horndon village creates significant issues when considering larger scale development around the village. The flood issues are also clearly stated in the Draft Local Plan (10.68). Previous consultations also rightly highlighted increased deliverability challenges should development be focused on West Horndon village. The village is already assumed to support 500 houses. If all development is concentrated on the village these houses' deliverability becomes more challenging, and viability clearly reduces.</p> | <p>The Council needs to make provision for additional homes, due to the different character and availability of land the capacity for growth in the A127 Corridor is potentially greater than elsewhere in the Borough. However, at this stage the Council are considering all development options and continuing to appropriately assess these alternative options within the SA. A potential allocation within the A127 Corridor represents an opportunity to accommodate additional homes in a sustainable location in accordance with national guidance and supported by evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal. It is acknowledged that the A127 suffers from congestion problems, as do all strategic roads in the wider area. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence required to inform whether development needs can be met. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Evidence is being undertaken alongside Plan preparation to ensure a Plan is delivered as soon as possible. This also includes an assessment of site landscape capacity and a site assessment of NPPF Green Belt tests. In allocating sites the Council will have regard to; settlement hierarchy and the role of key settlements; the need to phase development; essential infrastructure requirements; and flood mitigation.</p> | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|-----------|
| 15003 - Stephen Hill [612] | Support | Supports the approach set out in the draft Brentwood Local Development Plan which seeks to direct development to the A127 corridor and allocate land at Dunton Hills Garden Village. An advantage of new towns/garden villages is self sufficiency which means that all necessary facilities such as GP surgeries are included and, as such, are far more likely to meet the needs of residents compared to the erosion of services when attempting to boost existing facilities to meet additional needs. Another obvious benefit of this type of development is, despite accommodating large numbers, the impact of traffic in local towns would be far less compared to that created by the provision of in town housing schemes. | Noted | No action |
| 14943 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Support | Supports the approach set out in the draft Brentwood Local Development Plan which seeks to direct development to the A127 corridor and allocate land at Dunton Hills Garden Village. There is a clear demand for residential-led development in this location and we support the Borough's overall spatial strategy for growth. | Noted | No action |
| Policy 7.1: Dunton Hills Garden Village | | | | |
| 16005 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Would seek early consultation regarding any proposal to consider any impacts on designated and non- designated heritage assets, as identified in the Historic Environment Record (HER). | tbc | tbc |
| 15511 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | Whilst we have no comments to make on this policy. We have already provided our advice on this strategic site through the Joint Consultation with Basildon Council last year. | tbc | tbc |
| 15650 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Comment | It should also be noted that one of the proposed routes to the Lower Thames Crossing, Route 4, would alter the location of Dunton Hills Garden Village. Further consideration would need to be given to a revised location, especially in terms of impact on infrastructure. | tbc | tbc |
| 16006 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | In progressing any allocation further strategic and project level assessment of ecology and Country Parks will be necessary and should be in accordance with best-practice guidelines. In addition appropriate engagement with the Parks Services will need to be undertaken to inform any design of future assessment/mitigation studies for ecology and green infrastructure. ECC request further investigation into Enhancement Measures and ECC note that the strategic allocation is located between three living landscape areas which presents significant opportunities to establish a strategic framework to ensure the "concept" delivers a positive contribution to the local ecological network and habitat species. | tbc | tbc |
| 16014 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Consistency should be provided with regards the definition of the proposed allocation at Dunton, which is phrased as: - Policy 7.1 Dunton Hills Garden Village - Paragraph 7.5 - 'will provide a new settlement' - Hierarchy of Place, paragraph 5.30 - 'a new self sustaining village' within Settlement Category 2: Village Service Centre. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16015 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Advise if the allocation is being proposed as a 'Garden Village' consideration should be given to applying the Garden City principles as outlined in the NPPF and the 2013 Town and Country Planning Association's publication "Creating garden cities and suburbs today". | tbc | tbc |
| 15717 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | Dunton Hills Garden Village - we note that the Council wishes to establish green links from this new development to the rest of Brentwood Borough. We request therefore that these green links are accessible to all - pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians - rather than just pedestrians and cyclists. | tbc | tbc |
| 15789 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Comment | This area is identified location for route C, if route C be the preferred location for Lower Thames Crossing it would severely impact the deliverability of the proposed allocation. The Draft Plan has not identified how the Council will overcome this issue should Route 4 be progressed. The Council should identify reserved sites that can be called upon if (a) the allocation does not come forward or (b) the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. | tbc | tbc |
| 16377 - Ethan Williams [6194] | Comment | The need for better broadband in the area. | tbc | tbc |
| 15881 - Revera Ltd (Mr Renshaw Watts) [6113] | Comment | Agent for landowners of 39 acres of land between Basildon and West Horndon, support the allocation of land under Policy 7.1. The inclusion of land in this location would suggest the evidence base supports its development and request reconsideration of the allocation under Policy 7.1 working towards a cross boundary development with Basildon BC. Large scale development is supported by paragraph 52 of the NPPF. Clients land is under option with Persimmon Homes demonstrating deliverability in the plan period with no safeguarding beyond 2034. Should Brentwood BC deliver the land separately our clients land should still be considered for development. | tbc | tbc |
| 13940 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Comment | The Basildon draft policy H10 includes a provision to have regard to the route, impacts and implications of the Lower Thames Crossing, should Route Option C be pursued by the Government during the plan period. The supporting text states that a decision on the preferred route will be taken in 2016 by the Secretary of State for Transport and if this route is selected there are potential highways and land use implications for this site which will need to be considered in the preparation of the masterplan/development brief for this site. We contend that the Brentwood draft policy 7.1 should contain a similar provision, in order to maintain flexibility over the plan period. | tbc | tbc |
| 15933 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | It is unclear what the proposed phasing or delivery timing is for Dunton Hills Garden Village. It is not included in Appendix 3. WHPC state concern regarding any development within this site given its scale, and the knock-on impact to West Horndon should infrastructure not be delivered in an appropriate, timely, and properly phased manner. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15585 - Castle Point Borough Council (Steve Rogers) [4643] | Comment | <p>The Plan does not indicate what transport improvements will be undertaken to accommodate the growth planned within its borough. Further work would be needed to identify what impacts the proposed developments will have on the existing transport networks, and how to mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>For example the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 2,500 new homes; <input type="checkbox"/> at least 5 ha of employment land; <input type="checkbox"/> local shops; <input type="checkbox"/> community facilities; <input type="checkbox"/> schools; and <input type="checkbox"/> healthcare services <p>The Plan acknowledges that this development would have an impact on the A127 Corridor, but it does not indicate what mitigation measures would be put in place.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 15963 - Kelvedon Hatch Parish Council (Mr. Richard North) [1855] | Comment | <p>Kelvedon Hatch Parish Council Discussed the above Plan at our Council meeting on the 10th of March 2016. We decided that although there were no identified sites for housing or commercial development within our parish our response would largely remain as it was last year during the then consultation. There were some changes, of course, with regard to the developments to the south of the town in the then Dunton Garden Suburb. We were in agreement that the now proposed development under the sole control of the Brentwood Borough Council would seem a better option than under partnership with adjacent councils. The previous submission is attached for clarification of our position.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 15795 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | <p>ECC considers the growth at West Horndon and Dunton is the absolute minimum required to sustain a secondary school of sufficient size to be viable. A school is unlikely to be delivered until later in the development meaning secondary school age pupils moving into the area would need to be transported to and from existing schools in Brentwood/Shenfield. Consideration will need to be given to cross boundary issues with Basildon proposing development at the Basildon West Urban Extension.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 15908 - Kitewood [6116] | Comment | <p>There appears to be a lack of cross-boundary co-operation between Brentwood and Basildon Borough Council on this matter. The Basildon Consultation 2016 (Policy H10) confirms that insufficient evidence has been prepared to demonstrate that the Dunston Garden Village is appropriate or deliverable in the plan period.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 14949 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | <p>At present there appears to be little coordination in the drafting of Policy 7.1 and Policy H10/E7 (in Basildon's draft plan) up to this point. For such a key growth area we feel it is important that each emerging policy is prepared reflective of the aspirations on each side of the Borough boundary. This should include robust impact modelling that takes account of the proposed growth in each Borough and integrated infrastructure planning. To achieve a sustainable solution for the land West of Basildon the two allocations will need to be planned in a comprehensive fashion.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16000 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC recommends that growth identified in the Basildon Local Plan (Policy H10) would require a minimum of a 2 forms of entry (420-place) primary school. The 2,500 dwellings identified in the Brentwood Local Plan at Dunton Hills Garden Village could require the provision of at least one large (31/2 forms of entry - 735-places), or more probably two smaller (1 x 2 forms of entry (420-places) and 1 x 11/2 form of entry (315-places) new primary schools. The precise requirement would be dependent on the housing mix agreed for the development. A further 150 primary school places would be required to accommodate the pupils generated by the 500 homes identified for West Horndon. Some of this additional demand could probably be accommodated by an expansion of West Horndon Primary School but some of the growth may need to be accommodated in the new primary schools on the Dunton Garden Village development. | tbc | tbc |
| 13936 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Comment | A site of this scale will require significant infrastructure investment prior to delivery and whether the site is deliverable in highways terms has not been established. The consultation document states that the A127 is constrained and further work will need to be undertaken with the Highways Authority and Highways England to address capacity and traffic flow. The key diagram suggests that an enhanced junction will be required onto the A127. | tbc | tbc |
| 16011 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Will seek early consultation on any proposal to ensure that there are sufficient opportunities to meet the identified needs of an area for the management of waste and to apply and promote the waste management hierarchy within sustainable development. Consideration needs to be given to the provision for waste management uses as an employment activity within any proposed commercial or industrial employment areas. Considerations should also be given to the potential for integrated land uses and low carbon heating / power systems. | tbc | tbc |
| 16278 - Dunton Community Association [6184] | Comment | DHGV would overwhelm the adjacent village of Dunton Wayletts, if Basildon's Policy H10 would extend to the boundary with Basildon Council and would lie only about 200m away from the westernmost properties in Dunton Wayletts. A development on the scale proposed would dominate this rural area and overwhelm the adjacent village. The two developments would amalgamate to form a large scale development that would place a disproportionate number of homes in an appropriate rural area. The ancient Dunton Wayletts, in the middle of the development, would be obliterated as a distinct rural settlement. | tbc | tbc |
| 15998 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Consider that, given the proximity of the site to Policy H10 (Basildon Borough New Draft Local Plan), both local authorities should be in discussion concerning the potential synergies between development, potential for shared evidence base, and the consideration of the cumulative impact on primary and secondary education, and early years and childcare provision, key highway junctions and the wider network. Essential that joint working between relevant partners is progressed to ensure that the appropriate economies of scale can be achieved. | tbc | tbc |
| 16003 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC provided comments to the joint 'Concept Consultation in 2015, and these comments remain pertinent. The proposal is at an early stage, but there is limited evidence and information available to comment on its appropriateness, including Strategic Green Belt Review; Transport modelling and highway impact assessments; Infrastructure requirements (including education/early years and childcare); Environmental issues (ie landscape impacts; surface water management). | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15970 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | Paragraph 7.8 states that "It is recognised that the A127 highway is constrained and further work will need to be undertaken [...]" Rather than currently constrained, it is more accurate to identify that it's forecast to be under increased pressure in future years with the realisation of local plan development; for further examination with Highways England this should probably apply to the M25 Junction 29 as a key gateway for the borough, including direct access to the Brentwood Enterprise Park. | tbc | tbc |
| 16452 - Mrs W Colhoun [6205] | Comment | The idea of a new village with new facilities will just be an idea if the Laindon shopping centre and Basildon are anything to go by, the maintenance and improvements of these areas are non existent. | tbc | tbc |
| 16032 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | Development at Dunton seeks to provide 35% of housing for the Borough. Although a development of this type will bring forward some facilities and services, these are likely to be limited in nature and scale due to the limited size of the planned population. This site should either be excluded from the Plan or reliance on the delivery of this site within the Plan period should be reduced and other sites should be allocated adjoining the urban areas of Brentwood/ Shenfield. The Sustainability Appraisal identifies the potential for significant negative effects arising from the draft Plan "given the uncertainty that remains regarding Dunton Hills Garden Village". In the same report, flooding is also identified as a notable issue. | tbc | tbc |
| 16068 - Martin Grant Homes [2691] | Comment | There appears to be no considerable background to the appropriateness of this location for the Dunton Hills Garden Village. Basildon Council states that "Brentwood Borough Council had not provided sufficient information to show it was the best location for new housing provision in the Brentwood Borough" | tbc | tbc |
| 13545 - Mrs Andrea Wilkes [2489] | Comment | Whilst I am not in favour of development of greenbelt land, I think that the Dunton Garden Village seems like a sensible solution to the problem of housing in the borough. As a resident of West Horndon, I am concerned about the effect of too much housing development on the size and character of the village but the Dunton Garden Village could still have a similar adverse effect. I wonder how the proposed additional Thames Crossing Development will affect the plans for the Dunton Garden Village. | tbc | tbc |
| 15865 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | Development at Dunton seeks to provide 35% of housing for the Borough. Although a development of this type will bring forward some facilities and services, these are likely to be limited in nature and scale due to the limited size of the planned population. This site should either be excluded from the Plan or reliance on the delivery of this site within the Plan period should be reduced and other sites should be allocated adjoining the urban areas of Brentwood/ Shenfield. The Sustainability Appraisal identifies the potential for significant negative effects arising from the draft Plan "given the uncertainty that remains regarding Dunton Hills Garden Village". In the same report, flooding is also identified as a notable issue. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15673 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Comment | <p>Anglian Water has made an initial assessment of the impact of the proposed housing, employment retail and leisure allocation sites on existing water and water recycling infrastructure located within Anglian Water's area of responsibility. This will need to be revisited when planning applications are submitted to the District Council and we are approached by developers as part of the planning application process. A copy of the initial assessment made by Anglian Water is included with this consultation response.</p> <p>In relation to the strategic sites identified in the Local Plan it would be helpful to cross refer to the requirements of Policies 10.13 (Flood Risk) and (Sustainable Drainage) to ensure that these development proposals which are of strategic significance provide sufficient evidence relating to foul drainage and surface water management and the timing of any required improvements.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 14061 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | <p>7.5 talks about a development of the size proposed being necessary to provide critical mass for local services and infrastructure that otherwise could not come forward with smaller sites. 7.6 talks about the sustainability of this approach. Both are broad statements without supported evidence. 7.8 again makes unsupported and somewhat obscure statements such as the same opportunities not being possible in the 'A12 Corridor considering the higher impact on existing services and lack of contained land to provide for similar development numbers'.</p> <p>There are a number of settlements in the Borough that are overwhelmingly residential in nature and with limited retail and commercial premises, the varied size and location of existing settlements allow flexibility in approach. Directing growth and investments to these settlements will help to improve the balance and sustainability of existing communities.</p> <p>With the available wide range of sites it is not easy to see the size of the Dunton Village being essential to fulfill any particular aim for critical mass.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 14962 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | <p>Re. Dunton Hills Garden Village - In vehicular terms having an access onto both the A128 Tilbury Road to the west and to the B148 West Mayne would ensure that traffic from the development would be able to access both to the east and west which spreads traffic and offers two alternative connection routes to the A127 strategic route. Given that the most significant employment opportunities within the immediate area of the site are to the east of the site it is important to provide connections in this direction.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 16286 - Dunton Community Association [6184] | Object | <p>Breaking the circle of open land around London would be unlawful</p> <p>DHGV adjoining Policy H10 proposed by Basildon Council would effectively bridge the gap between Basildon and West Horndon. BEP would effectively bridge the gap between West Horndon and the M25. The circle of open land would be broken.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 13700 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13701 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] | Object | The NPPF shows that the proposed development of 2500 properties, plus employment and traveller sites on Green Belt at Dunton is not sustainable, as a loss of the very limited areas of Green Belt South of the A127 virtually links the areas of the London Borough of Havering through to Southend, so the LDP doesn't prevent neighbouring towns merging with one another. Development around the Dunton area fosters Brentwood's problems onto the people of Basildon, as development would be isolated from the rest of the Borough by the A127 and the A128. Brentwood has twice the amount of Green Belt as Basildon, yet it is choosing to destroy the small remaining green space to the West of Basildon, which completely goes against Green Belt policy. New residents wouldn't have access to amenities. Wildlife of the area would be destroyed. Increase the risk of flooding. | tbc | tbc |
| 16338 - London Borough of Havering [85] | Object | - Strongly oppose to this development. The Draft Plan states that the site can contribute to the Green Belt purposes, but not demonstrated how. Development will have a negative effect on the Green Belt purposes. - Both the A12 and A127 are already heavily trafficked and additional traffic using these routes linked to development in Brentwood will adversely affect traffic flows and have a detrimental environment impact through additional noise, pollution and vibration. | tbc | tbc |
| 15632 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | As detailed above, a SHLAA has not been carried out since 2011. As it stands there is therefore no robust and credible evidence to demonstrate that the land required to provide the Dunton Hills Garden Village is available or suitable for the purpose to which it is proposed, or whether development in this location is achievable (viable). In the absence of such evidence, the proposals for Dunton Hills Garden Village are not supported by evidence, and it is not clear that they are deliverable. Consequently, Basildon Council is clear that without any further evidence to support this proposal Brentwood's Local Plan is unlikely to be sound on the basis of justification and effectiveness. | tbc | tbc |
| 13608 - Mrs Catherine West [5649] 13609 - Mr Keith West [5650] 13610 - Mr Thomas West [5651] 13611 - Mr Daniel West [5652] | Object | Object strongly to the proposed development at Dunton Garden Suburb. The infrastructure cannot cope at the moment. The A127 would need to be motorway standard at least. Hospitals/schools/doctors, etc, cannot cope and I do not want to see any traveller site provision at all. I do not want to see any green belt land or wildlife destroyed. I strongly object to Brentwood dumping its housing on Basildon's doorstep. | tbc | tbc |
| 16285 - Dunton Community Association [6184] | Object | Dunton is an unsuitable location for large scale development because the development would: harm the character and setting of the historic village of Dunton Wayletts; ruin the setting of All Saint's Church, East Horndon; severely harm the setting of several other listed buildings; local infrastructure could not absorb the increase in population and vehicle movements; reduce public access to open space; reduce opportunities for open air pursuits; bisect and important wildlife connectivity corridor; intrude into Mardyke Valley, a valued landscape; frustrate the objectives of Thames Chase Community Forest; unacceptably close to an SSSI; threaten ancient woodlands; lie in a high risk flood zone; the land is in good productive agriculture use; the Dunton area is required to be left undeveloped for aviation purposes. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16281 - Dunton Community Association [6184] | Object | Dunton is an unsuitable location for large scale development because the development : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would reduce the narrowest and most critical section of the Metropolitan Green Belt - promote the coalescence of Southend with London - would constitute ribbon development - would replace a strong Green Belt boundary with a weak one - the area lacks landscape capacity for large scale development - the area does not exhibit any characteristics that indicate suitability for Green Belt boundary adjustment. - development would be adjacent to a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline - be in an area of exceptionally poor air quality. | tbc | tbc |
| 15912 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | WHPC comment up front that whilst the Draft Local Plan document sets out historic consultation processes, it fails to provide a full background as to consultation response on a number of points. In particular, and as noted in 2.12 of this document, 84% of respondents to the Dunton Garden Suburb consultation in January 2015 rejected the proposal for significant development at Dunton, with only 3% supporting conditionally, and 3% supporting unconditionally. Whilst Dunton Hills Garden Village looks only at the Brentwood side of the originally proposed Dunton Garden Suburb, there was clear rejection of material development both 1) at this site and 2) within West Horndon village as stated throughout the Draft Local Plan, in response to the 2013 consultation round. As such, consultations to date clearly reject material development at either potential location within the A127 Corridor. Yet the current Draft Local Plan is supporting this approach. | tbc | tbc |
| 15913 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | WHPC note that the proposed development within the Draft Local Plan is highly concentrated within the A127 Corridor. This scale and concentration will irrevocably harm Green Belt within this area (at a disproportionate level than the wider Borough), create problems and risks with regards to deliverability, contribute to urban sprawl rather than prevent it, and create material infrastructure requirements that are simply not considered in sufficient detail within the Draft Local Plan. These issues are either ignored, or glossed over, in the Draft Local Plan document. WHPC believe that these issues lead to the potential for the Draft Local Plan to be considered unsound, unsustainable, and lacking in the level of detail that is required for a proposal of this nature. Much of the discussion below picks up on, and expands on the issues around material development within the A127 Corridor. On this basis, and considering the independent Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by WHPC, WHPC represent that a sustainable level of development within the A127 Corridor would be limited to a maximum of 500 houses across sites 020 and 021 (the West Horndon Industrial Estates). As noted in 3.7 above however, even this level of development would require a significant amount of infrastructure expenditure to ensure it is sustainable. On this basis, and considering the independent Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by WHPC, WHPC represent that a sustainable level of development within the A127 Corridor would be limited to a maximum of 500 houses across sites 020 and 021 (the West Horndon Industrial Estates). Even this level of development would require a significant amount of infrastructure expenditure to ensure it is sustainable. | tbc | tbc |
| 16171 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] | Object | The key characteristics of a garden village are that it forms the expansion of existing small settlements, is within the catchment of a town, located on an existing transport corridor and is partly or mostly self-sufficient in terms of local social infrastructure. The Dunton Hills proposal cannot meet three of the four characteristics identified above. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 14976 - Ursuline Sisters [28] 15363 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15383 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15412 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15488 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15568 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15614 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16165 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16190 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | Serious questions remain regarding the deliverability of the Dunton Hills Garden Village and the cooperation between Basildon Borough Council and Brentwood Borough Council appears to have ceased following the consultation on the Strategic Growth Options and Dunton Garden Suburb Consultation in early 2015. The proposal for the Dunton Hills Garden Village is not sustainable and insufficient justification for its allocation has not been provided. | tbc | tbc |
| 15644 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Basildon Borough Council do not however support the proposed location of new employment within the Dunton Hills Garden Village, this area of land was not put forward in the call for sites and the land within the Green Belt is currently rated a 'high' in the Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt and their Relative Contribution to the Purposes of the Green Belt Designation when considering the purposes of land within the Green Belt. | tbc | tbc |
| 16084 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The key benefits that would arise from development of land to the east of West Horndon are considered to be: Countryside Properties track record of delivering high quality strategic schemes with genuine a sense of place and integration with existing villages; Fully deliverable and fully sustainable-within a 5 minute walk of the existing railway station and local facilities and services; Delivery of much needed high quality housing in the Borough; Development early on in the plan period with minimal infrastructure required to access and deliver proposals; Delivery of new open space, recreational facilities, primary school, new connections to wider countryside; Improvements to the existing village; No significant impact on the Green Belt, landscape character and visual amenity =; Development proposals can fully mitigate its impact; Comprehensive illustrative masterplan. | tbc | tbc |
| 15336 - Ford Motor Company [3768] | Object | In March 2015 Ford submitted representations to the joint consultation. At this stage, Ford raised significant concerns regarding this strategic allocation across to the administrative boundaries of the two local authorities. Ford maintains an objection to the strategic allocation at the Dunton Hills Garden Village due to the perceived wider impact on Ford's operational facility and strategic site at the Dunton Technical Centre in Dunton, Basildon. Ford has also emphasised these concerns in response to the strategic allocation included in the Draft Basildon Borough Council Local Plan. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13102 - mr david rontree [5338] 13212 - Paul Nixon [5435] 13346 - Lynne Henderson [5525] 13468 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 13469 - mr stewart henderson [5579] 13478 - Mrs Rachel Gibbs [5584] 13482 - mrs Amy Davis [5588] 13483 - mr simon davis [5587] 13493 - Mr Richard Massett [4341] 13503 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 13520 - mr simon davis [5587] 13552 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] 13566 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] 13569 - Anne Clark [4973] 13574 - Mr Adam Victory [5633] 13586 - Anne Clark [4973] 13617 - ms ann faithful [5655] 13647 - Mrs Linda Allport-Hodge [5653] 13655 - mrs zoe chambers [5634] 13692 - J A [5672] 13697 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] 13919 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 13979 - Bulphan Community Forum (Mr David Gilbane) [5626] 13995 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] 13996 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] 13998 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] 13999 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] 14001 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] 14189 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] | Object | <p>Damage to the Green Belt; loss of agricultural land disturb nature and the environment; better to develop around Brentwood, particularly with Crossrail and A12 improvements; A127 and A128 are at capacity; negative effect of local services; proposal lacks detail particularly on infrastructure; should follow Castle Point councils and not build on Green Belt; Council should listen to the opposition of residents and not to developers; infrastructure should be improved before new homes are developed; Trains currently at capacity, unacceptable pollution level; impact on local hospitals who are already on black alert and GP surgeries; local area already short of a secondary school; flooding concerns; Lack of funding; question the need for new homes in the first place; has the wildlife trust, RSPB, Butterfly and rare species group been consulted? Need wildlife corridors; where will the waste go? Need Green Belt; ecology, landscape and infrastructure assessment of site; overprovision of travellers sites which does not confirm to current guidance.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 15925 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | <p>The south of the Borough is bounded by neighbouring authorities Thurrock, Havering and Basildon. Whilst WHPC agree that it is bounded by the A127 and railway line, in reality it would be easy for all neighbouring authorities to develop up to their borders, creating massive urban sprawl from London to Basildon. Indeed, the Basildon Dunton Extension plans in their emerging LDP already point to this. As such, WHPC reject the notion stated throughout the Draft Local Plan that current "defensible boundaries" would prevent this.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16344 - Miss Elaine Heaps [6189] 16350 - Mrs R Nash [6190] 16355 - Mrs B.I. Staerck [6191] 16384 - Mr William Shine [6195] 16392 - Sandra Halliday [6196] 16393 - Sandra Halliday [6196] 16400 - Gary Howard [6197] 16424 - Mr D Nash [6203] 16439 - David Halliday [6204] 16440 - David Halliday [6204] 16450 - Mrs W Colhoun [6205] 16464 - Jean Williams [6211] 16472 - Mr William White [6213] 16480 - Sandra Carpenter [6214] | Object | Affect security at Dunton Park, use land in Brentwood, it would disturb nature and the environment; needs a feasibility plan for transport; this joins Dunton with Laindon; ruin character of area; it is urban sprawl; damage to wildlife, pollution problems; need infrastructure in place before development; | tbc | tbc |
| 15055 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | An assessment of 60 GB sites was produced after this plan was written. And yet the draft plan proposes to create a new garden village at Dunton Hills on GB land that is rated "medium value", for 2,500 new homes (35%) of housing needs in the Borough to 2033. | tbc | tbc |
| 16118 - Countryside Properties [250] 16120 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | An assessment by transport consultants - Odyssey Markides - on behalf of Countryside Properties, shows that the land cannot be accessed by road (Appendix 3). Previous linkages with Basildon Borough and a new station proposed in the adjoining Borough (now abandoned) will no longer make it accessible via public transport. The site is at high risk of flooding (zone 3). It is questionable, given land required for open space and landscaping, whether there is sufficient capacity to provide 2,500 new homes and other non-residential uses. The recently published study by Crestwood Environmental Limited entitled "Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt" (commissioned by BBC), found that out of 203 sites assessed the majority made a 'moderate' contribution to the Green Belt. Only 7 sites were found to make a 'high' contribution and this included land at Dunton. This assessment gives a damning report of land at Dunton, and as national planning policy advises, the Plan requires adjustment in the light of this new evidence. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16139 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Paragraph 7.10 confirms that land around West Horndon village remains a reasonable alternative to DHGV because it can provide for similar development numbers towards local needs. We submit that it represents a more sustainable option for strategic growth. The settlement of West Horndon had been emerging as the preferred location for strategic growth until the conception of the joint proposals for Dunton Garden Suburb a year ago. Although evidence regarding the development proposals for West Horndon has been submitted to previous versions of the Local Plan, to demonstrate its suitability and sustainability, this evidence and details have not been used by the Council and its consultants to inform the SA. Instead DHGV has emerged as the preferred option for growth, without the benefit of a full and comprehensive SA. The rejection of land at West Horndon as an option for growth is based on the single statement: "It has not been selected as a preferred site in this Draft Plan owing to the impacts on the existing village, which would not be consistent with the emerging spatial strategy." The DLP cannot be found to be sound based on the rejection of this option for growth without an SA that complies with the Directive and Regulations. Furthermore, we would argue that based on case law, this lack of assessment could not be 'corrected' at a later stage by an addendum because that would require evidence to show that a legally adequate reasoning process had occurred and influenced the plan, albeit not clarified or reproduced in a transparent way. | tbc | tbc |
| 16134 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Transport consultants to Countryside Properties have assessed the location for the DHGV and find that the land proposed as a strategic allocation cannot be accessed (Full report of Odyssey Markides is attached at Appendix 3). Without land in Basildon Borough, there is insufficient land to create a new grade separated junction onto the A127. Furthermore, access from the A128 is constrained by issues of flooding in the western part of the site. Even if issues of flooding could be overcome a scheme of the size proposed would need three to four access points which could not feasibly be positioned on the same road. They would also have an unacceptable traffic impact on the A128. In terms of visual amenity and landscape character we refer to the report of Crestwood Environmental which finds that development at Dunton would have a harmful impact on this area of open countryside. | tbc | tbc |
| 13136 - Mr David Charles [5361] 13429 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | I do not support the provision of sites for gypsy and traveller accommodation | tbc | tbc |
| 14379 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council is very concerned about the proposed Dunton Hills Garden Village concept and has fundamental objections: Lack of Technical Evidence; The concept of the Garden Village, a convincing case for a strategic development at this location has not been made and notes that West Horndon has capacity and infrastructure as a reasonable alternative; Masterplan approach: more evidence should be provided on the suitability of the project as part of the local plan process. Further information on viability; deliverability and phasing; partnership working with other local authorities and developers; infrastructure and public expenditure; road traffic and transport evidence (and mitigation proposals), Green Travel Route; design and layout; is needed; Green Belt detrimental impacts, significant loss to the openness and strategic function, coalescence, openness; Detrimental impact on the landscape at this location, including to settings of historical assets and to existing development; Unknown impact on Thurrock housing market; SA of Dunton should have a reduced score to reflect the distance that Dunton HGV is from main centres, services and other residents in Brentwood; Assessment of Potential sites in the Green Belt - Working Draft noted to be site specific and not a Green Belt review. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16181 - Anderson Group [2597] | Object | Object to the totality of this allocation because there is insufficient evidence available to the Council to ensure that an allocation of such a strategic scale in this location is justified or would be deliverable. This aspect of the Plan is therefore unsound because it is: Not effective: it is not deliverable over its period; Not justified: it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, because it is not based on proportionate evidence; and inconsistent with national policy: because it is not in accordance with the policies in the Framework. The site is on Lower Thames Crossing Route 4 which, if chosen, would affect the deliverability of the development. | tbc | tbc |
| 15645 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Brentwood Borough Council have set out to locate their employment land close to the strategic highway network. As detailed above a SHLAA does not appear to have been carried out since 2011, therefore the required changes to review economic land as part of the process have not been recently assessed along with any other form of review of suitable, available and achievable employment land. Consequently there has not been any evidence produced to inform the selection of employment sites for inclusion in the Local Plan. The suitability and availability of such sites is not therefore justified by the evidence currently available. Consequently, further evidence to justify the Dunton Hills Garden Village employment location, amongst others, is required. | tbc | tbc |
| 16067 - Martin Grant Homes [2691] | Object | Relying heavily on the Dunton Hills Garden Village could be detrimental to the Borough in meeting its OAN because: It could take a minimum of 8 years before anything could happen on the site. Dunton Hills Garden Village is not included in the housing trajectory at Appendix 3 hence no indication of when the site is expected to deliver; This development could be affected by the final location of the Lower Thames Crossing, especially option of route 4; The fact that Basildon Council has not chosen not to work jointly with Brentwood Council to include the Dunton Garden Suburb as an allocation in their Draft Plan creates considerable concern regarding the deliverability of the site. | tbc | tbc |
| 15630 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | The proposal included within the Brentwood Draft Local Plan departs from the proposal for a Dunton Garden Suburb insofar as it is a proposal for a stand-alone settlement to the south of the A127 and to the east of the A128 within the Brentwood Borough only. However, at this time the precise location and land requirement of this proposal is unknown, as are details such as access arrangements. It is therefore unclear as to whether these proposals will result in a stand-alone settlement or an extension to the Basildon urban area in the long-term. It is also unclear how this proposal will relate in terms of access and connectivity to the Basildon urban area in terms of highway impacts or demand for infrastructure and services within Basildon Borough. | tbc | tbc |
| 16147 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The Housing Trajectory at Appendix 3 to the DLP is referred to in para 7.37 but DHGV - the key strategic site proposed to deliver half the Borough's growth in housing going forward - is not included in the table at Appendix 3. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16117 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Government policy as set out in the NPPF (paragraph 52), and consultation on proposed changes in December 2015, extends support for the supply of new homes through larger scale developments such as urban extensions and new settlements. These should be located where they can meet the sustainable development objectives of national policy. Changes to the NPPF seek to ensure that housing is delivered on land allocated in plans and recognises the significant benefits to encouraging development around new and existing commuter hubs - reducing travel distances by private transport, making effective use of private and public sector land in sustainable locations, and helping to secure the wider regeneration and growth of the local area. In this context the government is keen to see higher density housing development around commuter hubs wherever feasible. | tbc | tbc |
| 15058 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | The proposed new village is not equitable, deliverable or sustainable, requires the release of a significant area of GB land, adds more pressure to the already congested A127, is disproportionate in terms of total housing capacity for the Borough from one single source and will not be deliverable within a reasonable timeframe. I strongly disagree that para 5.41 "A proportionate approach has been taken...". It is clear contrary to para 5.42 the Council has NOT "applied densities to potential development sites in a realistic manner...". | tbc | tbc |
| 15368 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15388 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15417 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15494 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15575 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15621 - Tony Hollioake [5618] | Object | The key characteristics of a garden village are that it forms the expansion of existing small settlements, is within the catchment of a town, located on an existing transport corridor and is partly or mostly self-sufficient in terms of local social infrastructure. The Dunton Hills proposal cannot meet three of the four characteristics identified above. | tbc | tbc |
| 15389 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] | Object | There is no evidence of the financial viability of the Dunton Hills development. Whilst it is accepted that the proposal will prove to be a vital source of housing, the ability to fund significant new capital infrastructure will be extremely limiting. The Council should be aware that the recent consultation on the Lower Thames Crossing included a proposed Route 4, which passes through the Dunton Hills area. However, this is unlikely to come forward as a result of the A127 and the junction with the roundabout at the M25 being at capacity. Essex County Council has already acknowledged that the A127 is one of the busiest non-trunk roads in the Country, with regular extensive and widespread delay and disruption to traffic and on the local road network. | tbc | tbc |
| 15260 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | Consider the levels of development within the Plan at Strategic Site Dunton Hills Garden Village to be completely unrealistic based upon reasons relating to: Suggested phasing as set out in Appendix 2. These completion rates are overly ambitious; Joint-working under the duty to co-operate is essential to bring the site forward. It is considered vital that the whole Strategic Site opportunity is fully embraced by both Local Plans, at present this is not the case, and therefore the contribution of the Strategic Site to Brentwood housing target is questionable; Lead-in period to the commencement of development would be expected to be several years. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13207 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | As set out in detail in Sport England's representations made on the 2015 consultation on this proposal, consideration will need to be given to issues relating to the potential loss of the Dunton Hills Golf Centre, the scale and nature of sports facilities required to meet the needs generated by the development and promoting active lifestyles through the masterplanning of the development. These should be considered in the supporting text to the policy to provide a framework for the masterplan. | tbc | tbc |
| 15364 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15384 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15413 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15489 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15569 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15615 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16166 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16191 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | The fact that the area annotated in the Basildon Borough Council Draft Local Plan H10b is not to be allocated until after 2034 is of serious detriment to Brentwood's own allocation and would result in Dunton Hills Garden Village sitting as an isolated development. It is highly unlikely, given the land ownership, infrastructure and other essential requirements and to ensure that this does not come forward as piecemeal development that the allocation could feasibly be delivered within the Plan period. As a result, the figures set out within Policy 5.2 do not meet the Objectively Assessed Needs of the plan period. | tbc | tbc |
| 15663 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Whilst Basildon Borough Council welcomes further engagement with Brentwood Borough Council to ensure that the points raised in this response are addressed and to continue working together on cross-boundary strategic priorities, it would need to be confident that the Dunton Hills Garden Village is the most appropriate location for growth based on evidence and supporting infrastructure mitigation in order to make an informed decision at a future date as to whether it can support this proposal. | tbc | tbc |
| 16288 - Dunton Community Association [6184] | Object | - The Authority has misconstrued government policy concerning the balance between meeting housing need and preserving critical portions of Green Belt. - The Authority's claim that DHGV will restrict urban sprawl and prevent settlement coalescence are absurd. - Despite most westerly houses in Dunton Wayletts lie only 200m beyond the borough boundary the Authority has failed to take into account any of the impact of its proposals on the village. | tbc | tbc |
| 16109 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | Remove policy. - The site has not been subject to any capacity or technical analysis; - Will require significant investment in new infrastructure; and - Is unlikely to deliver sufficient growth within the plan-period. | tbc | tbc |
| 16195 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | The key characteristics of a garden village are that it forms the expansion of existing small settlements, is within the catchment of a town, located on an existing transport corridor and is partly or mostly self-sufficient in terms of local social infrastructure. The Dunton Hills proposal cannot meet three of the four characteristics identified above. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16136 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | West Horndon is the only settlement along the A127 that benefits from a rail station, together with a grade separated junction, making it the most sustainable in this transport corridor. Most of the village including proposed development land to the east is within walking distance of the station and key local facilities and services. The nearest railway station to DHGV location is also West Horndon. This is not within easy walking distance and if developed the occupiers of the development using the train would be likely to drive or make use of a shuttle bus if one were provided. Overall the proposals at Dunton would have a significant impact on the village character at West Horndon in terms of an increase in traffic and parking. | tbc | tbc |
| 13582 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | We object to this policy to propose a new settlement to deliver 2,500 dwellings during the plan period to meet a significant proportion the Borough's housing needs. 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. We consider there to be both generic and site specific constraints to delivery and as such, the site is undeliverable over the timeframe envisaged in the housing trajectory. | tbc | tbc |
| 15631 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | The land which would form the Dunton Hills Garden Village does not appear to have been put forward in the most recent call for sites and has not been assessed within the Brentwood Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2011). The assessment of land availability is, according to the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (Ref ID: 3-001-20140306), an important step in the preparation of Local Plans and a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It ensures that all land is assessed together as part of plan preparation to identify which sites or strategic locations are the most suitable and deliverable for a particular use. | tbc | tbc |
| 14098 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Object | Policy 7.1 states it will provide 2500 homes, but does not say that the proposals are for a far larger scheme that include Basildon Council for a joint scheme of 4,000 to 6,000 new homes. The wording of this Policy is misleading and should show exactly what is being proposed at Dunton. The area of Dunton does not lie in a sustainable location, it is capable of limited development but not to the level proposed. The site at Dunton does not meet any of the requirements within the drat Plan regarding sustainability, managing growth and when considering the Vision Statement. The alternative approach should be providing new homes throughout the Borough, including sites on the edge of villages, this will not just meet local needs but also will meet the needs of local residents. | tbc | tbc |
| 16287 - Dunton Community Association [6184] | Object | The Council has failed to carry out landscape assessment and so its decision to remove the Dunton area from the Green Belt has no validity. | tbc | tbc |
| 13942 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | Whilst the policy is clear that the new settlement is intended to meet the needs of Brentwood Borough, we seriously question whether this will occur in reality. Being physically attached to Basildon, Dunton Hills Garden Village is likely to integrate more with Basildon Borough than Brentwood and serve the housing needs of Basildon as opposed to Brentwood. This is contrary to Strategic Objective 3, which is to plan for housing to meet the needs "of the Borough's population". It is also contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF which requires local plans to meet the full objectively assessed needs "in the housing market area". | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13935 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | The evidence base underpinning the Draft Plan does not appear to include any exploration of the developability or deliverability of this strategic site. We consider that such evidence is required in order for deliveries from Dunton Hills Garden Village to be considered robust and included in the trajectory. We strongly believe that such an exploration would demonstrate that deliveries from this strategic allocation as early as 2019 will be unachievable, based on research and evidence produced by other local authorities. The Brentwood housing trajectory envisages Dunton Hills Garden Village to start delivering within 2 years of adoption. In light of the above, we do not consider this to be a realistic timeframe. | tbc | tbc |
| 13939 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | It is apparent that the Brentwood allocation is intended to be a new settlement, whilst the Basildon allocation is intended to be an urban extension with no assessment of the impact each allocation will have on the other. The NPPF requires joint working to be "diligently undertaken" for "the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities". There are serious concerns as to whether either Council can demonstrate compliance with the Duty to Co-operate and at the very least indicates a lack of joined up thinking and due regard to how the two sites would operate alongside each other. Far from being compatible, there are significant conflicts between Basildon's draft policy H10 and Brentwood policy 7.1. | tbc | tbc |
| 16375 - Ethan Williams [6194] | Object | Very dissatisfied in relation to the likelihood / capability for the local road network to be improved sufficiently to handle the increased traffic. The new homes and industrial premises will add thousands more vehicles to the roads, on top of the traffic generated by Basildon's Plan. Roads such as the A127 already suffer regular congestion. Very dissatisfied in relation to the likelihood / capability of railway capacity to be increased sufficiently to accommodate the growth in passenger numbers. New homes proposed by Brentwood and Basildon Council will greatly increase the local population. The local railway service is currently overloaded at peak times. Very dissatisfied in relation to the ability for local medical services to sufficiently cope with the increased capacity generated by the additional residents. Very dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council have considered the impact that its plans would have on Dunton Wayletts, which is an important historical village. Very dissatisfied with the thought given to the risks associated with locating large housing development and schools in the Dunton area, which has extremely high levels of air pollution and is close to a major Accident Hazard Pipeline. | tbc | tbc |
| 15370 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15390 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15419 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15496 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15578 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15623 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16173 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16197 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | Of principle concern to the delivery of the Dunton Hills Garden Village is the location of the designated Flood Zone 2. Identification of the site fails to comply with Paragraph 100 of the NPPF, which requires that Local Plans are submitted by Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and that Local Plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment found in the Evidence Base was published in 2011, prior to the identification of the Dunton Hills Garden Village site. The SFRA provides a list of recommendations within Paragraph 7.1 in regard to the inclusion of sites. It states that "should the Council wish to allocate sites with an identified flood risk, then the policy should either be to avoid the areas of flood risk or to assess the risk in more detail through either Level 2 SFRA work or on a specific site level". | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 14329 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | Thurrock Council is fundamentally opposed to any large scale Strategic Green Belt releases either at Dunton Hill Garden Village as put forward in the Brentwood Local Plan consultation or the previous option for the Dunton Garden Suburb. The assumption that the A127 has greater potential for growth is questioned. | tbc | tbc |
| 16138 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | In the context of joint proposals with Basildon it was made clear that a significant wedge of open land would be required to the west of the site to maintain an open gap between Brentwood and Basildon. To achieve the scale of development now proposed, this open gap would have to be considerably eroded. The site is also subject to high flood risk. | tbc | tbc |
| 16172 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] | Object | There is no evidence of the financial viability of the Dunton Hills development. Whilst it is accepted that the proposal will prove to be a vital source of housing, the ability to fund significant new capital infrastructure will be extremely limiting. The Council should be aware that the recent consultation on the Lower Thames Crossing included a proposed Route 4, which passes through the Dunton Hills area. However, this is unlikely to come forward as a result of the A127 and the junction with the roundabout at the M25 being at capacity. Essex County Council has already acknowledged that the A127 is one of the busiest non-trunk roads in the Country, with regular extensive and widespread delay and disruption to traffic and on the local road network. | tbc | tbc |
| 15369 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15418 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15495 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15576 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15622 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16196 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | There is no evidence of the financial viability of the Dunton Hills development. Whilst it is accepted that the proposal will prove to be a vital source of housing, the ability to fund significant new capital infrastructure will be extremely limiting. The Council should be aware that the recent consultation on the Lower Thames Crossing included a proposed Route 4, which passes through the Dunton Hills area. However, this is unlikely to come forward as a result of the A127 and the junction with the roundabout at the M25 being at capacity. Essex County Council has already acknowledged that the A127 is one of the busiest non-trunk roads in the Country, with regular extensive and widespread delay and disruption to traffic and on the local road network. | tbc | tbc |
| 13684 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | Development at Dunton is unnecessary. Better to have high-density housing in existing urban areas, and lower the housing targets to account for green belt (as per NPPF guidance, which clearly states that green belt takes precedence over 'objective' need). | tbc | tbc |
| 15634 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Having regard to the absence of evidence regarding the consideration of this site within a SHLAA, and also the evidence regarding Green Belt impacts set out in the Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt and their Relative Contribution to the Purposes of the Green Belt Designation study, Basildon Borough Council cannot support the proposals for Dunton Hills Garden Village as it is not convinced that the proposals are justified, and present a high risk of the Brentwood Local Plan being found unsound. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15633 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Furthermore, evidence which is available for consideration indicates that the proposal for Dunton Hills Garden Village may not be the most suitable option for meeting the housing needs of Brentwood Borough. The working draft of the Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt and their Relative Contribution to the Purposes of the Green Belt Designation study shows that the Dunton Hills Garden Village location (referenced as Site 200) is classed as 'high' in terms of meeting the purposes of the Green Belt when reviewed for both housing and employment delivery. This initial evidence indicates that this area is not the most suitable location in terms of Green Belt impacts and should not be taken forward. It is questioned therefore as to whether this evidence of Green Belt impacts has informed the plan-making process in preparing the Draft Local Plan given that it was published part way through the consultation, and therefore Basildon Borough Council would suggest that further consideration be given to its findings prior to the finalisation of the Brentwood Local Plan. | tbc | tbc |
| 13943 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | The Draft Plan is not justified, as required by paragraph 182 of the NPPF. It is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. Reasonable alternatives exist, namely the allocation of more, smaller sites for housing adjacent to the Main Town, Village Service Centres and Larger Villages. | tbc | tbc |
| 15924 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | WHPC note significant concern however that the Green Belt boundaries are not currently defined. The Draft Plan is considered too vague, and given the importance within BBC's proposed Spatial Strategy, greater detail of boundaries of any development east of the A128 is required for any final Local Plan. | tbc | tbc |
| 16546 - Mrs Sheron Broom [5965] | Object | Object. The roads cannot take anymore traffic, 127 & 128 are at capacity. Green Belt should be left alone, there is so much other land you can build on. London is where they need the houses. The development would have a negative affect on local services. | tbc | tbc |
| 15365 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15385 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15414 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15491 - Mr Richard Lunnnon [4220] 15570 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15616 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16192 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | Council's Green Belt Assessment has commented that the proposed development would effectively harm three of the four purposes of the Green Belt - it would result in unrestricted sprawl of an urban area; significantly reduce the gap between West Horndon and Basildon; and encroach on the countryside. It's only positive attribute is that it does not impact on the setting or special character of historic towns. | tbc | tbc |
| 16135 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The explanatory text at paragraph 6.32 refers to the removal of land at West Horndon as a strategic area for growth, in order to protect its village character. We submit that this conclusion cannot be drawn in the absence of an appraisal of the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan and reasonable alternatives. There is simply insufficient information regarding the proposals for DHGV to allow any assessment to be undertaken or meaningful comparisons to be made. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16137 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Policy 7.1 - Dunton Hills Garden Village, proposes a self-sustaining community to include 2,500 new homes, at least 5 hectares of employment land, local shops, community facilities, open green spaces, schools and healthcare services. This is not supported by assessment of the site and potential constraints to ascertain whether there is sufficient land available to achieve the scale of development required. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16283 - Margaret Noonan [6186] 16342 - Miss Elaine Heaps [6189] 16348 - Mrs R Nash [6190] 16354 - Mrs B.I. Staerck [6191] 16368 - Brooke Williams [6193] 16382 - Mr William Shine [6195] 16390 - Sandra Halliday [6196] 16398 - Gary Howard [6197] 16406 - Mrs Winifred Wigington [6198] 16411 - Mr Christopher Saxon [6199] 16420 - Mrs A L Hobbs [6200] 16422 - Mr D Nash [6203] 16428 - Mr AC Hobbs [6201] 16436 - David Halliday [6204] 16447 - Mrs W Colhoun [6205] 16454 - Mrs Christine St Pier [6206] 16462 - Jean Williams [6211] 16469 - Mr William White [6213] 16478 - Sandra Carpenter [6214] 16485 - Mrs M Rimes [6207] 16495 - Mr James Noonan [6208] 16500 - Ms Michelle Hacks [6209] 16506 - Mr Anthony Smith [6210] 16519 - Ms Patricia Smith [6215] 16524 - Mr Pitman [6216] 16529 - Mrs Pitman [6217] 16534 - Mrs H Bron [6220] 16539 - Mr Peter Broom [5952] 16544 - Mrs Sheron Broom [5965] 16550 - Mrs Diane Hilton [6221] 16555 - Mrs P Moore [6222] 16580 - Mr and Mrs Murrey [6227] 16585 - Mr Roy St Piere [6228] 16590 - Mr Barry Floyd [6229] 16632 - Ms Eileen Riley [6263] 16637 - Mr Colin Wordley [6264] 16642 - Mr John Haly [6265] 16647 - Ms Judith Haly [6266] 16652 - Mr Charles Smith [6267] 16657 - Ms Margaret Smith [6268] 16662 - Ms Susan King [6269] 16666 - Ms Andrea Llewellyn [6270] 16671 - Ms S Sutton [6271] 16676 - Mr S Sutton [6272] | Object | <p>Very dissatisfied / dissatisfied in relation to the likelihood / capability for the local road network to be improved sufficiently to handle the increased traffic. The new homes and industrial premises will add thousands more vehicles to the roads, on top of the traffic generated by Basildon's Plan. Roads such as the A127 already suffer regular congestion.</p> <p>Very dissatisfied / Dissatisfied in relation to the likelihood / capability of railway capacity to be increased sufficiently to accommodate the growth in passenger numbers. New homes proposed by Brentwood and Basildon Council will greatly increase the local population. The local railway service is currently overloaded at peak times.</p> <p>Very dissatisfied / Dissatisfied in relation to the ability for local medical services to sufficiently cope with the increased capacity generated by the additional residents. Dissatisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council have considered the impact that its plans would have on Dunton Wayletts, which is an important historical village.</p> <p>Very dissatisfied / Dissatisfied with the thought given to the risks associated with locating large housing development and schools in the Dunton area, which has extremely high levels of air pollution and is close to a major Accident Hazard Pipeline.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16681 - Mr Ronald Mansfield [6273] 16686 - Ms P Mansfield [6274] 16691 - Mr Charles Williams [6276] 16696 - Mr Alan Webb [6275] 16701 - Mr Alan Carpenter [6277] 16705 - Mr Brian Spicer [6278] 16709 - Mrs Linda Spicer [6279] 16714 - Mrs Irene Miles [6280] 16719 - Ms Carol Brown [6281] 16723 - Mr John Turner [6282] 16728 - Mr David Bedford [6283] 16732 - Clive Bellingham [6284] 16736 - Mrs Maureen Bellingham [6286] 16740 - Jackie Diffey [6287] 16749 - Ms Emma Diffey [6288] 16754 - Mr R Calvey [6285] 16761 - Mr C Bowers [6289] 16766 - Mr M Hilton [6290] 16770 - Mr C Wheeler [6291] 16775 - Mrs A Hilton [6292] 16779 - Ms Brenda Scates [6293] 16786 - Mr Dennis Scates [6295] 16790 - Mrs Catherine Maguire [6218] | | | | |
| 16131 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Explanatory text at paragraph 6.13 refers to the importance of phasing and the timing of delivery of development in relation to land assembly and the provision of infrastructure. In this regard further objection is raised to the identification of land at Dunton and the unknown position on required landtake, land ownership, and the requirement for supporting infrastructure. In the absence of this information there must be uncertainty over its deliverability. | tbc | tbc |
| 15629 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | It is of concern to Basildon Borough Council that Brentwood Borough Council are looking to take forward development within the previously outlined Dunton Garden Suburb location. Basildon Borough Council do not believe that Brentwood Borough Council have provided sufficient evidence to show that development in that area would be the best location for new development, and that the scale of development proposed, over a third of the borough's entire housing provision for the plan period, could be supported by infrastructure. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15366 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15386 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15415 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15492 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15572 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15617 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16167 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16193 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | It is noted that representations were made to the Council during the last consultation which raised serious doubts over the deliverability of a proposed station at Dunton due to the proximity of other stations, Network Rail's technical requirements and viability issues. This does not appear to have been resolved within this version of the Draft Local Plan. Without a station, the site is solely dependent on travel by car, resulting in a highly unsustainable development. | tbc | tbc |
| 15367 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15387 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15416 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15493 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15574 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15619 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16168 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16194 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | The development at Dunton would not assist in meeting existing settlement specific housing and socio-economic needs in the Borough, especially in the villages throughout Brentwood. | tbc | tbc |
| 15788 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | Support this policy to meet the Borough's housing needs. Although Basildon's Draft Plan concluded that the joint area has not been progressed due to the lack of technical work to support the delivery of development in this location. However Basildon seeks to allocate and safeguard land to the west of Basildon therefore the proposed allocation of Policy 7.1 could result in coalescence. Therefore Brentwood and Basildon should work together to ensure that development in this location has regards to (a) neighbouring allocation, (b) cumulative impacts and mitigation, (c) that the totality of development is deliverable. | tbc | tbc |
| 16316 - Mr Adam Smith [6115] | Support | With regard to its relationship with Basildon the Dunton Garden suburb proposal provides an excellent opportunity to provide a significant contribution towards the housing figures conferred upon the local planning authority in a sustainable manner. | tbc | tbc |
| 14950 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Support | This Policy states that a new Borough village will be brought forward within the A127 Corridor at Dunton Hills and that a Masterplan will be produced to agree the form, mix and siting of development, to form part of the Brentwood Local Development Plan. Our client is supportive of this approach and would welcome early involvement in this exercise. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15893 - Mr Adam Smith [6115] | Support | Fully supportive of policy. Policy makes a very clear and fundamental contribution to the delivery of housing within the Plan period. This point needs to be considered within the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF and the requirement to have an up-to-date housing land supply or else applications across a variety of sites may be countenanced with regard to the provisions of the NPPF. | tbc | tbc |
| 15158 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Strongly support policy in its identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new self-sustaining community offering a mix of associated and integrated uses. Support the requirement to produce a Masterplan for the site. Suggest master planning for the site should progress rapidly from the work already undertaken. The aims of paragraphs 7.5 and 7.6 can be achieved by concentration of development on the single Dunton Hills site. | tbc | tbc |
| 14389 - Mr Alan Shaw [4564] | Support | The choice of a strategic development may be less than ideal is supported, it is serviced by two BR stations and has easy access to the A127 (and A13). The scale will facilitate required spend on infrastructure, schools, and doctors and make it self sustaining. Better than many small chunks of Green Belt without the infrastructure. | tbc | tbc |
| 16013 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | Landowners: Mrs Mountford, Mrs Collins and Mr Mountford own circa 15.7ha of land between Basildon and West Horndon. Previous consultation by Brentwood on the Dunton Garden Suburb has not been progressed according to Basildon's draft local plan "due to the lack of technical work undertaken to support the delivery of development in this location" despite both Council's allocating land identified within the document as an allocation in their draft local plans. The inclusion of this land would suggest that the evidence base supports its development and therefore we request that the council reconsider the allocation under policy 7.1 and work towards a cross boundary development with Basildon Borough Council. | tbc | tbc |
| 16017 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | Our land also benefits from being under Option with Persimmon Homes; therefore demonstrating that the site is deliverable within the plan period and should not be safeguarded for development post 2034. To ensure that a cohesive development is delivered we urge the council to work with Basildon Borough Council and progress with the idea of a larger cross boundary development in line with the Dunton Garden Suburb proposals. However, should Brentwood Borough Council seek to deliver land in this location separately then we invite the Council to consider our site for development. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16560 - Ms M Holloran [6223] 16565 - Ms Jennifer Holloran [6224] 16570 - Mr Patrick Holloran [6225] 16575 - Ms Daniella Holloran [6226] 16755 - Mr. Barrie Stone [1745] | Support | <p>Very satisfied / satisfied in relation to the likelihood / capability for the local road network to be improved sufficiently to handle the increased traffic. The new homes and industrial premises will add thousands more vehicles to the roads, on top of the traffic generated by Basildon's Plan. Roads such as the A127 already suffer regular congestion.</p> <p>Very satisfied / satisfied in relation to the likelihood / capability of railway capacity to be increased sufficiently to accommodate the growth in passenger numbers. New homes proposed by Brentwood and Basildon Council will greatly increase the local population. The local railway service is currently overloaded at peak times.</p> <p>Very satisfied / satisfied in relation to the ability for local medical services to sufficiently cope with the increased capacity generated by the additional residents. Very satisfied with the way in which Brentwood Borough Council have considered the impact that its plans would have on Dunton Wayletts, which is an important historical village.</p> <p>Very satisfied / satisfied with the thought given to the risks associated with locating large housing development and schools in the Dunton area, which has extremely high levels of air pollution and is close to a major Accident Hazard Pipeline.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 13126 - Mr William Trump [5351] 13542 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] 13698 - Mr Stephen Goulding [4525] | Support | Support this 'strategic site' as a solution to meeting the Borough's housing target. close to road links (A127/A128 & M25) & also a railway link to London & Southend. Although on green belt land it will include open spaces, schools & healthcare facilities. | tbc | tbc |
| 16016 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | Large scale development is supported by National Policy. Paragraph 52 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for large scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns". It is felt that this approach is relevant to Policy 7.1 as the council have an opportunity to deliver a large scale development which has the ability to deliver new employment land, social infrastructure and open space too. | tbc | tbc |
| 16470 - CPREssex [210] | Support | It is CPRE policy that no green belt land should be built on, however in the case of Brentwood, some Green Belt release is obviously going to happen therefore it is agreed in principle that Dunton Hills Garden Village is a suitable major site for housing development and should prevent greater reliance on green belt/ green field sites, detract from the rural character of the borough and increased car dependency. However without a masterplan CPRE cannot give its unequivocal support to the proposal. A larger number of homes should be allocated here than is proposed. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Housing Type, Mix, Size and Tenure | | | | |
| 14993 - Mr and Mrs Simon and Jeanie Hughes [4739] | Comment | There is likely to be a continuing under provision of homes for the elderly as well as the young first home seekers. There are many large family homes in Brentwood and Shenfield that are now occupied by two people. The lack of quality homes in which they could downsize means many of the over 60s will sit tight whereas the town would be best served by accommodating their move and freeing up the family homes. This is not just about bungalows but apartments and smaller homes near services. | Noted. Across the Borough there is a need to rebalance the housing market to provide a range of housing that will meet the changing needs of communities. Policies in the Draft Local Plan aim to support sufficient good quality housing of the right types, mix, sizes, and tenure in the right places, which will be attractive to and meet the identified needs of different groups in society, including older people. | No action |
| 14791 - Mr Jon Bright [5993] | Comment | Query - in Sections 7.20 /7.21 you refer to 17.1% of local households having someone with a disability / long-term illness, yet only 5% provision for such groups is proposed for new developments. | The Local Plan seeks to rebalance the housing stock to ensure it better reflects the identified needs and demands for housing of the existing and future communities as such policy amendment to increase the minimum percentage of dwellings to the requirements of Building Regulation M4(2) or M4(3) will be fully considered. | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 13813 - Mr Michael Jarvis [5739] | Comment | I see no mention of how appropriate independent accommodation for those with a variety of disabilities (not everyone lives in group homes) will be effectively embraced. | Noted. The Council recognises that a number of elderly persons and those with a variety of disabilities are likely to have a need for adaptable or accessible homes over the lifetime of the Plan, as part of providing a mix of housing to meet local housing needs, Draft Policy 7.2 seeks to secure from developments of 20 or more dwellings a minimum of 5% of new housing built is suitable, or easily adaptable for occupation by the elderly or people with disabilities. As part of the plan review we will continue to consider the issue with further consultation and in light of new evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| 13587 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | 7.12: "It is important that new housing development addresses local needs" - I've lived in Brentwood for nearly 11 years, and all our local needs are currently being met. | Noted. The Council will consider the issues raised in relation to meeting full Objectively Assessed Housing Need in light of National Guidance and evidence. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Policy 7.2: Housing Type, Mix, Size and Tenures | | | | |
| 15798 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Comment | 1. There is no detail of the evidence base to justify the need for self build units, their impact upon housing supply and development viability. Many small scale and windfall development would fall within the definition of self built. 2. The reliance on these as part of major developments is that the land may be put aside for them, with delivery being slow, therefore affecting the council housing trajectory and 5 year housing land supply. The Council should look to allocate smaller sites which will deliver 100% self builds and not be reliant on developers and landowners to deliver the land as part of their proposal. There is also confusion around what the Council will deem the most appropriate housing mix and the consistency in which this policy will be applied to residential developments. | 1. In line with National Guidance, demand data from the Council's self and custom build register has been considered during the preparation of the Council's SHMA 2016 and will continue to be considered when developing the Local Plan. 2. Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15792 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Comment | Developers will need to have regards to the Council's latest SHMA and Housing Strategy however the use of the two documents can result in conflicting evidence, which can create uncertainty as to what the policy requires and potential for inconsistent application of the policy. The policy should be reworded to say "that proposals should have regards to the Council's most up to date housing needs" whether it be the SHMA or the Council's Housing Strategy. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15604 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Policy 7.2, 7.7, Policy 9.2, Policy 9.9, Policy 9.13, Policy 9.14 and Policy 10.12. make reference to imposing Conditions on planning permission to secure the provision of housing types provided in perpetuity and by tenure. It should be noted that National policy (NPPF, para 206) states that planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development as permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. | Noted | No action |
| 14831 - Gerald Downey [4671] | Comment | For smaller dwellings (under 20) on brownfield land owned by the taxpayer, I propose that local Brentwood residents (represented as individuals or local community groups; eg Community Interest Companies) who have shown an interest in self-build by signing up to a self-build register should be given first priority for such brownfield sites with at least 10% of sites (IE, not dwellings within sites) being prioritised for self-build and custom housebuilding. | Comment noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14829 - Gerald Downey [4671] | Comment | 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 20 or more dwellings. | Noted. In line with National Guidance, demand data from the Council's self and custom build register has been considered during the preparation of the Council's SHMA 2016 and will continue to be considered when developing the Local Plan. | No action |
| 13685 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | There needs to be an explicit presumption against low-density development. In other words, detached and semi-detached housing should be permitted only in exceptional circumstances, and the presumption should be for high-rise flats, so as to make the most efficient possible use of land. As previously stated, the green belt must take precedence over any misguided notions of 'preserving' a skyline. | Whilst efficient land use is critical to the delivery of the Local Plan, the most appropriate density for the site will also need to ensure schemes are sympathetic to local character. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15601 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | We do not consider it appropriate to make reference to Building Regulations within Local Plan policies. BBC cannot require Applicants to comply with any standards other than the Building Regulations and the optional technical standards if these are adopted by the Council. As Written Ministerial Statement 25 March 2015 states: From the date the Deregulation Bill 2015 is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities...should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. This includes any policy requiring any level of the Code for Sustainable Homes to be achieved by development. | Disagree. National Guidance is clear that local authorities should plan to create safe, accessible environments and promote inclusion and community cohesion. It is for local planning authorities to demonstrate the need for Requirement M4(2) and / or M4(3) of the Building Regulations, and where appropriate reference requirement M4(2) and / or M4(3) within policy. | No action |
| 15346 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | Support the Council's approach to providing a balanced mix of housing types and tenure taking into account the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Council's Housing Strategy. However, we also encourage the Council's flexible approach and the confirmation that the housing mix will be based on negotiation, site constraints and development viability. | Noted | No action |
| 16335 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Concerned that piecemeal developments around Ingatestone will have adverse effects on our current infrastructure and surface water issues. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15600 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | We question the appropriateness of the Policy's requirement for 5% of dwellings to be suitable and easily adaptable for occupation by the elderly or disabled, and in addition, a minimum of 5% self-build properties. The NPPF is clear that LPAs must assess the cumulative impact of Local Plan policies on the viability of development. It is unclear from the DLP whether BBC has undertaken viability testing on such requirements. | Noted. The Local Plan seeks to rebalance the housing stock, in line with identified need as evidenced in the Council's SHMA, to ensure it better reflects the needs and demands for housing of the existing and future communities. The issue of development viability is one of importance. As part of the Local Plan process, the 'Brentwood Borough Council Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment' (May 2016) has been undertaken to inform the setting of a charging schedule. The report provides an appraisal of the viability of Brentwood's Draft Local Plan in terms of the impact of its policies on the economic viability of development proposed to be delivered by the Plan and the potential for development to yield Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Plan will be informed by further viability evidence as appropriate. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14828 - Gerald Downey [4671] | Comment | As referenced by Brandon Lewis MP in communication to Rt Hon Sir Eric Pickles MP The "Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015" comes into force in April 2016. I would like this to be referenced in the LDP self build policy 7.2 as appropriate. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16018 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | A gap exists in the provision of Independent Living housing across Essex. There are not sufficient numbers of Independent Living units to relieve pressure for residential care placements. A programme has been developed by ECC to increase the supply. Within Brentwood, it is estimated that there are 267 eligible social care clients amongst the 27,041 persons aged 55 or over. By 2020, 134 units are required; 26 units are already provided, which leaves 108 still to be provided by 2020 (split 50/50 social rented/shared ownership). | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13154 - Alexandra Hammond [5372] | Comment | I am intrigued by the 5% self build allocation on larger developments. How would somebody get involved with that? Would you be looking for people to set up a Community Land Trust? | The Government want to enable more people to build or commission their own home. In accordance with national legislation Brentwood Council maintains a register of individuals and groups interested in self build and custom house-building. The register provides the Council with information on the demand for self build and custom house-building locally and forms a key part of the Council's evidence base. Further information in relation to self build and custom build can be found on the Council's website via the link: http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=2733 | No action |
| 15313 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Comment | Policy 7.2 as drafted sets out a self-build requirement for sites with capacity of 100 or more dwellings. Site 159, despite having a smaller capacity, but the provision of some plots for self or custom builders would be something the owner is willing to explore. | Noted | No action |
| 13510 - Gerald Downey [4671] | Comment | Reference Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 in Policy 7.2. Propose that minimum 5% self-build should also apply to developments of 20 or more dwellings. For smaller dwellings on brownfield land owned by the taxpayer, propose that local Brentwood residents be given first priority with at least 10% of sites being prioritised for self-build. As referenced by Brandon Lewis MP to Rt Hon Sir Eric Pickles MP (ref 1834883), 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. | Comment Noted. In line with National Guidance, demand data from the Council's self and custom build register has been considered during the preparation of the Council's SHMA 2016 and will continue to be considered when developing the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15599 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Policy 7.2 requires that developments of 6 or more dwellings, or greater than 0.2 hectares, provide an appropriate mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures. This element of the Policy is supported where it is consistent with the NPPF. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 14832 - Gerald Downey [4671] 14833 - Gerald Downey [4671] | Comment | 1. For smaller dwellings (under 20) on brownfield land not owned by the taxpayer, the decision for the proportion of plots to be allocated as self-build should be a decision solely for the landowner, with the local council encouraging the landowners to consider "direct-to-consumer self or custom-build" as an option. A strong focus and lead on selfbuild within Brentwood will bring communities together, will get more dwellings built and more bricklayers trained in this country. 2. With regards to developing self build and custom build guidance, a useful site locally can be found on the neighbouring council website - this includes access to a custom build homes fund and a self build register: http://www.chelmsford.gov.uk/selfbuild | 1. Comment Noted 2. In accordance with national legislation Brentwood Council maintains a register of individuals and groups interested in self build and custom house-building. The register provides the Council with information on the demand for self build and custom house-building locally and forms a key part of the Council's evidence base. | Consider accordingly |
| 16019 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC is establishing a Developer-Provider Framework to enable Independent Living schemes on land owned and/or made available to public sector organisations. In addition, ECC has set aside a capital grant allocation of £27.7m to support the delivery of 1,800 units of Independent Living. This budget is available to spend on schemes developed between 2015/16 - 2021/22. Schemes requiring grant support can be those coming forward through the Developer-Provider Framework or by developers with their own sites. | Noted | No action |
| 14018 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Object | A rigid approach is not appropriate for all sites as it depends on the local character of the area and neighbouring properties could be adversely affected, leading to planning objections. However, it is welcomed that the final mix, type and tenure will be subject to negotiation. N.B. Table 7.1 is unclear and may contain an arithmetical error. | Noted. As part of the plan review we will consider the issue. | Consider and amend accordingly |
| 15076 - Mr and Mrs Jeremy and Emma Ellis [6049] | Object | The [SHMA] survey makes it clear (Table 6-2) that local prices for one bed flats are out of reach of the incomes of over 80% of concealed households yet the strategy states that the main areas people want live are Brentwood and Shenfield, which are the most expensive areas. It seems illogical therefore to plan to build so many flats in these areas | The Local Plan seeks to balance economic, environmental and social objectives to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. Aiming to locate all new development, covering the affordable sector as well as market housing, in sustainable locations with excellent transport links, access to jobs and services and town centre facilities. | No action |
| 15075 - Mr Ivan Armstrong [2909] | Object | The [SHMA] survey makes it clear (Table 6-2) that local prices for one bed flats are out of reach of the incomes of over 80% of concealed households yet the strategy states that the main areas people want live are Brentwood and Shenfield, which are the most expensive areas. It seems illogical therefore to plan to build so many flats in these areas | The Local Plan seeks to balance economic, environmental and social objectives to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. Aiming to locate all new development, covering the affordable sector as well as market housing, in sustainable locations with excellent transport links, access to jobs and services and town centre facilities. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15691 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | A number of DLP policies set out specific requirements for planning applications, for example Policy 7.2, Policy 10.1, Policy 10.3, Policy 10.13 and Policy 10.15. LPAs are required to publish a list of information requirements for planning application, proportionate to the nature and scale of the development proposals and reviewed on a frequent basis. National policy notes that local information requirements have no bearing on whether a planning application is valid unless they are set out on such a list. Such requirements should not therefore be included within policies. | The Council will ensure that the local validation list and the details within adopted policy will be consistent with national policy and guidance. | No action |
| 13695 - Mr Benjamin Hayes [5674] 14830 - Gerald Downey [4671] 14956 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] 14981 - Ursuline Sisters [28] 15347 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The policy states that developments of 100 or more dwellings will be expected to provide a minimum of 5% self build properties. The area for determining whether this policy applies will be the whole original site. The plan states that the policy will allow for the final housing mix, type and tenure to be subject to negotiation including consideration of development viability. This proposed policy will need to be looked at again in the context of the Housing and Planning Bill (once enacted) to assess if it remains deliverable in light of Starter Homes, the definition of affordable housing and permission in principle/brownfield register provisions. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15159 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Object | 1. The achievement of this policy aim will be easier as part of a master planned self-sustaining new garden village than in a series of extensions to existing villages. We suggest the addition of "market signals" in the first sentence of the final paragraph of the policy so that it reads: "The final housing mix, type and tenure will be subject to negotiation, account will be taken of the nature, constraints, character and context of the site, market signals and development viability". 2. CEG also express some concern about the policy's statement about the provision of a minimum of 5% self build properties. In the case of Dunton Garden Village this would translate to a minimum of 175 properties of a type which remain unproven. The provision of self build properties and their integration into the new community should be assessed at the time of application and subject to the suggested considerations above. | 1. Noted. 2. Noted. In line with national guidance, demand data from the Council's self and custom build register has been considered during the preparation of the Council's SHMA 2016 and will continue to be considered when developing the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 14679 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Support for this policy is not complete only because self-build has not so far been considered as part of the masterplan. Given policy 7.2 is seeking to control housing mix, it should be amended to reflect the experience and expertise offered by the Parish Council and local housing market experts. Our client suggest the final paragraph is amended accordingly: "The final housing mix, type and tenure will be subject to negotiation. Account will be taken of the nature, constraints, character and context of the site, as well as an up to date assessment of development viability and the types of housing required in the local area. Conditions may ..." | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15943 - CALA Homes [5237] | Support | Agree with this approach. A balance will need to be found when developing the proposals for the site at the planning application stage to ensure that efficient use of land is made to provide a mix of housing on site to meet a range of needs, whilst also delivering a development that is viable and appropriate to the character and context of the site and its surroundings. | Noted | No action |
| 14982 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Support | Support the final paragraph of Policy 7.2 - In respect of constraints, it should be made clear that this includes the ability to provide a site with appropriate infrastructure. For example, where a high density scheme cannot be supported by the existing or an improved local highway network, this is a constraint that will be taken into consideration and a different mix and type of properties would be considered, where it addresses the highway issue. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 16110 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Support | An assessment should be made on a case-by-case basis having regard to the quality of the design, the mix of uses and the amount and quality of public realm and open space. We therefore support this policy. | Noted | No action |
| 16325 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Support | Support the need for a higher proportion of 2 bedroom units. | Noted | No action |
| 14690 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Re. Horndon Industrial Park. The allocations are welcomed, but as with previous drafts of the local plan the allowance of 500 dwellings continues to be unjustified. This figure is based on a simple density calculation that does not take account of the design constraints affecting the sites. The supporting documents attached to this representation include draft masterplans and schedule of accommodation which have been subject to robust analysis of design, site and viability constraints - this has resulted in 324 houses and 63 flats. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

Figure 7.1: Housing Delivery by Tenure / Size

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|--|-------|-----------|
| 13430 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Comment | Even in ordinary houses the provision of a simple platform lift would make the homes more accessible to older occupants. | Noted | No action |
|------------------------------|---------|--|-------|-----------|

Residential Density

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|--|-------|-----------|
| 15556 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | The consultation on proposed changes to National Planning Policy to expect LPAs to require higher density development around commuter hubs wherever feasible. Shenfield with current and future transport links would be defined as a "commuter hub", therefore it is supported to focus higher densities here. However, such an approach will need to have regard to the existing nature of the site, including Landscape, Listed Buildings and Topography. | Noted | No action |
|---------------------------------------|---------|--|-------|-----------|

Policy 7.3: Residential Density

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|-------|--------------------------------|
| 13917 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14059 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | Policy could be elaborated upon more to make efficient use of land. Use of 'special character of the surrounding area' and 'other site constraints' and the way the densities are specified in the policy are very broad. Policy would be more robust if it went some way in defining general expectations and in refining designations where an exception may apply. Such exceptions could be based generally on site location relative to conservation areas, defined edges of the community, green spaces, surrounding densities etc. The greater of one and half times surrounding densities and Villages generally 35 dwellings/hectare net; Suburban generally 40 dwellings /hectare net; Urban areas generally 50 dwellings /hectare net. With centres of these being 1.5 X these densities. For example a recent small development of flats in Station Road at West Horndon yields a density of 80 dwellings/hectare net. Whilst such small sites can yield disproportionately high densities it does demonstrate how density within even rural settings can be accommodated. | Noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
|--|---------|---|-------|--------------------------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13303 - Ms Jenny Downs [2798] | Comment | 1. Should move away from the policy of allowing flats to built in Brentwood. Brentwood is a family town which needs family housing. The development around the station is a ghetto with a transient population. 2. The Sawyers Grove development is an excellent example of a great scheme. The central area of Brentwood is already extremely congested at peak times. | 1. The Local Plan seeks to rebalance the housing stock in line with identified need. Balancing economic, environmental and social objectives to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. 2. Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13299 - Mrs Fiona Trott [2458] | Comment | The site [an area of 9.7ha of land in Chelmsford Road] would be suitable for development by 250 houses, adopting a density of 26dph which is that assumed for the adjoining site at Officer's Meadow. This level of planned development would reduce by over 25% the Council's reliance on windfall site in the later years of the local plan. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16490 - CPREssex [210] | Comment | Regarding densities in rural and semi rural Greenbelt areas these should be low densities and should not exceed 20 dwellings per hectare and could be significantly lower depending on the location. This should be stated explicitly in the LDP. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13686 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | These proposed densities are too low. There should be an explicit presumption in favour of high-density development across the board, including out with town centres. Even in rural areas, there must be a presumption against new detached and semi-detached housing. Current policies on densities date from 2011, at a time of recession when the housing market was slower. The priority now should be to make the most efficient possible use of land. | Noted. Whilst efficient land use is critical to the delivery of the Local Plan, the most appropriate density for the site will also need to ensure schemes are sympathetic to local character. | No action |
| 14985 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Support | This policy is supported in general. However the consideration of site constraints which might affect achieved densities should include the ability of the proposal, at density levels specified by policy, to be adequately served by existing or improved infrastructure. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15799 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | Support policy. However if developers can demonstrate that a site can take a higher density without causing significant harm to the landscape then this could be supported to ensure effective use is achieved. | Noted | No action |
| 14019 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Support | Support. The proposals need to be sympathetic to the local character whilst making efficient use of the land, but prescriptive figures should not be applied. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14680 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Providing a strong guide for a minimum density of development is broadly welcomed, but only insofar as it does not stifle the best design solution - design should always be led by site constraints and viability concerns rather than the simple imposition of density targets. This is illustrated by our client's emerging masterplans for the redevelopment of the Horndon Estate, where the development density for the housing element is 28.4 dwelling per hectare. Even so, this result in an additional 324 houses, of varying sizes, and reflects West Horndon's existing development density. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|-----------|
| 15161 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | It is the correct approach to ensure that proposals for new residential development should take a design led approach to density, making schemes sympathetic to local character and making efficient use of land. The provision of housing in the context of a carefully master planned new self-community will achieve this aim with ease. | Noted | No action |
| 15950 - CALA Homes [5237] | Support | We support the flexibility to allow higher residential densities in sustainable locations with good public transport accessibility. | Noted | No action |
| 15348 - Countryside Properties [250] | Support | We support the design-led approach proposed by the Council in respect of residential density and the indicative numbers of dwellings per hectare set out by the policy. We also welcome that flexibility is afforded where the special character of the surrounding area or other site constraints make such densities unachievable. | Noted | No action |

Housing Allocations

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15207 - Clockwork Farms LTD [6070] | Comment | Possibility to include a 9.5 ha Green Belt brownfield site for development. The site is located towards the northern side of Church Road in Noak Hill village. The site currently falls within the Green Belt but is not subject to any landscape, environmental, open space, biodiversity or heritage designations. There are no known contamination issues on the site and it is not in an area identified as having potential for flood risk. It is not widely visible and does not perform a key role in performing Green Belt functions. It has physical and defensible boundaries created by adjoining sites. It is close to Harold Hill town centre, on the boundary with Havering Borough. If brought forward for low density housing development there would be a total contribution of 285 dwellings. | Disagree Site is not considered to fulfil the requirements of the Brentwood Spatial Strategy. Consideration of this site will be recorded in the updated site assessment work. | Consider accordingly |
| 15066 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Comment | The Council's SHLAA (2010) and Draft Site Assessment (July 2013) site (ref 70A, site 076 in this plan) is identified as a suitable site for development of new housing being within defensible boundaries of the village and available to be delivered within 1-5 years, the Council's new spatial policy eliminates this site? Crest Nicholson, second time National Builder of the Year, have a vision statement that identifies the benefits and opportunities to Blackmore for the development of site 076. I believe it can be proven that it falls within national policy and guidance. This site is achievable and could assist with the five year housing supply. This complies with site selection para 7.29 "The fourth tier allows for limited greenfield sites in the GB which comprise urban extensions within reach of services and infrastructure and with defensible boundaries". | Noted. The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. It is considered that this location is not in line with the current Spatial Strategy for the borough. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16207 - Mr. Richard Shayler [2245] | Comment | On a broader, strategic and residential land availability level , having regard to the requirements of the NPPF there would be advantage in adding another medium sized (around 70 units) site to the range included in Figure 7.2. As drafted, the plan is heavily reliant on sites with over 200 dwellings, in particular the Dunton Garden Village and Officer's Meadow allocations. It is submitted that delivery to satisfy the NPPF would be assisted by rather more provision of smaller sites. This would be smaller than almost all of the presently listed Greenfield Green Belt sites and could be brought forward and delivered rapidly without major infrastructure commitment. Flexibility would be added to the plan's capacity to meet assessed housing need. | The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 14781 - Mr David Lister [2960] | Comment | I would reluctantly agree to a new village of approximately 600 homes on the Timmermans Nursery by the A127, provided that a buffer zone, preferably a wooded area, was constructed between the new village and West Horndon. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15204 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | The site at Land South of Redrose Lane, Blackmore (076) should be released from the Green Belt in order to meet the existing and future housing and socio-economic requirements within Blackmore. The site is well screened, with defensible boundaries on four sides, ensuring that visual impact from the proposals will be minimal, and considerably less than other promoted sites; The site does not result in any symptoms of coalescence and is located within an area of established residential character, that presents itself as a logical extension to the existing settlement boundary; The site does not perform the function of preserving the setting and special character of a historic town or any assets of historic value; No environmental or ecological constraints have been identified on the site that would prevent its development for residential use; and The proposals would result in a number of significant socio-economic community benefits. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF | Consider accordingly |
| 15205 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | SHLAA identified site 076 as appropriate for housing development for 89 units. A design-led approach has resulted in a lower-density scheme of approximately 40 residential units. SHLAA also states that the site is suitable, achievable and available. Of all 7 sites considered in SHLAA, site 076 is the only suitable site around Blackmore. | Comment noted. Site is not considered to fulfil the requirements of the 2016 Brentwood Spatial Strategy. | Consider accordingly |
| 15187 - Punch Taverns [6067] | Comment | Land at Spital Lane, Brentwood site ref 035A has not be identified as a housing allocation, yet it fulfils each of the policy requirements set out in Policy 5.1 i.e. it is located within an identified transport corridor, has a clear defensible physical boundary. - The site is accessible to public transport and the key services and facilities. - Development of this site would have no significant impact on the Green Belt, visual amenity, heritage, transport and environmental quality including landscape, wildlife, flood risk, air and water pollution. - The site is deliverable in the 0 to 5 year timeframe. | The Council will be assessing further sites which have come forward during this plan consultation. These will inform the next iteration of the Plan, its allocations and policies. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13428 - Mr Richard Smith [4259] | Comment | Of the other proposed sites, I would suggest that only Warley Training Centre, the Council Depot and Ingatestone Garden Centre are acceptable. All of the other sites would result in traffic congestion. Many roads in the borough are already clogged with traffic. Why build more homes? The more you build the more it encourages people to move into the borough. Our essential services such as doctors are already "stretched". It is proposed to reduce the fire service. More homes would put added pressure on a reduced fire service. | Noted. Case law has shown that Local Plans that do not meet their Objectively Assessed Housing Need are unlikely to be approved by the Planning Inspectorate and therefore would leave the Planning Authority with no up to date Local Plan. This would in turn mean that defending the borough against inappropriate development, particularly in the Green Belt, would become even more difficult and present an unacceptable risk to the Council. | No action |
| 15312 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Comment | Site 159 at Crow Green Lane is relatively small, with a capacity of up to 70 or so dwellings together with local community infrastructure. The site's benefits include: a sustainable location in terms of access to existing local community and commercial facilities including schools; well served by existing public transport services; situated immediately adjacent to an established residential area; site has wholly defensible boundaries; can be serviced by the utilities; appropriate site access, as discussed with the Council's Highways; does not flood; one ownership; readily available; readily achievable; and therefore ideally suitable. | Noted. The site will be assessed along with existing sites for potential for new development. | Consider accordingly |
| 14931 - Mr Rob Marigold [6030] 14967 - Sue Marigold [2267] | Comment | 1. It would appear that the Council has allocated a number of its Car parks, as land suitable for building dwellings. This includes the car parks in Westbury Road, Chatham Way and William Hunter Way. This creates two problems: a) In fill like this does not provide an attractive environment - either for the new residents or existing residents. b) There does not seem to be clear provision of new/alternative car parking to replace the lost spaces. Where are visitors/shoppers supposed to park? Where do workers park, long-stay? Its difficult enough now. | Noted. The Council have commissioned a Town Centre Design Plan and along with other strategic evidence this will be used to bring suitable development to the town centre. | Consider accordingly |
| 16208 - Mr. Richard Shayler [2245] | Comment | It is submitted that the Huletts Farm land illustrated in the Ashby Design Study should be included In the Housing Allocations - Policy 7.4 and Figure 7.2 of the Local Plan. To that extent objection is made to the plan, though its general approach to Spatial Strategy is supported. Huletts Farm land would be an appropriate addition to the fourth, Greenfield Green Belt, tier of sites. It is submitted that it fits the criteria set out in Figure 5.4 - Sequential selection of sites - as a modest urban extension. Ecological survey submitted, note that strong hedges and tree lines which enclose the land to the north and east of the farmhouse. The western and southern boundaries of the Huletts Farm holding abut existing residential curtilages and there is no significant boundary landscaping. It is in a sustainable location with well defined boundaries, immediately adjacent to existing residential development. There would be the particular merit of facilitating the conservation of the heritage assets at Huletts Farm. There would also be advantage in resolving the awkward junction of Huletts Lane and Orchard Lane. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15209 - Mr Dhruv Patel [1800] | Comment | Possibility to include two Green Belt sites in Pilgrims Hatch for development. Both sites are within reach of existing services and infrastructure by way of their proximity with Pilgrims Hatch. Site 1 is approximately 3.2 ha in size and site 2 is approximately 2.5ha, both comprise fields/agricultural land. Both Sites 1 and 2 currently fall within the Green Belt but are not subject to any landscape, environmental, open space, biodiversity or heritage designations. There are no known contamination issues on either site and they are not in an area identified as having potential for flood risk. The sites are not widely visible and do not perform a key role in performing Green Belt functions. If both sites were brought forward for low density housing development there would be a total contribution of 171 dwellings. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15803 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | There are areas around the urban area of Brentwood that are covered by a MSA for sand and gravel. A high level assessment concludes that some proposed allocations in the Draft Local Plan are within MSAs for sand and gravel. However, these are either located within the defined urban area or are less than the 5ha threshold, as stated in Policy S8. However, ECC withholds the right to review any allocations which will be included in the Pre Submission Plan. | Agreed | Consider accordingly |
| 15272 - Bellway Homes Essex [6075] | Comment | Request to consider Dury's Farm site at Mountnessing for housing development. The site has capacity for between 150 and 180 residential units. As a Greenbelt site it's available immediately. The site is in a location which accords with the Spatial Strategy as set out in the draft Local Plan which seeks to focus development along the A12 corridor. The site is entirely contained as it is bounded by the A12, Roman Road and Mountnessing Primary School. It is close to the shops and services within the village and is within a short walk to the primary school. | Noted. New site will be assessed along with existing sites for potential for new development. | Consider accordingly |
| 15306 - Mr Haydn Clarke [6079] | Comment | Opportunity to include the land fronting Warley Street into the emerging Local Plan. With regards to the potential use for the land, given the number of business parks that are on the emerging local plan, the land would be a good site for housing in the future. The location close to the A127 and being located on the B186, it is good for transport connections. With the shape of the land there are two potential points of access. [Map provided]. | The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. It is considered that this location is not in line with the current Spatial Strategy for the borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 15217 - Bellway Homes Essex [6075] | Comment | The draft Local Plan seeks to allocate a significant amount of land for housing at West Horndon Industrial Estates (500) and Officer's Meadow(600) and whilst Bellway has no in principle objection to these draft allocations, the housing trajectory anticipates that completions happen in 2018 for Officer's Meadow and 2019 for West Horndon. However neither site has planning permission and the Local Plan isn't anticipated to be adopted until 2017, in addition, West Horndon may have contamination issues, it is considered that the projected levels of delivery for these two sites is very optimistic. Therefore in order to deliver the required number of houses in the first five years of the plan, the Council should allocate higher density development on those sites that are considered appropriate which can be delivered more easily and therefore quicker. | Noted. Densities will be considered with the opportunities and constraints for each site. | Consider accordingly |
| 14792 - Mr Jon Bright [5993] | Comment | I'm wondering what the plans are for 24 Norton Road, Ingatestone - the former Children & Families Consultation Service offices - which have been empty and boarded up for some months now. I assume this site will be earmarked for housing? | The Council are working with the NHS through the Duty to Cooperate to ensure investment into new health infrastructure and suitable release of assets as required. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14200 - Mr. K. Craske [2712] 14205 - Mrs Maureen Craske [3566] 14208 - Ms Louise Craske [5857] | Object | The A12 is set to be improved to Motorway standard by the Highways Agency, Crossrail is being built in Shenfield and Brentwood so there will be vastly improved traffic flows in the North of the borough but housing seems to concentrate in the South. There is no explanation why there are very limited plans for development in the North along the A12 corridor. | Council are considering sites that are accessible as well as available. Whilst improvement to the A12 in terms of flow are being considered, the access to the A12 remains the same with no realistic opportunity to change during the life of the Plan. The Council have identified sites that are more easily accessible to rail stations and site assessment considers opportunities and constraints at each site. The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to limit sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |
| 14778 - Mr David Lister [2960] | Object | The number of homes proposed is disproportionate and too high for West Horndon village currently made up of 650 homes. Traffic has increased greatly on the A127 and the train are so crowded. There is also a risk that homes proposed by adjoining Councils could impact our infrastructure. There are flooding issues around this village, which would be exacerbated by a large housing estate. The same goes for doctors surgeries. | The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities on cross boundary related issues and the Highways Authority (ECC) under the Duty to Cooperate. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13810 - Mr James Gooderson [5735] | Object | Generally, I am also concerned about the number of additional dwellings detailed in the plan which are proposed for the Town Centre. These will add considerably to congestion and will make Brentwood a less pleasant place to use. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15190 - Punch Taverns [6067] | Object | Object to the exclusion of Spital Lane, Brentwood from the residential allocations. The SHLAA assessment of this site states that it is suitable, available and achievable. Furthermore it is stated as being deliverable within a 0 to 5 year time period. There is no clear reasoning why this site has been excluded, whilst the comparable sites at Honeypot Lane and land at Nags Head Lane have been included as residential allocations. We request that this land be removed from the Green Belt and designated as a residential allocation. By way of an update, the land at Spital Lane has a site area of 0.25ha, otherwise this information is correct. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15308 - Site owner 75 Pear Tree Lane [6080] | Object | There are no Brownfield sites within towns and villages to the north of the District capable of triggering requirements for affordable housing. Opportunity to include the land at 75 Pear Tree Lane, which is currently a Green Belt land, however it is not serving any Green Belt functions. The NPPF recognises that sites can be developed in the Green Belt where they do not harm its function and openness. The site offers a defensible boundary to ensure the development of it would not result in urban sprawl or encourage any encroachment into the open countryside. | Consideration of this site will be recorded in the updated site assessment work. | Consider accordingly |
| 15057 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | The draft plan proposes to create a new garden village at Dunton Hills on GB land that is rated "medium value", for 2,500 new homes (35%) of housing needs in the Borough to 2033, compared to SHLAA site G070A, Land South of Redrose Lane, Blackmore, being promoted by Crest Nicholson for circa 40 houses within the village with clearly defensible boundaries is also rated "medium" but not part of the proposed allocation plan. | Noted. Assessment of sites is on-going and are considered in terms of opportunities and constraints with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 13760 - Mrs Wendy Gardiner [5705] | Object | Object to any development currently on the secondary list for 600+homes in Hatch Road as this would cause impact on the roads, doctors, dentist, schools and drainage. | The Brentwood Local Plan does not contain a "secondary list" of preferred sites. There is a list of preferred sites in Figure 7.2. The list of other sites is a list of all sites that have been put forward for consideration and have undergone assessment in line with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy and the requirements of the NPPF. | Comment noted. |
| 14545 - Mr Richard Swift [1747] | Object | I challenge the assessment of how sites have been allocated in this draft plan. Is there a Settlement Hierarchy paper? Land has been allocated at Mountnessing but Blackmore has more amenities and services and a population over twice the size of Mountnessing. | Settlement hierarchy is detailed in Chapter 5 of the Draft Local Plan. Assessment of sites is on-going and considers site opportunities and constraints in line with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy and the requirements of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Policy 7.4: Housing Land Allocations | | | | |
| 13792 - Mr Patrick Collinson [5727] | Comment | Oakwood Nursery on the Straight Mile, Ongar Road has just been given planning permission for the development of four houses. The building they are to replace was originally a glass house, later boarded over to become an office and store. I own and let out the area in front of this development as a store for tools and materials for a landscape business (Straight Mile Nursery Gardens). It also operates as a small garden centre/nursery selling their own stores and plants. There is also a small log store and supply business run from the site. The whole site has become considerably run down and, in part, derelict through the tenant's lack of investment. I am asking that the site be considered as a brownfield site suitable for the building of a small number of houses. I am only interested in low-profile eco houses (green roof, solar, etc.) to be shielded from the road by gardens and existing and extensive new tree planting. | The issues raised regarding this site will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15255 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Comment | Havering welcomes the decision not to progress with the A12 corridor site which was adjacent to the Havering borough boundary. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14608 - Ms Virginia Stiff [1748] | Comment | Wish to have site 076 reconsidered. Support the development of site 076, Land South of Redrose Lane, Blackmore. 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. Site 076 should be reconsidered for allocation. | The issues raised will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15677 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Comment | For a number of the allocation sites there is a pumping station located on the site or within close proximity of the site. A 15 metre distance between the boundary of the pumping station and the curtilage of any new dwelling should be maintained in order to reduce the risk of nuisance or loss of amenity. The design layout for these sites should take this into account. | The information provided by Anglian Water is welcomed. The Council is working with water and sewerage providers, informing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 16049 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Comment | The site - as set out in previous representations - is considered sustainable and deliverable. Furthermore, it would not undermine the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, and its allocation for development would result in the creation of a new robust, defensible Green Belt boundary for this location. As such it is a suitable site capable of helping to meet housing need in the short-term. It is not clear from the DLP or its supporting documentation how information submitted to the Council since the publication of the SHLAA has been considered, and why land adjacent to Rayleigh Road, Hutton has not been identified for development in the DLP. | Noted. Assessment of sites is on-going and are considered in terms of opportunities and constraints with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15802 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Comment | This policy should provide details of how regularly the Council will assess the Borough's current situation to determine whether there is a need to bring forward sites ahead of their phasing for development. This will ensure that the Council can demonstrate a robust 5 year housing land supply and not open themselves up to speculative applications. | The issues raised will be considered within the site assessment and review process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15264 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Comment | Recommended that Policy 7.4, and supporting Figure 7.2, is revised to include the site at Sawyers Hall Lane as a Housing Land Allocation. The sequential approach towards site selection and delivery is supported, however the delivery of identified sources of housing supply is questionable, and it is recommended that the housing target is increased. In the SA the site at Sawyers Hall Lane achieves the same overall "score" as the three allocated Greenfield Green Belt sites in Brentwood. | Noted. Assessment of sites is on-going and are considered in terms of opportunities and constraints with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 14084 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Comment | Collins Farm lies at the end of Goodwood. The site is approx 14 acres (5.6 ha) 4 acres for Housing and 10 acres would be given to the Council to extend the Country Park that adjoins the site. Collin Farm lies in a sustainable location being within easy access of local shops, amenities and schools. The site is well supported by public transport, with a regular bus service being within easy walking distance. It is clear that children that live in the near vicinity use public transport to access the various local schools. Originally the whole of Collin Farm was submitted for development and it was due to the size, at the time over 24 acres (9.79 ha), that it was rejected in the SHLAA. The SHLAA recognized that the site was sustainable and capable of development. The new proposal reduces the area to be developed from 24 acres (9.79 ha) to approximately 4 (1.6 ha). The site would be able to take advantage of the Crossrail scheme with the station being a 10 mins bus journey away. | Site information noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15598 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Considered appropriate that the DLP is revised to include individual policies on allocated development sites containing criteria against which subsequent proposals can be assessed. This will ensure that the Local Plan is 'consistent with national policy', 'effective' and therefore "sound" in this regard. | Noted. The issues raised will be considered within the LDP process and site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |
| 16026 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Sites: 001A, 001B, 003, 005,013B, 039, 040, 041, 044 and 178, 081, 099, 100, 010, 022, 023, 032, 034, 087and 235. Primary School Capacity - Currently very little surplus capacity Brentwood Town group. Current forecasts indicate a deficit of 94 permanent places by the school year 2019-20. There is limited scope for possible expansion of existing primary schools, many restricted or constrained by the "green belt" or land designated as "special landscape areas" or "conservation areas". Given the Plan is proposing significant release of Green Belt to meet its housing need, ECC considers appropriate consideration should be given to allowing the expansion of existing primary schools and potentially new schools in the Green Belt to meet an identified local need and to minimise unnecessary additional home-to-school journeys on the congested road network at peak times. As indicated, it is difficult to accommodate level of growth via the expansion of existing schools and it would be prudent to identify a site for a new 2 form of entry (420-place) primary school to accommodate this growth within the Local Plan. This would require a site of 2.1 ha (to include Early Years provision). | Comment welcomed. The Council will continue to work closely on ECC on issues such as education and is updating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to inform development needs. | Consider accordingly |
| 13316 - Julia and Ray Blencowe [5495] | Comment | Seems that if only one or two of the proposed sites were developed an enormous strain would be put on transport, hospitals, surgeries, schools and care homes. Not sure if these facilities will be increased to cope with the extra housing. Could not see the possibility of another hospital being built. Feel that a complete new town would be best provided there was enough Green Belt that could be released. | The issues raised will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15401 - Hopefield Animal Sanctuary (Mr David Schlaich) [5682] | Comment | Hopefield Animal Sanctuary is a popular and important local community facility, but only has a lease that expires in 2022 and are keen to secure a long-term future. A residential allocation on this site will help achieve this objective as it will allow Tesco to guarantee our ongoing freehold occupation on part of the site in addition to providing us with a freehold replacement site in another suitable location. | The issues raised will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15323 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Comment | Site 159 is a greenfield Green Belt site, but the Council needs sites with a high degree of certainty about its deliverability like this. Otherwise, it faces continuing challenges through the plan preparation and appeal processes. | The issues raised will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |
| 15669 - Southend on Sea Council (Mr Matthew Thomas) [6097] | Comment | We note in Policy 5.2 'Housing Growth' and supporting text that Brentwood Borough Council seeks to fully meet objectively assessed housing needs within the Brentwood Borough boundary. We note, however, that the plan does not appear to acknowledge that Brentwood may need to consider assisting other constrained neighbouring authorities within adjoining housing market areas to meet unmet housing need, in accordance with national policy and guidance, if this need cannot be met within that particular housing market area. | Brentwood are working on the Duty to Cooperate with adjoining boroughs, including on issues of meeting OAN. The Borough of Brentwood is 89% Green Belt, has minimal brownfield land and is therefore very limited in options for new homes. The OAN has risen from the former Regional Spatial Strategy figure to more than twice the number of new homes needed and despite this is aiming to meet its OAN within the borough. The borough, despite an increase in the number of permissions are not meeting the current OAN and the backlog is therefore increasing. Brentwood Borough is not in a position to meet unmet development need from any other housing market area, particularly one that contains greater opportunity for regeneration and density increase. | Noted |
| 14089 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Comment | Please find attached a plan and details of Gardeners Ongar Road Brentwood. The owners are Ordnance Land (Holdings) Ltd. Gardeners extends to approximately 8 acres and faces the Ongar road and Frog Street. Gardeners clearly have defensible boundaries, being surrounded by roads, houses and a wood. At present there is a house with outbuildings on the site with the land being used as garden land for the house. The site lies less than 0.5 miles from the shops at Kelvedon Hatch. There are well maintained pavements from the site to the shops. Within 300 yards of the site are 6 bus stops, providing a regular service to recognized employment areas and Brentwood Station. There are two primary schools within 0.6 miles. The site lies in adjacent to the public footpath network and less than 200 yards from Bentley Golf and Country Club and is just over 0.5 miles from Ashwells Sports. The site has two access points that have been previously recognized by the Council- one off the Ongar Road and one of Frog Street. The site is capable of containing Housing. The site is well screened and would not adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt in visual terms. The site is available immediately for development. | Your comments are noted and the issues raised will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14572 - Mr Richard Swift [1747] | Comment | Propose again: development of 40 residential units on site 076, Land South of Redrose Lane, Blackmore. It 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 has defensible boundaries and is therefore well screened and is adjacent to Orchard Piece. A footpath through Orchard Piece leads to the village centre. The site was first supported in the SHLAA (2010) and in the Draft Site Assessment (July 2013)Ref G070A. Crest Nicholson, an award winning national builder are able to deliver a sustainable, high quality residential development adding significant benefit to the local community. Reconsidered site 076. | The issues raised will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |
| 13758 - Ms M Giles [567] | Comment | In considering additional dwellings account must be taken of existing resources and how this would be managed/enlarged to cope with increase in population e.g. all three schools, medical services and parking amongst others. These services provide for an area that extends well beyond the village itself. | Noted and agreed. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15900 - Sunbury Homes [3785] | Comment | Client has interest in land on Coxtie Green Road for residential development (refs 171 & 172). This site has not been selected despite meeting the requirements for limited Green Belt release described in Policy 5.1 and the site selection tests in paragraph 7.29. The site is within a transport corridor, a strategic location, part of a self sustaining community, nearby local services, clear defensible boundaries and will provide development swiftly. The site is not isolated in the countryside and would be a logical extension to the existing development on the north side of the road. Currently the scrap yard is a nuisance and would be improved with redevelopment. An application for 12 dwellings is already being considered which confirms the site will have no significant impact, this shows it is viable. | Site assessment considers a number of opportunities and constraints which include Green Belt impact. The issues raised will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |
| 13311 - Mrs Fiona Trott [2458] | Comment | There has already been considerable development (house-builder) interest in the site and it is both viable and available as a short-term residential development opportunity or as a safeguarded site for release in the latter part of the Local Plan period (from 2029 onwards) when all the identified sites are expected to have been developed and the Council are reliant upon windfall sites becoming available. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF | Consider accordingly |
| 16024 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Regarding the high level assessment of potential impacts of the preferred spatial strategy on primary and secondary education - Windfall sites have not been considered because it is not possible to assess where they may occur. However, it should be noted that these 928 dwellings have the potential to generate up to an additional 275 primary places, well in excess of an additional form of entry. | Comment welcomed. The Council will continue to work closely on ECC on issues such as education and is updating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to inform development needs. | Consider accordingly |
| 15674 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Comment | Anglian Water has made an initial assessment of the impact of the proposed housing, employment retail and leisure allocation sites on existing water and water recycling infrastructure located within Anglian Water's area of responsibility. This will need to be revisited when planning applications are submitted to the District Council and we are approached by developers as part of the planning application process. A copy of the initial assessment made by Anglian Water is included with this consultation response. In relation to the strategic sites identified in the Local Plan it would be helpful to cross refer to the requirements of Policies 10.13 (Flood Risk) and (Sustainable Drainage) to ensure that these development proposals which are of strategic significance provide sufficient evidence relating to foul drainage and surface water management and the timing of any required improvements. | The information provided by Anglian Water is welcomed. The Council is working with water and sewerage providers, informing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14368 - Mr and Mrs Clive and Lesley Tanner [1071] | Comment | Should consider a new village with new infrastructure and links to the M25 north of Brentwood. As downsizers and parents of young adults we would welcome this if the houses were right and probably lots of other people would feel the same. | Options such as this are considered by the Council, however the scale of development needed to sufficiently fund such infrastructure is prohibitive. The Spatial Strategy focuses development on the two transport corridors. | No action |
| 15705 - Mrs P R Tredget [6099] | Comment | Potential to include land at the back of Grange Close, Ingrave, Essex. The land is of approximately 3 hectares | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF | Consider accordingly |
| 15590 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Policy 7.4 refers to Figure 7.2, which provides a list of housing land allocations but does not provide detail on form, scale and access as required under paragraph 157 of the NPPF. Whilst it is not considered appropriate that a Local Plan is overly prescriptive in terms of development requirements, it is deemed necessary that policies and criteria for each allocation site are provided to assist decision makers in considering development proposals (NPPF, para 154). Equally, an Applicant should be provided with guidance to ensure an appropriate planning application for those sites allocated can be submitted. It is therefore considered appropriate that the DLP is revised to include individual policies on allocated development sites containing criteria against which subsequent proposals can be assessed. This will ensure that the Plan is 'Consistent with national policy', 'effective' and therefore "sound" in this regard. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15832 - Mr Ronan Hart [1897] | Comment | Own part of site 053B to the rear of 146-148 Hatch Road, Pilgrims Hatch which has access rights from Crow Green Lane. Ask that this be considered as a suggested housing site. This could provide a doctors surgery which would benefit the Bishops Hall and Flowers Estate which do not currently have a health centre. The site is on the edge of existing housing and would provide an opportunity to allocate a good number of houses with minimal effect on existing residents. | Your comments are noted and the issues raised will be considered within the site assessment process. | Consider accordingly |
| 14745 - Mrs Jennifer Lewsey [5986] | Comment | Costcutters, and land to the rear, Hatch Road is a very busy road - any further traffic here would have dire consequences for residents. Rural villages should be kept rural, that is why residents choose to live there in the first place. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF | Noted |
| 15665 - Tony Hollioake [5618] | Comment | It is evident that some Green Belt land will have to be released in order to meet the objectively assessed target. As a result, it is recommended that a detailed review of Green Belt boundaries is undertaken. | The Council is commissioning further Green Belt assessment. | No action |
| 15593 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] | Comment | Sites, such as that at 365 Roman Road, Mountnessing (see supporting site location plan), should be considered by the Local Planning Authority as smaller windfall development, which meet the criteria of infill development and combined with other similar sites, can provide considerable housing numbers to help the Council achieve their objectively assessed needs. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16025 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | It will be important that in considering the housing applications which will come forward that the interests of schools should be taken fully on board. This is likely to involve reserving suitable sites on new developments for new schools. Details of the site areas required are provided in the ECC "Developers' Guide Education Supplement" (currently the 2010 version). | Welcome comment. The Council will continue to work with ECC to consider the impact on the existing and future need for schools | Consider accordingly |
| 14744 - Mrs Jennifer Lewsey [5986] | Comment | To the north, Hulleys Lane has wonderful wildlife and historic value with listed buildings on site, any further traffic joining the Ongar Road at that junction would be unjustified. Although brown field land it is full of historic and characteristic value, an absolute no. (I believe the pilgrims used this area as their stop over on the way to Canterbury). | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13528 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024] | Comment | Buildings have been bought and been allowed to rot, this has and is happening in Blackmore. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 17829 - Mr Jonathan Chaplin [6551] | Comment | Collins Farm lies at the end of Goodwood. The site in question extends to approximately 14 acres of which, approximately 4 acres would be for Housing development and 10 acres would be given to the Council to extend the Country Park that adjoins the site. Collin Farm lies in a sustainable location being within easy access of local shops, amenities and schools, The site is well supported by public transport, with a regular bus service being within easy walking distance. It is clear that children that live in the near vicinity use public transport to access the various local schools. Originally the whole of Collin Farm was submitted for development and it was due to the size, at the time over 24 acres, that it was rejected in the SHLAA. The SHLAA recognized that the site was sustainable and capable of development. The new proposal reduces the area to be developed from 24 acres to approximately 4. The site would be able to take advantage of the Crossrail scheme with the station being a 10 mins bus journey away. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF | Consider accordingly |
| 15502 - Mr Richard Lunn [4220] | Comment | It is evident that some Green Belt land will have to be released in order to meet the objectively assessed target. As a result, it is recommended that a detailed review of Green Belt boundaries is undertaken. Sites, such as that submitted, form the allocation of a parcel of land fronting Hay Green Lane, Hook End, should be considered by the Local Planning Authority as smaller development, which meet the criteria of infill development and combined with other similar sites, can provide considerable housing numbers to help the Council achieve their objectively assessed needs. | The Spatial Strategy for the borough aims to achieve the right balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. Limited development, including infilling where appropriate, will take place in villages within rural areas at a level commensurate with services and facilities available thus maintaining local amenity and distinctiveness. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14192 - Ms Norma Jennings [5444] | Comment | 011A/B/C; 053A/B; 148; 156; 159; 176. Applaud the decision not to allocate the above listed sites for development as they have no significant permanent boundary. North Pilgrims Hatch is the most historically significant areas in Brentwood. More ancient buildings and the Pilgrims Trail, on the only medieval green lane left in the area (Beads Hall Lane and Green Lane). The character is rural, since destruction of ancient woodland only 5 pockets of woodland left, rich in wildlife. Hatch road unsuitable for traffic as narrow and poorly surfaced. Destruction of ancient woodland along Ongar Road shows need alertness to importance of historical considerations. | Site specific comments noted. | No action |
| 15628 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | In relation to identified housing land supply, it would appear from the evidence base that Brentwood Borough Council has not carried out a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) since 2011. Basildon Borough Council made it clear in its response to Brentwood Borough Council regarding the Brentwood Borough's Local Plan Strategic Growth Options in early 2015 that it would expect the SHLAA to be updated before a Local Plan for Brentwood is progressed. Brentwood Borough Council should update its SHLAA by undertaking land availability assessments to help inform the emerging Local Plan, and review this on an annual basis. These assessments must review whether sites are suitable, available and achievable in both planning and viability terms, otherwise they cannot be relied upon to make up Brentwood's development land supply. It is not clear how any of the proposed housing sites included in the Draft Local Plan have been put forward and how the sites are justified as suitable without crucial supporting evidence which is missing including recent landscaping, ecology and open space evidence. | An update to the site assessment evidence base will be published, in line with Government guidance. | No action |
| 14555 - Mr Richard Swift [1747] | Object | The Plan is not in line with the NPPF strategic objective 3. Consideration of impact of no new homes in northern villages has not been considered. Issues of affordability, aging population, decreasing demand for existing facilities and services are dropping and puts villages future vitality at risk. Lack of development in Blackmore is justified by the need to retain the character of the borough. This will result in stagnation. | Noted. Assessment of sites is on-going and are considered in terms of opportunities and constraints with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15107 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Object | The phasing of such allocations should not be constrained by an arbitrary 5 year phasing timetable. The delivery of new housing is often driven by economics and the general health of the economy, and where new development is being sought it should not be denied by the indicative phasing applied within Appendix 2 of the Local Plan. It is considered that the only relevant matter restricting the phasing of development is that set out at (c) of Policy 7.4, which requires infrastructure requirements of the development can be fully met and satisfactorily addressed. Recommended Change: Delete (a) and (b) of Policy 7.4. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15208 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | Recommend that the site at Sawyers Hall Lane is identified as a Housing Land Allocation in the Local Plan, and that the site is released from the Green Belt. The site at Sawyers Hall Lane is available, the location is suitable, development is achievable. Recommend that the site is brought forward within the first five years of the plan period. The site is able to secure the long-term future of Hopefield Animal Sanctuary (and this approach to the proposals has been agreed in principle with the existing occupier). The proposals are also able to deliver a range of social, economic and environmental benefits to Brentwood and would meet the Council's strategic objectives. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14560 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | The Council is relying on a small number of allocations to deliver the plan, with only 22 sites listed in Figure 7.2. A lack of delivery of any of these sites will result in the plan not meeting the identified need. The release of further sites, especially those in Green Belt locations, will provide flexibility to the plan and meet the objectives and requirements of the plan process. Policy 7.4 - Housing Land Allocations should therefore include land at Salmonds Farm, Ingrave [Site Ref. 067A & B]. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15307 - Site owner 75 Pear Tree Lane [6080] | Object | The proposed draft allocations are heavily reliant upon the Dunton Hills Garden Village, which relies upon acceptance from Basildon Council. Furthermore, the draft plan does not allow for any strategic growth within the north of Brentwood, hence runs the risk of effectively killing off the planned growth of the towns and villages that comprise the north of Brentwood. Doddinghurst should be allowed to grow in a controlled and sustained manor to help provide much needed market and affordable housing. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15321 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Object | There are 9 allocations with potential to deliver early in the plan period and help relieve the current significant shortfall in supply. These allocations have a total capacity of around 390 new dwellings and are: Wates Way Industrial Estate; Essex County Fire Brigade HQ; Warley Training Centre; Westbury Road Car Park; Chatham Way/Crown Street Car Park; Hunter House Western Road; Sow and Grow Nursery Pilgrims Hatch; Ingatestone Garden Centre; Ingatestone Bypass Among these, 2 are currently town centre car parks, a further 2 are public service establishments, whose future may be liable to further public service review. Added to this would be the delivery from planning permissions already given but yet to be implemented; an allowance from permitted development conversions of offices to residential, and a windfall site allowance. The net result is an annual production of around 150 to 200. This leaves the Draft Local Plan struggling to meet its target. | Reasonable options to accommodate Brentwood's dwelling requirements are being tested by the process of the development of the Local Plan. Evidence is being considered and further site assessment will reflect this. Further consultation will take place before submission for independent assessment by the Planning Inspectorate. Consider accordingly. | No action |
| 14495 - Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909] | Object | The number of dwellings identified for Brentwood Town centre will overwhelm an already congested and polluted area and residents will have to accept a deterioration of the quality of the town centre. There are plenty of Brownfield sites available for development in the Parishes and on the outskirts of the town centre. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 13481 - mr simon davis [5587] 14190 - Ms Norma Jennings [5444] 14612 - Mr Gerry Jordan [4702] | Object | Object to all greenfield sites on Green Belt apart from the old Plotlands area at Dunton. Deplore precedent set for building on Green Belt. Probably a ploy to make it more acceptable to use Green Belt and absorb Brentwood / Essex into Greater London the very thing green belt was intended to prevent. | The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14095 - Mr Charles Courage [5807] | Object | Sites: 237 Chainbridge Farm and 107 Land at Mountnessing Roundabout, J12 A12. The Council did not send out a letter therefore we were not consulted. The housing development at Mountnessing Roundabout came to our attention on Monday 21st when we saw the hoardings erected and Weston homes signs advertising that 85 homes were to be built soon. I called the Council offices after trying to unsuccessfully for sometime to find information on the Planning website. They first of all gave the Warley planning number. Several calls later and I was given 14/01446/EIA. A ward Councillor gave me printed copies of the application. We then learned that Chainbridge Farm has been put forward to the Local Plan for housing and neighbours told me it was in the Shenfield library. We object most strongly to both developments. Chainbridge is surrounded by our farmland and is in Green Belt. Our private farm road is the only access from Roman Road and is in constant use by heavy farm machinery. | Objection noted. Public consultation as the Draft local Plan has developed has been considered appropriate: there has been an Issues and Options consultation in 2009, a Preferred Options consultation in 2013, a Strategic Growth Options consultation in 2015 as well as this consultation on the Draft Local Plan (2016). Each stage has been widely advertised in line with the Councils Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and have public reports on each consultation summarising comments made along with the Councils response. There will be a further public consultation on the next draft of the Local Plan at the beginning of 2017 where there will be opportunity to comment further. | Consider accordingly |
| 13745 - Mrs S McAnslan [5697] | Object | 1. Object to proposed development in Ingatestone which cannot be accommodated. Do not have the infrastructure to cope with more houses. Already problems with flooding at one end of the village with the sewage system unable to cope. The doctors surgery cannot cope with the new residents. It is impossible to park and there are not the places in local schools. 2. Our Green Belt is disappearing quickly and Ingatestone is being swallowed up and merged with Brentwood, Shenfield and Mountnessing and no doubt shortly to Margaretting and eventually joining up with Chelmsford. | 1. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 2. A strategic Green Belt review has been commissioned. The results of which will feed into the Plan and be considered alongside other constraints. | No action |
| 16205 - South Essex Partnership University NHS Trust [2555] | Object | Object to policy 7.4 because site 083 land at Warley Hill is not proposed for allocation. There is no sound justification for the non-allocation of site 083, because: - the site is brownfield land - The site is in a highly sustainable location and its allocation would accord entirely with the Council's proposed spatial strategy; - The site has been assessed by the Council as having a moderate to low Green Belt impact, and is therefore well placed for release; and - The site is vacant and serves no useful purpose in its current state. | Site is not considered to fulfil the requirements of the Brentwood Spatial Strategy. Consideration of this site will be recorded in the updated site assessment work. | No action |
| 14811 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | 037A, B and C, 038A and B, and 126 are all Green Belt sites surrounding West Horndon village. Development of these sites would change the existing West Horndon village beyond recognition, and put a very significant strain on local residents and infrastructure. I believe that the very significant development this would represent within the Green Belt would be an inappropriate development and represent significant harm to the local environment, harm which would not be outweighed by the need for housing within the Borough. | Noted. These Green Belt sites are not preferred sites and the focus for development in the south of the borough is for a new Garden Village, Dunton Hills. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13583 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Object | We object to the exclusion of any sites in Mountnessing (save for those which already have planning consent/resolution to grant) from the housing land allocations. Mountnessing lies within the A12 corridor, which the spatial strategy claims to be the focus for development. It is also a sustainable settlement, being served by a local shopping parade and primary school. Land adjacent to Mountnessing Primary School should be allocated for residential use to serve the needs of Mountnessing and contribute towards the Borough's needs. Our full case in this regard is set out in response to Policy 5.1 Spatial Strategy. | Noted. Assessment of sites is on-going and are considered in terms of opportunities and constraints with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 16062 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | There are significant concerns with the current direction being taken in respect of the Brentwood Local Plan. If the Local Plan were to proceed along the lines of the DLP it is considered unlikely to be found sound. To rectify this the following should be done: Review the current proposed number of homes to be provided 2013-2033 having regard to market signals and unmet housing need within areas with which the Borough is connected, to be determined through further working under the Duty to Cooperate with relevant Authorities. Ensure that the Local Plan does not rely on the delivery of Dunton Garden Hills Village or windfall to meet housing needs, due to considerable uncertainty regarding their potential to deliver housing. Reduce reliance on large strategic sites that will not be delivered in the short- term, and seek to address the current, urgent housing need through the identification of a range of smaller, deliverable sites in sustainable locations; and ensure the provision of a five-year housing land supply. Apply a more sophisticated and transparent approach to site selection (and Sustainability Appraisal of potential sites) that considers the sustainability and deliverability of sites, along with their potential to relate to a spatial strategy for development linked to the settlement hierarchy. | The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan. Assessment of sites is on-going and are considered in terms of opportunities and constraints with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 16124 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The SHMA for Brentwood was prepared in 2013 and redated 2014. It does not take account of the latest household projections nor consider an appropriate Housing Market Area. The notion that Brentwood is a self-contained district lacks credibility when the OAN report itself attests to the Borough's strong inter-connectivity with Essex and London. The Borough is located with the London Arc and the construction of Crossrail will only increase this connectivity. The HBF and others consider that Brentwood should be assessed in a joint SHMA with Basildon, Chelmsford and Epping Forest. It is unclear how the Council has engaged with the Mayor of London and the London Boroughs on the matter of migration. | An update to the site assessment evidence base will be published, in line with Government guidance. Consultation with the Mayor of London and London Boroughs is taking place as part of plan preparation and in line with the Duty to Cooperate. | No action |
| 14687 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Object | Objection related to the Council's new requirement that the phasing of development of Horndon Estate referred to in appendix 2, which is tied into this policy. The Council has two incompatible positions in respect of phasing the housing delivery on the Horndon Estate: - The first is the housing contribution of the Horndon Estate identified as part of the current 5 year housing land supply - The second is set out in the latest draft LDP, where appendix 2 shows the housing coming forward in the medium term i.e. after 5 years. Our client has been working for some time on a planning application for the redevelopment of Horndon Estate. The new phasing requirement set out in the draft LDP does not appear to be underpinned by any assessment/ evidence and is unjustified. Consequently, our client objects to this policy and appendix 2. | Noted. Assessment of sites is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15317 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Object | The other strategic greenfield sites, Officer's Meadow, Shenfield; Honeypot Lane, Brentwood; and Nags Head Lane, Brentwood, are all included in Appendix 3's Housing Trajectory. All are shown as starting delivery in 2018. This is less than two years from now and, in our opinion, it is unlikely that delivery from these sites will start much before end of 2020, beginning of 2021. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed for their deliverability, as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15322 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Object | The Local Development Scheme states that the new Local Development Plan is scheduled for adoption by the second quarter of 2017. Even if this is achieved, its land allocations will still need to be based on very robust foundations. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15351 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The requirement set out at Policy 7.4 for planning applications submitted in advance of the indicative phasing to only be approved if further tests are undertaken is overly onerous. It is our opinion that the phasing estimates set out at Appendix 2 should be viewed as indicative, rather than forming the basis to introduce additional barriers to the delivery of allocated sites that have already been rigorously tests to ensure their suitability for development. | Noted. Phasing will be considered in light of the evidence base. | Consider accordingly |
| 15319 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Object | It is the smaller allocations that are likely to make an early contribution to meeting what is already a significant housing shortfall in Brentwood Borough. The last Five Year Deliverable Housing Supply Assessment, published in June 2014, recorded a 4.3 year supply, well below the level required by the NPPF. | Noted. The assessment is on-going and sites will be assessed as required by the NPPF | Consider accordingly |
| 15424 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Object | Of the five sites that have been identified for release from the Green Belt, site 079A is considered to have a 'Low-Moderate' assessment rating, sites 022, 023 and 032, 087, 235 are considered to have a 'Moderate' rating, whilst 034 has a 'Moderate-High' rating. A 'Moderate' rating is defined as being where "development of the site will moderately affect the site's contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt" and where either: - Three, or all, Green Belt Purposes is assessed to a Moderate Level; or - One Purpose of the Green Belt is assessed to a High Level and at least two Purposes are assessed to a Moderate Level; or - Two Purposes are assessed to a High Level and the other two Purposes limited to a Low level." Given that the Assessment also lists 50 sites that are either within the 'Low-Moderate' or the 'Low' assessment rating, the Council has failed to take into account their own Evidence Base in identifying sites and when informing their Local Plan strategy. As a result, it is considered that the Local Plan, as it stands, is unsound. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15324 - Mr. N & R Hart and Mr. K & P Watson [2795] | Object | Object to the Policy on the basis that clients site at Hatch Rd, Pilgrims Hatch has not been identified as Housing Land Allocation. The site should be allocated for the following reasons: - Site allocation will allow for a logical extension of Pilgrims Hatch in accordance with the Green Belt purposes in the NPPF. - Will allow for clear and planned growth of Pilgrims Hatch within what is a derelict former brownfield site. Site was used as a commercial nursery. - The site has been previously developed and whilst the buildings have since disappeared from the site, their foundations exist and the land remains contaminated and derelict. Allocation and development of the site will allow the remediation work to take place for decontamination. - Opportunity to positively enhance the environmental and ecological quality of the site through a development led proposal. - The site offers a defensible boundary to ensure the development of it would not result in urban sprawl or encroachment into the open countryside. | Noted. Assessment of sites is on-going and are considered in terms of opportunities and constraints with the Brentwood Spatial Strategy, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 16111 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | We have concerns regarding the site selection process which has resulted in this list of sites allocated for development, such as: - We do not consider that the sites allocated for development over the emerging plan period could have been properly assessed on robust evidence, given that the SHLAA was last updated in 2011 and the Council's Urban Capacity Study was published in 2002. - Appendix outlines the Council's estimated delivery timetable which fails to include the delivery rates of Dunton Hill Garden Village, which leads to the assumption that the Council do not anticipate the delivery of the development within the plan period. | An update to the site assessment evidence base will be published, in line with Government guidance. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15338 - Ford Motor Company [3768] | Object | Ford notes that the land north of its car park (north of Eagle Way), known as the 'Council Depot, The Drive, Warley - site reference 081' has been allocated for residential development. Ford has assumed that the employment designation to the north of Eagle Way, Warley is retained within the Draft Local Plan. Ford believes that an appropriate policy should be included within the Brentwood Local Plan which provides future flexibility for the redevelopment of this site for range of land uses should the car park become surplus to Ford's requirements during the Plan period. Should the site become surplus to requirement during the Plan period, then there should be no requirement for Ford to justify the loss of employment on this land as it has not previously been used for employment uses - only ancillary car parking. A more flexible policy wording for Ford's land to the north of Eagle Way may assist in realising or enhancing this development aspiration in future years. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14261 - Mr David Gooderson [5871] | Object | The number of dwellings identified for Brentwood Town centre will overwhelm an already congested and polluted area and residents will have to accept a deterioration of the quality of the town centre. There are plenty of Brownfield sites available for development in the Parishes and on the outskirts of the town centre. | Noted. The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 16044 - Elizabeth Finn Care [5080] | Object | There is reference at paragraph 7.28 of the DLP to the 2010 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) being the starting point for considering sites as part of the plan making process. The most recent SHLAA is the 2011 iteration, and as such is somewhat dated. Furthermore, whilst a larger parcel of land in which our client's site sits was assessed by the Council as part of the Brentwood Borough 2011 SHLAA as site reference GO92, it is unclear how the site as submitted in response to consultation on the Strategic Growth Local Plan in February 2015 has been assessed or considered. | Noted. An update to the site assessment evidence base will be published, in line with Government guidance. | No action |
| 15325 - Mr. N & R Hart and Mr. K & P Watson [2795] | Object | Proposed draft allocations are heavily reliant upon the Dunton Hills Garden Village, which relies upon acceptance from Basildon Council. Furthermore, the first draft does not allow for any strategic growth within the north of Brentwood. | The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver self sustaining communities with accompanying local services to minimise the impact on existing services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to avoid sprawl. The Council will continue to work with neighbouring authorities on cross boundary related issues under the Duty to Cooperate. | No action |
| 15163 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Supports policy and suggested mix and phasing contained in Appendices 2 and 3. The allocation of a new garden village on a site largely in a single ownership, requiring no third party land and planned in a comprehensive way through the preparation of a master plan will help to ensure the achievement of an appropriate mix of uses, phasing and early delivery. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--------------------------------------|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15349 - Countryside Properties [250] | Support | It is welcomed that a range of smaller sites have been allocated for residential development and will enable the Council to maintain a rolling five year land supply. | Noted | No action |
| 14025 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Support | The SA considered 270 alternative housing site locations, scoring each on 24 sustainability criteria. It is disappointing that they identified only 18 suitable sites within the urban area before having to consider eroding the Green Belt, where the vast majority of new dwellings are now planned. It is important that every effort is made to promote the most sustainable and appropriate urban development sites as listed in the DLP. [Policy 7.4: Support] | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14020 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Support | Support. The list of housing sites at figure 7.2 is the best solution to the problem of building 7240 new homes in the Borough over the Plan period. However, there should be some flexibility in the phasing timetable. N.B. The Sustainability appraisal considered 270 sites in some detail, of which only 18 Urban Area sites considered acceptable (1266 dwellings). Unfortunately all the remaining sites listed are located in Green Belt (3889 dwellings). Important that listed Shenfield and Brentwood Sustainable Urban Area sites promoted where possible (inline with policy 5.1) Good example site 178, which I support without reservation. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15005 - Stephen Hill [612] | Support | The area proposed for the land across the A128 from it [Dunton Hills Garden Village]which extends westwards to the B186 (Warley Street) is well chosen for housing. [Area to the north of A127 and west of A128]. If plans such as this came to fruition, local residents could actually benefit from a satellite settlement such as this. Those living near to them would have local shops, supermarkets, which would mean they would not have to go into Brentwood for their main shop. | This location has not been considered suitable for new homes, it contains Thorndon Country Park which includes a number of SSSIs. | No change |

Site Selection

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---|-------|-----------|
| 13925 - Mr Deniel Cuthbert [5780] | Comment | Agree with your decision to keep the greenbelt land to the north of Hatch Road off your primary development list. Wildlife would be affected which would include breeding buzzards, deer, bats, newts and fieldfares. The boundaries to development are not strong. The area is criss-crossed with footpaths, but if land designated as greenbelt can be developed then a footpath won't stop further development. Shame to develop land before an archaeological study of pilgrims places of rest could be undertaken given it's Christian heritage. Development vastly change character of the site. Land tended, but is countryside not urban, mixed use or industrial. Houses reduce the countryside. A fundamental change. Question of amenity. Sandpit Lane not suitable as a major thoroughfare, although it is being used as such. Traffic lights at Wigley Bush Lane takes 10 minutes to get through, this is often preferable to trying to get through Brentwood. The only directions able to cope with more traffic at busier times (i.e. at times convenient to peoples way of life) from Pilgrim's Hatch is Ongar or Doddinghurst. Neither of those though have amenities to spare. I applaud your decision not to develop on the land to the north of Hatch Road. | Noted | No action |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---|-------|-----------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16206 - Mr. Richard Shayler [2245] | Comment | Ford Wells has entered into an agreement with the Landowner at Hulletts Farm, Pilgrim's Hatch, Brentwood (east of A128 Ongar Road, west and east of Hulletts Lane and north of Orchard Lane) to promote the residential development of the landholding including the conservation of the Grade II listed farmhouse and the two interesting buildings , a byre and a stable within its curtilage. The latter are considered suitable for residential conversion , the farmhouse itself is presently occupied but requires extensive repairs, refurbishment and updating. The outbuildings will require very considerable work to effect sympathetic repair and conversion. To inform the Local Plan process two reports by Alan Stones AADip TPDip IHBC ret , heritage consultant and former head of design and historic buildings at ECC are included with this Comment Form. Also included is a preliminary study by Ashby Design which indicates how up to 71 new houses could be accommodated on the land adjoining the farmhouse and curtilage listed outbuildings. The need to safeguard the setting of the latter is fully appreciated | Noted | No action |
| 13762 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [4967] | Comment | The number of houses proposed in most sites (Eg the site of Priests Lane) seems to have been identified without ANY consideration of infrastructure. Eg water, mains & supply; GPs; school places; roads, etc. | The densities considered for each site are based on current evidence. Opportunities and constraints are therefore assessed for each site and the proposed densities considered accordingly. An update to the SHLAA will give further information on this for each site considered. | No action |
| 13300 - Mrs Fiona Trott [2458] | Comment | The site is in the Green Belt (but not a special landscape area) and therefore comes within the fourth tier of the Council's sequential approach to sustainable land use. This tier allows for limited greenfield sites in the Green Belt which comprise urban extensions within reach of services and infrastructure and with defensible boundaries. The site satisfies all these criteria. | Noted | No action |
| 13172 - Mrs Lisa Glascock [5389] | Object | Shopping in Shenfield again is impossible with limited parking and local schools are over subscribed, with classes so full even local children are not receiving places. I cannot see how Shenfield will cope with the extra traffic and population. More houses mean you will need more schools. doctors, parking, facilities and larger roads to take the traffic impact. | Noted. The Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. | Consider accordingly |
| 16320 - Go Holdings [3818] | Object | Support the high level priority given to PDL redevelopment and small releases of Green Belt land, as set out in the Draft Local Plan that meet the objectives of both containments but at the same time connectivity, considering this, alongside the adjacent land at Ingatestone Nursery (Site Ref. 128), land at Valentine should also be given preference in the site allocations document for residential development and open space. The eradication of brownfield sites is a priority in the NPPF and more recent planning documents. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|-----------|
| <p>15376 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15395 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15501 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15587 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15664 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16178 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16204 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620]</p> | Object | <p>Of the five sites that have been identified for release from the Green Belt, site 079A is considered to have a 'Low-Moderate' assessment rating, sites 022, 023 and 032, 087, 235 are considered to have a 'Moderate' rating, whilst 034 has a 'Moderate-High' rating. A 'Moderate' rating is defined as being where "development of the site will moderately affect the site's contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt" and where either: - - Three, or all, Green Belt Purposes is assessed to a Moderate Level; or - One Purpose of the Green Belt is assessed to a High Level and at least two Purposes are assessed to a Moderate Level; or - Two Purposes are assessed to a High Level and the other two Purposes limited to a Low level." Given that the Assessment also lists 50 sites that are either within the 'Low-Moderate' or the 'Low' assessment rating, the Council has failed to take into account their own Evidence Base in identifying sites and when informing their Local Plan strategy. As a result, it is considered that the Local Plan, as it stands, is unsound.</p> | <p>Consideration of Green Belt designation is only one consideration, all be it a very important one, used when determining the most appropriate strategic approach to site allocation. The Green Belt Assessment (March 2016) is a working draft and will become part of a series of Green Belt evidence documents which taken as a whole will guide allocations and policies in the emerging Local Plan. This Green Belt work is just one of a number of evidence documents that is informing the Local Plan, the strategy and selection of strategic sites. When evidence is combined this builds a picture of the most sustainable places for growth.</p> | No action |
| <p>13163 - Ms Linda Rodrigues [5380] 13541 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612] 14536 - A. Burton [1628]</p> | Object | <p>Green Belt should be treated as irrevocably sacrosanct, No new building should be permitted in rural/Green Belt locations - including on "brownfield" sites therein since this causes hideous impairment of the landscape viewable from many angles over considerable distance. Any compelling/imperative residential development should take place exclusively on "brownfield" sites such as redundant/obsolete industrial estates, eg. Water Way, West Horndon; Any redundant/unoccupied offices and shops could be converted to residential use All flora and fauna should be fully safeguarded at all times, in all circumstances, in all locations.</p> | <p>The proposed Spatial Strategy considers appropriate land uses sequentially in line with guidance and best practice. If Green Belt land needs to be considered to help meet needs then it is proposed this is only after all suitable and available brownfield locations are brought forward first. The objectively assessed housing needs assessment published in December 2014 is considered to be the most up to date evidence and is NPPF compliant. It is considered that the need for 400 homes per annum can be sustainably accommodated in the Borough, albeit not all on brownfield land given the finite capacity of available sites and 89% of the Borough being Green Belt. The Council will ensure that evidence, such as that dealing with housing needs, is kept up to date as part of informing the Local Plan.</p> | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14472 - Asphaltic Developments Ltd [2664] | Object | Given the Council's reliance on greenfield urban extensions in Green Belt it is considered that more sustainable sites which do not have significantly greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt such as our clients site [Brentwood Leisure Park at Warley Gap] should be considered as potential sites for housing development (in line with Policy 9.11), in addition to the proposed allocations in the Green Belt, such as sites no. 010 and 128, which are brownfield land in the Green Belt that are connected to or close to urban areas. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14071 - Mr Benjamin Stapley [5455] | Object | Site selection of Priests Lane conflicts with the following: Para 6.18 - Priest Lane is very narrow in places with provision of pavements on one side only. The need to cross the road multiple times when walking from Shenfield to Brentwood is a significant hazard. Extra traffic using this section of Priests Lane will result in accidents with pedestrians and road users due to the road / pavement arrangement. Para 6.18 - The Priest Lane infrastructure is already under significant stress through volume of traffic and physically could not cope with the implied number of extra cars using Priests Lane to access site 044 and 178. This is a congestion and a safety issue. Priests Lane has no public transport. It's development would be directly at odds with paragraph 10.7 (and 10.6). Development of valuable open greenfield space. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14275 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Object | By providing new homes throughout the Borough, including sites on the edge of villages or within easy walking distance, the criteria as set down by the government and the SHMA would be met. How does the Council propose to meet the Borough's housing need by building over 40% of new homes along the A127 and at the same time maintain stringent planning policies? An integrated housing approach throughout the Borough would meet the needs identified in the SHMA (housing for holder people, concealed households), that the current approach fails to do and as a result will alienate families. | The evolution of the spatial strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | No action |
| 15004 - Mrs Patricia Lamputt [6042] | Support | I am writing to put forward my land Title number: EX640944 Three Oaks Meadow for the future Brentwood Development Plan. The land is nicely located central in Hutton and also adjoining an established residential property 5 Hare Hall, and is opposite existing residential estates. It is easy access direct from Hanging Hill lane with public transport and accessible to all amenities: i.e. local schools, Shenfield Satin, Brentwood Town and Motorways. Site map and land registry details provided. | Noted. The site will be assessed along with existing sites for potential for new development. | Consider accordingly |
| 13699 - Mr Stephen Goulding [4525] | Support | I agree with the sites selected | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| Figure 7.2: Housing Land Allocations | | | | |
| 14126 - Mr John Cavill [2391] | Comment | 1. The closure of Ingatestone Garden Centre is a sad loss. The Council should refuse change of use and encourage a new garden centre operator to take over the site. 2. Regarding the other Ingatestone development, we support the choice of brownfield sites. 3. We will not support any development on Green Belt land, the government needs to learn to manage national population so that this is not necessary. We have written to Eric Pickles regarding this issue. Thank you for bringing your display to Ingatestone. We much appreciate the helpful and friendly approach of the Planning Policy Team staff. | tbc | tbc |
| 15891 - Cadena Holdings Limited [233] | Comment | Potential to include land at Bellropes, Warley Street, Great Warley for residential development. The site is long established and lawful and will be available for residential development in the short term. It could deliver 20-30 new homes in a manner which can be appropriately assimilated within the Green Belt. The site is close to hotels and public houses. It is a short distance from Brentwood town centre and the strategic road network such that longer distance trips are easier to access. The site will lie on a planned green travel route. | tbc | tbc |
| 16052 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Sites: 001A, 001B, 003, 005,013B, 039, 040, 041, 044 and 178, 081, 099, 100, 010, 022, 023, 032, 034, 087and 235. Secondary School Capacity - Currently a significant level of surplus secondary school places in the Brentwood/ Shenfield area. Whilst the level of surplus is forecast to fall over the course of the next 5 years as Becket Keys Church of England Free School fills there will still be a significant level of surplus places, that could be utilised to accommodate growth generated by new housing in the Brentwood/ Shenfield area. The impact of the opening of the new secondary "free school" in Chipping Ongar on the intakes of the secondary schools in the Brentwood/ Shenfield area is yet to be determined. | TBC | TBC |
| 16412 - Mr and Ms M Geisa [6128] | Comment | Possibility to include all of the site at 21 Rectory Chase, Doddinghurst within the residential allocation. | TBC | TBC |
| 16050 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Sites: 020,021,152 and 200. Primary School Capacity - Only primary school serving this area is West Horndon Primary School which is currently operating at capacity. The school has the site capacity to enable it to expand beyond its current size. However, part of the current site is leased to a scout group until 2020. It may be possible to acquire some additional land to the rear of the school to enable a more significant expansion than could be accommodated on the current site. The 2,500 dwellings identified as the Dunton Garden Suburb could produce up to 750 primary aged pupils. This level of growth would require the provision of at least one large, or more probably two smaller new primary schools. It would be imperative for a primary school site to be made available as early as possible on the Dunton Garden Village site. | TBC | TBC |
| 15452 - Mr Andrew Sadler [6090] | Comment | Land Adj. Hanging Hill Lane, Hutton, Brentwood put forward for allocation in the local plan for possible residential development of either self build or smaller properties for either rental or affordable or a mixture of both. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15959 - Simply Planning (Mrs holly Mitchell) [5416] | Comment | The Stondon Massey Scrap Yard site should be identified within the emerging Local Plan as a significant brownfield site suitable for housing. As a large brownfield site within the Green Belt the site is acceptable for housing provided that the proposed development does not have any greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The site is over 3ha and is too large to be left to be treated as a windfall site. The potential housing that could be accommodated should be assessed at the Local Plan stage so that it can be assessed whether other greenfield Green Belt sites are required for release. | tbc | tbc |
| 13687 - MR MOHAMMED OMAR ALI BINHAIDER ALHARTHI [5670] | Comment | We wish to submit a site for consideration within the housing land allocation. The site in question is the Land on the south east side of Bird Lane, Great Warley. | TBC | TBC |
| 14615 - Stonebond Properties Ltd [5948] | Comment | Re. land between 38-50 Crescent Road [see supporting site location map]. The site is situated within the town of Brentwood, 0.3 miles from the town centre and railway station. It is therefore considered to be a sustainable site capable of accommodating 10 dwellings as set out in planning application 15/01175/FUL. It is therefore considered that the site should be included within Figure 7.2. The land has not been used in connection with the nursery use and it has been gated off at the entrance from Crescent Road. The site was declared surplus to requirements following the relocation in 2003. | TBC | TBC |
| 16459 - Joint Owners of Land at Coxtie Green Road Brentwood [6212] | Comment | Possibility to include the site at Coxtie Green Road covering an area of 3.4 hectares for housing development. The site is a former sports ground, well served by public transport, close to primary and secondary schools, shops and country park. Although the site is designated Metropolitan Green Belt, the NPPF states that under very special circumstances, permission for the construction of new buildings can be given. New development on site could infill the established settlement to provide affordable housing, promote informal countryside recreation and provide public open space with improved access. The site is immediately available with all necessary infrastructure and essential services in place. | TBC | TBC |
| 16461 - Mr M Legonidec [2234] | Comment | Possibility to include site at Oak Hurst, Chelmsford Road, Shenfield for housing development. The site covers an area of 0.55 hectares and can deliver 15 dwellings. Site map attached. | TBC | TBC |
| 15911 - Ms Sheryl Thomson [6118] | Comment | Opportunity to include land in Herongate for housing development. Location Plan submitted. | tbc | tbc |
| 15726 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] | Comment | Request to include Ongar Garden Centre for development allocation sites. Although the site does not immediately adjoin a settlement boundary such that a future resident or occupier of the site would be likely to utilise private means of transport, it is within easy reach of an established centre hence reducing the impact of traffic on the character and amenities of the locality. | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 14510 - Mrs Fiona Trott [2458] | Comment | <p>The site that I wish to put forward is an area of 9.7ha of land in Chelmsford Road, the land is available, economically viable and has a realistic prospect of any early development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site would be suitable for development of 250 houses, adopting a density of 26dph. - The site is in Green Belt but not a special landscape area. - The site lies at a key gateway to the Borough from the A12, on of the key transport corridors. - The site is ideally located to benefit from Crossrail and its effect on growth and transport around Shenfield hence it helps maximize sustainable development. - There has been considerable development interest in the site and it is both viable and available as a short term residential development opportunity or as a safeguard site for release in the latter part of the Local Plan period. | TBC | TBC |
| 15704 - Go Holdings [3818] | Comment | <p>Potential to include the triangular site of 4.7 ha (ref106), located to the east of the A12, for residential development. The site has defensible boundaries, location to transport links, proximity to education facilities and potential for open space provision. This site is compliant with the criteria of sustainability for development of housing and open space, where accessibility can be improved through footways and cycle ways to the centre of Ingatestone. The capacity of this site range from 97-197 units depending on the density levels.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 15397 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] | Comment | <p>Confirm support for the allocation of a parcel of land at Fairview, Magpie Lane, Brentwood. (see supporting Site Location Plan). The site would fall within criteria 2 of the approach to identifying land [Brownfield Green Belt Urban Extension]]. The site is a brownfield site and is harmful to character and visual amenity in its locality. It is predominantly used as a waste transfer station and generates excessive heavy goods vehicle traffic on the local rural road network. The allocation of the site for residential use possibly with a small element of appropriate employment space would improve local amenity and provide resources to relocate the business.</p> <p>A preliminary assessment indicates that up to 25 dwellings of range of sizes and tenures could be accommodated on the site, helping meet local housing need and improving the character and appearance of the area.</p> | TBC | TBC |
| 14909 - Sue Lister [2269] | Comment | <p>There are flooding issues around this village, which I believe would be exacerbated by a large housing estate, but I would reluctantly agree to a new small village of approximately 600 homes being built on the Timmermans Nursery site by the A127, provided that a buffer zone, preferably a wooded area, was constructed between the new village and West Horndon.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 14141 - Drs M. & Z. Sahirad [2118] | Comment | <p>Supporting for the allocation of Site 162 'Little Warley Hall Farm, Little Warley Hall Lane' for a proposed 150 bedroom residential nursing home for the elderly.</p> <p>Identifies very special circumstances case to justify the departure from established Green Belt policy, primarily focused upon: The need case; Demographic circumstances and forecast growth in elderly population; Lack of alternative sites, and delivery economics; Highway Improvements; Additional community benefits; Landscape and biodiversity enhancements.</p> | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13934 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Comment | Sites should be released from the Green Belt adjacent to Mountnessing to serve the needs of Mountnessing and contribute towards the Borough's needs. One such suitable site is Land Adjacent to Mountnessing Primary School, (site 073 under the Strategic Growth Options Consultation and SHLAA site G093) which could provide short term delivery of much needed private and affordable homes of up to 18 units. The site is well screened, with defensible boundaries and development on four sides, ensuring minimal visual impact, it would not result in any coalescence with Ingatestone and represents a logical extension to the existing settlement boundary. | TBC | TBC |
| 16047 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Sites: 042, 098, 128 and 079A. Primary School Capacity - The 3 schools in Ingatestone/ Mountnessing are currently close to capacity. The limited amount of new housing identified for sites in this area could produce up to 38 additional pupils. This level of growth could probably be accommodated within the existing schools by the replacement of the existing temporary accommodation with permanent accommodation. However, a significant level of "windfall" sites in this area would require an expansion of provision. | TBC | TBC |
| 15706 - Mr Owner Land East of Hall Lane Shenfield [6101] | Comment | Request to include Land East of Hall Lane, a part of which is referred as site 218 in the Draft Plan, for housing development. The site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. The site is sustainably located, being adjacent to the built up area of Shenfield, accessible by a range of transport options. The development of the site will be a logical extension to Shenfield and could provide a range of housing, including smaller units and affordable housing as appropriate to contribute to meeting the identified housing need. To meet the housing need large areas of land that are currently green belt and greenfield sites are proposed to be developed for housing. The LPA have accepted that some green belt and greenfield land is needed for housing development. | tbc | tbc |
| 16132 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Comment | Sites 037a & 037b Land West of Thorndon Avenue in the Housing Sites Assessment are considered a moderate contribution to the overall purposes of the Green Belt. It is considered that the risk of a reduction of countryside gaps between towns would not be significant and any existing interlying barriers can be maintained. There is also no or very limited potential for other Conservation (Heritage) Designations to be adversely affected by development, and it is accepted that some encroachment into the countryside would occur as a result of development. | tbc | tbc |
| 16058 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Seeking new early years and childcare facilities preferably co located with new primary schools, where appropriate, and which will be funded through developer contributions. The preferred strategy is likely to require the following additional 56 place early years and childcare facilities to accommodate between 450-500 additional places: Brentwood North - 1 new 56 place facility - suitable site to be identified. Dunton Hills Garden Village (2500 dwellings) - 4 new 56 place facilities. West Horndon (500 dwellings) - 1 new 56 place facility. Shenfield - 1 new 56 place facility - potential to allocate facility at the Officers Meadow, Alexander Lane (600 dwellings). | TBC | TBC |
| 13918 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14060 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | I do not agree with the Hierarchy of Figure 5.4 in particular, in relation to the placing of the strategic allocation before Greenfield Green Belt sites. | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14539 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Comment | <p>It is considered that land at Salmonds Farm, Ingrave [Site Ref. 067A & B], should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development in order to assist with the soundness of the Plan and to ensure it is deliverable.</p> <p>This site would provide flexibility in the delivery of homes in a sustainable location to meet the needs of the local area.</p> <p>This site while in the Green Belt does not result in sprawl as a result of allocation. The allocation of development on sites with clear boundaries and that relate to the existing settlement are able to provide predictable and defined development without resulting in sprawl into the countryside, which would be more likely to arise from development imposed on the borough as a result of failure of the plan to properly meet its housing needs. A proposed layout is supplied with this representation to assist the council in recognising the defensible boundary this site can provide.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal concludes the site has potential to meet housing need, being suitable, available and achievable for around 44 dwellings. Given the suitability of the site for development and the immediate delivery of the scheme to assist with meeting housing need, it would seem perverse not to allocate the site.</p> | TBC | TBC |
| 13156 - Mr and Mrs L and S Belcher [5375] | Comment | Please consider the development potential of Hillcrest Nurseries site. This is the only developable area within the settlement of Herongate and Ingrave. | tbc | tbc |
| 16077 - Martin Grant Homes [2691] | Comment | Martin Grant Homes requests to include site 244 to deliver a modest and sustainable infill development in accordance with policies 9.8 and 9.12. The site can deliver approximately 10-15 dwellings in the short term and would assist in addressing the lack of a five year housing supply, as well as provide significant community benefit. The site is well located to existing transport corridors and regular public transport links. There are clear defensible boundaries to the site and development of the site would provide a new defensible boundaries. Land release from Green Belt in this location would not conflict with the purpose of Green Belt. | tbc | tbc |
| 15228 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Comment | Noted in the SA the option to the North of Brentwood scored comparably against Dunton Hills Garden Village and West Horndon. Therefore although no specific location is set out, it is considered that as a result, development to the North of Brentwood (Sawyers Hall Lane) represents a sustainable site. | TBC | TBC |
| 15906 - Kitewood [6116] | Comment | 'Land to the rear of BT officers' (15.6ha) offers the opportunity to infill development contained within the urban area of Brentwood. The site should therefore be allocated. | tbc | tbc |
| 15866 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | The site at Brook Street/Nags Head Lane (ref 175B) can make a modest contribution towards housing supply as part of an office-led mixed use scheme. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15398 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] | Comment | <p>Confirm support for the allocation of a parcel of land at Chitral, Swallows Cross, Brentwood (see supporting Site Location Plan). The site would fall within criteria 2 of the approach to identifying land [Brownfield Green Belt Urban Extension]. The site is a brownfield site and is harmful to character and visual amenity in its locality.</p> <p>Our client has prepared a masterplan study including an indicative layout, indicative elevations and perspectives to demonstrate an appropriate form of development that can be achieved on this site. The proposals also show the provision of some employment space for local rural businesses. The site delivers a range of planning benefits including providing towards housing need, making efficient use of a brownfield site and improving visual amenity. The preliminary proposals indicate approximately 20 houses and 2 commercial units.</p> | TBC | TBC |
| 15707 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] | Comment | <p>Request the Council to consider the allocation of Ongar Garden Centre as a suitable site for residential, retail, employment or leisure purposes.</p> <p>The highly developed nature of the existing site would allow it to be redeveloped to contribute towards meeting the Borough's identified needs in a manner compliant with national Green Belt policy and without detriment to the existing character of the area.</p> <p>The site may have a lower degree of accessibility to existing facilities but due to its previously developed nature it has a nil or even reduced impact.</p> | TBC | TBC |
| 16054 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | <p>Sites: 020,021,152 and 200.</p> <p>Secondary School Capacity - There is no secondary school located within safe walking distance of West Horndon/ Dunton. New housing development in this area would require all secondary aged pupils to be transported to existing schools located in Brentwood/ Shenfield, until such time as a new secondary school was opened on the development. If no new secondary school was opened on this development ECC would face significant ongoing home-to-school transport costs. Whilst there are secondary schools in Basildon that are geographically closer to West Horndon/ Dunton than those located in Brentwood any surplus places at these schools are likely to be utilised by pupils residing in Basildon.</p> <p>Concerned the description of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a 'new self-sustaining community' implies that the scale of development allows the necessary critical mass to provide for local services and infrastructure', this may not prove true in respect of the provision of a new secondary school to serve this development. A joint or linked development with Basildon Borough Council in this area would provide the critical mass of pupils required to sustain a new secondary school in this area.</p> | TBC | TBC |
| 16220 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Comment | <p>Confirm support for the allocation of the land surrounding Ashwells Lodge, Doddington. The site has been assessed within the Council's 'Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt' and is within a parcel of land that can accommodate more than 10 dwellings. The development of the site would amount to logical rounding off of the settlement boundary and has no greater purpose for the Green Belt than those already suggestion for allocation by the Council. The site comprises grassland; it has residential development on two sides and the surrounding countryside is of varying character and quality. The majority of the boundaries are well screened, forming a strong natural barrier.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16183 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] | Comment | Support the allocation of the Joy Fook Restaurant, which sits adjacent to Bentley Golf Club, in Kelvedon Hatch. The site would fall within criteria 2 [Brownfield green Belt Urban Extension] of the approach to identifying land. | tbc | tbc |
| 16184 - Anderson Group [2597] | Comment | Site 076 - the land south of Redrose Lane, off Woollard Way- is an appropriate site for residential development and should be released from the Green Belt because it is suitable, available and deliverable. The site has the capacity to deliver between approximately 40 and 56 dwellings, taking account of public open space, infrastructure requirements and density preferences. Development could be delivered in a manner that would not cause harm to its Green Belt function, the local landscape, heritage interests, natural resources or other local sensitivities. | tbc | tbc |
| 16198 - South Essex Partnership University NHS Trust [2555] | Comment | Opportunity to include site 083 covering 2.13 hectares for housing development. The site lies in a highly sustainable location, well connected by public transport and is close to school, doctor's surgery, and sport ground and is currently performing little Green Belt functions. | tbc | tbc |
| 15375 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] | Comment | We confirm support for the allocation of the land to the south of Carmel, Mascalls Lane, Great Warley (see supporting Site Location Plan). The site has been assessed within the Council's 'Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt' and is within a parcel of land that can accommodate more than 10 dwellings. The development of the site would amount to logical rounding off of the settlement boundary and would not impact on the five purposes of the Green Belt. | TBC | TBC |
| 16036 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | The inclusion of Dunton Hills Garden Village for 2,500 dwellings within the Plan period is questioned. The site at Bayleys Mead can make a modest contribution towards housing supply and is deliverable within the early part of the plan period.. The site has good access to public transport, services and facilities, within Brentwood Urban Area. Although the site falls within the Green Belt, it performs poorly and hence development is considered to be appropriate. Development on the site would have a minimal impact on the countryside as identified in SHLAA. There are no heritage assets on the site. It has a relatively low landscape quality in the Council's GB Assessment and not at risk from flooding nor in close proximity to an Air Quality Management Area. | tbc | tbc |
| 16046 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Sites: 001A, 001B, 003, 005,013B, 039, 040, 041, 044 and 178, 081, 099, 100, 010, 022, 023, 032, 034, 087and 235. Primary School Capacity - Currently very little surplus capacity Brentwood Town group. Current forecasts indicate a deficit of 94 permanent places by the school year 2019-20. There is limited scope for possible expansion of existing primary schools, many restricted or constrained by the "green belt" or land designated as "special landscape areas" or "conservation areas". Given the Plan is proposing significant release of Green Belt to meet its housing need, ECC considers appropriate consideration should be given to allowing the expansion of existing primary schools and potentially new schools in the Green Belt to meet an identified local need and to minimise unnecessary additional home-to-school journeys on the congested road network at peak times. As indicated, it is difficult to accommodate level of growth via the expansion of existing schools and it would be prudent to identify a site for a new 2 form of entry (420-place) primary school to accommodate this growth within the Local Plan. This would require a site of 2.1 ha (to include Early Years provision) and replacement of existing temporary accommodation at schools within the group with permanent accommodation. | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 16055 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Sites: 042, 098, 128 and 079A. Secondary School Capacity - Anglo-European School is the only secondary school included within this forecast planning group. As the school gives priority in terms of admissions to local children it should be in a position to accommodate the growth in pupil numbers produced by the limited new housing. | TBC | TBC |
| 15960 - Simply Planning (Mrs holly Mitchell) [5416] | Comment | Potential to include site 104 at Stondon Massey for housing development, the site currently covering 3.2 hectare is a heavily used, heavily trafficked site and is an eyesore in the Green Belt. Very close parallels can be drawn between site 104 and Thorby Priory (site 18) which was given a resolution to grant planning permission in July 2015. The Council's Green Belt Assessment of the Thorby Priory is almost identical to this site. It was accepted that the resulting development would be relatively isolated and require residents to use private cars however it was accepted that the current uses generate a significant amount of traffic. | tbc | tbc |
| 15206 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | Recommend that the site at Sawyers Hall Lane is allocated for housing in the Local Plan. In particular the site achieves the requirements of Policy 5.1 and Policy 9.12 in relation to defensible boundaries. The planning reason for non-allocation relating to the Green Belt / clear physical defensible boundaries has been fully addressed [see full representation]. Overall the site is considered to have moderate capacity to accommodate change to residential development (based on landscape findings and visual assessment findings). The Highways Note [see supporting document] demonstrates that the proposals for 450 units is unlikely to have an adverse effect on traffic capacity or safety. The planning reason for non-allocation relating to accessibility has been fully addressed. It is clearly illustrated the site is in close proximity to important supporting community infrastructure as well as public transport. The issue of school capacity would impact upon all new development sites in Brentwood. Recommend the site is acknowledged as being part brownfield / PDL in the Local Plan. | TBC | TBC |
| 13283 - Mrs Joanne O'Hare [5467] | Object | - Increase in an already congested area of traffic; - Strain on local services that are already oversubscribed | tbc | tbc |
| 16085 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Key benefits that would arise from development on land to the east of West Hordon : * Countryside Properties track record of delivering high quality strategic schemes with genuine a sense of place and integration with existing villages; * Fully deliverable and fully sustainable- within a 5 minute walk of the existing railway station and local facilities and services. * Delivery of much needed high quality housing in the Borough. * Development early on in the plan period with minimal infrastructure required to access and deliver proposals. * Delivery of new open space, recreational facilities, primary school, new connections to wider countryside. * Improvements to the existing village. * No significant impact on the Green Belt, landscape character and visual amenity * Development proposals can fully mitigate its impact. * Comprehensive illustrative masterplan. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 16146 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Table 7.2 has not been assessed in an SA . We object to the implied encouragement of early applications that accord with this list, this would be premature without the SA. The statement in paragraph 7.30 that the sites have been assessed against criteria, including a long list such as suitability for housing, accessibility to public transport infrastructure provision, impact on Green Belt etc, is wholly incorrect. There is no evidence to demonstrate such assessment has been undertaken. | tbc | tbc |
| 15263 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Object | Site 187 have been assessed as part of the Council's Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt. The Assessment of this Greenfield site, suggests the site is not contained. This is incorrect, as it has boundaries formed by the A128, A127 and the Tilbury Road. As well as the surrounding roads, there are substantial embankments and extensive screening which provide a very clear boundary. It is not considered likely that the development at West Horndon or Dunton would result in development close to the site and as such any concerns regarding the potential coalescence with the adjacent settlements as a result of the development of this site, are unsubstantiated. | Objection to the site not being brought forward in the Draft Local Plan is noted. Further evidence is being considered with regard to site assessment and an update of this work will be published. | Consider accordingly |
| 13515 - Mrs Helen Jenkins [5408] | Object | Road Safety and traffic concerns; Lack of safe cycle path; Lack of public transport; Pollution; Loss of protected urban space. | tbc | tbc |
| 14906 - Sue Lister [2269] | Object | The number of homes proposed for the area in and around West Horndon is totally disproportionate compared to the total number of homes being proposed by Brentwood Borough Council, and is also much too high for a village currently made up of 650 homes. We are also very close to the borders of Basildon, Thurrock and Havering, and there is a real risk that homes proposed by these councils could also impact our infrastructure, especially as Thurrock has not yet published their LDP. West Horndon was originally put forward for its transport connections however, traffic has increased greatly on the A127 and the trains are now so crowded. | tbc | tbc |
| 15178 - Mr Christopher Andrews [2934] | Object | Objection to development on sites 011A, 011B, 011C and 0176. I am a resident of Hulletts Lane and I have a strong concern regarding the Lane itself, the pot holes have become so bad that in the past three weeks I have had to buy two new tyres for my car and my partner struggles to push our baby up the lane in his buggy as it has become so bad. There is a large field in front of us which was covered with trees and bushes but around 80% of the trees and bushes have been taken down in this green belt which also joins the Ongar road. This field is like a swamp and I believe that the rain water is not being soaked up by the trees as much as it use too and is causing the lane to become extremely dangerous as the rain water sits in the pot holes which then makes them worse and the lane becomes like a stream. I have attached a few photos I took when it was raining and I was driving down the lane, this shows how the lane becomes like a stream and the field opposite is like a swamp. Also the noise from the Ongar road has become much louder now the trees have been taken down. Even though we have had a few weeks of lovely weather it is still like a swamp and the lane is in a terrible condition. I am just concerned that if this is what it is like now, if there is any more traffic coming in down the lane from any potential future developments or more trees taken down it will become impossible to live here. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14270 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Object | The Draft Plan concedes the importance of the car to everyday life and the fact is people rely heavily on their cars. With the problem associated with parking at Brentwood Town Centre it is difficult to comprehend the proposal to build on one of the car parks adjacent to the shops. There are other sites that could handle development whilst retaining the car park. | tbc | tbc |
| 14635 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] | Object | 037A, B and C, 038A and B, and 126 are all Green Belt sites surrounding West Horndon village. Development of these sites would change the existing West Horndon village beyond recognition, and put a very significant strain on local residents and infrastructure. I believe that the very significant development this would represent within the Green Belt would be an inappropriate development and represent significant harm to the local environment, harm which would not be outweighed by the need for housing within the Borough. | tbc | tbc |
| 15258 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Object | Havering remain concerned about the cumulative transport implications of further development in the A12 corridor with a potential adverse impact on Havering's section of the A12, the A127 and the rest of Havering's road network. This is underlined by the Brentwood SA which expresses traffic congestion and air pollution concerns on both the A12 and A127 corridors. Havering is especially concerned about the likelihood that the proposed development sites will add to the existing congestion and road safety problems at the Gallows corner intersection of the A12, the A127 and Main Road (A118). recommend liaison and consult with TfL regarding the A127 and other main routes and key junctions inside Havering. | TBC | TBC |
| 13431 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Please don't use greenfield sites for development until every scrap of brownfield has been used. | tbc | tbc |
| 15420 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Support | Support the proposed housing allocations within the urban area as set out within Table 7.2. Support the redevelopment of brownfield land within the Green Belt; however there are far more sites that those stated within Table 7.2 that are suitable for redevelopment for housing. | tbc | tbc |
| 15371 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15391 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15497 - Mr Richard Lunnion [4220] 15579 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15639 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16174 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16199 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Support | Support the proposed housing allocations within the urban area as set out within Table 7.2. Support the redevelopment of brownfield land within the Green Belt; however there are far more sites that those stated within Table 7.2 that are suitable for redevelopment for housing. | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 001A & 001B Land north of Highwood Close including St Georges Court, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15095 - Mr Tom Bailey [6052] | Comment | On behalf of the residents of St Georges Court and Highwood Close. We are not opposing the building of 52 homes on this land. Our main concern is that Greenshaw and Highwood Close are NOT used as the access road for this development. Greenshaw has parking problems, cars having to park both sides of the road. Highwood Close also has parking problems. St Georges Court has a constant flow of nurses, carers, paramedics and ambulance's. Also if Highwood Close was used as access to these homes it would loosing a large part of, if not all on the car park that serves Highwood Close , St Georges Court And the flats in Greenshaw. | tbc | tbc |
| 15816 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: 001B YES Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. The north eastern portion of this site is shown to be at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 15459 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver. | tbc | tbc |
| 14646 - Mr Simon Wells [2557] | Object | There is already considerable lack of space to park cars on either Highwood Close or Greenshaw. Greenshaw is very restricted and dangerous, amazing there are not more accidents. During and after construction these roads will remain dangerous. Highwood Close would become busy and dangerous discouraging disabled to go out. Would result in the loss of lots of old trees. Site is not suitable, other areas such as the derelict site on Ingrave Road. | tbc | tbc |
| 13796 - Mr Dave Ridge [5732] | Object | Access through Highwood Close. Lorries creating fumes and noise to old residents. Ambulances regularly called to St Georges Court in my opinion would be hampered by building traffic. Parking issues should be considered. Disruption to old often ill residents with all sites. Mud along exists to sites would be a problems for crossing road. Would be respectful if the Council Members would come to St Georges Court to iron out any issues with tenants. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 003 Wates Way Industrial Estate, Ongar Road, Brentwood | | | | |
| 13304 - Ms Jenny Downs [2798] | Comment | Would favour a development at this site which consists of family housing rather than flats. The Sawyers Grove development is an excellent example of a great scheme. | tbc | tbc |
| 15460 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver. | tbc | tbc |
| 15817 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. | tbc | tbc |
| 15372 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15392 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15421 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15498 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15582 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15641 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16175 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16201 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Comment | Remains a question mark over the housing numbers for Wates Way Industrial Estate, which has been sold to Lidl, which does not generally provided for residential within its development. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 005 Essex County Fire Brigade HQ, Rayleigh Road, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15818 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: Brent-H Within EA UFMfSW: Yes Number of Properties at Risk: 6 The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. The southern tip of this site is at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. In addition, this site falls entirely within the Brent-H flooding hotspot and 6 properties are at risk of internal flooding in a 1:20 year event. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 15070 - Mr and Mrs Jeremy and Emma Ellis [6049] 15071 - Mr Ivan Armstrong [2909] 15072 - Mr and Mrs Jeremy and Emma Ellis [6049] 15073 - Mr Ivan Armstrong [2909] | Object | Appendix 2 shows that you have applied a density of 40dph and an estimate of 50 dwellings. I would challenge the use of 40 per hectare as it would conflict directly with several of the policies in the Plan as follows: - Policy 7.3: the site has a very large number of trees which make anything higher than 30dph "unachievable", particularly to meet the first para of 7.3 in terms of "sympathy to local character" - This number of dwellings could not be accommodated within the terms of Policy 6.3, Policy 6.16a and e, and Policy 6.4d. | tbc | tbc |
| 013B Warley Training Centre, Essex Way, Warley | | | | |
| 15461 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15820 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: YES Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. The centre of this site is at risk of flooding in a 1 in 100 event from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 020, 021 & 152 West Horndon Industrial Estates, Childerditch Lane and Station Road, West Horndon | | | | |
| 14128 - Charles Fox of Covent Garden (Mrs Ann Lee) [2902] | Comment | Charles Fox Ltd are long term lease holders at the West Horndon Business Park and have concluded that it is not suitable to move out of their current premises. A high degree of certainty regarding future development on this site is essential and further detail regarding proposals for the site are needed. We hope we can work with the Council to ensure that our workforce can have a level of certainty regarding future proposals, as well as for the business as a whole. | tbc | tbc |
| 15928 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | A re-think of current transport would be essential. The existing C2C trains are well above capacity at peak times, and roads around the village (A127, A128) are characterised by standstills and queues in both the morning and evening peaks. An additional 500 cars (assuming just 1 per property) would have a very material impact on already severely congested roads. This comment does not consider the proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village which would clearly have an even greater impact on the local infrastructure network. | tbc | tbc |
| 14591 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] | Comment | I accept development of the Brown Field Industrial estate but need to find appropriate solutions to the infrastructure issues this creates. These include: Safe acceptable road access onto the site - the current entrance is already a hazard. Changing the Industrial estate to mixed residential without a security gate to slow traffic would increase the hazard significantly. Need to ensure development has SuDs in place. Schools places. Doctors/medical facilities. Mixed development some of the more modern industrial units to remain. Starter homes. Family homes. Homes for elderly/disabled residents. Development that is compatible with the current village style not too dense, 30 homes per ha maximum if possible somewhat less. Maximum housing density of 30 homes per ha (pro rata down if as probable some of the smaller industrial units remain). | tbc | tbc |
| 15927 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | As a general representation, WHPC state that even if sites 020 and 021 are developed in line with the Draft Local Plan (500 houses), material infrastructure would be required to ensure that this development is considered sustainable. With the village close to doubling in size, further health and education facilities would be required. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15821 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: 020 and 021-Horn-C Within EA UFMfSW: YES Number of Properties at Risk: 159 The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. Significant parts of these sites are at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. In addition, 020 and 021 fall entirely within the Horn-C flooding hotspot and 159 properties are at risk of internal flooding in a 1:20 year event. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 15230 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | The type of businesses currently located at West Horndon Industrial Estate are, in the main, Class B2/B1c uses with ancillary offices, occupying relatively small units. It is estimated that the redevelopment of this site for housing will lead to the displacement of around 100 businesses. We consider that the lack of choice in suitable alternatives and businesses will leave the Borough. The development of a new Industrial Park at East Horndon Hall will provide a genuine choice for the existing businesses at the West Horndon Industrial Estate which would ensure local jobs are retained and the delivery of new housing is not undermined. | tbc | tbc |
| 14862 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349] | Object | Any building on greenbelt land is outrageous considering other locations such as Blackmore, Shenfield, Doddinghurst are available to be built on and are not greenbelt land. | tbc | tbc |
| 14110 - Mr Anthony Crowley [3147] | Object | Vehemently oppose the proposals as set out for West Horndon. I do support again in alignment with WHPC, for limited and controlled residential development of the current West Horndon Industrial sites. However, this support would be subject a full transport highways appraisal as the current entrance/exit to the site could absolutely not support 500 new homes with the additional traffic congestion this would bring with it! There are no assurances that the loss of employment land would be offered up at the new BEP. West Horndon has a primary/junior school which already operates over capacity. Its doctors surgery is near capacity, any development simply has to come with the guarantee of amenities and infrastructure upgrade not just a proposal for it. | tbc | tbc |
| 14670 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] | Object | At present, the sites are served by a small entrance placed in a hazardous location below a blind hill created by the railway bridge, opposite the station, and on a busy road. Traffic is already considered dangerous in this location. Any redevelopment of the sites will need to be able to show an improvement in road layout safety, together with appropriate access consideration (one entrance/exit will be insufficient for size of proposed development). | tbc | tbc |
| 14111 - Mr Anthony Crowley [3147] | Object | Neither C2C or Network Rail have any scope to improve the current rail link. In fact recent changes to the timetable have in fact backfired causing WH residents more travel problems. Whilst Green Transport routes are mentioned in the document, here again there is no detail to support the intention for these routes. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14821 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | Need to create a sustainable community, improve public transport, cycling and walking facilities. Densities and styles will need to reflect and complement the existing village, to create a seamless transition between the "new" development and the "old" village. Need to prevent urban sprawl with neighbouring boroughs. Defensible Green Belt boundaries are not defined. I reject the notion stated throughout the Draft Local Plan that current "defensible boundaries" would prevent the urban sprawl. Thorndon Country Park should have a further environmental buffer between it and the A128. it would also improve an existing leisure and environmental resource. | tbc | tbc |
| 16148 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Housing on this site is not achievable to meet the Brentwood 5 year housing land need. The density proposed would not meet the needs of the housing market and the mixed ownership/leaseholders would make this unfeasible. Brentwood would need to demonstrate leaseholders needs are addressed, freeholders needs are addressed, there are no tenants with rights under the Landlord and tenant act 1954 and there are no restrictive covenants on site. | tbc | tbc |
| 14649 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] | Object | Need to create a sustainable community, improve public transport, cycling and walking facilities. Densities and styles will need to reflect and complement the existing village, to create a seamless transition between the "new" development and the "old" village. Need to prevent urban sprawl with neighbouring boroughs. Defensible Green Belt boundaries are not defined. I reject the notion stated throughout the Draft Local Plan that current "defensible boundaries" would prevent the urban sprawl. Thorndon Country Park should have a further environmental buffer between it and the A128. it would also improve an existing leisure and environmental resource. | tbc | tbc |
| 14713 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14779 - Mr David Lister [2960] 14795 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540] 14907 - Sue Lister [2269] | Object | Nearly 50% of the Borough's housing needs are planned to be met by using land in the West Horndon Parish. West Horndon is currently a small rural village of low density development surrounded by open spaces. In the core of the village there are around 500 houses, with more in outlying areas, making it a well sought after location. Adding another 500 houses on sites 020, 021, and 152 would double the size of the village and change its classification from a Settlement Category 3 to a Settlement Category 2 (a larger settlement category). There is a mention of "Mixed use developments" for this site which would include industrial units. In fact less industrial units than envisaged will probably relocate elsewhere resulting in less space to locate 500 houses than planned. This could mean a higher density development which would conflict with the density throughout the rest of the village. | tbc | tbc |
| 16129 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Evidence is awaited on the impact of Crossrail. However the available evidence on jobs and the economy demonstrate strong levels of growth. This calls into question a spatial strategy for growth that seeks to redevelop existing employment land at West Horndon. Strategic growth at this settlement could accommodate both homes and jobs. Furthermore, proposed public transport measures could potentially link the new homes with proposed employment land at the M25 (junction 29). | tbc | tbc |
| 14827 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | At present, the sites are served by a small entrance placed in a hazardous location below a blind hill created by the railway bridge, opposite the station, and on a busy road. Traffic is already considered dangerous in this location. Any redevelopment of the sites will need to be able to show an improvement in road layout safety, together with appropriate access consideration (one entrance/exit will be insufficient for size of proposed development). | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13693 - J A [5672] 13827 - S. Arkieson [1387] 13912 - Mrs Annette Scammell [2736] 13915 - Mrs Jill Saddington [2549] 14198 - Mr. K. Craske [2712] 14203 - Mrs Maureen Craske [3566] 14206 - Ms Louise Craske [5857] 14634 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14650 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14704 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14706 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14708 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14711 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14749 - Mrs Doreen Worth [2974] 14764 - Mr. Stuart Giles [2625] 14768 - Jill Peterson [3229] 14810 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] 14822 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] 14852 - Jane Powell [1315] 14858 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349] 14859 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349] 14860 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349] | Object | Object because: 1- LDP remains too focused on the A127 corridor 2- Brentwood council needs to reconsider A12 corridor and North of the Borough 3- Shenfield has 4 track railway with the coming of Crossrail, West Horndon has 2 track railway and no room for more tracks here. Transport network will not support proposed development of Dunton Garden Village 4- A127 already at full capacity, A12 being upgraded to three lanes 5- Proposed Dunton Garden Village will link London to Basildon and create ribbon development 6- Loss of Green Belt 7- We must protect Brentwood villages 8- Very low support for development at Dunton but the Council continues to ignore this 9- Less heavy goods but more private vehicles though village 10- Infrastructure insufficient - roads, rail, schools and travel to schools, GPs, buses, shops, playing fields, leisure facilities, Green Travel Route detail needed, policing, road repairs 11- Flooding in area needs to be addressed 12- Takes away local jobs 13- Almost doubles size of the village, too many 14- Will destroy the community 15- Build on Timmerman site and a only smaller development on the Industrial Estate at West Horndon. 16- Use other sites such as the fields opposite Running Waters, spread the allocation around Borough 17- Impact of Dunton Hills Garden Village on West Horndon 18- Want West Horndon to remain a village and not become a town | tbc | tbc |
| 16473 - CPREssex [210] | Support | Agreed in principle to develop this site. With a commuter line rail station, good access to the A127 and the highway network, West Horndon has far better transport capacity than any other potential candidate development site. However there should be a requirement in the Plan to ban all construction and developers traffic from using Station Road and Thorndon Avenue, and all construction traffic can only access the site via Childerditch Lane or the A127. A larger number of homes should be allocated here than is proposed. | tbc | tbc |
| 13546 - Mrs Andrea Wilkes [2489] 14699 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Support the development of the West Horndon industrial estate site for new housing as, although this will substantially increase the size of the village, there could also be benefits providing that infrastructure and services (e.g. Access to doctor's surgery and schools) are planned for and included from the outset. | Tbc | tbc |
| 16144 - Threadneedle Property Investments Ltd [2613] | Support | The reuse of previously development land is consistent with national planning policy guidance and should be encouraged. West Horndon village is a highly accessible and sustainable location. It benefits from local village services, public transport links and quick access to the A127. The proposed density of 29DPH for the West Horndon site allocations is too low and consideration should be given to increasing the density to the region of 50-60DPH. To artificially restrict the density of the site allocation would not be consistent with national policy or to make the most effective use of previously developed land. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 039 Westbury Road Car Park, Westbury Road, Brentwood | | | | |
| 13139 - Mr. Michael R. M. Newman [1823] | Comment | 039 & 040 suggest the re-use of two car-parking areas for residential property. The council should bare in mind that parking in the centre of Brentwood is already difficult to find and shoppers traveling by car need to be able to park to visit the shopping centre. If the number and variety of shops is intended to increase and attract more shopper to the area, this need will only grow. Removing car parking facilities and not replacing them will create a major shortage of parking in Brentwood centre. | tbc | tbc |
| 15822 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: YES Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. The northern tip of this site is at risk of flooding in a 1 in 100 event from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. In addition, this site falls entirely within the Brent-H flooding hotspot and 6 properties are at risk of internal flooding in a 1:20 year event. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 14935 - Mr Rob Marigold [6030] | Comment | I note that there are dwellings planned for Westbury Road car park. The surrounding Victorian houses have been affected by flooding in the past. This needs to be considered when building new properties. What is to happen to the land where the St Charles Napier Pub once stood. This is unsightly and needs developing. | tbc | tbc |
| 15465 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. | tbc | tbc |
| 14977 - Miss Susan Maclean [4252] | Comment | Westbury Road is already a danger - insufficient parking borough wide leads to people (including the disabled and those with pushchairs) walking in the road facing dangerously fast traffic. How could more housing and less parking would help? | tbc | tbc |
| 13770 - Mr Gerard Smith [5710] | Object | Object to loss of parking to housing. This will encourage people to other retail centres with more and free parking. New homes will need parking too. The housing in Regency Court are below ground level, there will be noise and light impact for which a Council Tax reduction should be considered. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 040 Chatham Way/ Crown Street Car Park, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15823 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. | tbc | tbc |
| 15467 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. | tbc | tbc |
| 14105 - Mr. Michael R. M. Newman [1823] | Comment | 039 & 040 suggest the re-use of two car-parking areas for residential property. The council should bare in mind that parking in the centre of Brentwood is already difficult to find and shoppers traveling by car need to be able to park to visit the shopping centre. If the number and variety of shops is intended to increase and attract more shopper to the area, this need will only grow. Removing car parking facilities and not replacing them will create a major shortage of parking in Brentwood centre. | tbc | tbc |
| 16481 - CPREssex [210] | Object | We believe the retention of this car park is essential as Brentwood grows, and that in any event the area forms part of the diminishing attractive character of central Brentwood. | tbc | tbc |
| 13577 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 13768 - Mr Gerard Smith [5710] 14085 - Dr Robert Giles [5418] 14877 - Mr James Tiff [6008] | Object | Using the car parking space in the Chatham way car park without any additional infra-structure development to accommodate the additional needs of the people who will live in these buildings is going to bring problems with respect to health needs and education initially. What type of dwellings are proposed? There could well be an additional 200+ cars to cater for along Crown Street; reducing the car parking facility in the Chatham Way car park seems particularly short-sighted. | tbc | tbc |
| 14086 - Mr James Stonebridge [5404] | Object | I believe that this area is already too congested and we will exacerbate already stretched road systems, causing issues with traffic and parking. | tbc | tbc |
| 041 Land at Hunter House, Western Road, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15470 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15825 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | <p>ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site:</p> <p>Within Flooding Hotspot: No</p> <p>Within EA UFMfSW: YES</p> <p>Number of Properties at Risk: N/A</p> <p>The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures.</p> <p>The northern tip of this site is at risk of flooding in a 1 in 100 event from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. In addition, this site falls entirely within the Brent-H flooding hotspot and 6 properties are at risk of internal flooding in a 1:20 year event. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| 042 Land at Bell Mead, Ingatestone | | | | |
| 15536 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | <p>Sites 042, 034, 087 and 235 are adjacent to a tributary of the River Wid, which is designated a Main River. We do not currently hold modelled data for this watercourse and these sites therefore appear to be in Flood Zone 1 on our Flood Map. However, there is likely to be some fluvial flood risk associated with this watercourse. Any development proposed here will need to be supported by a flood risk assessment that is informed by fluvial modelling of this watercourse. Any works in, over under or within 8m of the River Wid will need an Environmental Permit from us under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (2010).</p> | tbc | tbc |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| 15826 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | <p>ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site:</p> <p>Within Flooding Hotspot: No</p> <p>Within EA UFMfSW: YES</p> <p>Number of Properties at Risk: N/A</p> <p>The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures.</p> <p>A significant part of this site is at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| 14149 - Mrs Jaqueline Craythorne [5824] | Object | <p>Additional houses will cause issues for already stretched village infrastructure. Schools are full, is already a problem getting doctors appointment & roads already crumbling. More traffic & increased number of residents will make it worse. Roam road at end of Ingatestone floods badly in heavy rain. More housing (in addition to employment land at 079C, will increase the flood risk and stretch sewage pipes etc causing health and safety risk.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 13821 - J Kemble [5743] | Object | Policy 10.7 is not addressed for the potential development of sites 042, 098, 179a, 128 plus already approved houses at Mountnessing Toby Priory and Mountenssing roundabout. Necessity for significant expansion of local infrastructure. Policy 10.2 (Parking) is not addressed. A proper assessment and solutions should be made for car parking in the village centre and station. Policy 10.13. Site 042 is prone to flooding, a proposed "solution" for a "tank" is unacceptable as it does not account for an alternative when the tank is full. Policy 7.3 Proposals are for higher than appropriate residential density on a site with restricted access. The wood copse at the eastern end of Bell Mead should be retained as "Open Space" to conform to Policy 10.8 and separate any new development from Fairfield flats. | tbc | tbc |
| 13756 - Ms M Giles [567] 14855 - Mr Ken Batson [1849] | Support | Good idea if mixed development. | tbc | tbc |

044 & 178 Land at Priests Lane, Brentwood

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|-----|-----|
| 15091 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Comment | The description of the Land at Priests Lane (Site Refs: 044 & 187) Table 7.2 makes reference to include provision of open space and/or Sports facilities for public use. Although the site is currently open land it makes no contribution to either public open space or sports provision. The only contribution it makes as open land is to provide the limited number of properties that bound with an open outlook. Therefore the requirement to make the provision of open space or sports facility for public use is not one that is justified. Furthermore, in the absence of an up to date Open Space Audit, it has not been shown that this area is deficient in, or in need of any additional public open space or sports facility to meet an identified need. Suggest deletion of "to include provision of open space and/or Sports facilities for public use" or at the very least changed to read "potential for the provision of open space and/or Sports facilities for public use". | tbc | tbc |
| 15472 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15828 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | <p>ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site:</p> <p>Within Flooding Hotspot: BRENT-E</p> <p>Within EA UFMfSW: No</p> <p>Number of Properties at Risk: 1</p> <p>The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. These sites fall entirely within the Brent-E flooding hotspot. 1 residential property is at risk of internal flooding in a 1:20 year event. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development.</p> | tbc | tbc |
| 14579 - Ms Chloë Sanders [5937] | Object | <p>The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (October 2011) concluded that these greenbelt sites 044 and 178 were unsuitable for development since "the Council's open space audit values the site's contribution to open space provision within the area". It is considered that this conclusion remains apposite. It is not without significance that Eric Pickles, when Minister for Communities and Local Government, committed the government to protecting green spaces as special areas significant to the local community, wildlife habitats and general health, even in the form of local playing fields.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 13128 - Mr Graham Nash [5353] 13129 - Mr Richard Booth [5354] 13132 - Mr Simon Wyatt [5359] 13140 - Dr Paula Booth [5367] 13141 - Mr Alistair Barnwell [5368] 13142 - Penelope Russell [1272] 13161 - Mr John Askew [5378] 13162 - Mr Alan Morton [5379] 13164 - Ms Linda Rodrigues [5380] 13166 - Mr Roger Haynes [5381] 13168 - Mr Brian Taunton [5382] 13169 - Mrs Irene Walls [5383] 13170 - Mr Keith Russell [5388] 13171 - Mrs Lisa Glassock [5389] 13173 - Mr Ian Jamieson [5390] 13175 - Mr James Brooking [5391] 13176 - dr david Taylor [5394] 13178 - Mrs Alison Morton [5398] 13179 - Mrs Stephanie Askew [5399] 13181 - Mr Michael Ekers [5403] 13182 - Maneesh Jain [5409] 13183 - Ms Tracy Smith [5412] 13184 - Mr Keith Skipp [5413] 13185 - Mr John Brandler [5414] 13186 - Mrs Peta Bainbridge [5415] 13188 - Mr Trevor Martin [5401] 13189 - Mrs Sylvia Allum [5419] 13190 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420] 13191 - Mr Lakshmanan Prasad [5417] 13192 - Mr Frank Halford [5421] 13193 - Mr Petrus Odendaal [5422] 13194 - Mr Harinder Prasad [5423] 13195 - Mrs Tina Walker [5425] 13196 - Mrs Philippa Webb [5426] 13197 - Mr Simon Peacock [5427] 13198 - Mr John Twyford [5429] 13199 - Mrs Valerie Cripps [5430] 13200 - Mrs Diana Davis [808] 13201 - Dr Sabena Gopinathan | Object | <p>Strongly object to development at Priests Lane because it will cause problems Including access, small lane, narrow, non-continuous pavements, road safety, congestion, speeding, pedestrian and cyclist safety, parking, impact on emergency services response, any road widening will ruin the attractiveness of the road, detrimental to visual amenity. Infrastructure over capacity - schools, GPs, dentists, waste collection, shops, and other civic amenities. Air quality, noise, drainage inadequate, will damage underground pipes, will affect utilities. Too dense, flats are out of character, other areas should be developed - especially where new infrastructure can be added, too close to railway line.</p> <p>Object to building on sports field / Protected Open Space, damage to wildlife, quality of life, no bus service along this road and liable to flooding.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| [5431] | | | |
| 13202 - Miss Anne Todd [5432] | | | |
| 13203 - Mrs Iris Mais [5376] | | | |
| 13213 - Mr Paul Reeves [5436] | | | |
| 13215 - Master Matthew Reeves | | | |
| [5437] | | | |
| 13216 - Miss Anna Reeves [5438] | | | |
| 13218 - Mrs Mary Reeves [5439] | | | |
| 13221 - Mr Paul Mais [5440] | | | |
| 13222 - Miss Rebecca Mais | | | |
| [5441] | | | |
| 13225 - Mrs Sarah Howson [5452] | | | |
| 13226 - Mr Adam Howson [5453] | | | |
| 13227 - Mr Benjamin Stapley | | | |
| [5455] | | | |
| 13274 - Mr Keith Howlett [5449] | | | |
| 13275 - Mrs Lisa Howlett [5330] | | | |
| 13276 - Mr Peter George [5457] | | | |
| 13277 - Mrs Mandy George [5458] | | | |
| 13278 - Miss Grace George | | | |
| [5459] | | | |
| 13279 - Claire Hamer [5461] | | | |
| 13280 - Julia Ebsworth [5462] | | | |
| 13281 - Mrs Margaret Sees [5463] | | | |
| 13284 - Mrs Elaine Stoffer [5468] | | | |
| 13285 - Mr Graham Green [5474] | | | |
| 13286 - Mr David Alton [5406] | | | |
| 13287 - Mr Laurence Green | | | |
| [5475] | | | |
| 13288 - Mrs Nicola Green [5477] | | | |
| 13289 - Mrs Sheila Alton [5476] | | | |
| 13293 - Ms Anne Rimmer [5484] | | | |
| 13294 - Ms Juliet Masterson | | | |
| [5488] | | | |
| 13310 - Mrs Irene Collins [5490] | | | |
| 13312 - Mr David Bolton [5491] | | | |
| 13314 - Mr Steven Hearn [5492] | | | |
| 13315 - Mrs Nicola Hearn [5493] | | | |
| 13317 - Mr Alan Smith [5499] | | | |
| 13320 - Mrs Ann Slawson [5501] | | | |
| 13321 - Mr Richard Slawson | | | |
| [5502] | | | |
| 13322 - Mrs Ingrid Whichello | | | |
| [5503] | | | |
| 13323 - Mrs Margaret Wynn | | | |
| [5504] | | | |
| 13324 - Mr William Meredith | | | |
| [5496] | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 13325 - Mr Ronald Hayns [5505] | | | |
| 13326 - Mrs Margeurite Hayns [5506] | | | |
| 13327 - Mrs Margaret Meredith [5507] | | | |
| 13329 - Mrs Diane Payne [5508] | | | |
| 13330 - Mrs Julie Barnwell [5509] | | | |
| 13331 - Mr Robert Payne [5511] | | | |
| 13332 - Mrs Margaret Lamming [5512] | | | |
| 13333 - Mr Paul Joyner [5486] | | | |
| 13334 - Mrs Frances Kirby [5513] | | | |
| 13335 - Mrs Julia Sexton [5514] | | | |
| 13336 - Mrs Trudy Westbrook [5515] | | | |
| 13337 - Mrs Mary Jones [5516] | | | |
| 13338 - Mrs Carol Lissmann [5517] | | | |
| 13340 - Mr Ray Fielding [5520] | | | |
| 13341 - Mrs Deborah Fielding [5521] | | | |
| 13342 - Mr Toby Fielding [5523] | | | |
| 13343 - Mr Samuel Fielding [5524] | | | |
| 13345 - Mr Ian Aspinall [4088] | | | |
| 13348 - Mr Martin Ballard [5528] | | | |
| 13350 - Mr Jeffrey Kenny [5530] | | | |
| 13351 - Mrs Rowan Forman [5531] | | | |
| 13352 - Mrs Jane Ballard [5532] | | | |
| 13353 - Mr Michael Duke [5533] | | | |
| 13356 - Mrs Stephanie Hackett [5535] | | | |
| 13357 - Ms Ruth Cooper [5536] | | | |
| 13358 - Mrs Julia Coles [5537] | | | |
| 13362 - Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538] | | | |
| 13363 - Mr D Coull [5299] | | | |
| 13364 - Mrs Monica Donegan [5539] | | | |
| 13366 - mr luke youlden [5541] | | | |
| 13368 - Mrs Victoria Ellis [5542] | | | |
| 13369 - Mrs Trisha Burgess [5544] | | | |
| 13371 - Mr Vitus Luk [5547] | | | |
| 13374 - Ms Denise Tedder [5550] | | | |
| 13375 - Miss Linda Welham [5551] | | | |
| 13376 - Mrs Rosalind Garrod | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| [5552] | | | |
| 13378 - Miss Tracey Knowles | | | |
| [5554] | | | |
| 13383 - Mrs Teresa Coull [5557] | | | |
| 13386 - Mrs Doris Welham [5560] | | | |
| 13387 - Mr Arthur Welham [5561] | | | |
| 13388 - Mr Andrew Moreton | | | |
| [5562] | | | |
| 13390 - Mrs Julie Moreton [5563] | | | |
| 13391 - Dr Martin Lissmann | | | |
| [5564] | | | |
| 13392 - Mr Gerald Rimmer [5556] | | | |
| 13394 - Mrs Christine Weafer | | | |
| [5534] | | | |
| 13420 - D Westfall [5310] | | | |
| 13427 - Mrs Roma Boad [5567] | | | |
| 13433 - Mr Frank Lummis [5568] | | | |
| 13440 - Mrs Faith Roeder [5569] | | | |
| 13444 - Miss Marilyn Wright | | | |
| [5570] | | | |
| 13447 - Mr Glenn Roeder [5571] | | | |
| 13461 - Miss Holly Roeder [5572] | | | |
| 13476 - mr Lawrence Jenkins | | | |
| [5582] | | | |
| 13479 - Mrs Denise Russen | | | |
| [5585] | | | |
| 13480 - mr keith pengilly [5586] | | | |
| 13486 - Mrs Clare Lynch [5592] | | | |
| 13487 - Mr Gerald Lynch [5593] | | | |
| 13497 - Mrs Clare Walters [5577] | | | |
| 13498 - Mr Bernard Szukalski | | | |
| [5597] | | | |
| 13519 - Mrs Amanda Murray | | | |
| [5608] | | | |
| 13521 - Ian Hollocks [5606] | | | |
| 13522 - Mrs Eirlys Davies [5610] | | | |
| 13524 - Mr John Kidd [5613] | | | |
| 13525 - Mrs Angela Burgess | | | |
| [5614] | | | |
| 13549 - Mr Matthew Jenkins | | | |
| [5624] | | | |
| 13550 - Mrs Annette Moorhouse | | | |
| [5332] | | | |
| 13562 - Mr Clive Garrod [5628] | | | |
| 13584 - Mr Anton Jenkins [5623] | | | |
| 13585 - John Utting [1888] | | | |
| 13593 - Mr Michael Large [5637] | | | |
| 13597 - Mr P. J. Florey [2138] | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 13598 - Mr Ashvin Patel [5640] 13600 - Mrs Janet Kingshott [5645] 13601 - Mrs Joan Lummis [5646] 13664 - Miss Holly Moorhouse [5665] 13666 - Miss Holly Moorhouse [5665] 13715 - Miss Mary Allum [5681] 13716 - Mrs Patricia Ould [5683] 13719 - Miss Sophie Skinner [5685] 13720 - Miss Amelia Skinner [5686] 13742 - Mr Robert Dohoo [5695] 13744 - Mr Alan Harley [1304] 13747 - Mr Ivan Jaffa [5698] 13748 - Mrs Jillian Ibrahim [5699] 13749 - Mr Ian Mitchell [5700] 13750 - Mrs Janis James [5701] 13751 - Mr Josh James [5702] 13752 - Mr John James [5704] 13766 - Ms J Stickings [5708] 13771 - Mrs Beryl Scott [5711] 13774 - Mrs Valerie Parker [5714] 13775 - Mr Brian Grout [5715] 13778 - Mrs Florence Bodley [5716] 13779 - Mr Richard Johnston [5146] 13781 - Mrs K Johnston [5718] 13783 - Ms Rachel Gooderson [5720] 13784 - Mr Brian Kinnear [5719] 13785 - Mr Nigel Panzetta [5721] 13786 - Mrs J Tuckwood [5723] 13787 - Mr David Gibson [5722] 13788 - Mrs Susan Gibson [5725] 13790 - Mrs Doreen Bushell [5726] 13794 - Mr Trevor Reader [5730] 13795 - Mrs Susan Reader [5731] 13798 - Mrs B Woollard [5733] 13802 - Mr Kenneth Davies [5611] 13809 - Mr James Gooderson [5735] 13826 - Mr Robert Fox [5740] 13829 - Mrs M Bing [5744] | | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 13839 - Mrs Anne Sutherland [5745] | | | |
| 13840 - Mr James Sutherland [5746] | | | |
| 13863 - Mr Vincent Burgess [5748] | | | |
| 13864 - Mr. A. Rowland [1271] | | | |
| 13865 - Mrs Susan Rowland [5749] | | | |
| 13868 - Mr Maurice Norman [5754] | | | |
| 13871 - Mrs Marion Archard [5755] | | | |
| 13874 - Mrs Judith Jeffery [5756] | | | |
| 13885 - Mr R.V. Pearson [5758] | | | |
| 13888 - Mrs Jacqueline Kinnear [5759] | | | |
| 13892 - Mr Richard Jeffery [5762] | | | |
| 13898 - Mrs Jacquelin Hutchinson [5764] | | | |
| 13900 - Mr Ian Colclough [5765] | | | |
| 13902 - Hoskins Family [5767] | | | |
| 13905 - Mr Ralph Clapham [5770] | | | |
| 13906 - Mrs Heidi Holland [5771] | | | |
| 13908 - Dr Gareth Scott [5772] | | | |
| 13909 - Mrs. E. Hughes [1424] | | | |
| 13910 - Mrs Hedy Lai [5774] | | | |
| 13913 - Mary Ryder [2332] | | | |
| 13914 - Mrs Helen Scott [5775] | | | |
| 13924 - Mr William Roeder [5779] | | | |
| 13947 - Mr Alan Gemmell [5786] | | | |
| 13955 - Mrs Alexandra Garcia [5788] | | | |
| 13967 - Mr Andrew Carter [5793] | | | |
| 14009 - Mr Benjamin Usher [5796] | | | |
| 14022 - Mr Brian Jones [5799] | | | |
| 14076 - B. and V. Clark [1635] | | | |
| 14087 - Mr James Stonebridge [5404] | | | |
| 14120 - Mr Nick Bryant [5811] | | | |
| 14127 - Miss Charlotte Lord [5816] | | | |
| 14131 - Mr Joseph Roeder [5817] | | | |
| 14133 - Miss Juliette Raison [5818] | | | |
| 14134 - Mrs Karen Raison [5819] | | | |
| 14138 - David Garrett [1476] | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 14139 - David Garrett [1476] 14142 - Dr Colin Lazarus [5821] 14145 - Mrs Jackie Andrews [5823] 14151 - Mr Mohan Singh Kochhar [5825] 14152 - Mr Stanley Gilbert [5827] 14154 - Mrs Ruby Le Grand [5831] 14155 - Dr Amanda Davies [5832] 14160 - Mr. D Haynes [2336] 14161 - Dr Harischandra Boralessa [5834] 14162 - Mrs Patricia Rogers-Harrison [5835] 14164 - Mr Michael Andrews [5837] 14165 - Mr Glen Hudson [5838] 14166 - Mr & Mrs Lee and Rachel O'Meara [5839] 14169 - Mrs Lynn Farrand [5395] 14170 - Mr Adrian Raison [5841] 14172 - Mrs Betty Copsey [5843] 14175 - Mr & Mrs Keith Palmer [5847] 14176 - Mrs Concetta Hudson [5848] 14183 - Mr Darren Hackett [5850] 14184 - Mr David Burns [5852] 14188 - Mrs Julia Grange [5854] 14194 - Mrs Pamela Renshaw [5855] 14209 - P. Steptoe [1217] 14210 - Mr Michael Andrews [5837] 14211 - Mr John Steptoe [5856] 14212 - Mr John Steptoe [5856] 14213 - Mr Stephen Lucas [5858] 14216 - Mrs Verica Collier [5859] 14222 - Mrs Sarah Clark [5861] 14224 - Mr Adrian Clark [5863] 14225 - Dr Matthew Naylor [5864] 14226 - Mr Tim Hembrough [5865] 14227 - Mrs Clare Acheson [5866] 14228 - Mrs Frances Naylor [5308] 14229 - Mr Anthony Scott-Russell | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| [5867] | | | |
| 14250 - B. and V. Clark [1635] | | | |
| 14252 - Ms Devjani Das [5344] | | | |
| 14255 - Mr David Turner [5870] | | | |
| 14260 - Mr David Gooderson | | | |
| [5871] | | | |
| 14289 - Dr Colin Lazarus [5821] | | | |
| 14298 - Mrs Wendy Gemmell | | | |
| [5873] | | | |
| 14299 - Mr Michael Andrews | | | |
| [5837] | | | |
| 14302 - R.H. Plumtree [1544] | | | |
| 14326 - Tracie Murray [5874] | | | |
| 14338 - Mr Anthony Falder [1539] | | | |
| 14359 - Miss Vena Clark [5879] | | | |
| 14386 - Mr Christopher Bailey | | | |
| [5885] | | | |
| 14393 - Carl Fiddimore [5886] | | | |
| 14394 - Cllr Graeme Clark [1960] | | | |
| 14395 - Cllr Graeme Clark [1960] | | | |
| 14396 - Cllr Graeme Clark [1960] | | | |
| 14440 - Mrs Margaret Gil [5893] | | | |
| 14461 - Mrs Iris Sawtell [5900] | | | |
| 14477 - Mr Barry Sawtell [5904] | | | |
| 14494 - Mrs Carol Gooderson | | | |
| [5909] | | | |
| 14497 - Miss Dale Rutherford | | | |
| [5912] | | | |
| 14498 - Mr Jonathan Levy [5913] | | | |
| 14499 - Mrs Helen Pearson | | | |
| [5910] | | | |
| 14500 - Mrs Helen Pearson | | | |
| [5910] | | | |
| 14502 - Mrs Helen Pearson | | | |
| [5910] | | | |
| 14503 - Mrs Helen Hegan [5914] | | | |
| 14504 - Mrs Helen Pearson | | | |
| [5910] | | | |
| 14505 - Mr Fernando Garcia | | | |
| [5918] | | | |
| 14506 - Mrs Helen Pearson | | | |
| [5910] | | | |
| 14509 - Mr John Griffiths [5921] | | | |
| 14527 - Mrs Jill Charters [5929] | | | |
| 14528 - Mr James Lawler [5931] | | | |
| 14531 - Ms Mary Johanna Danby | | | |
| [5482] | | | |
| 14535 - Mrs Sarah Harvey [5933] | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 14537 - Mr John Holland [5934] | | | |
| 14554 - mr antti nupponen [5573] | | | |
| 14561 - Ms Chloë Sanders [5937] | | | |
| 14562 - Ms Chloë Sanders [5937] | | | |
| 14574 - Mr Kaixuan Wang [5939] | | | |
| 14575 - Ms Chloë Sanders [5937] | | | |
| 14576 - Ms Chloë Sanders [5937] | | | |
| 14582 - Mr & Mrs Jorstad [5942] | | | |
| 14583 - Mr Keith Kan [5943] | | | |
| 14595 - Mr Francis Lai [5946] | | | |
| 14606 - David Longhurst [2187] | | | |
| 14613 - Mrs Hilary Longhurst [5451] | | | |
| 14614 - Ms Linda Jameson [5950] | | | |
| 14617 - Mr & Mrs Corinne and Thomas Dissen [5951] | | | |
| 14623 - Ms Chris Massie [5955] | | | |
| 14624 - Ms Natalie Coleman-Dale [5956] | | | |
| 14625 - Mrs Grace Howe [5957] | | | |
| 14626 - Mr and Mrs T Smith [5958] | | | |
| 14633 - Mrs Susan Ginn [5960] | | | |
| 14651 - Ms Jinyu Shen [5966] | | | |
| 14676 - Mrs Eileen Withrington [5967] | | | |
| 14681 - Mr Alan Grange [5968] | | | |
| 14686 - Mrs Doreen Brock [5972] | | | |
| 14688 - Mr Terence Brock [5973] | | | |
| 14701 - Mrs Brenda Russell [4622] | | | |
| 14720 - Mr Lee Aspinall [5980] | | | |
| 14723 - Mrs Carol Ann Hennessy [5981] | | | |
| 14726 - Mr Gavin Hennessy [5984] | | | |
| 14747 - Geoff Sanders [1215] | | | |
| 14755 - Geoff Sanders [1215] | | | |
| 14760 - Geoff Sanders [1215] | | | |
| 14766 - Geoff Sanders [1215] | | | |
| 14767 - Mrs Chris Savage [5987] | | | |
| 14771 - Mr Kevin Meister [5988] | | | |
| 14773 - Mr & Mrs Dennis & Diane Rensch [5989] | | | |
| 14780 - Mrs Jean Honour [5607] | | | |
| 14782 - Mr Stephen Honour [5991] | | | |
| 14793 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995] | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 14835 - Mrs Jill Archer [5997] | | | |
| 14841 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999] | | | |
| 14842 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999] | | | |
| 14844 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999] | | | |
| 14845 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999] | | | |
| 14846 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999] | | | |
| 14847 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999] | | | |
| 14848 - Miss Charlotte Kenyon [6000] | | | |
| 14849 - Miss Danielle Kenyon [6001] | | | |
| 14870 - Ms Jan Sanders [6007] | | | |
| 14871 - Ms Jan Sanders [6007] | | | |
| 14873 - Ms Jan Sanders [6007] | | | |
| 14874 - Ms Jan Sanders [6007] | | | |
| 14875 - Ms Jan Sanders [6007] | | | |
| 14878 - Mr Jason Oliver [6009] | | | |
| 14883 - Mr Andrew Wilkinson [3891] | | | |
| 14884 - Miss Katherine Webster [6005] | | | |
| 14885 - Miss Katherine Webster [6005] | | | |
| 14897 - Ms Karen Massie [6017] | | | |
| 14900 - Mrs Namita Das [6018] | | | |
| 14910 - Mr Mike Kenyon [6023] | | | |
| 14911 - Mr Mike Kenyon [6023] | | | |
| 14922 - Mrs Karen Jewers [6026] | | | |
| 14927 - Mrs Pippa Wiltshire [5374] | | | |
| 14929 - Mrs Pippa Wiltshire [5374] | | | |
| 14936 - Mr Robert Boad [6032] | | | |
| 14954 - Mrs Patricia Carter [6034] | | | |
| 14984 - Mr Simon Oborn [6037] | | | |
| 14994 - Mr Martin Skinner [6039] | | | |
| 14999 - Mr Martin Skinner [6039] | | | |
| 15024 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] | | | |
| 15028 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] | | | |
| 15029 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| [6046] 15030 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 15031 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 15032 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 15033 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 15034 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 15035 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 15036 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 15085 - Mrs Purita Martin [6051] 15088 - Mr Paul Harvey [5454] 15099 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] 15109 - Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054] 15117 - Mr richyallum@gmail.com [6060] | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 14186 - Dr Harsha Boralessa [5853] | Object | I have the following concerns: - Increase in traffic on Priests Lane which already has heavy traffic; - Danger to pedestrians due to lack of footpath on both sides; - Increase in noise and exhaust pollution. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13177 - Mrs Judy Taylor [5397] 13208 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | Objection is made to the proposed allocation of site 044/178 - Priests Lane, Brentwood as it would involve the permanent loss of land last used as playing fields which may offer potential to meet community playing pitch needs. Unless the Council's emerging evidence base demonstrates that there is a clear surplus of provision or replacement provision is made, the loss of this site would be contrary to Sport England's playing fields policy and Government planning policy on playing fields set out in paragraph 74 of the NPPF. | tbc | tbc |
| 14872 - Ms Jan Sanders [6007] | Object | The only Sustainability Appraisal that has been found is that produced in January 2015. It reviewed a number of sites in detail, but the Priests Lane sites (044 and 178) were not mentioned or identified. | tbc | tbc |
| 15167 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] | Object | We attach for information, a copy of the letter received by one of our members from Eric Pickles showing his support (a few members have received such letters of support but for ease only one is attached.) | tbc | tbc |
| 14401 - Endeavour School (Mr John Chadwick) [5889] | Object | Concerns over the possibility of a housing development on Priests Lane fields, which are adjacent to our school field. The development of houses will undoubtedly cause noise pollution & increased traffic around an area that is already congested each morning & afternoon. This is partly caused by the number of schools in this area & traffic caused by parents driving their children to school. The noise pollution will finish when any construction finishes, but the increased number of cars, parents & pupils will cause problems for years to come. | tbc | tbc |
| 15402 - Essex Playing Fields Association (Tracy Smith) [6084] | Object | Would be the loss of yet another valuable playing field in the area. A large amount of correspondence has been received from local residents objecting to it being developed. Removing the play area will add to the problems of unfit children and adults. Once lost it is gone forever. | tbc | tbc |
| 14843 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999] | Object | The site has been designated Protected Urban Open Space and it is important to retain it as such to maintain the quality of life within Brentwood as a whole. Green areas near the town centre are essential for health and well-being and are also a combatant against the increase in air pollution. The sites have been visited by Essex Wildlife and they have noted it is home to various flora and fauna. They are also home to a number of animals. Any removal of the protected status of this site can only be detrimental to the community. | tbc | tbc |
| 14037 - Mr David Brown [5801] | Object | Proposal for this site is not detailed enough. Informing the public about the proposal was pitiful. Current levels of service should be maintained for existing residents. The Council should improve its own and ensure that all other parties supply a standard of service up to an acceptable standard BEFORE even considering taking on further challenges. Examples of the Council currently not fulfilling its social and moral duties include health, communications (transport), recycling, flooding, education, shopping and allied services. The site has been classified as liable to flooding for several years. Condemn the Council for even considering further housing and failing to notify the ratepayers of their proposals. | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14163 - Mrs Jackie Andrews [5823] | Support | Support Site Ref 178. Priests Lane. | tbc | tbc |
| 14029 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Support | The SA considered 270 alternative housing site locations, scoring each on 24 sustainability criteria. It is disappointing that they identified only 18 suitable sites within the urban area before having to consider eroding the Green Belt, where the vast majority of new dwellings are now planned. It is important that every effort is made to promote the most sustainable and appropriate urban development sites as listed in the DLP. [Policy 7.4: Support] | tbc | tbc |
| 14026 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Support | The SA considered 270 alternative housing site locations, scoring each on 24 sustainability criteria. It is disappointing that they identified only 18 suitable sites within the urban area before having to consider eroding the Green Belt, where the vast majority of new dwellings are now planned. It is important that every effort is made to promote the most sustainable and appropriate urban development sites as listed in the DLP. [Policy 7.4: Support] | tbc | tbc |
| 081 Council Depot, The Drive, Warley | | | | |
| 15829 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. | tbc | tbc |
| 13500 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] | Object | Object strongly to the footprint of the Imperial Youth Band Hall being included in proposed site at The Depot, Warley | tbc | tbc |
| 098 Ingleton House, Stock Lane, Ingatstone | | | | |
| 15830 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14220 - Mr A.M. Witney [5757] | Object | Ingatestone is supposed to be a village, the proposed development will turn it into a 'feeder' town like Brentwood. When site 098 is planned, where will the old people be placed if this happens and they lose their homes? All these properties in Ingatestone & Mountnessing will have a minimum of 1 car each and many of the houses 2, it could be an extra 300 cars, where will they park when they use facilities in Ingatestone. We have no room now! Public bus services is not reliable or convenient. Infrastructure in the village is at capacity. | tbc | tbc |
| 14146 - Mrs Jaqueline Craythorne [5824] | Object | Concerned that current residents will not be rehoused in new housing. Will they be given first refusal? | tbc | tbc |
| 14201 - J Kemble [5743] | Object | Policy 10.2 (Parking) is not addressed. A proper assessment and solutions should be made for car parking in the village centre and station. | tbc | tbc |
| 16326 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Support | Only support if satisfactory rehousing of the tenants of the sheltered housing complex is arranged and they are able to return after redevelopment if they so wish. Proper negotiation with the affected residents will be essential. | tbc | tbc |
| 099 Victoria Court, Victoria Road, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15831 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: Brent-D Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: 15 The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. This site falls entirely within the Brent-E flooding hotspot. 15 residential properties are currently at risk of internal flooding in a 1:20 year event. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 15474 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 100 Baytree Centre, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15833 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. | tbc | tbc |
| 15476 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver. | tbc | tbc |
| 14887 - Mr and Mrs Josie and Richard Lloyd [6014] | Comment | We are concerned about losing the shops in the Baytree Centre. Brentwood is not very welcoming for shoppers as it is. Only one large food store and Iceland for food. We cannot lose Wilkinson and B and M and the remaining few shops left there now. The Centre is also the easiest access for the Library. Please keep us informed about the progress of this Site. We have attended one of your meetings and received some information. | tbc | tbc |
| 15373 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15393 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15422 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15499 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15584 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15658 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16176 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16202 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Comment | 200 dwellings appears very optimistic for the Baytree Centre and further investigation should be undertaken to ascertain whether this number is achievable. | tbc | tbc |
| 16488 - CPREssex [210] | Comment | To date the residents of West Horndon have been given very little detail regarding this proposal which is sketchy and ill thought out in the extreme, and it is understandably of huge concern. This plan does not take into account the existing residents and we have had no involvement in the plans so far. There has been very little consultation and no information as to how this would impact on utilities such as water, waste etc, and services. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13382 - Mrs G Matthews [2409] | Object | I oppose any proposed dwellings sites on top of existing buildings in the Baytree Centre. The centre buildings are to the direct rear of my property. This development currently affects my right to the peaceful amenity of my home in three ways: 1- Overshadow by high rise buildings and flats. 2- Noise vibrations from the plant room Brentwood library. 3- Curtailment of natural light by overshadow of buildings and air conditioning noise emissions. Any increase in building, overshadow, noise and light pollution will be compounding, what I feel is already an unacceptable situation enforced upon these tiny dwellings at present. | tbc | tbc |
| 14876 - Mr James Tiff [6008] | Object | Building 226 properties in such close proximity to the town centre is not going to be beneficial for the current residents of Brentwood. Parking is going to be a major problem and there will definitely be parking overspill into local residential roads especially at weekends. The new proposed flats will increase congestion in Brentwood Town Centre. It is easily noticeable that the roads are more congested around Brentwood Town Centre. The 200 extra properties is going to bring nothing but congestion and noise down my road. | tbc | tbc |
| 13956 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] | Object | Against redevelopment of much-needed car-parks, including that servicing the Baytree Centre, for housing. This will kill off Brentwood as a shopping or retail destination. | tbc | tbc |
| 13180 - Mr James Stonebridge [5404] 13187 - Dr Robert Giles [5418] 13282 - Mr Robert Armstrong [5466] 13769 - Mr Gerard Smith [5710] | Object | I feel the addition of 200 flats at the Baytree Centre would be an over development of the locality with unsightly crowding of structures, and congestion with more people moving around there. Increased traffic flows would be another negative. | tbc | tbc |
| 14772 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] | Support | Generally supportive of plan. Look forward to town centre masterplan. Makes sense for William Hunter Way and the Baytree centre to be reated together, a holistic approach. With online shopping and forecast drop in future retail demand, the future retail shopping space in Brentwood should be very closely looked at as customer behaviour is changing fast and mistakes would be very costly. Improvement need around chapel ruins. Concerned about the noise and disruption of the Baytree centre redevelopment. More should be considered about the role of the Coptfold Road car park. The open green space to the south should be enhanced so enable it to become more of a magnet for those entering the High Street from the south. | tbc | tbc |
| 010 Sow and Grow Nursery, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch | | | | |
| 13869 - Mrs Caroline Knight [5747] 13872 - Mrs Caroline Knight [5747] | Comment | I hope that the priority will be given to small units or low rise flats/masonettes suitable for social housing and downsizing to encourage local people to stay in the area. Site 010: The shaded area shown for housing includes the access to the allotment plots behind Sow&Grow nurseries and part of the garden of the adjacent house. Ongar Road becomes congested when traffic divert to/from Harlow area to avoid problems on the M11/25. Will consideration be given to providing a roundabout at the Larchwood Garden/Ongar Road junction? Will the access to the allotments stay or be moved? | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|-----------|
| 15834 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. | TBC | TBC |
| 14741 - Mrs Jennifer Lewsey [5986] | Comment | Sow and Grow nursery site may be a viable option. | Noted | No action |
| 13986 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] | Object | Object to proposed developments Pilgrims Hatch is already overdeveloped. I am concerned about further development (287 houses) & the increase in traffic on Ongar Road, Doddinghurst Road & Hatch Road. Hatch Road already poorly maintained. Loss of Green Belt Land. Local doctors surgeries already over subscribed. Local Primary school would not be able to cope. | TBC | TBC |
| 15326 - Mr. N & R Hart and Mr. K & P Watson [2795] | Object | Concern raised to the draft inclusion of working garden centres at Sow and Grow Nursery and Ingatestone Garden Centre. These represent clearly definable employment sites and working nurseries. The loss of these employment sites for housing is counterintuitive to the principles of sustainable development. Whilst they satisfy the social limb of sustainability they will result in a severe negative impact upon the economic limb. | TBC | TBC |
| 15746 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 15748 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 15750 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] | Support | The site is located in a highly sustainable location well served by public transport and other urban services and facilities within walkable distance. It would not take any greenfield land away from agricultural use. The proposed redevelopment would give many amenity and visual improvements to the locality. The site could be developed sooner than programmed and bring forward more than 37 dwellings units as proposed. | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13613 - Mr Colin Robert [5654] 13620 - Miss Lucy Hinwood [5656] 13624 - Mr Nick Pain [5657] 13627 - Mrs S. Walker [5659] 13631 - Mrs Rhoda Jopson [5660] 13637 - Mr Michael Nicholls [5661] 13708 - Mr Paul Sharpe [5678] 13711 - Mrs Shirley Fraser [5679] 13714 - Mr Mehmet Doru [5680] 13726 - Mr Paul Watson [5689] 13729 - Mr Tim Murray [5690] 13732 - Miss Clare Dubbin [5691] 13735 - Mr Ian Sweetlove [5692] 13738 - Mrs Elizabeth Jones [5693] 14264 - Miss Dawn Elphick [5872] 14337 - Mr Venon Thomas [5875] 14346 - Mr Zak Harvey [5877] 14356 - Mr Andrew Watson [5878] 14363 - Miss Tilly O'Leary [5880] 14371 - Mr Dan Morrow [5881] 14372 - Mr Dan Morrow [5881] 14414 - Mr Stanley Jopson [5890] 14425 - Mrs Rosa Dwyer [5891] 14432 - MBE Roy Dyer [5894] 14438 - Mr Robert Grey [5895] 14445 - Mr Mital Patel [5896] 14449 - Miss Lois Whitehead [5897] 14452 - Mr Stephen Bunton [5899] 14457 - Mrs Judith Wright [5901] 14467 - Mr Jason Paisley [5902] 14473 - Miss Deana Adansi [5905] 14484 - Mr Chris Edwards [5907] | Support | Houses and flats are needed in Pilgrim Hatch area. Page 47 Use of Brownfield land in the Green Belt supported. Para 7.36 proposal for Pilgrim Hatch supported. Page 78 Site ref 010 Sow n Grow Nursery site supported for housing land allocation as a Brownfield Green Belt urban extension. Page 185 Appendix 2 is supported where the Sow n Grow site is listed no.010 Approx. dwellings could be higher. | TBC | TBC |
| 16224 - Landmere Carwash (Administrator) [6173] 16238 - Mr Paul Day [6181] 16252 - Time 4 pets (Administrator Time 4 Pets) [6183] | Support | Support the Brownfield Green Belt urban extension. Number of dwellings could be higher. We need more housing in the Pilgrims Hatch area, better for local businesses. | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14854 - Ms Sharon Cropley [6003] | Support | We acknowledge the development on the sow & grow nursery site on Ongar Road, is a positive site for development. "Right place - Most good - Least harm". | TBC | TBC |
| 128 Ingatestone Garden Centre, Roman Road, Ingatestone | | | | |
| 15218 - Bellway Homes Essex [6075] | Comment | <p>We disagree that the capacity of the site to 60 is appropriate or represents the best use of this previously developed site. As demonstrated in the attached Design Statement, it is considered that the site can deliver at least 80 units but there is scope for more.</p> <p>There is no explanation or evidence base as to why the site capacity has been reduced and it is considered that the professional team can address any technical issues in relation to the site and deliver additional housing in a balanced layout. The site has capacity for at least 80 residential units, without having an adverse impact on amenity.</p> <p>The allocation should therefore be increased to between 90 and 100 residential units.</p> | TBC | TBC |
| 14006 - Steve Undrill [2496] | Comment | Even more confused - why does one business closes down (ie the garden centre - Site Reference 128 - which gave employment) and another area (Site Reference 079C) have a proposed change of use in order to give employment? What is stopping the 'Proposed Employment Site - 079C of being put onto Site Reference 128 which is already an employment site rather than changing the use of the green belt land? | tbc | tbc |
| 15220 - Bellway Homes Essex [6075] | Comment | <p>The NPPF (paragraph 173) states that sites that are identified for development should be of a scale that are deliverable and viable to ensure that the required level of housing can be delivered. In this regard, a site allocation of 60 residential units will undermine the overall delivery of the site and the social infrastructure necessary to facilitate this development.</p> <p>It is noted that the Council has not prepared an infrastructure delivery plan and we request that one is prepared that reflects the requirements of the Borough in light of the proposed allocations. In any events, to ensure the site is delivered and contributes to housing in the way envisaged, the Council should increase the level of housing identified for the site.</p> | TBC | TBC |
| 15835 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | <p>ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site:</p> <p>Within Flooding Hotspot: No</p> <p>Within EA UFMfSW: YES</p> <p>Number of Properties at Risk: N/A</p> <p>The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures.</p> <p>The eastern portion of this site at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development.</p> | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15221 - Bellway Homes Essex [6075] | Comment | The proposed allocation of 60 residential units would result in a density of 18.5 dph which, not only, does not reflect the surrounding densities which are around 20 dph , is also not making efficient use of land. An allocation of around 90 residential units, would be more appropriate. | TBC | TBC |
| 13297 - Mrs Fiona Trott [2458] | Comment | The site that I wish to put forward is an area of some 9.7 Ha of land in Chelmsford Road, Shenfield. The land is bounded by houses in Chelmsford Road, the Mountnessing roundabout and slip road off the westbound A12 at Junction 12, the main Norwich to London railway line and, to the south west, the site which is identified in Policy 7.4 and Figure 7.2 of the Draft Local Plan, January 2016, as Officer's meadow (site reference 034, 087 and 235). | tbc | tbc |
| 16327 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Concerns of 60 houses proposed on site 128 Ingateston Garden Centre surround sewage disposal capacity and inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The site is only partly developed at present and contains areas of undeveloped land which if developed would impact on the openness contrary to the Green Belt policy. Development of 42 properties is far from ideal place for people to live and children to grow up in. Air pollution figures obtained for development close to this site required expensive mitigation measures to be taken before planning permission was granted. The atmosphere in this area is not conducive to healthy living and the Council should re-designate the site as being unsuitable for housing. | TBC | TBC |
| 13137 - Mr James Toward [2907] 13143 - Mrs Jean Sleep [5373] 13158 - Mr James Toward [2907] 13273 - Mr James Toward [2907] 13290 - Mrs Jan Wootton [5479] 13328 - Mrs Kathleen Richardson [4801] 13757 - Ms M Giles [567] 15222 - Bellway Homes Essex [6075] | Object | The reduction in site capacity is as a result of the need to ensure separation between Mountnessing and Ingatestone through the provision of a green buffer on the site. However, the Council's Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt (2016 draft) identifies the site as making a low to moderate contribution to the five purposes of including land within the green belt and the 'moderate' contribution is partly as a result of the assessment concluding that the two settlements (Ingatestone and Mountnessing) would no longer be separate and there is a risk of coalescence. The assessment states that the site has a countryside function, but since the Garden Centre has stopped trading and much of the site being previously developed land, it is considered that it has no countryside function. The A12 provides a strong physical barrier to prevent coalesce and therefore this should not be a 'moderate' classification but a 'low' contribution. | TBC | TBC |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 13717 - Mrs Brenda Hennessy [5684] 13746 - Mr James Toward [2907] 13799 - Mrs Nikita Young [5729] 13818 - Mr and Mrs George and Ann McKenna [5741] 13823 - J Kemble [5743] 13878 - Mr A.M. Witney [5757] 13890 - Cllr Noelle Hones [1987] 13907 - Heidi Head [5773] 14005 - Steve Undrill [2496] 14147 - Mrs Jacqueline Craythorne [5824] 14276 - Mr John Cavill [2391] 14507 - Mr Darren Bryanton [5919] 14526 - Ms Claire Ford [2421] 14529 - Mr James Jenkins [5930] 14590 - Mr Richard Wright [1644] 14609 - Gary Howitt [2420] 14655 - Mr Peter Kavanagh [4731] 14853 - Mr Ken Batson [1849] 14863 - Jan & Graham Wootton [2891] 15019 - Julia O'Farrell [2758] 15020 - Julia O'Farrell [2758] 15022 - Julia O'Farrell [2758] 15023 - Mr Stuart McDonald [6047] 15025 - Mr Stuart McDonald [6047] 15027 - Mr Stuart McDonald [6047] 15123 - Mr Michael Low [6061] 15152 - Mrs Lisa Bryanton [5596] 15153 - Mrs Lisa Bryanton [5596] 15154 - Mrs Lisa Bryanton [5596] 15156 - Mrs Lisa Bryanton [5596] | Object | Object to the impact on green belt; schools; GPs; traffic; amenity; concern over access and traffic safety; increase in air pollution; loss of trees; construction impacts; impacts on drains and sewerage; A12 would make this a poor site for new homes; proposal too dense; not sufficient parking in village already; transport insufficient (bus, rail and car); need further infrastructure information; loss of garden centre business; Council should refuse change of use; drainage and flood issues, particularly as there is a stream on site; protection of wildlife behind site needed; site is green belt not brownfield; loss of privacy'; protect trees with TPOs; merges Shenfield and Chelmsford; | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15026 - Mr Stuart McDonald [6047] | Object | There has been a history of flooding in the area around Burnt House Lane. If trees and natural vegetation are removed there is a real risk that this could result in increased flooding of the area. It would seem inappropriate and of major concern if the trees on the boundary to the properties on Burnt House Lane that have a past history of flooding were removed. The access road into the entrance of the Garden Centre is currently inadequate to cope with the proposed number of houses and subsequent increase in traffic. We have real concern that the current road would serve as the main access / egress point, causing major road safety implications. This will be aggravated by the current location of the Bushcade Lorry Depot, at present we have a high volume of HGV lorries which travel at speed into the location. How will this safety concern be mitigated? | tbc | tbc |
| 15327 - Mr. N & R Hart and Mr. K & P Watson [2795] | Object | Concern raised to the draft inclusion of working garden centres at Sow and Grow Nursery and Ingatestone Garden Centre. These represent clearly definable employment sites and working nurseries. The loss of these employment sites for housing is counterintuitive to the principles of sustainable development. Whilst they satisfy the social limb of sustainability they will result in a severe negative impact upon the economic limb. | tbc | tbc |
| 14088 - Mrs Dawn Priest [5627] | Object | Very concerned over the misinterpretation that everyone has when it involves "Green Belt" land and how when it benefits the Council it is just easy for areas to be released. In particular my objection would be for Ingatestone Garden Centre. A thriving business that has slowly been run into the ground deliberately to accommodate 50+ homes on what was/is Green Belt land and yet when an individual case has been put forward for an extension to an existing dwelling or to build a modest home on Green Belt land which is amongst residential and commercial properties, this has been declined based on the fact it is Green Belt with no further consent. This example is speaking from true experiences of people we know in the last year which makes a mockery of the whole system. Where is the logic here? | tbc | tbc |
| 15021 - Julia O'Farrell [2758] | Object | There has been a history of flooding in the area around Burnt House Lane. If trees and natural vegetation are removed there is a real risk that this could result in increased flooding of the area. It would seem inappropriate and of major concern if the trees on the boundary to the properties on Burnt House Lane that have a past history of flooding were removed. The access road into the entrance of the Garden Centre is currently inadequate to cope with the proposed number of houses and subsequent increase in traffic. We have real concern that the current road would serve as the main access / egress point, causing major road safety implications. This will be aggravated by the current location of the Bushcade Lorry Depot, at present we have a high volume of HGV lorries which travel at speed into the location. How will this safety concern be mitigated? | tbc | tbc |
| 200 Dunton Hills Garden Village | | | | |
| 14558 - Mr C Loneragan [5926] | Comment | The delay in preparing a strategic allocation and securing the supporting infrastructure can be significant. It is therefore important that the Council aim to meet the housing need of the Borough through a more dispersed allocation of sites, particularly early in the plan. The Council should consider alternative sites that are able to provide housing that supports the larger villages and delivers a secure quantum of housing in more sustainable locations. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|-------------------------|--------|
| 15836 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: YES Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. A significant part of this site is at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 15535 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | Most of the allocations lie in Flood Zone 1, apart from site 200 Dunton Hills Graden Village and we have already provided comments on flood risk to this site through a separate consultation. These must be considered. | tbc | tbc |
| 15551 - Rochford District Council (Natalie Hayward) [6094] | Comment | A127, A130 and A13 forms part of the strategic road network for South Essex. Any development proposed in proximity to these corridors should be accompanied by adequate mitigation measures. Two strategic development sites are proposed within the vicinity of the A127 corridor to the south east and south west of the Borough. Unclear from the Draft Local Plan what mitigation measures would be required to accompany significant development in this location. Strongly recommended that any future iterations of the Local Plan are clearly accompanied by appropriate mitigation measures. This will ensure proposals would not detrimentally impact the A127. | tbc | tbc |
| 14223 - Mr Iain Low [5329] | Comment | Without detailed plans it is unclear whether the development includes our property/land. Hence it is difficult to respond from a personal perspective. The major frustration being the lack of any plan with not even a scheme and a real possibility of not seeing one until the end of 2016. There could well be a situation where value is taken off our property. Therefore, we accept the situation if our land could be incorporated as part of the development plan and sold with that permission or seek planning permission on the land that would fall into line with the overall requirements of the proposed Dunton Garden Village. | tbc | tbc |
| 14991 - Mr Iain Low [5329] | Comment | With personal and financial investment in our property, theres a lack of any Dunton plan or scheme and maybe not seeing one until the end of 2016. Without any reassurance of how this development will affect us we will have to finish our renovation project and hope the proposed development is not to the detriment of our property and living space. Options include to realise any potential to sell with development rights. Alternatively, try for these rights ourselves and incorporate our land into the development plan. This could leave us in a compromising situation residing in a property surrounded by a large scale development without any control of what will end up around us. | tbc | tbc |
| 15177 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] | Comment | COUNCIL TAX Understand expect yearly costs of major developments to be self-financing after 15 years, therefore, in meantime can expect Council Tax to increase to cover them, is this correct? | This is not correct ... | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14597 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] | Comment | Done properly this is possibly the least harmful option. Accept the idea of achieving the required level of development by building new villages that are self-sustainable and developed in such a way as to deter further development creep. Question the size at 2500 - the new West Horndon with the development of the industrial estate will be ~ 1100 to 1200 homes. DHGV should replicate that and not be much bigger, although I might accept slightly more if it could be proved that a larger number was absolutely necessary to generate the required infrastructure. There needs to be an environmental barrier between DHGV and West Horndon so as to prevent the possibility of developmental creep in the future. There are a lot infrastructure issues that need to be resolved these include: Road access; Schools - junior & senior; Medical facilities; Access to the railway station; A127 capacity; C2C rail capacity. | tbc | tbc |
| 15430 - Diocese of Chelmsford (Mrs Carol Richards) [6086] | Comment | Existing villages usually have a church at the centre - often on the village green and next to the public house - and a church should be included in plans for Dunton Garden Village. It is helpful if this is a shared church and community centre. There is an excellent model at the Greater Beaulieu Park Development, Chelmsford. The developer is providing a building, as part of the planning obligations, and Springfield Parish Council and local Churches have set up a Trust to run the Centre on behalf of the whole community. It will be a church and community facility. | tbc | tbc |
| 14986 - Mr Iain Low [5329] | Comment | Once the Development is completed: Damage that impacts on the rural scene, affecting ourselves significantly, the development will only grow. Pollution through additional traffic, entry and exit to our property will be compromised. Reduction of privacy and potential safety risk, as we cannot evaluate who or what will be developed near us. Without detailed plans it is unclear at this moment whether the development includes our property/land or whether our property/land is to remain undeveloped. Hence it is difficult to respond. | tbc | tbc |
| 14776 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] | Comment | Noted changes at Dunton Garden Suburb and that Basildon has scaled back its proposal. Hope that the potential benefits which were in the original project visualised will not be lost as the consultation process rolls forward. | tbc | tbc |
| 14983 - Mr Iain Low [5329] | Comment | Concerns/Issues: Potential implications to our local environment and its impact on what we thought, and have been repeatedly told, is green belt. Affect on our local environment during construction through noise dust, mud and the affect of site traffic on entry and exit to our property, traffic flow interruption impacting on the A127 and A128. Overall consideration of this proposed development, that goes a long way to fulfill the requirements of additional housing in the Borough, brings us to believe, in principle only, that we do not object. | tbc | tbc |
| 14571 - Mr Richard Swift [1747] | Object | The impact on neighbouring boroughs should be considered. Residents may prefer a more historical backdrop to their new homes? | tbc | tbc |
| 15202 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Object | We object to the scale of the garden suburb and consider that an urban extension to the west of Basildon Town (PADC 5 in Basildon's Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options) represents a more suitable and deliverable approach. The scale of the Garden Suburb currently proposed would unduly restrict the remainder of Brentwood and Basildon's towns and villages to meet local, settlement - specific housing and socio-economic needs. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13811 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] | Object | Objection: A127 is at capacity and no evidence of improvement; impact on A128 junction with A127; needs crossing over A127; rail at capacity; concerned about Gypsy and Travellers on site; Laindon regeneration would be adversely affected; loss of Green Belt; loss of wildlife; use brownfield first; what about schools; pressure on rail; flood risk; pollution; too close to gas transmission line; detrimental to Grade 1 listed building and other heritage assets; bisect a wildlife corridor; affect badger, Great Crested Newts and barn owls; too close to Thorndon SSSI; land is good for agriculture; damage to Eastland Springs woodlands and Mardyke Valley landscape; too many homes in south of the borough; more detail on infrastructure needed (Secondary School, Primary School, Nursery Care, Police, Healthcare, Electricity, Internet, Water and Sewage.); impact on Basildon amenities; should be working with Basildon on infrastructure; need an infrastructure plan; need more buses; tip of the iceberg to a new town; no money for new schools; healthcare improvement needed; will overwhelm Dunton Waylett; should use A12 and Crossrail more; too many homes being built than needed; Plan is therefore unsound | tbc | tbc |
| 15271 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Object | Dunton Hills GV will result in a significant development within the Green Belt, whilst the Draft Local Plan states that the site can contribute to the Green Belt purposes it is not demonstrated how. Havering therefore find it more likely that development will have a negative effect on the Green Belt purposes. | tbc | tbc |
| 15282 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Object | The A12 and A127 are the responsibility of TfL within Havering and both roads are essential elements of the highway infrastructure of Havering and are fundamental to traffic being able to travel both within and to and from the borough safely and conveniently. Both highways are heavily trafficked and Havering consider using these routes linked to development in Brentwood will adversely affect traffic flows and have a detrimental impact on the environment, particularly Gallows Corner and the A127 road entering Havering. | tbc | tbc |
| 14093 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Object | The building of over 5,000 homes at Dunton will contravene Policy 5.1. The impact of this development will affect not only the Green Belt but also existing services. The A127 is already a pinch point for traffic, adding more industrial traffic and vehicles from over 5,500 new homes will exacerbate the problem. | tbc | tbc |
| 15124 - Mr James MacKevoy [6059] 15125 - Mrs Lynda Franklin [6058] | Object | Speeds limits are rarely observed, HGVs use the A128 and Lower Dunton Road as short cuts, vehicular weight restriction are rarely enforced as witnessed by the constantly distressed state of the road surfaces. The impact of the number of dwellings proposed on already over-used roads is beyond comprehension. At peak times the roundabout /bridge complex at the junction of the A127 and Westmayne/Lower Dunton Road reaches grid lock, combined with traffic from the Ford's site Congestion is exacerbated by an equally massive bottleneck at the junction of the A127 and A128. At times miles of tail backs occur at these junctions along the A127. All of this points to the fact that these two junctions represent the worst location to have chosen to create what is effectively a small town. There are suggestions too that the A127 itself would require widening. Who will pay? | tbc | tbc |
| 14078 - Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361] | Object | Gypsy and Traveller provision in paragraph 7.10 is too high. Concern that provision for all the boroughs pitches would be at Dunton. Sites of no more than 15 pitches should be considered. Noted that current evidence needs updating for Gypsy and Traveller provision. Must ensure that schools are available for Gypsy and Traveller but Dunton Hills schools will be more than 2 miles away so the location is not suitable. The site is not suitable because of surface water flooding. Noise and air quality must also be considered. No transit site is proposed so travellers may settle permanently. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15087 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | Object | The Basildon local plan gives detail of how and where they will update road infrastructure to ease the congestion in their district. The Brentwood Local Plan fails to provide any detail leaving little confidence that it has a robust plan. In order to access Brentwood, DHGV will be forced to use the A128 which is already gridlocked most days with two severe pinch points at Hanging Hill Lane and Wilson's Corner. | tbc | tbc |
| 15374 - Maylands Green Estate Co. Ltd [4699] 15394 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15423 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15500 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15586 - Mr Lee O'Connor [4701] 15660 - Tony Hollioake [5618] 16177 - Joy Fook Restaurant [2566] 16203 - Mr Hugh Thomson [5620] | Object | Significant doubt over the deliverability of the Dunton Hills Garden Village strategic site allocation and the figure of 2,500 is unrealistic. | tbc | tbc |
| 15128 - Mrs Lynda Franklin [6058] 15129 - Mr James MacKevooy [6059] | Object | The Village plans speak of commercial premises required in the area. This will be of no benefit to the existing residents of the area, as there is no evidence that they have insufficient provision at present, will be to attract those from outside Brentwood, will the cost of infrastructure make these viable? Whilst adding to congestion, the commercial area will attract late night commercial services, litter, noise, light pollution and a host of various nuisances, to the detriment of existing local residents. Residents will be more likely drawn from outside the area to use the Village as a dormitory, commuting to jobs already held in locations elsewhere than Brentwood including London. Local industrial estates are hardly a ringing endorsement, judging by their already underutilised and the ever so slightly shabby appearance of many of them. | tbc | tbc |
| 15281 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Object | It is recognised that the option to join the separate allocations in each borough to form a cross boundary urban extension is still being explored, but this does not form part of the current plans as they cannot be fully justified by evidence at this point in time. Havering welcomes this decision but strongly opposes any consideration being given to this option now or in the future. | tbc | tbc |
| 15320 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Object | The Dunton Hills Garden Suburb Statement of Consultation, published in December 2015 says that it "... will inform both Basildon Borough Council and Brentwood Borough Council's decision about whether there are planning merits to consider a cross-boundary development option at Dunton in their respective Local Plans ...". The consultation itself was carried out in January and February 2015. 84% of those who responded objected to the proposal; only 6% supported it. This looks like a project that is going nowhere, and there must be very serious doubts over when this proposed allocation will start to make a contribution to the housing needs identified in Policy 5.2. | tbc | tbc |
| 14801 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] | Object | At present proposals are being done piecemeal and leaves one wondering if this is a back door way of getting them through, which will lead to Dunton New Town! If both Basildon & Brentwood Borough Council proceed with their current proposals without being able to confirm the whole of Dunton and local areas will be completely safe and risk free if any development proceeds then the government must be called in to stop them proceeding. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 14577 - Mr Martin Scott [5938] | Object | With Basildon proposals, this would mean 3,500 new homes. Results form 2015 joint consultation rejected this scheme. Impact would be high. A127 is gridlocked, C2C trains are overcrowded; Basildon hospital is overstretched; larger GP surgeries are not the solution. Not enough schools; should protect Green Belt at all costs. Countryside are heart and lungs of Basildon; wildlife will be impacted; should not be building new travellers pitches at the expense of Green Belt; need to prevent Basildon from urban sprawl. | tbc | tbc |
| 14108 - Mr Anthony Crowley [3147] 15084 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | Object | From an earlier consultation on the Dunton scheme, 84% of respondents opposed this. Why is it still being put forward? West Horndon is being targeted with almost 60% of the entire Boroughs housing requirement. This is an increase on the 43% proposed in the 2013 draft! This increase is still being proposed despite the 84% objection rate to DGS. DGV as proposed is not sustainable. Once again BBC has produced insufficient assessments to justify such a proposal. Adjoining Authorities including Basildon and Thurrock objected to DGS as did Essex County Council. With such united rejection of the proposal, why does BBC persist with it? Neither ECC nor Highways England have plans to upgrade the A127, again rendering the DGS proposal unsustainable. | tbc | tbc |
| 15094 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | Object | Development in the proposed DHGV area does not help in any way to make use of the new Crossrail link being extremely difficult to access due to poor and congested transport links. Concentration of development along the North-East corridor would make much more sense in this regard. | tbc | tbc |
| 15120 - Mrs Lynda Franklin [6058] | Object | Where is the evidence that housing in the numbers proposed by the Village are needed in this locality? Where is the fair distribution of new housing to parts of this immediate area of South Essex other than Brentwood if in reality what is proposed here is merely the provision of homes for London overspill. And why should Dunton be saddled with vast overdevelopment if the number of alternative Brownfield sites have not been considered when these are readily sustainable and have pre-existing adequate infrastructure to support development with comparatively little extra "tweaking" without recourse to major civil engineering works implicitly required by the Village. Growth for growths sake, given the infrastructural deficit in this area, cannot be sustained or justified when whole areas in South Essex are lacking adequate investment in infrastructure to support the current population. Significant areas of the region are classified as requiring remedial action including derelict and under-utilised industrial areas. It is questionable that Green Belt should be used in preference to these sites which will still be left wanting if this Village development goes ahead. | tbc | tbc |
| 15122 - Mr James MacKevoe [6059] | Object | Where is the evidence that housing in the numbers proposed by the Village are needed in this locality? Where is the fair distribution of new housing to parts of this immediate area of South Essex other than Brentwood if in reality what is proposed here is merely the provision of homes for London overspill. And why should Dunton be saddled with vast overdevelopment if the number of alternative Brownfield sites have not been considered when these are readily sustainable and have pre-existing adequate infrastructure to support development with comparatively little extra "tweaking" without recourse to major civil engineering works implicitly required by the Village. Growth for growths sake, given the infrastructural deficit in this area, cannot be sustained or justified when whole areas in South Essex are lacking adequate investment in infrastructure to support the current population. Significant areas of the region are classified as requiring remedial action including derelict and under-utilised industrial areas. It is questionable that Green Belt should be used in preference to these sites which will still be left wanting if this Village development goes ahead. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15068 - Ms RS Cross [6048] | Object | Councils have historically failed to effectively manage large developments (family members have experience of this). The existing map suggests significant urban sprawl with no breaks, for green belt or green corridors. It brings the urban sprawl closer to key wildlife areas and will inevitably have a negative impact on wildlife and the environment. There is far too little detail of infrastructure that is required to support such a development, which would have been included in a 106 agreement. Unless the council can guarantee early provision ahead of the actual building of houses (which has rarely happened in the past). The development is unsustainable. | tbc | tbc |
| 14798 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 14799 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 14800 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 14802 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] | Object | How can anyone comment on your supposed 2016 consultation regarding Dunton hills Garden Village when there is no infrastructure and various reports contain inaccurate information, so only totally object! The information in reports appears is basically a revamp of your 2015 reports and other reports referred to also contain inaccurate information. Your reports with accurate information proves that ALL your 5,500 houses should be built in North Brentwood with most North of the A12, where there is great demand. Other issues that need further detail in a Masterplan are: soil &/or water contamination; flooding; surface water; gas explosion - gas leaks; gridlock (e.g. a127); impact on insurance; ring-fenced finance; roads, infrastructure. Development should not take place until everything has been resolved. | tbc | tbc |
| 15337 - Ford Motor Company [3768] | Object | In March 2015 Ford submitted representations to the joint consultation. At this stage, Ford raised significant concerns regarding this strategic allocation across to the administrative boundaries of the two local authorities. For the reasons set out in the objection to the Dunton Garden Suburb, Ford maintains an objection to the strategic allocation at the Dunton Hills Garden Village due to the perceived wider impact on Ford's operational facility and strategic site at the Dunton Technical Centre in Dunton, Basildon. Ford has also emphasised these concerns in response to the strategic allocation included in the Draft Basildon Borough Council Local Plan. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13298 - Keeley Jacks [5489] 13560 - Anne Clark [4973] 13599 - Mr P Gibson [5644] 13654 - Sharon Howells [5663] 13887 - Mr Iain Low [5329] 13911 - Mrs Annette Scammell [2736] 13957 - Mr Max Aitkins [5790] 14077 - Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361] 14079 - Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361] 14080 - Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361] 14081 - Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361] 14082 - Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361] 14083 - Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361] 14179 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] 14199 - Mr. K. Craske [2712] 14204 - Mrs Maureen Craske [3566] 14207 - Ms Louise Craske [5857] 14248 - Mrs Jill Saddington [2549] 14400 - Mrs D Middleton [5639] 14403 - Mrs D Middleton [5639] 14405 - Mrs D Middleton [5639] 14488 - Mrs Anne Smith [4540] 14490 - Mrs Anne Smith [4540] 14491 - Mrs Anne Smith [4540] 14501 - Ms Hayley Stapleton [5915] 14598 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 14616 - Mr Peter Broom [5952] 14618 - Mrs Lynda Hatcher [5953] 14636 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14638 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14644 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14645 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14648 - Mrs Sheron Broom [5965] 14705 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14707 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14709 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14712 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] | Object | <p>Objection: A127 is at capacity and no evidence of improvement; impact on A128 junction with A127; needs crossing over A127; rail at capacity; concerned about Gypsy and Travellers on site; Laidon regeneration would be adversely affected; loss of Green Belt; loss of wildlife; use brownfield first; what about schools; pressure on rail; flood risk; pollution; too close to gas transmission line; detrimental to Grade 1 listed building and other heritage assets; bisect a wildlife corridor; affect badger, Great Crested Newts and barn owls; too close to Thorndon SSSI; land is good for agriculture; damage to Eastland Springs woodlands and Mardyke Valley landscape; too many homes in south of the borough; more detail on infrastructure needed (Secondary School, Primary School, Nursery Care, Police, Healthcare, Electricity, Internet, Water and Sewage.); impact on Basildon amenities; should be working with Basildon on infrastructure; need an infrastructure plan; need more buses; tip of the iceberg to a new town; no money for new schools; healthcare improvement needed; will overwhelm Dunton Waylett; should use A12 and Crossrail more; too many homes being built than needed; Plan is therefore unsound</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 14717 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] | | | | |
| 14732 - Mr John Purbrick [5985] | | | | |
| 14743 - Mrs Jennifer Lewsey [5986] | | | | |
| 14752 - Mrs Doreen Worth [2974] | | | | |
| 14769 - Jill Peterson [3229] | | | | |
| 14812 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | | | | |
| 14814 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | | | | |
| 14818 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | | | | |
| 14819 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | | | | |
| 14879 - Mr Danny Lovey [6010] | | | | |
| 14881 - Mr Danny Lovey [6010] | | | | |
| 14882 - Mr Danny Lovey [6010] | | | | |
| 14941 - Mr Robert Boad [6032] | | | | |
| 15086 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15090 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15096 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15097 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15098 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15100 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15101 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15102 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15103 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15105 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15106 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | | | | |
| 15115 - Mrs Lynda Franklin [6058] | | | | |
| 15116 - Mr James MacKevey [6059] | | | | |
| 15126 - Mrs Lynda Franklin [6058] | | | | |
| 15127 - Mr James MacKevey [6059] | | | | |
| 15131 - Mrs Lynda Franklin [6058] | | | | |
| 15132 - Mr James MacKevey [6059] | | | | |
| 15133 - Mr James MacKevey [6059] | | | | |
| 15134 - Mrs Lynda Franklin [6058] | | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 15137 - Ms Jenni Parlour [6062] 15140 - Ms Jenni Parlour [6062] 15149 - Ms Jenni Parlour [6062] 15162 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 15164 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 15171 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 15174 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] | | | | |
| 15089 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] | Object | Further there are very few footpaths, cycleways and bridges spanning the A127 and A128 which would be needed to allow DHGV residents to access Brentwood district in the North and West. The Thames crossing route 4 proposes to use the same land for road links. This risk is not even considered as part of the local plan document. To build 2000 houses on the proposed area would lead to significant density of housing which is completely at odds with the vision of a wide avenue, open space Garden Suburb | tbc | tbc |
| 15270 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Object | It is noted that the extent of development proposed has been reduced and that each authority are now progressing their own proposals. However, Havering strongly oppose the Dunton Garden Suburb concept and concerns relating to transport, congestion and harm to the character and openness of the Green Belt still apply. | tbc | tbc |
| 15069 - Ms RS Cross [6048] | Object | I hope that both councils and government wish to see this development as one which is creating sustainable communities. It will not do so when there is a lack of strong controls in planning and implementation. This will not be provided by a market let approach to development. Unless the councils approach differs to that indicated I will be opposed to the development of Dunton Garden Suburb. Perhaps what this development would most benefit from is an Urban Development Agency (UDA) with local representation as is the case with Ebbsfleet Garden City. | tbc | tbc |
| 14236 - Miss Angela Cox [5868] 14402 - Mrs D Middleton [5639] | Object | The development would destroy a large expanse of open countryside. Which will totally undermine the Urban Sprawl corridors that were put in place to protect villages etc. Timmermans site close to the A127, available for development was put forward at previous consultation stages as proposed site is ignored. This is close to the A127 and will not significantly impact on the surrounding greenbelt. Why ignored? Dunton Garden Suburb consultation document stated that the suburb could accommodate 4,000-6,000 homes. How can it be possible that greenbelt can be released for development on such a huge scale? | tbc | tbc |
| 14559 - Mr Richard Swift [1747] 14607 - Ms Virginia Stiff [1748] 15118 - Mrs Lynda Franklin [6058] 15121 - Mr James MacKevoey [6059] | Object | Growth is needed in villages, including the north of the borough. Further evidence is needed, such as an urban capacity study, village character studies, Green Belt exceptional circumstances. Local needs of rural areas has not been considered. Inappropriate to have 1/3 of housing in the south of the borough. The Plan is contrary to the Dunton Garden Suburb consultation responses. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 13555 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 13740 - Mr Philip Hinde [1028] 13791 - Mr Philip Hinde [1028] 13879 - Mr A.M. Witney [5757] 13937 - M Streather [5783] 14315 - Mrs Valerie Wells [4877] 14412 - Valerie Godbee [4943] 14464 - Mr Eric John Webb [1830] 14867 - Mr Gerald Smith [4433] 15136 - Mr Phil Hobbs [6053] | Support | Minimal use of Green Belt in proportion to whole borough; pleased there will be job opportunities; more housing needed; good idea to concentrate new homes in one area; Agree with the sites allocated and they make sense to me. Basildon will benefit a great deal. There is so much going for this particular development in that area with shops, buses, trains etc. Scale of development will facilitate infrastructure; impact less than many smaller sites; proximity to rail and A127 seems appropriate; self contained village seems practical; needs proper development to create a real community; site does not adversely affecting many existing residents. | tbc | tbc |
| 022 Land at Honeypot Lane, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15462 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver. | tbc | tbc |
| 14926 - Mr Graham Miles [6028] | Comment | Many other residents have encouraged me to oppose development at Honeypot Lane, however I would like more information to be provided. Where for example will the access be? Unfortunately residents in the area are only objecting as they are worried about the value of their house being affected. I am neither for or against the proposal at Honeypot Lane I just want the Council to shake off self agendas and decide on merit without the divisive local party politics. The country is in desperate need of new homes, the decision for Honeypot needs to be on planning merits, choosing sites with the best attributes. | tbc | tbc |
| 14898 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | Comment | Having reviewed the 2013 consultation responses, I see that the proposer for the Honeypot Lane site is Barwell Land and Estates Ltd. AECOM, who I assume are the successors to PBA who produced the 2013 Sustainability Appraisal, have produced the Sustainability Appraisal for Brentwood Council which has several inaccuracies (see 4th March email). In the previous consultation response by Barwell Land they highlight aspects such as public transport being easily accessible by foot, which is not necessarily the case. In reviewing the website of Barwell Land and Estates Ltd it seems that in other projects they are acting together with AECOM. Has this conflict of interest by AECOM been advised? | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15539 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | Allocation 022 Land at Honeypot Lane is bisected by a large ordinary/non main river watercourse. Full consultation should occur with Essex County Council as LLFA. | tbc | tbc |
| 15837 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: YES Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. A significant portion of this site is at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 16793 - Mr Dominic Woodford [6337] | Comment | Because we will move out of Brentwood if it goes ahead. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16961 - Mr Neil Abbott [6301] 17542 - Mr Duncan Pringle [6297] 17543 - Mr Michael Robinson [6518] 17544 - Mr Wilson Lopez [6300] 17545 - Mr Paul Coombs [6296] 17546 - Ms Stacey Bastian [6298] 17547 - Ms Louise Black [6302] 17548 - Ms Catherine Robinson [6303] 17549 - Mr Henry Norton [6305] 17550 - Ms Helen O'Donoghue [6312] 17551 - Mr David Terrell [6309] 17552 - Bernadette Harrington [6310] 17553 - Ms Lorraine Hunwick [6320] 17554 - Ms Rose Barry [6325] 17555 - Ms Donna Murphy [6324] 17556 - Ms Pauline Davidson [6327] 17557 - Mrs Deboarah Caruana [6330] 17558 - David Chardin [593] 17559 - Sophie Maher [6333] 17560 - Mr Terry Evans [6334] 17561 - Mr Eward Dobie [6335] 17562 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] 17563 - Ms Julia Wilson [6339] 17564 - Ken Key [834] 17565 - Ms Lorraine Key [6343] 17566 - Mrs Daniella Evans [6347] 17567 - June Simmons [1659] 17568 - Mr G Bender [6349] 17569 - Ms Alison Fulcher [3895] 17570 - Mr Jason Laplain [6353] 17571 - Ms Denise Buckley [6356] 17572 - Mr Neil Duhig [6358] 17573 - Jackie Birnie [6361] 17574 - Sarah Street [6362] 17575 - Mr David Brook [794] 17576 - Mr Nigel Bixby [6368] 17577 - Mrs Heath [6138] 17578 - Sunil Gupta [6372] 17579 - Mr Christopher Hazell | Object | No to housing development at land off Honeypot Lane | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| [6375] | | | |
| 17580 - Grace Robertson [6376] | | | |
| 17581 - Ms Nicola Newman | | | |
| [6387] | | | |
| 17582 - MR Richard Savill [4383] | | | |
| 17583 - Ms Nancy Archer [6391] | | | |
| 17584 - Lesley Ottewell [6392] | | | |
| 17585 - Louise Wridgway [6395] | | | |
| 17586 - Paula Green [6398] | | | |
| 17587 - Mr Paul Koppen [6400] | | | |
| 17588 - Mr Sean O'Sullivan [6404] | | | |
| 17589 - Jenny O'Sullivan [6406] | | | |
| 17590 - Caroline Harper [6407] | | | |
| 17591 - Adele Walker [6408] | | | |
| 17592 - Mrs Joanne Robinson | | | |
| [5849] | | | |
| 17593 - Diane Phillips [6412] | | | |
| 17594 - Andrew Appleton [6420] | | | |
| 17595 - Jodie Felstead [6419] | | | |
| 17596 - Louise Pope [6421] | | | |
| 17597 - Victoria Hague [6422] | | | |
| 17598 - John Marder [6423] | | | |
| 17599 - Philippa Brown [6425] | | | |
| 17600 - Ms Natasha Head [6427] | | | |
| 17601 - Ms Emily Newton [6428] | | | |
| 17602 - Ruth Bradley [6433] | | | |
| 17603 - John Brown [6451] | | | |
| 17604 - Mr Mike Tarling [6454] | | | |
| 17605 - Ms Nichola Webber | | | |
| [6457] | | | |
| 17606 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472] | | | |
| 17607 - Keelie Davis [6460] | | | |
| 17608 - Rebecca Burden [6464] | | | |
| 17609 - Natasha Mitchell [6465] | | | |
| 17610 - L Boyes [6468] | | | |
| 17611 - Solange Roast [6469] | | | |
| 17612 - Jane Ricahrdson [6471] | | | |
| 17613 - Marie Keon [6472] | | | |
| 17614 - Geoffrey Powell [6474] | | | |
| 17615 - Mr Stellios Papi [755] | | | |
| 17616 - Mrs Jackie Palmer [4251] | | | |
| 17617 - Ms June Spencer [6480] | | | |
| 17618 - Mr Nicholas Papi [6481] | | | |
| 17619 - Mrs Gillian Hobbs [5598] | | | |
| 17620 - Maria Selwyn [1216] | | | |
| 17621 - Mr Bill Davis [6483] | | | |
| 17622 - Mr and Mrs Head [6153] | | | |
| 17623 - Ms Elizabeth Sargent | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
| [6490] 17624 - Lisa Cross [6494] 17625 - Mr and Mrs Kelly [6136] 17626 - Ms Kim Oxford [6496] 17627 - Mr James Mack [6497] 17628 - Stuart Harper [4506] 17629 - Ms Terri Van Praagh [6499] 17630 - Pat Smith [6500] 17631 - Ms Anita Caley [6503] 17632 - Ms Nicola Brook [6505] 17633 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 17634 - B Bracken [6508] 17635 - Mr Henry Catlin [6509] 17636 - Ms Suzannah Burrell [6511] 17637 - Guy Beck [6512] 17638 - Mr Steven Wilson [6515] 17639 - Ms Hannah Humphreys [6519] 17640 - Mr Chris Fitcher [6313] 17641 - Mr Ralph Scrutton [6521] 17642 - Ms Claire Wilson [6522] 17643 - Mr Christopher Luck [1554] 17644 - Mr John Hicks [6523] 17645 - Ms Sophia Bellia [6524] 17646 - Mr Jon Macgowan [6528] 17647 - Mr Nicholas Seymour [6530] 17648 - Mr Peter MacDougall [6533] 17649 - Mr Max Beckett [6534] 17650 - Ms Georgia Marder [6536] 17651 - Ms Penny Richardson [6538] 17652 - Ms Stephanie Allen [6539] 17653 - Ms Becky Norton [6540] 17654 - Ms Rachel Norton [6541] 17655 - Ms Natalie Kimpton [6542] 17656 - Ms Olivia Marder [6543] 17657 - Mr Alan Axccl [6311] 17658 - Ms Emmanuelle Caumette [6321] | | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 17659 - Mr Andreas Schroeder [6326] | | | |
| 17660 - Mr James Kinsella-Brown [6336] | | | |
| 17661 - Mr Françoise Milli [5998] | | | |
| 17662 - Ms Kirstey Hooper [6348] | | | |
| 17663 - Mr Richard Defries [809] | | | |
| 17664 - Mr Phil Gray [6367] | | | |
| 17665 - Mr John Everitt [6370] | | | |
| 17666 - Ms Joanne Squirrell [6373] | | | |
| 17667 - Ms Linda Payne [6378] | | | |
| 17668 - Ms Brenda Blaber [6386] | | | |
| 17669 - Mr Stephen Curtis [6389] | | | |
| 17670 - Ms Sarah Walsh [6390] | | | |
| 17671 - Sarah Sawyer [6394] | | | |
| 17672 - Mr Richard Beggs [6397] | | | |
| 17673 - David Holliday [6410] | | | |
| 17674 - Helen Hickford [6413] | | | |
| 17675 - Ms Jane Byrne [6429] | | | |
| 17676 - Ms Kate Harris [6430] | | | |
| 17677 - Vashti Green [1092] | | | |
| 17678 - Ms Susan Morris [6434] | | | |
| 17679 - Ms Leah Flack [6439] | | | |
| 17680 - Mr Gerry Jordan [4702] | | | |
| 17681 - Mr James Graham [6444] | | | |
| 17682 - Mr Kemp Alan [6447] | | | |
| 17683 - Ms Angela Berry [6448] | | | |
| 17684 - Nicola Melton [6456] | | | |
| 17685 - Penny Marshall [6462] | | | |
| 17686 - Lorraine Massarella [6466] | | | |
| 17687 - Lloyd Hayden [6477] | | | |
| 17688 - Ms Jacqueline Horne [6478] | | | |
| 17689 - Mr Nathan Hobbs [6486] | | | |
| 17690 - Edward Cross [4347] | | | |
| 17691 - Laura Moore [6502] | | | |
| 17692 - Mr Joe Mills [6510] | | | |
| 17693 - Ms Sara Charles [6516] | | | |
| 17694 - Ms Jennifer Mason [6529] | | | |
| 17695 - Mr David Bennett [6520] | | | |
| 17696 - Ms Noella Walkin [6531] | | | |
| 17697 - Mr David Sawkins [6535] | | | |
| 17698 - Ms Denise Evans [6299] | | | |
| 17699 - Ms L Cornell [6304] | | | |
| 17700 - Ms Julie Buckley [6307] | | | |
| 17701 - Ms Judy Turner [6308] | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 17702 - Ms Karen Evans [6314] | | | |
| 17703 - Mr Edward O'Donoghue [6315] | | | |
| 17704 - Ms Catherine Giles [6316] | | | |
| 17705 - Mr Tom Lane [6317] | | | |
| 17706 - Ms Helen Dobie [6318] | | | |
| 17707 - Ms Joanna Loader [6319] | | | |
| 17708 - Ms Hema Narayan [6322] | | | |
| 17709 - Mr Andrew Sawyer [6323] | | | |
| 17710 - Ms Hayley Kew [5785] | | | |
| 17711 - Mr Jamie Kew [5789] | | | |
| 17712 - Mr Darrell Etchells [6328] | | | |
| 17713 - Anne Richardson [6329] | | | |
| 17714 - Ms Katy Corp [6331] | | | |
| 17715 - Mr Stephen Caruana [6332] | | | |
| 17716 - Cllr Karen Chilvers [1963] | | | |
| 17717 - Mr Dominic Woodford [6337] | | | |
| 17718 - Susan Wright [6338] | | | |
| 17719 - Kam Pallen [6340] | | | |
| 17720 - Mr Jean Robinson [6341] | | | |
| 17721 - Mr Gary Sherriff [6342] | | | |
| 17722 - Mr Neil Herridge [6344] | | | |
| 17723 - Becky Assenheim [6345] | | | |
| 17724 - Julie Jones [6346] | | | |
| 17725 - Ms Charlotte Saxon [6350] | | | |
| 17726 - Ms Debra Green [6352] | | | |
| 17727 - Ms Susan Harvey [6351] | | | |
| 17728 - Mr James Lawrence [6354] | | | |
| 17729 - Emma Cuthbert [6357] | | | |
| 17730 - Kerry Ackroyd [6359] | | | |
| 17731 - Dawn Duhig [6360] | | | |
| 17732 - Laura Gara [6364] | | | |
| 17733 - Mr Mike Gara [6363] | | | |
| 17734 - Clare Flanagan [6365] | | | |
| 17735 - Joe Flanagan [6366] | | | |
| 17736 - Emma O'Brien [6369] | | | |
| 17737 - Mrs Alison White [6371] | | | |
| 17738 - Ms Emma Renwick [6374] | | | |
| 17739 - Samantha Crook [6377] | | | |
| 17740 - Ms Candy Todd [6379] | | | |
| 17741 - Ms Samantha Smith [6380] | | | |
| 17742 - Ms Sarah Carless [6381] | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 17743 - Ms Celia Hardy [6382] | | | |
| 17744 - John Booth [6383] | | | |
| 17745 - Ms Celia Hardy [6384] | | | |
| 17746 - Ms Claire Coakley [6385] | | | |
| 17747 - Nicki Rouse-Emeny [6393] | | | |
| 17748 - Sharon Waithe [6396] | | | |
| 17749 - Helen Bakal [6399] | | | |
| 17750 - Regine Dyer [6401] | | | |
| 17751 - Mr Anthony Coates [6403] | | | |
| 17752 - Vikki Holder [6405] | | | |
| 17753 - Sarah Clark [6409] | | | |
| 17754 - George Churchill [6411] | | | |
| 17755 - Brigid Barnett [6414] | | | |
| 17756 - Elliott Pope [6415] | | | |
| 17757 - Natalie Morgan [6416] | | | |
| 17758 - Roobrh Zandi [6417] | | | |
| 17759 - Mr Jeremy Maher [4736] | | | |
| 17760 - Ms Sue Heazel [6424] | | | |
| 17761 - Martin Ball [6426] | | | |
| 17762 - Graham Palmer [4725] | | | |
| 17763 - Mr George Almeroth [6431] | | | |
| 17764 - Ms Elaine Jobin [6432] | | | |
| 17765 - Ms Katie Grimes [6435] | | | |
| 17766 - Mr Jordan Winnett [6436] | | | |
| 17767 - Mr Stuart Furzer [6438] | | | |
| 17768 - Mr Paul Romer-Ormiston [6440] | | | |
| 17769 - Mr Paul Hawkins [2959] | | | |
| 17770 - Miss Elaine Sparks [4567] | | | |
| 17771 - Mr Peter Spicer [6441] | | | |
| 17772 - Ms Naomi Cummings [6443] | | | |
| 17773 - Ms Michelle Jones [6445] | | | |
| 17774 - Mr Scott Hawkins [6446] | | | |
| 17775 - Ms Lucy Johnson [6449] | | | |
| 17776 - Ms Emma James [6450] | | | |
| 17777 - Parisa Sheri [6452] | | | |
| 17778 - Mr Jonathan Pope [6455] | | | |
| 17779 - Louise Booth [6458] | | | |
| 17780 - Mr Mark Jackson [6459] | | | |
| 17781 - Mrs Jane Kelly [4732] | | | |
| 17782 - Ross Phillips [6461] | | | |
| 17783 - Mr David Vanniasingham [6463] | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 17784 - Hayley Messenger [6467] | | | |
| 17785 - Mrs Mary Hunt [3052] | | | |
| 17786 - Marion Tracey [6470] | | | |
| 17787 - Mrs. M. Lethbridge [1353] | | | |
| 17788 - Margaret Nolan [6473] | | | |
| 17789 - Mr Stephen Beckett [5548] | | | |
| 17790 - Joanne Harris [6475] | | | |
| 17791 - Paul Evans [6476] | | | |
| 17792 - Jan Boyes [6479] | | | |
| 17793 - Mr Denny Ford [6482] | | | |
| 17794 - Mrs Sharon Catlin [5345] | | | |
| 17795 - Mr Mark Phillips [5753] | | | |
| 17796 - Mr Jason Selwyn [6485] | | | |
| 17797 - Mrs Tina Davis [6029] | | | |
| 17798 - Ms Emily Hobbs [6488] | | | |
| 17799 - Ms Lucy Clements [6489] | | | |
| 17800 - Ms Joanne Connelly [6491] | | | |
| 17801 - Mr John Hazelton [6492] | | | |
| 17802 - Mr Raymond Sargent [6493] | | | |
| 17803 - Ms Julia Saxon [6495] | | | |
| 17804 - Dr Nazir Kuchhai [5688] | | | |
| 17805 - MS Vicky Davies [6498] | | | |
| 17806 - Ms Lisa Farquhar [6501] | | | |
| 17807 - Mr Malcolm Smallman [6504] | | | |
| 17808 - Mr Phil Hobbs [6053] | | | |
| 17809 - Mr Paul Beckett [6506] | | | |
| 17810 - Ms Sasha Hardy [6513] | | | |
| 17811 - Mr Ken Copleston [5322] | | | |
| 17812 - Mr Denis Head [6537] | | | |
| 17813 - Lewis Jones [6355] | | | |
| 17814 - Ros Brown [6388] | | | |
| 17815 - Ms Ciara Mitchell [6437] | | | |
| 17816 - Mr Nick Catlin [6484] | | | |
| 17817 - Ms Nicol Sedgeley [6507] | | | |
| 17818 - Ms Sheila Hornsby [6514] | | | |
| 17819 - Ms Ellie Humphreys [6517] | | | |
| 17820 - Mr Jonathan Levy [5913] | | | |
| 17821 - Mrs Jemma McDowell [6526] | | | |
| 17822 - Mr Steven Flashman [6525] | | | |
| 17823 - Mr Lee McDowell [6527] | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 17824 - Mr Stuart Mears [6143] 17825 - Ms Sylvia Morrissey [6532] 17826 - Mrs Lesley Beckett [5549] 17827 - Ms Laura Heazel [6544] 17828 - Ms Christine Seymour [2499] | | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13963 - Mr Andrew Brabham-Neil [5792] 16216 - Ms Bishop [6126] 16243 - Mr and Mrs Haggerstone [6165] 16880 - Ms Caroline Nutthall [5800] 16881 - Mrs J Redman [6129] 16882 - Mr and Mrs Boswell [6131] 16883 - Mr Paoll [6134] 16884 - Mr William Aubrey Kirk [5696] 16885 - Mrs Gill White [6064] 16886 - Mr and Mrs Simons [6139] 16887 - Mrs. S. Puchakayala [1365] 16888 - Mr Ryan Canham [6141] 16889 - Mr Alan Hewlett [5778] 16890 - Mr and Mrs Danino [6150] 16891 - Ms Fran Brabham-Neil [6155] 16892 - Mr Richard Husdon [6156] 16893 - Dr and Mrs Denny [6157] 16894 - Mr W Gosling [6159] 16895 - Mrs Mansell [6160] 16896 - Ms D Greenland [6161] 16897 - Mr and Mrs Appleton [6162] 16898 - Mr Taylor [6164] 16899 - Mr and Mrs Grover [6166] 16900 - Mrs W Owers [6167] 16901 - Mr and Mrs Kirton [6169] 16902 - Mr Butcher [6171] 16903 - Mrs Madden [6174] 16904 - Mr Fry [6175] 16905 - Ms Norma McIntyre [6178] 16906 - Mr DJ Bickley [6179] 16907 - Mr and Mrs Wridgeway [6180] 16908 - Mrs Janice Yellor [5766] 16909 - Mr Michael Yellor [5768] 16910 - J. S. and R. Mack [6055] 16911 - Mr Denis Gulley [5820] 16912 - Anthony Walker [890] | Object | South Hill Residents Association Ltd members face a continual financial burden to maintain the estate roads which are not constructed to adoptable standards. The estate currently suffers through traffic accessing London road via Hill Road, South Weald Road and Hillside Walk. The increased volume of traffic accessing Honeypot Lane from a 250+ housing estate in Honeypot Lane would see a significant increase in traffic wanting to use our private roads putting an increased financial burden on SHRAL members. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 16913 - Mr and Mrs Sturgess [6145] | | | |
| 16914 - Mr and Mrs Jensen [6147] | | | |
| 16915 - Mr and Mrs Howgate [6146] | | | |
| 16916 - Mrs Heath [6138] | | | |
| 16917 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472] | | | |
| 16918 - Mr and Mrs Head [6153] | | | |
| 16919 - Mr and Mrs Kelly [6136] | | | |
| 16920 - Stuart Harper [4506] | | | |
| 16921 - Mr and Mrs Williams [6158] | | | |
| 16922 - Mr Brian Evans [5434] | | | |
| 16923 - Mr Robinson [6135] | | | |
| 16924 - Mr and Mrs White [6130] | | | |
| 16925 - Mr and Mrs Sullivan [6132] | | | |
| 16926 - Mrs M Browne [6133] | | | |
| 16927 - M. Frewer [736] | | | |
| 16928 - Mr & Mrs Peter & Penny Wines [6036] | | | |
| 16929 - Mr Heath [6137] | | | |
| 16930 - South Hill Residents Association Ltd (Mr Joseph Carr) [5962] | | | |
| 16931 - Carol Burpitt [5908] | | | |
| 16932 - Mr and Mrs Kirilov [6140] | | | |
| 16933 - Ms Kathy Canham [5728] | | | |
| 16934 - Mrs Brookes [6148] | | | |
| 16935 - Mr Brookes [6149] | | | |
| 16936 - Mr and Mrs Wilkes [6151] | | | |
| 16937 - Mr/Ms White [6152] | | | |
| 16938 - Mr A Deakins [6154] | | | |
| 16939 - Mr & Mrs Lee and Rachel O'Meara [5839] | | | |
| 16940 - Mr and Mrs Bryan [6163] | | | |
| 16941 - Mr and Mrs Haggerstone [6165] | | | |
| 16942 - Ms Marion Scanlon [6168] | | | |
| 16943 - Mrs Butcher [6172] | | | |
| 16944 - Mr and Mrs Turner [6176] | | | |
| 16945 - Mr K McIntyre [6177] | | | |
| 16946 - Mrs E Magwood [6144] | | | |
| 16947 - Roger Bonnett [718] | | | |
| 16948 - Sally Paull [5763] | | | |
| 16949 - Mr Paul Carroll [6142] | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16950 - Mr Stuart Mears [6143] | | | | |
| 16818 - Mr and Mrs Head [6153] | Object | This deal is backhand central. They will be exposed. | tbc | tbc |
| 13945 - Mrs Jackie Palmer [4251] | Object | Brentwood had a target for new builds (175 houses per annum but has built In excess of 200 units built for past 10/12 years) clarification is sought as to whether Brentwood has already exceeded targets set? The proposed site is on the Community asset list. | tbc | tbc |
| 14343 - Ms Teresa English [5876] | Object | Possible access points onto Weald Road or Honeypot Lane are unsuitable and the proposals will lead to traffic congestion on both the High Street and London Road which are already busy at peak times. There is no public transport in this area. Air quality for all residents in the area is already affected by traffic congestion including from the A12. Site would be better suited for public amenity space, allotments, doctors surgery and other small scale development. Understand the need for housing but 250 dwellings on this site is unsuitable, would not object to a smaller development of 50 dwellings. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 13305 - Mr Terry Orford [4738] 13313 - Mr Stellos Papi [755] 13349 - Mrs Pauline Nightingale [5529] 13367 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 13372 - Mr Stephen Beckett [5548] 13373 - Mrs Lesley Beckett [5549] 13471 - Mr John Mitchell [5580] 13499 - Mrs Gillian Hobbs [5598] 13578 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 13721 - Mrs Farouqa Kuchhai [5687] 13722 - Dr Nazir Kuchhai [5688] 13743 - Mr William Aubrey Kirk [5696] 13767 - Mrs Brenda Woodford [5709] 13772 - C.E. Free [5712] 13773 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713] 13789 - Mrs Margaret Brown [5724] 13793 - Ms Kathy Canham [5728] 13817 - B. Impey [1308] 13866 - Mr John White [5750] 13867 - Mr Mark Phillips [5753] 13889 - Kenneth Baker [5760] 13893 - Sally Paull [5763] 13901 - Mrs Janice Yellor [5766] 13903 - Mr Michael Yellor [5768] 13927 - Mr Alan Hewlett [5778] 13930 - Mr Matthew Bennett [5782] 13931 - Mr Matthew Bennett [5782] 13944 - Mrs Jackie Palmer [4251] 13946 - Ms Hayley Kew [5785] 13948 - Mr & Mrs M & P Tyler [5787] 13953 - Mr Jamie Kew [5789] 13958 - Mr & Mrs Connolly [5791] 13966 - Ms Linda Jarvis [1850] 14035 - Ms Caroline Nutthall [5800] 14051 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 14125 - Neville A. Brown [1293] | Object | <p>Oppose for one or more of the following reasons: Green Belt and precedent for Green Belt release; Contradicts refusal to expand St Peters school onto Green Belt; Traffic; Narrow lane; Increase rat-running; Road capacity; Road safety, pedestrian safety (as no pavements); Issues with speeding; Impact on private roads of the Homesteads; Flood issues, particularly as there is a water course on the site; Impact on surrounding residents, including noise and light impact; Air pollution; Biodiversity; Historical factors; Infrastructure including schools, GPS, water and sewerage; Impact on allotment holders; Construction disruption; Site is already used for recreation; Density proposed is too high; Devalue properties; Increase in crime; Other areas offer better opportunities for development; There has not been a full open pre-debate before being proposed.</p> | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 14137 - Mr Denis Gulley [5820] | | | |
| 14230 - Ms Alison Fulcher [3895] | | | |
| 14231 - Kenneth Baker [5760] | | | |
| 14232 - Kenneth Baker [5760] | | | |
| 14233 - Kenneth Baker [5760] | | | |
| 14234 - Kenneth Baker [5760] | | | |
| 14385 - Mr and Ms J. Hicks and A. Maxwell [5911] | | | |
| 14387 - Mr and Ms J. Hicks and A. Maxwell [5911] | | | |
| 14390 - Mr and Ms J. Hicks and A. Maxwell [5911] | | | |
| 14492 - Carol Burpitt [5908] | | | |
| 14512 - Ms Susan M Hughes [5924] | | | |
| 14619 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472] | | | |
| 14627 - Mr Tony Walker [5959] | | | |
| 14836 - Mr Françoise Milli [5998] | | | |
| 14837 - Mr Françoise Milli [5998] | | | |
| 14838 - Mr Françoise Milli [5998] | | | |
| 14839 - Mr Françoise Milli [5998] | | | |
| 14840 - Mr Françoise Milli [5998] | | | |
| 14886 - Mr Michael Noake [6013] | | | |
| 14912 - Mr and Mrs N and J Kelly [6024] | | | |
| 14921 - Mrs Karen Jewers [6026] | | | |
| 14928 - Mrs Tina Davis [6029] | | | |
| 14960 - Gillian Marder [6035] | | | |
| 14964 - Mr & Mrs Peter & Penny Wines [6036] | | | |
| 14978 - Miss Susan Maclean [4252] | | | |
| 15006 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043] | | | |
| 15007 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043] | | | |
| 15008 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043] | | | |
| 15078 - Paul Downes [557] | | | |
| 15079 - Paul Downes [557] | | | |
| 15080 - Paul Downes [557] | | | |
| 15104 - Mr Phil Hobbs [6053] | | | |
| 15112 - J. S. and R. Mack [6055] | | | |
| 15130 - Mrs Sharon Catlin [5345] | | | |
| 15160 - Mrs Gill White [6064] | | | |
| 16474 - CPREssex [210] | | | |
| 16794 - Ms Julia Saxon [6495] | | | |
| 16795 - Mr Neil Herridge [6344] | | | |

| Representation | Nature Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------|
| 16796 - Ms Kim Oxford [6496] | | | |
| 16797 - Ms Alison Fulcher [3895] | | | |
| 16798 - Ms Debra Green [6352] | | | |
| 16799 - Adele Walker [6408] | | | |
| 16800 - Ms Terri Van Praagh [6499] | | | |
| 16801 - Mr Stellos Papi [755] | | | |
| 16802 - Helen Hickford [6413] | | | |
| 16803 - Ms Nicola Brook [6505] | | | |
| 16804 - Roozbrh Zandi [6417] | | | |
| 16805 - Mrs Sharon Catlin [5345] | | | |
| 16806 - Kerry Ackroyd [6359] | | | |
| 16807 - Mr Mark Phillips [5753] | | | |
| 16808 - Mr Phil Hobbs [6053] | | | |
| 16809 - Mr Bill Davis [6483] | | | |
| 16810 - Joe Flanagan [6366] | | | |
| 16811 - Mr Jason Selwyn [6485] | | | |
| 16812 - Emma O'Brien [6369] | | | |
| 16813 - Mr Henry Catlin [6509] | | | |
| 16814 - Mrs Tina Davis [6029] | | | |
| 16815 - David Holliday [6410] | | | |
| 16816 - John Brown [6451] | | | |
| 16817 - Ms Lucy Clements [6489] | | | |
| 16819 - Mr John Cleminson [6254] | | | |
| 16821 - Ms Suzannah Burrell [6511] | | | |
| 16822 - Ross Phillips [6461] | | | |
| 16823 - Mr John Everitt [6370] | | | |
| 16825 - Ms Emma Renwick [6374] | | | |
| 16826 - Ms Claire Coakley [6385] | | | |
| 16827 - Ms Sarah Walsh [6390] | | | |
| 16828 - Ms Catherine Giles [6316] | | | |
| 16829 - Hayley Messenger [6467] | | | |
| 16830 - Mr Andreas Schroeder [6326] | | | |
| 16831 - L Boyes [6468] | | | |
| 16832 - Ms Sasha Hardy [6513] | | | |
| 16833 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | | | |
| 16834 - Marie Keon [6472] | | | |
| 16835 - Mr Françoise Milli [5998] | | | |
| 16836 - Mr David Brook [794] | | | |
| 16837 - Ms Sheila Hornsby [6514] | | | |
| 16838 - Mr James Mack [6497] | | | |
| 16839 - Lesley Ottewell [6392] | | | |
| 16840 - Rochelle Mazarelo | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
| Seshan [6402] | | | | |
| 16841 - Ms Ellie Humphreys | | | | |
| [6517] | | | | |
| 16842 - Mr Anthony Coates | | | | |
| [6403] | | | | |
| 16843 - Anne Richardson [6329] | | | | |
| 16844 - Pat Smith [6500] | | | | |
| 16845 - Mr Sean O'Sullivan [6404] | | | | |
| 16846 - Jenny O'Sullivan [6406] | | | | |
| 16847 - Geoffrey Powell [6474] | | | | |
| 16848 - Joanne Harris [6475] | | | | |
| 16849 - Mr Alan Axccl [6311] | | | | |
| 16850 - Mr Malcolm Smallman | | | | |
| [6504] | | | | |
| 16851 - Jane Ricahrdson [6471] | | | | |
| 16852 - Ms Helen O'Donoghue | | | | |
| [6312] | | | | |
| 16853 - Mr Nigel Bixby [6368] | | | | |
| 16854 - Mr Chris Futchet [6313] | | | | |
| 16855 - Mr Michael Robinson | | | | |
| [6518] | | | | |
| 16856 - Mr Jonathan Levy [5913] | | | | |
| 16857 - Ms Patricia Whiteley | | | | |
| [1816] | | | | |
| 16858 - Ms Joanna Loader [6319] | | | | |
| 16859 - Mr Christopher Luck | | | | |
| [1554] | | | | |
| 16860 - Ms Hayley Kew [5785] | | | | |
| 16861 - Mr Jamie Kew [5789] | | | | |
| 16862 - Mr Stuart Mears [6143] | | | | |
| 16864 - Mr Terry Evans [6334] | | | | |
| 16865 - Mrs Gillian Hobbs [5598] | | | | |
| 16866 - Mr Phil Gray [6367] | | | | |
| 16867 - Graham Palmer [4725] | | | | |
| 16868 - Ms Jane Byrne [6429] | | | | |
| 16869 - Ms Susan Morris [6434] | | | | |
| 16870 - Mr Stuart Furzer [6438] | | | | |
| 16871 - Ms Leah Flack [6439] | | | | |
| 16872 - Mr Paul Romer-Ormiston | | | | |
| [6440] | | | | |
| 16873 - Mr Paul Hawkins [2959] | | | | |
| 16874 - Ms Michelle Jones [6445] | | | | |
| 16875 - Mr Scott Hawkins [6446] | | | | |
| 16876 - Mr Kemp Alan [6447] | | | | |
| 16877 - Mr Mike Tarling [6454] | | | | |
| 16878 - Mr Mark Jackson [6459] | | | | |
| 16951 - Ms Olivia Marder [6543] | | | | |
| 16952 - Mr David Bennett [6520] | | | | |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16953 - Mr Ralph Scrutton [6521] 16955 - Mr Lee McDowell [6527] 16956 - Mr Nicholas Seymour [6530] 16957 - Ms Noella Walkin [6531] 16958 - Ms Georgia Marder [6536] 16960 - Mrs Lesley Beckett [5549] | | | | |
| 16879 - Ms Judy Turner [6308] 16954 - Mrs Jemma McDowell [6526] 16959 - Ms Penny Richardson [6538] | Object | I want the beauty to stay as is. | tbc | tbc |
| 14896 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] | Object | Disappointing to see the Honeypot Lane site 022 included in the plans. I assume it is due to the comments from Barwood Land and Estates Ltd, together with their agents Chilmark Consulting, who in their responses to the 2013 consultation implied that Brentwood Council was failing to plan to deliver Brentwood's full objectively assessed housing needs. All local roads are too narrow for construction vehicles and then residential vehicles. Flooding from surface water has been identified by the ES as high risk and adjoining properties will be affected. Schools are oversubscribed; medical facilities are not nearby and are at capacity; Brentwood Station is more than a 15 minute walk away and so the presumption that the station would be walked to is incorrect and will exacerbate congestion, wildlife would be lost including badgers. | tbc | tbc |
| 16863 - David Chardin [593] | Object | How is this now being proposed when it was not in the original Local Development Plan? | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16592 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713] 16593 - Mrs Teri Emery [4082] 16594 - Ms Mary Emery [6230] 16595 - Ms Abbie Emery [6231] 16596 - Ms Abbie Emery [6231] 16597 - Mr Ben Emery [6232] 16598 - Mr & Mrs David & Jane Brewster [6233] 16599 - Ms Raquel Michaels [6234] 16600 - Ms Sarah Truesdale [6235] 16601 - Nicola Ashton [6236] 16603 - Maria Mauremodoo [6238] 16604 - Ms Vangie Stockwell [6239] 16605 - Ms Sue Maybee [6240] 16606 - Ms Marlene Bradshaw [6241] 16607 - Ms Christine Powell [6242] 16608 - Ms Carole Windham [6243] 16609 - Mr and Mrs Christophe and Kathleen Pope [6244] 16610 - Ms Charlotte Castle [6245] 16611 - Mr Samuel Pope [6246] 16612 - Mrs Victoria Maher [6247] 16613 - Mr Nathan Maher [6248] 16614 - Mr Michael Andrews [6249] 16615 - Mrs Helen Andrews [6250] 16617 - Mr Mark Francis [6251] 16618 - Mrs Matilda Francis [6252] 16619 - Ms Tracie Cleminson [6253] 16620 - Mr John Cleminson [6254] 16621 - Ms Jane Wiggins [6255] 16622 - Ms Janet Oliver [6256] 16623 - Ms Rosemary Beal [6257] 16624 - Ms Sharon Murphy [6258] 16625 - Ms Sophie-Christine Cleminson [6259] | Object | Object to the potential development at land off Honeypot Lane. Traffic in this area is already at its maximum and there is no easy access to this land that will not carve up Honeypot Lane and Weald Road. Parking is a real problem and we can take no more. Our local facilities and schools are already oversubscribed and at breaking point. A development here will have a detrimental effect on those homes in Honeypot Lane, Weald Road, the Homesteads and historic South Weald. Please remove this site from the potential developments identified for Brentwood. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 16626 - Mr Frasier Cleminson [6260] 16627 - Jo Martin [6261] 16628 - Ms Angela Davies [6262] 16781 - Mr Wesley Collins [6294] | | | | |
| 15905 - Kitewood [6116] | Support | Support the removal of site 022 from the Green Belt and its proposed allocation for around 250 dwellings. | tbc | tbc |
| 15898 - Barwood Land and Estates Ltd [2704] | Support | Support the inclusion of Land at Honeypot Lane because the site is: - readily deliverable now and can therefore contribute to the five-year housing land supply - close proximity between jobs, homes and open spaces - accessible by public transport, on foot and by bicycle - offers a development opportunity that will support and reflect the distinctive character of Brentwood and the contribution of the wider Green Belt to Brentwood's quality of life, biodiversity and environment - opportunity to refine and re-align the Green Belt boundary. | tbc | tbc |
| 023 Land off Doddington Road, either side of A12, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15841 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: YES Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. The southern tip of this site is at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 13870 - Mrs Caroline Knight [5747] 13873 - Mrs Caroline Knight [5747] | Comment | I appreciate the need for additional housing in the Brentwood area. I hope that the priority will be given to small units or low rise flats/masonettes suitable for social housing and downsizing to encourage local people to stay in the area. Site 023: Doddington Road becomes very congested when large events take place at the Brentwood Centre. With the proposed widening of A12 will access/egress to the Brentwood Centre be included in the plan from the A12? Will steps be taken to mitigate the considerable noise from the A12? | tbc | tbc |
| 15000 - Stephen Hill [612] | Comment | The plan to build on this land is at odds with what I believe is best for our town. The noise levels here exceed those that are considered to be acceptable and it was proposed that a low noise surface be reinstated. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 13149 - Alexandra Hammond [5372] | Comment | I think the land by Doddinghurst Road would be better used to provide a slip road giving access to the A12 at that point. It would reduce the traffic heading through Brentwood town centre and possibly open up opportunities to build dwellings in Pilgrims Hatch and further north in the borough without impacting so much on traffic through the town. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13306 - Mr Terry Orford [4738] 13377 - Mr David Filer [5407] 13543 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] 13575 - Mr Robert McLean [5635] 13604 - Mr and Mrs Medcraft [5638] 13679 - Mrs Felicity Knights [5667] 13753 - Mr Paul Gardiner [5703] 13759 - Mrs Wendy Gardiner [5705] 13765 - Mrs S Manning [5707] 13904 - David and Hilary Dobinson [5769] 13921 - Mr Aaron Hardy [5776] 13938 - M Streather [5783] 13941 - Mr D.E. King [5784] 13968 - Mr and Mrs Pickard [5794] 14008 - Mr Adam Rajubally [5795] 14010 - Beth Sanders [5798] 14305 - Cllr Vicky Davies [1994] 14367 - Mr and Mrs Clive and Lesley Tanner [1071] 14384 - Mr Paul Praveen [5884] 14508 - Ms Angela Kay [5920] 14511 - Mr Mark Lee Inman [5923] 14523 - Mrs Jane Reeves [5925] 14525 - Peter, Jennifer and Susan Caley [5928] 14547 - Mrs Ann. Burge [5935] 14552 - Aron Graves [5936] 14573 - Mrs Julia Georgiou [2435] 14580 - Mr Keith Woodcock [894] 14585 - Mr Ian Sutton [5944] 14588 - Mrs Kelly Butcher [5945] 14605 - K.J and E.A Bench [5947] 14611 - Linda Field [5949] 14684 - Gaynor Watson [5970] 14685 - Mr Andrew Watson [5971] 14702 - Mr Roger Hayman [5978] 14729 - Mr R Walmsley [5621] 14730 - Mr R Walmsley [5621] 14731 - Mr R Walmsley [5621] 14774 - Mr & Mrs Dennis & Diane Rensch [5989] | Object | Object: To building on Green Belt and heritage; the impact on schools; impact on GPs increase in traffic; impact on amenity; impact on Viking Way especially if used for access; impact on Sandpit Lane and Ongar Road; drainage issues; loss of wildlife; Wilsons corner is already gridlocked; construction impacts; impacts if access is through Viking Way; drains and sewerage; impact on horses on the site; loss of grazing land; A12 noise would make this a poor site for new homes; there is a large sewer pipe across the site; proposal too dense; loss of privacy'; devaluing existing homes; loss of Green Belt "wedge"; increase in air pollution; increase in anti-social behaviour. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14803 - Mr & Mrs Hakes [5996] 14804 - Mr & Mrs Hakes [5996] 14805 - Mr & Mrs Hakes [5996] 14834 - Mrs Karen Porter [2835] 14851 - Mr and Mrs M and L Bond [6002] 14856 - Ms Sharon Cropley [6003] 14857 - Ms Sharon Cropley [6003] 14865 - Mr Paul Nooney [6004] 14888 - Mr and Mrs Josie and Richard Lloyd [6014] 14902 - Ms Sarah Moss [6019] 14905 - Ms Karen Wilson [6022] 14924 - Mrs Liza Picton [5464] 14945 - mr peter welch [5522] 14998 - Mr Michael Jones [6040] 15082 - Mr Michael Fitzgerald [6050] 15113 - Mrs A Marshall [6056] 15114 - Mrs Marie Benson [6057] 15708 - Hatch Road Neighbourhood Association (Ms Susan Simpson) [6104] 15709 - Hatch Road Neighbourhood Association (Ms Susan Simpson) [6104] 15710 - Hatch Road Neighbourhood Association (Ms Susan Simpson) [6104] 15712 - Hatch Road Neighbourhood Association (Ms Susan Simpson) [6104] 15713 - Hatch Road Neighbourhood Association (Ms Susan Simpson) [6104] | | | | |
| 14383 - Mr Paul Praveen [5884] | Object | Proposed development will have serious impact on our standard of living and object strongly to the development at this location & the plan to make Viking way a through road. We moved here recently as it is ideal for me and my family. However, the plan for the new development violates the rights of my family and myself and under the Human Rights Act, in particular Protocol 1, Article 1. This states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. The protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 13475 - Miss Lucy Walsh [5583] | Object | As to more housing in Pilgrim Hatch; the local schools cannot sustain more children, local public transport is not great in this area. As to wildlife that will be impacted as it will be pushed away (particularly birds, such as Wrens, Green Woodpeckers etc.) The boundary within the report provided a noise abatement from the A12, with out that the traffic noise will increase (even after midnight there is still traffic noise.) | tbc | tbc |
| 15711 - Hatch Road Neighbourhood Association (Ms Susan Simpson) [6104] | Object | Infrastructure provision:It is noted for this site that the urban density principle of 30+ houses per hector is being applied and yet its surrounding area to the North side of the A12 divide, does not have a density at this level. It is noted that the area of land to the South of the A12 divide has been included in this site where, not surprisingly, the urban density levels are higher than to the North but still not at the proposed development level. It would appear that you are applying this higher density level to the whole site and then adding some more. This would be out of keeping with the density of existing residential homes and areas of open spaces to the North having a detrimental impact to this area. | tbc | tbc |
| 13764 - D Field [5706] 14096 - Ms Toni Bryson [5808] 14100 - Ms Patricia Bryson [5809] 14101 - Mr Premchand Sohun [5810] 14530 - Mrs M A Judd [5932] 14742 - Mrs Jennifer Lewsey [5986] 14806 - Mr & Mrs Hakes [5996] 14807 - Mr & Mrs Hakes [5996] | Object | This has caused great devastation and concern amongst our lovely and committed community. Our private and much cared for Viking Way provides security, community and comfortable living despite the increase in traffic over the past 2 years which we are already struggling with. Issues with parking, manoeuvring and safely cornering is already an issue. Accidents and vehicle obstructions are an issue. Residents are proud of the community, the area and our homes. Issues such as GPs, parking, greenery and loss of the feeling of community are important. This development would ruin our community and is unreasonable and uncompassionate. | tbc | tbc |
| 14925 - Mrs Liza Picton [5464] | Object | * The fields offers many children the experience of visiting green space and removing this green space would mean that many children would no longer have this opportunity due to cost and transport issues vising country parks. * Maintenance of the area would fall below the expected minimum standard. Services are somewhat unreliable at present and increased dwellings would add pressure. | tbc | tbc |
| 15318 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Object | The Doddington Road site is programmed to start delivery in 2020. We have objected strongly to this allocation in past consultations, as the land lies astride a major trunk road, the A12. | tbc | tbc |
| 13579 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] | Object | The land to north & south of A12 has no access to it, therefore developments at these site would only add to the traffic congestion experienced on the Ongar Road, which is awful at peak times. How else would the home-owners access Brentwood or the the A12 to the east or west? The increased parking and traffic problems in Brentwood would make for poor quality of life for everyone who lives in the town and beyond. There may be scope for a limited number of house but not 250 as indicated on site allocation maps. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 14362 - Miss Tilly O'Leary [5880] | Support | Para 7.36 proposal for Pilgrims Hatch supported. | tbc | tbc |
| 15350 - Countryside Properties [250] | Support | Allocation of site welcomed. Site provides a logical extension to the existing urban area without encroaching into the countryside beyond well-defined and defensible boundaries. The site is identified for approximately 250 dwellings, which is considered appropriate. The level of flexibility provided in respect of the number of units to be delivered is also welcomed. The site is within a single ownership, with no known constraints to its deliverability and is developable within the first 5 years of the plan period. It is therefore considered that the phasing estimate for the delivery of the site (5-10 years, as set out at Appendix 2 of the Plan), sets a longer timescale than required. | tbc | tbc |
| 032 Land east of Nags Head Lane, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15464 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Comment | On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. | tbc | tbc |
| 15843 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: No Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: N/A The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. | tbc | tbc |
| 14049 - National Grid UK (Mr Robert Deanwood) [4616] | Comment | 032 Nags Head Lane has been identified as being crossed by or within close proximity to high pressure gas transmission apparatus. Local authorities have a statutory duty to consider applications for development in the vicinity of high pressure (above 7 bar) pipelines and to advise the developer on whether the development should be allowed on safety grounds on rules provided by HSE. This advice is provided by the HSE Planning Advice for Development near to Hazardous Installations (PADHI) process. The relevant HSE guidance can be accessed via the following link: http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.pdf | tbc | tbc |
| 13307 - Mr Terry Orford [4738] | Object | Object to any proposal to build on Green Belt land including site 032. | tbc | tbc |
| 13928 - Mr Matthew Bennett [5782] | Object | Concern regarding destruction of green belt and on the future impact of local services and infrastructure of new development. Local school over subscribed and doctors appointment requires three week delay the Beechwood surgery. Train station 30+ mins walk from. Difficult to see how proposals meet with the councils 'vision'. Increased urban sprawl closer to Havering, with limited infrastructure outside the proposed housing. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 13929 - Mr Matthew Bennett [5782] | Object | Plan seems to contradict itself in 5.34 stated development opportunities are limited within smaller villages and no amendment is proposed to the Green Belt boundaries of the small villages. South Weald is listed as a smaller village in Settlement Category 4 and it is difficult to see that an extra 370 homes within the parish would not constitute significant development. | tbc | tbc |
| 16155 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Support | We support the proposed allocation of site 032 - land east of Nag's Head Lane for 150 dwellings. The site is wholly in accordance with the spatial strategy, the site selection criteria and the Sustainability Appraisal, in particular because: - It is highly accessible - Defendable Green Belt boundaries - It is highly sustainable - It would balance the strategic growth of Brentwood town providing much needed residential development at this western gateway location - No significant ecological constraints -Low Flood Risk - No significant noise constraints - It would provide significant planning benefits - Early delivery would be ensured. | tbc | tbc |
| 034, 087 & 235 Officer's Meadow, Shenfield | | | | |
| 15538 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | Sites 042, 034, 087 and 235 are adjacent to a tributary of the River Wid, which is designated a Main River. We do not currently hold modelled data for this watercourse and these sites therefore appear to be in Flood Zone 1 on our Flood Map. However, there is likely to be some fluvial flood risk associated with this watercourse. Any development proposed here will need to be supported by a flood risk assessment that is informed by fluvial modelling of this watercourse. Any works in, over under or within 8m of the River Wid will need an Environmental Permit from us under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (2010). | tbc | tbc |
| 15565 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Site 034 is identified to deliver housing in the first 5 years: 40 dwellings to be delivered in 2018, and 80 dpa thereafter, up to 2025 (Appendix 3). There is a possibility that the residential development of the Site could immediately follow the permitted Crossrail works. This would assist in reducing the level of construction necessary on the Site, and therefore reduce the associated impacts to the surroundings. It will assist BBC in realising its Strategic Objective no. 7 to optimise the social and economic benefits arising from Crossrail. To meet OSN, we would seek the submission of an early planning application in respect of the Site. Although it is recognised that, in the context of National Green Belt policy, permission may not be granted until after the adoption of the Local Plan. | tbc | tbc |
| 15845 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: Brent-A Within EA UFMfSW: YES Number of Properties at Risk: 13 The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. The western and northern portions of these sites are at risk of flooding in both 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 events from surface water according to the EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water. In addition, sites 087 and 235 fall entirely within the Brent-A flooding hotspot and there are currently 13 residential properties at risk of flooding in a 1 in 20 year event. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|--------|
| 14996 - Mr and Mrs Simon and Jeanie Hughes [4739] | Comment | We are very strong in our opinion that building housing should come with a plan for services. In that context the plan to build football pitches for Hutton FC near to Officers Meadow is an excellent one but should be extended to build an all year round facility perhaps including cricket and tennis and even bowls for the summer to the assets are used fully. | tbc | tbc |
| 14937 - Mr Robert Boad [6032] | Comment | This proposal will not only destroy a valuable piece of Green belt land but will inevitably lead to more traffic joining the jams that already clog up the roads in to Brentwood at peak times and will reinforce the existing overload on the A12 Brentwood by-pass. This is a very large development and is out of all proportion to the surrounding area. | tbc | tbc |
| 14202 - J Kemble [5743] | Object | Policy 6.3 and 6.4: Significant danger to pedestrians would be created by the proposal because of the twists, "blind corners", narrow railway bridges and lack of pavement along Alexander Lane (Policy 6.4). Altering the configuration of Alexander Lane would contravene its rural nature, Policy 6.3. A more suitable site for a car park or a less dangerous pedestrian access route should be found, e.g. a pedestrian tunnel under the railway on to Long Ridings Avenue. Before the number and density of new houses on Officers Meadow are agreed, assessment should be made of the impact how many new classrooms and additional sports field will be required to accommodate the additional children attending Shenfield School. These new classrooms and additional sports field should be completed before or at the same time as the houses become occupied. | tbc | tbc |
| 13209 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | Objection is made to the proposed allocation of site 087 - Officer's Meadow, Shenfield as it would involve the permanent loss of the playing fields which meet (or offer potential to meet) community or school playing pitch needs. Unless the Council's emerging playing pitch strategy demonstrates that there is a clear surplus of provision, the loss of this site would be contrary to Sport England's playing fields policy and Government planning policy. Consequently, at this stage, Sport England would object to the potential allocation of this site for residential unless off-site replacement playing field provision was made. [No objection is made to the allocation of site references 034 and 235 which comprise other parts of this site allocation.] | tbc | tbc |
| 13308 - Mr Terry Orford [4738] 13439 - D Westfall [5310] 13523 - Mrs Eirllys Davies [5610] 13803 - Mr Kenneth Davies [5611] 13807 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612] 13824 - J Kemble [5743] | Object | These proposals will have a detrimental affect on the nearby roads causing considerable congestion on the already heavily congested Priests Lane and Alexander Lane (a country lane). A further concern is access for emergency vehicles. The roads are also dangerous for pedestrians. These areas should not be developed as the increase pressure on facilities such as doctors and schools, hospitals. Both Priests Lane and Alexander Lane are in close proximity to schools. In fact Alexander Lane has to be crossed to enable pupils to gain access to the playing fields. Should be Country Park instead. These developments will obviously be detrimental to existing residents and strongly object to the proposal. | tbc | tbc |
| 15636 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Support | The site is identified in SHLAA to be 'developable' and 'deliverable' if assessed as being 'available', 'suitable' and 'achievable'. Although located within the Green Belt, the Site forms an enclave of open land framed for the most part by existing development and transport infrastructure. As a development opportunity that would have little environmental impact on the locality, the Site benefits from effective physical and visual enclosure. It is well placed to accommodate future development by virtue of its sustainable position in close proximity to Shenfield. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 15550 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Support | The allocation of Site 034 will: * Make a substantial contribution to meeting local housing need, in an area that is likely to be in high demand following the introduction of Crossrail; * Contribute towards securing an effective and balanced supply of dwelling types and tenures; * Contribute toward the continued economic vitality of the settlement. | tbc | tbc |
| 13385 - Mr Stephen Beckett [5548] | Support | I fully support this idea. - It's very close to the excellent road links. - It's very close to Shenfield High school which may have potential to expand, and locate an infant/primary school on site. - There would be potential for a pedestrianised route to Shenfield station (Crossrail) which could deliver a 'green' element to the plan - The site is bordered by a railway line which reduces impact on the local community. | tbc | tbc |
| 15646 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Support | Many potential economic, social and environmental benefits could arise from development at Site 034, contributing to sustainable development. These include: - Provision of a wide range of much needed housing in a highly sustainable location; - Provision of generous areas of public open space; - Strengthening of Shenfield's vitality and viability; - Delivery of a significant number of affordable homes; - Contributions towards improved community facilities; - Making a substantial contribution to meeting the Borough's overall housing need on a well contained site, thereby protecting more sensitive and visual sites from development; - The creation of direct construction jobs plus additional indirect jobs; and - New Homes Bonus payment (over 6 year period) of £2.6M generated by the scheme. | tbc | tbc |
| 15642 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Support | Site 034 makes a very limited contribution to the NPPF Green Belt purposes as it is well contained by existing built form and infrastructure, exhibits defined and defensible boundaries and is strongly influenced by the adjoining urban/built elements. Development, set within a robust landscape framework, would provide the opportunity to enhance the existing landscape and biodiversity of the Site whilst maintain defensible and robust boundaries to the Green Belt. | tbc | tbc |
| 13776 - Mr Brian Grout [5715] | Support | The proposal for development of Officers Meadow off the Chelmsford Road of 600 houses, recreational facilities, Surgery and traffic calming measures including safe road crossing features would be much preferable and safer compared to proposals at Priests Lane. It would have easier access to a larger roadwork and be closer to the A12. There is room there. | tbc | tbc |

079A Land adjacent to Ingatestone by-pass

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|--|-----|-----|
| 13891 - Cllr Noelle Hones [1987] | Comment | The site is situated next to the A12, a noisy environment by any standards. There is the issue of sustainability, the local primary schools and doctors surgeries in Ingatestone and Shenfield are over subscribed. The sewage according to Anglian Water is at capacity in the area. | tbc | tbc |
| 15948 - CALA Homes [5237] | Comment | Agree with the Council's decision to identify the site to come forward in years 1 to 5, which is supported by SHLAA (2011) which identifies that there are no achievability concerns with the site, and no active uses that will affect its availability. In view of this, and the emerging development proposals for the site, we do however consider that the site is capable of delivering homes sooner and at a higher rate than currently anticipated by the Council. Consider that it is entirely appropriate for the site to be developed at a higher density than 30 dph demonstrating a more efficient use of land. A development of 57 dwellings is considered more appropriate and one supported by the SHMA. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--------|
| 14788 - Mr Jon Bright [5993] | Comment | As IGC has closed down that seems to be an ideal site for genuinely affordable rented housing and/or low-cost owner-occupied dwellings - ideally affordable in perpetuity and perhaps with a reasonable priority for local people. | tbc | tbc |
| 14610 - Miss Claire Griffin [2396] | Comment | The Garden Centre has been trading for 75 years. It was a much needed public resource, particularly for those, often elderly, residents who do not have access to a car. Ingatestone has a fairly large population in relation to available local amenities. I find it highly suspicious that this has happened at almost exactly the same time as a planning proposal is being made for a housing development on that very spot. Does the planning department share my concerns, given it does seem to suggest possible foreknowledge as to the outcome of the proposal? Does the council have protocols in place to investigate possible wrongdoing should planning be granted to the housing developers? Does the council recognise that the community desperately needs accessible amenities as opposed to yet more houses and more people? | tbc | tbc |
| 16324 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Policy 6.3d states that development should have no unacceptable effect on the environment or amenity. These conditions will be experienced by residents if properties are built on site 079A next to the A12 in Ingatestone as proposed. | tbc | tbc |
| 13144 - Mrs Jean Sleep [5373] 13291 - Mrs Jan Wootton [5479] 13318 - Mrs Evelyn Prince [5500] 13755 - Ms M Giles [567] 13819 - Mrs O Witney [5742] 13822 - J Kemble [5743] 14148 - Mrs Jaqueline Craythorne [5824] 14168 - Mr and Mrs T and J Gladwin [5840] 14217 - Mrs Denise J. Sowerbutts [5860] 14219 - Mr A.M. Witney [5757] 14239 - Mrs James Sowerbutts [5869] 14581 - Mrs Rosemary Spouge [5941] 14678 - Peter Dedman [3596] 14861 - Jan & Graham Wootton [2891] | Object | Object for one or more of these reasons: Impact on Green Belt and scenery; Impact on infrastructure including GPs, dentists, rail and schools, sewerage. Safety and pollution issues. Traffic and safety problems; Parking. Not sufficient buses, Exacerbate potholes, new slip road would be needed, safety of access. Flood issues. Will change for a village into a town. Share development throughout borough and use brownfield land. Next to the A12 not a good place for new homes. | tbc | tbc |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13309 - Mr Terry Orford [4738] 14003 - Steve Undrill [2496] 15847 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Object | ECC has undertaken a high level assessment of the proposed sites identified in Figure 7.2 - Housing Land Allocations. Results for site: Within Flooding Hotspot: Ingate-B Within EA UFMfSW: No Number of Properties at Risk: 17 The adopted SuDs Design Guide should be used with regards to appropriate standards for mitigation measures. This site falls within the Ingate-B flooding hotspot. 17 residential properties are currently at risk of internal flooding in a 1:20 year event. It is strongly recommended that any development actions on this site do not exacerbate the existing risk of surface water flooding on this site and flood management infrastructure should be installed to accommodate any additional development. | tbc | tbc |
| 15932 - CALA Homes [5237] | Support | Site 079A does not contribute to any of the five purposes of Green Belts and is fully consistent with both the NPPF and the Council Spatial Strategy which seeks to identify urban extensions in the Green Belt with clear defensible physical boundaries. Its location is within walking distance of sustainable transport connections and the allocated employment land on site 079C. Technical work demonstrate that the site can deliver 57 dwellings, higher than identified in the Plan (42 dwellings). For a more efficient use of land, it is entirely appropriate for the site to be developed at a higher density than 30 dph. | tbc | tbc |
| Estimated Capacity | | | | |
| 13588 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | Para 7.35 - When decimating Green Belt land, don't use physical boundaries such as roads and railway lines - where are the animals whose homes you are destroying supposed to go?? They need somewhere safe to escape to, and running across busy roads/railway lines in fear of their lives is a dreadful situation!! Leave them somewhere safe that they can easily escape to! Somewhere large enough to accommodate them all! | Noted. The Local Plan seeks to balance economic, environmental and social objectives to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. | Consider accordingly |
| 15165 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Support the flexibility noted in paragraph 7.32 which confirms that the "numbers set out in the draft policy provide a guide and are not necessarily a cap depending on the appropriateness of increased density or more efficient land use in line with policies in this Plan". | Noted | No action |
| 14159 - Mrs Elizabeth Jones [5693] | Support | Para 7.36 proposal for Pilgrim Hatch supported. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Affordable Housing | | | | |
| 13150 - Alexandra Hammond [5372] | Comment | 1. The Plan doesn't make the definition of the term "intermediate" clear. Would this be "affordable" properties such as shared ownership and Help to Buy? Will there be family homes which would be affordable to families with average income. 2. Given that Brentwood has very high house prices compared to other towns in Essex I am concerned that "affordable" homes will still be out of the reach of many of the town's residents. 3. What impact will the Government's new Starter Homes scheme have? | 1. Intermediate housing is defined by the NPPF as a type of affordable housing. Intermediate housing is aimed at those households who can't afford the open market but can afford more than very low social rents. Examples of intermediate housing schemes include shared ownership, discounted home ownership and help to buy equity loans. 2. Noted. The need to provide a proportion of affordable family housing has been identified in the Council's SHMA 2016. Affordable Housing Policy 7.5 aims to ensure affordable housing has regard to meeting the identified range of type, size and tenure. 3. The introduction of Starter Homes will be closely monitored and reported in the Council's Authority Monitoring Report. | No action |
| 14890 - Kingsley Dent [6015] | Comment | Is it possible that housing associations could become actively involved where the property can be retained and controlled for those who work in the Borough? We must be able to find a way around the private developers and their 'need' for market value. This may sound a little like 'Council Housing' but until supply outstrips demand, our young residents will continue to lose out. | Noted. Policy 7.6 Affordable Housing in the Green Belt seeks to ensure priority for affordable housing in rural areas are given to people in local housing need, it states "the Council will require the affordable housing provider to enter into a nomination agreement with cascade provisions, under which applicants with a connection to the parish or ward are given first priority for newly created housing." This approach will be kept under review as the plan-making process progresses. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|---------|--|--|-----------|
| 13153 - Alexandra Hammond [5372] | Comment | I recently enquired about the homes to be built on the old Warley Adult College site and the developer informed me that the flats would not be eligible for the scheme and there was no guarantee that the houses would be part of the scheme either. This is because according to them the terms of Right to Buy state that there must be no longer than 6 months between reservation and completion. Do you think this could be an issue with providing other Help to Buy homes in the proposed developments? How could this be prevented? | Through the Help to Buy Scheme you are able to reserve a new build home off plan at any time with the Equity Loan scheme. However, you are correct in that you need to complete the sale within six months from the exchange of contracts. The Help to Buy Scheme is one of a range of government backed initiatives to help people buy a home. Further information about the scheme, together with alternatives to help to buy, can be found on the official Government Help to Buy website: www.helptobuy.gov.uk The Local Plan recognises a growing number of households in the Borough cannot afford to buy or rent on the open market and is therefore committed to ensuring the greatest choice possible of housing is delivered over the plan period. Affordable Housing Policies 7.5 & 7.6 seek to address this identified imbalance. | No action |
| 13432 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Please do not develop any Green Belt until every scrap of brownfield has been utilised. | The capacity of brownfield sites in the Borough do not meet the requirements indicated by National Guidance and thus at this stage the Council are considering development options. This will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 13589 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | There is not a need nor a shortage of "affordable" housing. | In line with National Guidance and in order to establish the future type and tenure of housing needed in the Borough, the need for affordable housing has been considered during the preparation of the Council's SHMA 2016 and will continue to be considered when developing the Local Plan. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14787 - Mr Jon Bright [5993] | Support | The definition of "affordable" is somewhat contentious - i.e. affordability = unaffordability. The Government seems to regard affordable as being something like 80% of market rents for the rented sector, although their whole housing policy now seems to lean over heavily towards owner-occupation with little regard for those that are unable or do not wish to buy. My view is that there is a definite need for more sub-market rented homes, provided by Housing Associations or the local authority itself. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 7.5: Affordable Housing | | | | |
| 16145 - Threadneedle Property Investments Ltd [2613] | Comment | The minimum requirement should be removed in lieu of a viability led approach to ensure the requirement for affordable housing is balanced and the delivery of development sites is not stalled, in line with paragraph 173 of the NPPF. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15314 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Comment | There are uncertainties surrounding the provision of affordable housing as a result of proposed changes to national policy. The owner is willing to include a good proportion of affordable housing in developing Crow Green Lane site (159), even a higher level than the minimum requirement, provided that development of the whole site remains financially viable. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15108 - Ursuline Sisters [28] 15352 - Countryside Properties [250] 15805 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Comment | The policy requires the exact mix to have regards to policy 7.2 however concern in relation to the use of the two documents (SHMA and Council's Housing Strategy) in determining the most appropriate mix and the consistency in which this policy will be applied to residential development. Question whether it would be possible to implement criteria g. (availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices) in practice given the provisions set out in the Housing and Planning Bill. Anticipated that, once the Bill has been passed, local authorities will be under a duty to promote the supply of starter homes regardless of local needs. We would therefore request justification on how this element of the policy would work in practice, and suggest the wording of this element of the policy will evolve once the Bill has been passed. | Noted. As part of the Plan review we will consider the raised issue. | Consider accordingly |
| 13152 - Alexandra Hammond [5372] | Comment | The ratio of 1,2,3 and 4 properties should be reconsidered. Given that families on the waiting list for social housing are waiting longer for 3 bedroom properties than for smaller ones it makes me think the need for larger properties is high. | Noted. The Local Plan seeks to rebalance the housing stock, in line with identified need as evidenced in the Council's SHMA, to ensure it better reflects the needs and demands for housing of the existing and future communities. | Consider accordingly |
| 14790 - Mr Jon Bright [5993] | Comment | I am aware that developers will at times seek to avoid any affordable quotas, instead making a payment for the Council / HA to develop elsewhere. I think this leads to less mixed communities and should be resisted as far as possible. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14196 - Mr Michael Jarvis [5739] | Comment | I see no mention of how the following will be effectively embraced: Affordable housing for those on low income | Policy 7.5 and 7.6 seek to ensure delivery of sufficient high quality affordable homes to meet local needs. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13151 - Alexandra Hammond [5372] | Comment | I don't think the 35% minimum of affordable housing goes far enough given that that will include social housing. At the end of 2012 there were around 1000 people on the social housing waiting list. The plan is for a little over 5000 new homes, so around 20% should be for social housing. This leaves only 15% for "affordable" homes. I expect the 35% also includes the sheltered housing that will need to be replaced. More affordable properties (if not all properties) should be offered to people with a strong local connection first. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14420 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | Policy 7.5 g (i). The Parish Council understands the drive for affordable housing but is nevertheless concerned about the possibility of unintended consequences of this policy clause which has the laudable intent of making new homes truly affordable in Brentwood, but, the Parish Council suspects that this approach could backfire badly in one of two ways, by either (i) Deterring development entirely, or (ii) By resulting in homes built to every minimum standard in the book in a race to the bottom in design with microscopic footprints and amenity space. In short, homes that are affordable but quite undesirable. | Noted. In line with National Guidance and in order to establish the future type and tenure of housing needed in the Borough, the need for affordable housing has been considered during the preparation of the Council's SHMA 2016 and will continue to be considered when developing the Local Plan. In order to ensure that homes meet the needs of local residents, whatever their income level, it is important that national minimum housing space standards apply to all new housing development, Draft Policy 7.8 seeks to achieve this. | Consider accordingly |
| 15247 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Comment | Evidently not all schemes will be able to deliver policy-compliant affordable housing provision (taking account of site viability) and some developments will fall below the threshold. Assuming 30% affordable housing delivery with a target of 362 dwellings per annum, 109 affordable homes would be delivered per annum. The plan thus can be expected to meet less than half of the affordable need - providing a clear basis considering higher provision. The high need for affordable housing clearly points to a need to consider increasing overall housing delivery. | Updated evidence in the SHMA 2016 identifies a total annual affordable housing need in Brentwood of 107 households per year, this represents 30.6% of the annual projected household growth in in the Borough between 2016 and 2033. The evidence in the SHMA 2016 suggests that the Council should pursue an overall affordable housing target of 35% and that the Council can be confident that the affordable housing requirement can be met by the Objectively Assessed Need identified and no adjustment is required to this figure. However, this evidence will continue to be kept under review. | No action |
| 15612 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | Part (g) bullet (i) of Policy 7.5 advises that affordable housing should be at a cost low enough for eligible households to afford. This is a matter for an Affordable Housing Provider, to be agreed, and such wording is therefore not considered appropriate in a Local Plan policy. Part (g) bullet (ii) directs that affordable housing should remain at an affordable price for future eligible households. Similarly, this requires agreement with an Affordable Housing Provider or as part of a Section 106 Agreement, and such wording is not considered appropriate in this context. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------------|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15605 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | In supporting text to Policy 7.5, paragraph 7.57 notes that the SHMA suggests a 35% affordable housing target on "all suitable sites" to be justified, subject to viability and the balance of tenure mix. There is no evidence to demonstrate that BBC has undertaken a viability assessment to establish whether a 35% target is viable. This Policy requirement therefore does not accord with NPPF in that sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking, and therefore the scale of obligations and policy burdens (such as affordable housing) should not be such that development viability is threatened. | In line with National Guidance and in order to establish the future type and tenure of housing needed in the Borough, the need for affordable housing has been considered during the preparation of the Council's SHMA assessment 2016 and will continue to be considered when developing the Local Plan. | No action |
| 16149 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | The evidence base as it relates to affordable housing is out of date. This is being addressed in ongoing work towards an update to the SHMA, published on 15 March 2016. This update needs to address recent government announcements and measures that propose to considerably increase provision. The DLP should consider full objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing, which now needs to reflect the government's latest initiative towards building 400,000 affordable homes, of which 50% should be starter homes. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15606 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | Part (e) seeks to require affordable housing standards to be equal to that of market housing in terms of appearance, built quality and materials. With regards to building standards and as stated above, Local Plans should not set local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of dwellings. In addition, whilst the external appearance of affordable units can be sought to be indistinguishable from market dwellings, the internal layout is limited to the requirements of the Affordable Housing Provider. | Noted. The Council consider policy in light of national policy. | Consider accordingly |
| 14021 - Mr. Simon Fleming [3779] | Object | Object. A rigid approach is not appropriate for all sites as it depends on the local character of the area and neighbouring properties could be adversely affected, leading to planning objections and delays. It is also inappropriate for rental housing to be exactly the same specification as open-market owner-occupied housing. Pepperpotting of social housing throughout a development is not always the solution favoured by RSLs. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|-----------|
| 13557 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] | Object | Greenbelt should be kept for further generations; Roads overloaded to standstill already No evidence of needing this housing where is proof? Unsustainable with our failing roads as they are. This is not Affordable housing for my generation; I disagree with carving up greenbelt to make one huge urban sprawl of concrete. | The Local Plan seeks to rebalance the housing stock, in line with identified need as evidenced in the Council's SHMA, to ensure it better reflects the needs and demands for housing of the existing and future communities. The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 15353 - Countryside Properties [250] | Support | Welcome Section h iii) of the policy, which allows flexibility where proposals cannot viably support the provision of the full affordable housing requirement. We support the opportunity for developers to submit evidence which demonstrates the level of affordable housing that can be provided without jeopardising the viability of the development. | Noted. | No action |
| 16113 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] 16328 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Support | Strongly support the provision of sufficient high quality affordable housing to meet local needs and unlike those at the True Love site these should be integrated and spread evenly through the site rather than grouped in one area. This policy provides a level of certainty to the developer as to what the Council expects to be achieved on the site, whilst providing flexibility to take into account when site constraints do not allow for a target compliant development. | Noted | No action |
| Justification | | | | |
| 13590 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | "Shortage of affordable housing" and all the clap-trap you say comes with it is all a load of rubbish. If you can't afford to buy a house, you save your money each month until you can! You will create an over crowded and unhealthy town by building more houses!! Prices in Brentwood are not as high as you think! I'd like a £million house now please. I aspire to have a swimming pool and snooker room too. | The NPPF and National Guidance require that Local Planning Authorities identify whether there is a need for affordable housing in their area and to ensure their local plan meets such need. The need to provide a proportion of affordable family housing has been identified in the Council's SHMA 2016. Affordable Housing Policy 7.5 aims to ensure affordable housing has regard to meeting the identified range of type, size and tenure. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Policy 7.6: Affordable Housing in the Green Belt | | | | |
| 13544 - Mrs Andrea Wilkes [2489] 13591 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | It is never acceptable to build housing on green belt land. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 15067 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Object | It is not reasonable to have a policy para. 7.62 that requires: "the ability to travel by non-car modes" in a Borough with an extensive rural community. This again demonstrates extreme bias and a lack of consideration for assuring the future viability of the Borough's rural villages in the north. Furthermore if development is to be limited to areas where non-car modes exist, then the local plan will be spatially inequitable... as this draft is. | Noted. Paragraph 7.62 indicates 'preference will be given to sites with good access to local facilities and the ability to travel by non-car modes', and makes no requirements in this respect. | Consider accordingly |
| 13434 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Very uncomfortable with this as I imagine that there'll be lots of granny annexe requirements. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13511 - Helen Jackman [745] | Support | This must be considered only if recommended by the Parish Council | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Specialist Housing | | | | |
| 14214 - Mr John Darragh [4862] 14939 - Mr Robert Boad [6032] | Comment | The plan mentions the need to address the requirements of an ageing population. One need is for bungalows. Brentwood Council allows the existing stock of suitable bungalows to be depleted, this should be strongly discouraged. The plan leaves it to developers to submit proposals without stipulating any need for bungalows. Concerned if this continues it will be impossible for older residents to stay in this area or to downsize. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 7.7: Specialist Housing | | | | |
| 13435 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Don't think this Policy covers the wishes of the elderly. I wouldn't want an apartment in a block, I would want a warden-available village type of site. | Policy 7.7 is intended to support the provision of specialist accommodation in the Borough, this includes sheltered housing which is defined as self contained properties designated for older people that are linked to and supported by sheltered housing support staff. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------------|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 13512 - Helen Jackman [745] | Support | The neighbourhood plan must take precedence over private applications. | Noted | No action |
| 13125 - Drs M. & Z. Sahirad [2118] | Support | Documents submitted in support of the proposal for Site Ref: 162 of Brentwood Local Development Plan. This is re development of 150 Bed Nursing Home and services at Little Warley Hall Farm. This proposal has support of Brentwood Councillors. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

Policy 7.8: Housing Space Standards

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14957 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | 1. Para 7.70 - 7.72 set out the Borough's rationale but this does not address the evidence requirements from the PPG that requires evidence on properties currently being built, the potential impact on demand for starter homes and the potential impact on land supply and viability. Without this evidence base the policy should not be applied across all housing types. 2. It is likely to impact the viability of our client's site [within the allocation for Dunton Hills Garden Village] but affordability is also an issue, as is the need to ensure that there is proper mix of provision that delivers across a whole variety of different needs. Whilst the policy states this policy will be subject to viability, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to assess for viability at the plan making stage. | 1. Noted. The Council will publish technical evidence when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. 2. The issue of development viability is one of importance. As part of the Local Plan process, the 'Brentwood Borough Council Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment' (May 2016) has been undertaken to inform the setting of a charging schedule. The report provides an appraisal of the viability of Brentwood's Draft Local Plan in terms of the impact of its policies on the economic viability of development proposed to be delivered by the Plan and the potential for development to yield Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Plan will be informed by further viability evidence as appropriate. | Consider accordingly |
| 13436 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Can't envisage what these numbers mean. | Policy 7.8 sets out requirements for the Gross Internal (floor) Area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home, notably bedrooms, storage and floor to ceiling height. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14522 - Home Builder's Federation [144] 15620 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15809 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Object | Note the Council's wish to adopt the nationally described space standard through the new local plan. No evidence has been presented to demonstrate this, and no justification is provided on the appropriateness of adopting such standards. Council need to justify this by meeting the tests set out in the relevant section of the NPPG. The tests are ones of necessity, viability, and the impact on affordability including the supply of starter homes. Without this evidence base the policy should not be applied across all housing types. | Noted. The Council will publish technical evidence when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |

Policy 7.9: Mixed Use Development

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13437 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | The proposed development should have to indicate solutions to transport and parking. | Comment noted. Draft Policy 10.1 and 10.2 aim to provide a sustainable transport strategy to support new development. The Council are working with Essex County Council on infrastructure provision. | Consider accordingly |
|------------------------------|--------|--|--|----------------------|

Gypsy and Travellers

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15767 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Acknowledge BBC is seeking to meet Gypsy & Traveller pitch need, reference should be made to the need to work with ECC and partner local authorities to identify and deliver at least two publicly provided transit sites in the Greater Essex Area by 2033 with between 10 and 15 pitches per site. | Agreed | Amend accordingly |
| 14119 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] | Comment | Para 7.83 Policy fails to allocate enough to meet the immediate need and fails to indicate broad locations for further provision. Policy as drafted fails to do what is required. It is not NPPF/PPTS compliant. It will not address the immediate need for sites with no certainty future need will be met either. More sites need to be put forward to meet the immediate need especially if there is to be reliance on Green belt sites. | Noted. In drafting policy 7.10 the Council has endeavoured to set out a policy whereby it accords with the duty to identify land to meet the local needs of Gypsies and Travellers and maintain a five year supply of deliverable land and traveller accommodation. In doing so, it is acknowledged pitch requirements in the 2014 GTAA are in the process of review in light of the 2015 amendments to the National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Until such a time as this updated technical evidence is available, there remains uncertainty over the projected pitch requirements and so to the level of need for Brentwood. The Council recognises the need to keep draft policy 7.10 under review and update in accordance with the forthcoming GTAA review. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| 14751 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Object to Paragraph 7.80, which indicates that applications will be determined according to the criteria set out in Policy 7.10. Policy 7.10 is, in our view, unsound as it does not reflect the criteria of the PPTS, nor does it allocate sufficient sites for plots or pitches. We request the Council review the PPTS and reflect the criteria as set out in Paragraphs 24 and 26. | Noted. In line with recent national policy changes, the Council is working to update the Gypsy Traveller and Travelling Showpeople evidence base in order to assess current need for pitches within the borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 14118 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] 14748 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Para 7.8 - Object to references regarding supply, as the proposed policy and supporting text does not adequately allocate provision for pitches and plots, and therefore it does not comply with the requirements of Paragraphs 9 & 10 of the PPTS. We therefore request that the paragraph be re-written to indicate that the Council will meet its requirements according to the PPTS guidance, among other things. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14728 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Object to the whole section regarding 'Gypsy and Travellers' as it excludes the needs of showpeople within the Borough. Indeed, there is no reference to travelling showpeople anywhere within the Local Plan, which is, in our view, contrary to the PPTS, and clearly identified need set out above. It also fails to allocate sites for plots. It is 'unsound' in this respect. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14753 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | 1. Para - 7.81 appears to only cherry-pick the Green Belt reference from the PPTS, whereas there is specific guidance which should also be referenced. 2. Additionally, we object to the reference that a review of the GTAA in 2016 will 'potentially reduce [the pitch requirement]' as a result of PPTS being published. The requirement should be determined by objectively assessing the needs, including market signals, and not because there are planning constraints. Following the needs being correctly established, only then should the Council consider how this provision can be sufficiently met. Any other method for establishing needs would be 'unsound' against the evidence base. We request the Council delete any references to a lower need due to Green Belts or reviews of the GTAA. We request that the Council replace this with references to the Council stating they will meet all requirements regardless of constraints as it always seeks to support all people of the Borough, including the travelling community. | 1. Noted. 2. The primary reason for reviewing the GTAA 2014 is the publication of the revised version of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites in August 2015, which included a change to the definition of Travellers for planning purposes. The primary objective of the updated GTAA is to provide a robust revised assessment of current and future need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation. This assessment is being undertaken independently to any consideration of Green Belt constraints. | Consider amendments accordingly |
| 14727 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Support | Para 7.77 - we support the requirement that the Council has a duty to identify sites, and that PPTS and other national planning policy requires equal treatment for Travellers, regardless of type, ethnicity, etc. We also agree that the Council must maintain a five year supply of deliverable land for travellers, including those specific to showpeople, whose needs are quite different to other travellers. | Noted | No action |
| Policy 7.10: Gypsy and Traveller Provision | | | | |
| 13797 - Mrs Christine Rogers [2565] | Comment | Totally disagree with any planning permission which would allow building on which would now appear to be known as "Brown Field Sites". The better option would be to develop sites which have or are being used as Factories or Garden Centres. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15638 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Comment | Basildon Borough Council will await the forthcoming review of the GTAA for Brentwood Borough Council which is being undertaken during 2016 in light of the national policy changes, and where the level of need for Brentwood Borough Council may be subject to change and potentially be reduced, Basildon Borough Council would ask for assistance in meeting the un-met need arising from Basildon Borough. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Basildon Borough Council on provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches under the Duty to Cooperate and in light of the forthcoming update to the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment. | Consider accordingly |
| 15657 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Comment | Basildon Borough Council is unable, as demonstrated by evidence to make sufficient provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the Basildon Borough area, and Brentwood Borough Council is requested to consider making provision for at least a proportion of this un-met need within the Brentwood Draft Local Plan as it is progressed to submission. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Basildon Borough Council on provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches under the Duty to Cooperate and in light of the forthcoming update to the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment. | Consider accordingly |
| 14770 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Comment | request that the Council allocate Land at Chequers Public House, Chequers Road, South Weald for a showmen's yard in accordance with guidance set out in the NPPF and the PPTS. We are not asking for the site to be de-allocated from the Green Belt, but remain inside the Green Belt but also be designated for use as showmen's yard. The Site is deliverable in the contents of the NPPF, it is PDL and it is already developed with a similar use operating at present. We consider that the site is acceptable for use as a showmen's yard given the criteria found in the PPTS [see full text for detailed breakdown of how the site addresses each of the criteria] the draft emerging Local Plan as well as the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain's guidance. It is also found to be sustainable development within the context of the NPPF. | Noted. New site will be assessed along with existing sites for potential for new development. | Consider accordingly |
| 14124 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] | Comment | It is not clear how provision will be made for non travelling Gypsy Travellers ie those who fail the legal definition in Annex 1 PPTS either because they do not have a driving licence or are too young to legally tow a caravan, are too old to travel, are too infirm to travel, or are unable to travel for work due to caring responsibilities or for other reasons, yet may still retain a cultural preference to live in caravans with their own families and community and whose needs have to be addressed by Equalities Act 2010. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14050 - Brentwood Gypsy Support Group (Dr Thomas Acton) [5546] | Comment | We are concerned, however, over the current Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment currently being carried out by Opinion Research Services Ltd. We regard this survey as flawed, and any attempt to remove Gypsy planning status from our members on its or any other basis will be vigorously resisted. We are also concerned that if the same flawed methodology being used by the ORS is used in neighbouring authorities, particularly London boroughs and Basildon, that will result in serious undercounting of people of nomadic habit of life. Urge Brentwood not to rely on county-wide accommodation needs assessments. | Concerns noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14112 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] | Comment | Criteria (a) is wholly unacceptable and unrealistic and will continue to be relied on to thwart provision. Inappropriate development will by definition give rise to unacceptable harm when judged against PPTS/NPPF as made clear in para 7.81. This policy seems set to fail from the outset. Criteria (b) is also unreasonable as few sites are well related to services until/ unless land is found in and close to settlements. Criteria (e) will be used to object to most new sites as in the past. Criteria for windfall sites need to be positive and fair. If sites can not be found in settlements then it is wholly unfair to include criteria (a) as this is a contradiction in terms. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14114 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] | Comment | It is unclear why policy refers to a 5 year supply for 2013-2018. By the time policy is adopted the 5 year supply is more likely to be 2017-2022 is 59 plus 8 ie 67 pitches. Policy should however stress need to front load provision as there is a large immediate need. Dunton Hills can not be relied on to meet immediate need for 59 pitches to 2018 of which only 17 have been granted. It is not clear how quickly Dunton Hills can be delivered and how. Policy must identify suitable sites for the immediate need and a 5 year supply ie 2016-2021 minimum. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14047 - Brentwood Gypsy Support Group (Dr Thomas Acton) [5546] | Comment | There is some concern that the criteria for choices of site may be interpreted in too sweeping a way, especially criterion (a). We urge that the re-drawing of boundaries take account of places where derelict land is classed as Green Belt, so inhibiting development which would actually be a planning gain on any reasonable assessment, such as the site at Roman Triangle. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15588 - Castle Point Borough Council (Steve Rogers) [4643] | Comment | The Plan's provision for Gypsy and Traveller pitches is supported; however the Plan states that, due to possible changes to the definition of Gypsy and Travellers, this could change. It would be more prudent to deal with this uncertainty through a process of monitoring and review of the effectiveness of the Plan. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14113 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] | Comment | Policy should safeguard all existing sites esp whilst there is a need for more sites. Support the fact need is expressed as a minimum fig as there are issues/ concerns with the ORS 2014 assessment, in particular the use of a low 2% for household formation. Until and unless the Gov provides an explanation as to what the new definition in PPTS means then no revisions should be made to any need assessment. The 2016 update survey by ORS should not be relied on unless and until it is explained to those interviewed what is meant by travelling and a nomadic way of life and what policy now seeks. Policy should be committed to careful monitoring of ORS assumptions in particular ability of London authorities to deliver enough sites and how soon. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14045 - Brentwood Gypsy Support Group (Dr Thomas Acton) [5546] 14123 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] | Comment | Would suggest that the figure for the 5-year supply should be given for the likely date of adoption of the policy, so, perhaps a figure of 67 pitches as a target for 2022. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14533 - Mr and Mrs Lighterness [2956] | Comment | It appears that the current 'view' (probably to meet government guide lines) is to squeeze such sites into existing spaces and gaps across the borough. Young people, struggling to buy or rent property, older people who have worked hard to establish their homes are expected to accept the sudden arrival of a caravan next door - a family who pitch for free. Whilst I understand the need to help all to a basic level of 'life', the Travellers site is rarely used as a Springboard into housing. The current Travellers zone at Blackmore should continue to be utilized and balanced with a similar site at Dunton Garden Village. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers through the plan-making process, in line with policy set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13138 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] | Comment | Support inclusion of policy/ acceptance of high, immediate need, BUT: Policy is not sound/ will fail to deliver sites to meet large immediate, No idea how sites in Fig 7.5 have been chosen over others. Allocated sites in Green Belt locations must be inset or removed from the Green Belt as per par 85 NPPF. Criteria (a) is not fair or realistic-will merely thwart provision as before. Pressing need for more transit sites is not addressed. It is unclear how Council will address any need for non travelling Gypsy-Travellers. | Noted. In drafting policy 7.10 the Council has endeavoured to set out a policy whereby it accords with the duty to identify land to meet the local needs of Gypsies and Travellers and maintain a five year supply of deliverable land and traveller accommodation. In doing so, it is acknowledged pitch requirements in the 2014 GTAA are in the process of review in light of the 2015 amendments to the National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Until such a time as this updated technical evidence is available, there remains uncertainty over the projected pitch requirements and so to the level of need for Brentwood. The Council recognises the need to keep draft policy 7.10 under review and update in accordance with the forthcoming GTAA review. | Consider accordingly |
| 15283 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Comment | Welcome plans to meet its own need for Gypsy and Traveller sites within the borough. However it is unclear where these will be provided. Noted that a revised Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment is being prepared in light of new National Planning Policy for travellers Sites. Havering welcome continued dialogue and engagement as this assessment progresses. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with the London Borough of Havering regarding the location and provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation under the Duty to Cooperate. | No action |
| 14958 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | The policy states that Dunton Hills Garden Village is identified as a broad location for future provision to be planned in an integrated way as part of a mixed use development. Provision will be made for 20 pitches as part of this strategic allocation. We would request that this land [Crest Nicholson's land interests within the allocation for Dunton Hills Garden Village] is not considered in locations adjacent to market housing identified for the site. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|--|
| 14380 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | With recognition of changes made to legislation on Travellers and the plan refers to further work being carried out to assess need. Concerned there may be un-met needs arising from neighbouring authorities for the provision to accommodate Gypsies and Travellers, and there is no acknowledgement of this within the Local Plan documents or implications for Duty to Cooperate. Need recognition of need to travelling show people and it is recognised that Travelling Showpeople have become concentrated in a number of local authorities including Thurrock. Thurrock Council would wish to engage under the Duty to Cooperate with other authorities in Essex including Brentwood to ensure that there is appropriate provision for future needs and requirements of Travelling showpeople. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. The Council will engage under the Duty to Cooperate with other authorities in the context that Brentwood is entirely located within Green Belt and are therefore very constrained in opportunities for new homes or new sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. | Consider in line with duty to cooperate accordingly. |
| 13438 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | We have seen recently that a young person was tragically killed trying to cross the A127. It may be critical to ensure the traveller sites are not close to a main road. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14734 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Paragraph 2 - Object to the Council's approach to identify the provision via both allocations and through the grant of planning permissions. In particular, PPTS Paragraphs 9 and 10 are clear that the Council must identify deliverable sites for the next 5-years (which in Paragraph 7.79 of the same section indicates to be some 59 pitches). This is reinforced in Paragraph 25 where it indicates LPAs should strictly limit the development of new traveller sites are not allocated in the Development Plan. We therefore request that allocations for the next five-years, and also for 6-to-10 years are identified in accordance with this guidance. The land at Chequers Road should be allocated in this respect. | Noted. In drafting policy 7.10 the Council has endeavoured to set out a policy whereby it accords with the duty to identify land to meet the local needs of Gypsies and Travellers and maintain a five year supply of deliverable land and traveller accommodation. In doing so, it is acknowledged pitch requirements in the 2014 GTAA are in the process of review in light of the 2015 amendments to the National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Until such a time as this updated technical evidence is available, there remains uncertainty over the projected pitch requirements and so to the level of need for Brentwood. The Council recognises the need to keep draft policy 7.10 under review and update in accordance with the forthcoming GTAA review. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14738 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Object to criteria b, on the basis that this reflects a requirement only for other travellers, but it is clear from guidance and elsewhere that showmen's yards should not necessarily be located immediately adjacent to residential neighbourhoods given their mixed-use nature. The GTAA specifically indicates in Paragraphs 4.35-4.37 that there is no benefit for having shops or a bus stop near to the site, and a preference of showpeople to live in Green Belts in Paragraph 4.58 given the reduction in conflict with neighbouring uses. When taking this together with the separation requirements as emphasised in the Showmen's Guild's model standards [see full text, Section 6], it is clear that 'well-related' is not appropriate when considering the needs of showpeople. We request this criteria is deleted. We request other criteria are also included, particularly those set out in the PPTS. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |
| 14030 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 15640 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | It is also noted that within the proposal for Dunton Hills Garden Village a requirement for a 20 pitch site is included. It is good practice that sites should comprise no more than 15 pitches in order to ensure a comfortable environment which would be easier to manage. Brentwood Borough Council should therefore re-consider whether this larger site allocation is the most appropriate. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 14031 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 14032 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 14033 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] | Object | PPTS section 13 states that policies must ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis and traveler, that the effect of noise and air quality on health must be considered, and gypsy sites must not be located in areas at risk of flooding. The nearest secondary school to any site at Dunton Hills will be in excess of two miles away making it difficult for traveller children to attend, Dunton is close to the A127 and the EA flood maps risk of surface water flooding. The location should therefore be considered unsuitable | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. The potential development at Dunton Hills Garden Suburb would include educational provision either on the site or nearby, minimising daily journey to/from school. | Consider accordingly |
| 14034 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] | Object | PPTS Annex 1 section 1 defines "gypsies and travellers" to mean those of a nomadic habit who may only have ceased to travel temporarily. With such a large concentration of travellers it will be impossible to prevent them from settling permanently. Furthermore, no provision has been made in the form of transit sites for nomadic travellers so they may continue to use unauthorised sites for this purpose. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|---|
| 14733 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Paragraph 1 - Whilst we would normally support the Council's intention to meet the identified needs for sites, we must object as the Policy contains no references to 'plots' or 'travelling showpeople' with regard to this provision. This does not take into account of any requirement for 'plots' in the plan period, contrary to Government guidance. Again, we note that Paragraph 25 of the PPTS is clear that LPAs should be avoiding development of travellers sites that are not allocated. In this respect, this policy is 'unsound' in it does not allocate enough sites to meet its needs, both from pitches and plots. To correct this, we request that travelling showpeople's provisions are included in the Policy, alongside allocated sites (including land at Chequers Road). | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |
| 13648 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 13837 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13849 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13861 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] 13877 - mrs zoe chambers [5634] | Object | Placing at least 20 sites in the 'strategic' location of Dunton is unfair on local residents in the surrounding area. This is as far away as it is possible to be from the rest of the Brentwood Borough, bordering as it does the Basildon Borough. To dump Brentwood's allocation so close to the high numbers of travellers in this area sound too much like a ghetto situation is being created, which is not good for the travelling community or the neighbouring non-travelling community. Development at Dunton will not provide the travelling community with adequate medical and educational needs. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. Proposed policy refers to pitches rather than sites. | Consider accordingly |
| 14724 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | We object to the Local Plan in its entirety as 'unsound' with respect to the consideration of and provision for travelling showpeople community. We note that there is only one single reference to travelling showpeople in the draft Local Plan in its entirety, which relates to a title of a document (the GTAA). We would consider that the draft Local Plan, as it stands, is 'unsound' in this context as a result of this glaring omission. | Comment noted | Consider accordingly, in line with evidence update. |
| 13971 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] | Object | Object to policy 7.10 for Gypsy and Traveller provision on the following grounds: (1) Paragraph 7.79 states that the policy is based on allocations specified in the Essex Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment prepared in July 2014 prior to the new Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) published in August 2015. Section 2 of PPTS states that it must be taken into account in the preparation of development plans and this has not been done. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14750 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Paragraph 7.79 refers to the GTAA, and the need for 84 pitches, but it does not indicate the need for plots in Brentwood. We therefore object to this paragraph. We request that references to unidentified needs, including those determined via market signals, and through a 'Duty to Cooperate', will be pro-actively addressed by the Council. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14735 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | The policy as a whole does not identify any 'plots' and does not identify sufficient 'pitches' for the demand, and in particular, provides no allowance for any issues arising from sites that are allocated but do not come forward for a variety of reasons. As with housing allocations, NPPF Paragraph 47 sets out additional buffers should be incorporated into the plan for housing, and we consider the same should also apply to 'pitches' and 'plots'. We therefore consider that that this paragraph of the draft Local Plan is 'unsound' in respect of both the NPPF and PPTS, in ensuring appropriate provision is planned for. We request the Council provide for such provision, as allocated sites. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |
| 14746 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Paragraphs 3 and 4 - Object to these paragraphs, as there is only a reference to an allocation of six pitches, and does not allocate any 'plots'. It is therefore considered to be 'unsound' when considered against the requirements set out in the PPTS, particularly Paragraphs 9 & 10. We request that the policy properly identify enough pitches and plots, to meet both a five-year deliverable and 6-to-10 year developable requirements of the PPTS. We request that land at Chequers Road [See full text for site plan] be allocated for a showmen's yard for these purposes. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |
| 14754 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Object to Paragraph 7.82. While the Council may have been able to identify windfall sites in the past, the PPTS is clear in Paragraphs 9 & 10 that the Council should be identifying and allocating sites, and when coupled with Paragraph 25 of the PPTS (restricting development on unallocated sites), it is absolutely clear from the Government's advice that Policy 7.10 should be allocated pitches and plots based on needs. We therefore consider Paragraph 7.82 to be 'unsound', and needs to be re-written in accordance with the PPTS, taking on board our requests. | Noted. The Council recognises the need to keep draft policy 7.10 under review and update in accordance with national guidance and the forthcoming GTAA review. | Consider accordingly |
| 14737 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | We object to Criteria a, on the basis that travelling showpeople's sites are incompatible with being located in well-settled locations. Paragraph 7.78 of the draft Local Plan already acknowledges that much of the Borough is Green Belt, and there are limited options for sites. We consider the client's site [Land at Chequers Public House, South Weald] to be a suitable brownfied site and we therefore request its allocation as a showmen's yard. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15635 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Brentwood Borough Council have an identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the Essex Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). The Assessment established a need for 84 pitches for the plan period of 2013-2033. It is not clear where all of the proposed Gypsy and Traveller pitches would be located and further evidence of this should be provided. The Brentwood Borough Council Draft Local Plan recognises the recent changes made to national policy relating to Gypsies and Travellers. Policy 7.10 and the supporting text does however detail that following these changes the pitch requirement, as set out in the GTAA (completed in July 2014), may potentially be reduced. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13118 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Object | Any traveller provision should be in such a location that traveller convoys do not have to access/egress their sites by driving through town roads or small lanes in the GB. ie. when they want to travel they should have quick and easy access to trunk roads. The ideal location for this will be alongside the enterprise park located at the A127 junction with the M25. This would be equally convenient if a council depot facility is to be located nearby to facilitate the servicing and maintenance of such a site. Traveller sites should not be located near existing settled/ permanent/ established residential communities or near park land. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |
| 14719 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] | Object | The initial estimated 20 traveller pitches at Dunton Hills Garden Village is out of proportion to the much smaller allocations elsewhere. West Horndon Parish would be taking a disproportionate amount of the total pitch requirements of 67. No indication has been given as to where the 20 pitches are to be located. NPPF states that the use of Green Belt for traveller/gypsy sites is classed as inappropriate development. Such a site would harm the character and appearance of the Parish and result in an unacceptable visual impact. House prices in the area would plummet. The events of Dale Farm have proved how a supposed limit of a legal number of pitches can mushroom out of control. Existing traveller sites are situated in locations away from developed areas because the travellers have chosen these secluded locations for compatibility with their lifestyle. Their wishes should be respected by allocating similar sites unbounded by other development. | Disagree. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. The change in house prices is not a material consideration. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|---|--|
| 15637 - Basildon Borough Council (Mr. Matthew Winslow) [369] | Object | Basildon Borough Council has prepared a Gypsy and Traveller Site Potential Study, in order to identify the available supply of land for the provision of pitches for Gypsy and Travellers within Basildon Borough. This assessment was unable to identify sufficient land for such purposes, giving rise to an un-met need of 136 pitches as set out in the Council's Draft Local Plan which is currently out for consultation until 24th March 2016. In progressing their Local Plan, Brentwood Borough Council, as a neighbouring LPA to Basildon, is strongly requested to cooperate with Basildon Borough Council in helping to make provision for this un-met need, and is asked to give further consideration to evidence as to how this un-met need, or a proportion thereof, could be met within the Brentwood Borough area. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. The Council will engage under the Duty to Cooperate with other authorities in the context that Brentwood is entirely located within Green Belt and is therefore very constrained in opportunities for new homes or new sites for Gypsy, Traveller and travelling Showpeople. | Consider in line with Duty to Cooperate. |
| 14740 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | This Policy makes no reference to the 'significant material consideration' of any planning application where the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5 - year supply of deliverable sites (Paragraph 27 of PPTS). We consider the policy as a whole is therefore 'unsound' as it does not ensure the Council maintains a five year deliverable supply as well as a 6 to 10 year developable supply, or adequately address planning applications in the absence of sufficient allocations, contrary to the PPTS. | Noted. In drafting policy 7.10 the Council has endeavoured to set out a policy whereby it accords with the duty to identify land to meet the local needs of Gypsies and Travellers and maintain a five year supply of deliverable land and traveller accommodation. In doing so, it is acknowledged pitch/plot requirements in the 2014 GTAA are in the process of review in light of the 2015 amendments to the National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Until such a time as this updated technical evidence is available, there remains uncertainty over the projected pitch/plot requirements and so to the level of need for Brentwood. The Council recognises the need to keep draft policy 7.10 under review and update in accordance with national guidance and the forthcoming GTAA review. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 17830 - Mrs Christine Rogers [2565] | Object | The Council's continued "Travellers" policy is also of great concern. I think that the Zone in Blackmore should continue to be utilised together with a similar site at Dunton Garden Village. These sites should certainly not be created by using existing spaces and gaps across the borough. Many residents would be greatly affected by this unforeseen and unwanted change to both their surroundings and lives. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers through the plan-making process, in line with policy set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |
| 14736 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Criteria of Paragraph 2 - We object to this paragraph generally, as it does not reflect the criteria for considering planning applications as set out in Paragraphs 24 and 26 of the PPTS. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13347 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 14027 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] | Object | 7.79 states that the policy is based on allocations specified in the Essex Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment Section 2 of PPTS states that it must be taken into account in the preparation of development plans and this has not been done. The Accommodation Assessment and Policy 7.10 must therefore be revised from scratch and will require a new public consultation in line with regulation 18 to be conducted.] Please read the full representation. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |
| 16362 - London Borough of Havering [85] | Support | Welcome the Borough's approach to meet its own need for G&T. However the plan identifies a need for 89 pitches and makes provision for 22 pitches with an additional 20 proposed at Dunton Hills Garden Village. It is unclear how or where the remaining 47 pitches will be provided. It is noted that a revised G&T Accommodation Assessment is being prepared in light of new National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Havering would welcome continued dialogue and engagement as this assessment progresses. | The primary reason for reviewing the GTAA 2014 is the publication of the revised version of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites in August 2015, which included a change to the definition of Travellers for planning purposes. The primary objective of the updated GTAA is to provide a robust revised assessment of current and future need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation. This assessment is being undertaken independently to any consideration of Green Belt constraints. The Council will meet the identified need of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople within the borough. The Council look forward to continuing dialogue with adjoining boroughs under the Duty to Cooperate. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13370 - Brentwood Gypsy Support Group (Dr Thomas Acton) [5546] 14263 - Ms. Doreen Acton [2639] | Support | Broad support, comment on details, concern at the flawed methodology of current needs assessment by ORS. | The methodology for assessment (by ORS) was considered in April 2016 by the Planning Inspector for the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy who concluded: 'The methodology behind this assessment included undertaking a full demographic study of all occupied pitches, interviewing Gypsy and Traveller households, including those living in bricks and mortar accommodation, and considering the implications of the new Government policy. On the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the assessment has been appropriately carried out, and there is no reason for me to dispute the figures.' | Consider accordingly |

Figure 7.5: Gypsy & Traveller Sites With Temporary Permission (January 2016)

| | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14409 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | Page 93 of the LDP. The Willows, Place Farm Lane is within the boundary of Doddinghurst Parish Council and therefore the address should be Doddinghurst and not Kelvedon Hatch. This error is also repeated in the pattern book on page 30. | Error noted. The Council will amend the address in light of this information. | Amend accordingly |
| 14117 - Mrs Alison Heine [2211] | Comment | Support the allocation of three sites in fig 7.5-but why only these? This is not enough to meet the immediate need. It is far from clear how they were chosen and not others. It is far from clear if you propose to inset from the Green Belt and if not why not? How will they be made permanent if not inset from the GB? They will still fail criteria (a) and national policy test. It is not clear why plots at Lizvale Farm is not listed in Fig 7.5 or the rest of Orchard view given Hope Farm is supported. What has happened to Cottage Gardens Beads Hall Lane or whether the Council has, in the alternative, agreed to a replacement house on this site. But if the owner still wants a caravan site this should be included in Fig 7.5 along with the unauthorised pitches at Blackmore and Hunters Green. | The Council is required to meet the needs of all people groups, including Gypsies and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Further updating of evidence is being undertaken following the re-definition of Travellers. Future versions of the Plan will reflect the most up-to-date evidence and seek to meet the requirements set by Government in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Chapter 8. Economic Prosperity | | | | |
| Brentwood's Economy | | | | |
| 16066 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | In addition to Policy 8.5 a Broadband Policy is recommended for inclusion in the new Local plan which will support the provision of broadband into new development. Increased broadband coverage will support businesses and attract investment to Essex. It also has the potential to increase opportunities for home-working and remote-working, reducing the demand on travel networks at peak periods. | Noted. The Council will consider elaborating on the expansion of Broadband already underway within the borough and its opportunities for flexible working. | Consider accordingly |
| 15512 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | Economic Prosperity: It is a shame that these objectives do not explicitly link the role of natural assets in a prospering economy. | Agree. Link to be considered. | Consider accordingly |
| 16060 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC welcomes and supports the ambition for economic growth in Brentwood. Reference should be made to the Brentwood Economic Development Strategy 2014. | Noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 16073 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Paragraph 8.14 - Reference should be made to the recent study undertaken to introduce a Centre for Enterprise in Brentwood which would encourage small and micro businesses to start and establish themselves and enable more flexible working. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14102 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Comment | Constructing new employment sites within easy access of the M25 and A12 is sensible, there needs to be a degree of flexibility to enable the Borough to take advantage of a healthy economic climate. There must be consideration to allow local business to expand and to encourage new business with residential areas provided they are compatible. By providing an integrated approach it will encourage new sites to be developed and for business to grow within villages thereby providing local employment. Although working from home is recognized in section 8.14, there is no mention of new developments focused on working from home. These could be created by live/work units or fully functioning offices above their garage or within their house. To ensure the Town Centre remains economically sustainable, public transport needs to improve as well as parking provisions, a coordinated approach that considers the motorist is also essential. | Noted. However the area is designated as Metropolitan Green Belt land, so this and other constraints are taken into account when considering suitable sites. | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 8.1: Strong and Competitive Economy | | | | |
| 15542 - Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093] | Comment | Given the Borough's good access to the strategic road network (via M25/A12/A127), it would be useful to understand better your thoughts on the future consideration of land specifically for industry and logistics, and related opportunities that could potentially arise from the promotion of growth and development across London and its Opportunity Areas in particular. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16150 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | We support the Council's objective to promote economic growth. The DLP states in Policy 8.1 the ways in which this will be secured. The first refers to the economic benefits arising from Crossrail. However, background evidence assessing the impact of Crossrail is not available and has not therefore influenced this plan. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 16061 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Criteria a) - ECC supports the ambition to capitalise on the economic benefits which will arise from Crossrail and the potential increased footfall to the surrounding area. However, it would be helpful to understand what this could amount to, how the economic benefits will be capitalised and understand what the Council believe the economic benefits to be for the area. An economic impact study would identify these issues. Criteria b - i) - Whilst the policy and outline proposals are supported, it would be beneficial to understand how these will be delivered in the short, medium and longer term in light of land infrastructure constraints. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14130 - Charles Fox of Covent Garden (Mrs Ann Lee) [2902] | Comment | How does this policy relate to the West Horndon Business Park and its existing occupiers, particularly long term leaseholders occupying the modern units in the northern areas of the Industrial Estate? Employees are mainly local and would be detrimentally affected should the Unit have to move. The close proximity to the station and local staff are important factors in locating in West Horndon. | Noted. The Council aim to encouraged employment growth in the existing main centres as well as other suitable locations which utilise brownfield land. It is also required to consider sites for new homes. The precise balance of employment and homes for the industrial estates in West Horndon is still under discussion and the Council wish to work with all those concerned to obtain the best outcomes for all those involved, facilitating discussion with owners and leaseholders where appropriate. | Consider accordingly |
| 15778 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The importance of telecommunications and broadband as an infrastructure requirement and its links to economic growth is welcomed. However, Policy 8.1 should be strengthened by making reference to the need for collaborative working with ECC, communication operators and providers for high quality communications infrastructure in all new and existing development. It is recommended that this is done through support of measures such as requiring high-speed Broadband for key areas, such as Warley Business Park, the proposed Brentwood Enterprise Park or Brentwood Town Centre. Suggested wording could be: 'High quality communications infrastructure will be provided by working collaboratively with Essex County Council, communications operators and providers, and supporting initiatives, technologies and developments which increase and improve coverage and quality throughout the Borough.' | Noted | Consider amendment accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16210 - Bolson's Limited (Mr. J.J.A. Cowdry) [2695] | Support | Supports will be given to proposals that secure job growth with "high value" business and retail. This will be secured by criteria b and d. Please supply details as to how this relates to Bolsons and the adjoining modern Units. | Noted. The Council aim to encouraged employment growth in the existing main centres as well as other suitable locations which utilise brownfield land. It is also required to consider sites for new homes. The precise balance of employment and homes for the industrial estates in West Horndon is still under discussion and the Council wish to work with all those concerned to obtain the best outcomes for all those involved, facilitating discussion with owners and leaseholders where appropriate. | Consider accordingly |
| 15883 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Support | Support the policy's aims to maintain high and stable levels of local economic growth. | Noted | No action |

Strategic-led Employment Development

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|------------------|----------------------|
| 16151 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | There is inconsistency in terms of the proposals for redevelopment of existing employment land for housing at West Horndon, when this serves as an important and much needed employment resource. High proportion of the Borough's residents commute to work elsewhere and employment provided by small businesses is growing. A127 will see significant economic growth based on plans to redevelop land at junction 29 of the M25, some growth at Childerditch Industrial Estate, and as part of DHGV. Growth is best provided at West Horndon that would be well-placed to meet all these employment objectives. It is in the A127 corridor, is accessible to A127, A12 and M25), served by a railway station and public transport links to key urban areas. Economies of scale would allow local employment provision, specifically aimed at small businesses, which would be accessible by walking and cycling. It lies close to proposed M25 employment location and public transport measures could be introduced to improve linkages between the two. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16075 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Paragraph 8.21 - Welcome the proposed separate master planning for the site which should focus on identifying the business use, demand, floor space requirement and connectivity levels to ensure the premises are relevant for the Borough. | Support welcomed | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|---|
| Policy 8.2: Brentwood Enterprise Park | | | | |
| 15775 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC and Highways England would seek additional evidence regarding any impact of the Brentwood Enterprise Park on the strategic junction, local road network and any necessary mitigation requirements. The potential impact on the above would also depend on the mix of B1, B2 and B8 uses proposed on the site. The location is not favourable to sustainable transport measures and additional clarification will be required on this. Criterion di) - reference is made to the need for a 'Green Travel Plan'. Amend to read 'Travel Plan', and to be consistent with Policy 8.3, criterion f. | The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council and Highways England in developing the emerging highway modelling work and understanding the mitigation that would be required. | Consider recommended policy wording amendments accordingly. |
| 15700 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] | Comment | Within the supporting text, at paragraph 8.23 we would suggest that the first sentence is amended to state that "Land at Codham Hall, site 101B, provides an opportunity to regularise existing industrial uses...." | Noted | Amend text to state 'regularise' rather than 'regulate' |
| 15886 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | The site at Brooke Street/Nags Head Lane (175B) is preferably located as it has a higher level of public transport accessibility and also is located in close proximity to existing and proposed dwellings, and can therefore provide opportunities for employees to walk and cycle to work. | Disagree. Site assessment considers a number of constraints and opportunities. The Council is considering development options and has weighed this against the importance of protecting Green Belt and its five purposes, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. | No action |
| 14266 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14268 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] | Comment | This area has already been severely degraded by development. Conditioning further development in this critical location to simply ameliorating further impacts is simply not good enough. Some thought has gone into a masterplan for the commercial viability (8.21) and travel (8.24) but a far more wide ranging masterplan is essential. Such a masterplan should not just look at on-site minimization of impacts, but at how development can contribute to a restoration of the environment. The allocation should not go ahead until the need for the scale of the development has been better understood together with a study covering all environmental aspects in the vicinity of the strategic allocation. I suggest this takes in all land west of the B186, south of Warley Road, east of Tomkyns Lane and built up Cranham and north of the B187. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15758 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | A key employment development site is Brentwood Enterprise Park, which is located to the east of M25 J29. We consider that this could have a significant effect on the operation of the junction, due to the size of the development and its proximity to the junction. The Local Plan indicates that public transport will be encouraged at the site to encourage employees to make use of alternatives to private car use. However, the extent of the public transport provision, access by cyclists and pedestrians is unclear at this stage. It is important that this provision is extensive and covers long distance as well as short distance trips, to try and minimise the impact of the development on the Strategic Road Network. The access and egress arrangements to this site are also potentially challenging and it is recommended that the proposals for these are discussed with Highways England to provide reassurance that safe and acceptable operation can be achieved at an early stage. It is important that all out of town sites are well connected to the public transport network, both in terms of bus provision and access to nearby rail stations to ensure longer distance strategic trips have an alternative to private vehicle use. Whilst this approach is supported through Policy 8.3, the Local Plan does not provide specific public transport details and therefore the extent of the intended public transport provision is unknown. | Noted. The Council are working with service providers and the Highways Authority in order to consider and assess a variety of modes of access. | Consider accordingly |
| 15541 - Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093] | Comment | In terms of employment, the Brentwood Enterprise Park is expected to make a significant contribution towards meeting the Borough's need. In the light of its proximity to London, close cooperation with the relevant neighbouring authorities is required. | Noted, the Council will work with the adjoining local authorities under the Duty to Cooperate in the development of the Local Plan. | No action |
| 15250 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | Policy 8.2 does not identify the floor area of each employment use at Brentwood Enterprise Park and as such there is currently little control in the policy as to what is provided in this location and therefore no guarantee that it would meet the needs of employers / operators in the Borough. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16213 - S Walsh and Sons Ltd [2635] | Comment | It is also questioned why Land at Codham Hall 101B is being put forward for allocation and additional expansion of the industrial site within the Green Belt, whereas sites such as East Horndon Hall Industrial Estate have not even been allocated for employment purposes. In regard to its impact on the purposes of the Green Belt, the Council's published assessment results in a similar overall assessment between the two sites. It is considered that consistency should be made by the Council in their consideration of employment sites, particularly where there is little difference between the impacts of the allocation on the Green Belt purposes. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15981 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | In accordance to criteria c, areas required for structural landscaping, earthworks and planting extend to a significant area to the south and east of the site. Therefore the BEP allocation should include this area of land, as this will allow for work to be undertaken to most appropriately mitigate the proposals. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16074 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Support the ambition to develop new key strategic employment sites but this needs to be set within the wider context of Brentwood's Spatial Strategy, and any location is consistent with the criteria in Policy 8.3 - Employment Development Criteria and Policy 10.1 - Sustainable Transport, which seeks to ensure future developments are located in accessible locations reducing the need to travel. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 15719 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | Brentwood Enterprise Park (Policies 101A and 101B) - we note the proposal to regularise and expand the employment-led development at the junction of the M25/A127 and request that this park is planned appropriately so that the existing bridleway network in this vicinity is protected; the current enforcement issues with regard to the bridleways in this area are regularised, and a safe crossing of both the M25 and A127 is provided as part of this development, linking the bridleway networks either side of the M25. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways and multi-user paths, are considered an important part of the borough's Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 15993 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | We have no issue with developments requiring a Green Travel Plan, however clarification is sought regarding how a Travel Plan is proposed to link the site with Brentwood, Shenfield, West Horndon and Dunton Hills Garden Village. If this means that the Travel Plan should consider green/sustainable links to these places, we would suggest that the policy should be reworded accordingly. | Noted. Travel plan should consider green/sustainable links. | Consider clarification accordingly |
| 15979 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | The allocation of Brentwood Enterprise Park is strongly supported. Request that the following changes are made: The policy wording should formally state that the site is allocated for employment development and removed from the Green Belt. Wording in the plan should allow for ancillary and supporting uses (i.e. "principally use classes B1, B2 and B8 instead of just "use class B1,..." | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15884 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | Although the M25 works site is well located in terms of access to the highway network, it is poorly located in terms of access by non-car modes. It is neither located within close proximity to facilities or services nor is residential development therefore employees working at this site will make all trips by car. The nearest stations are Brentwood and West Horndon and there is no bus route to either station. As a consequence it will only be attractive to a very limited number of low employment density transport related uses. The principle of the allocation of this site is questioned, as is the extent of land identified. It is likely that development would be visible from the surrounding area, changing the character of the area, not only covering a far greater area than the former works site, but also having a far greater impact. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15013 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | Policy 8.2 relates to a site which is affected by Route 4 on the Highways England Consultation proposals for a new road crossing of the Lower Thames. The Route 4 new road would gouge out a visual scar in the Green Belt village landscape contrary to national planning policy and only justifiable by overriding national need. Route 4 is an alternative routing option and the Local Development Plan should reject this option, support growth of the Thames Estuary but allow for a limited coach transfer station. | Brentwood Borough Council formally objected to Route 4 as part of the Lower Thames Crossing consultation. This would result in strategic housing option of Dunton Garden Village and Brentwood Enterprise Park not being delivered. | No action |
| 15996 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | Site 101A represents a new strategic employment allocation whereas the land at Codham Hall North (101B) consists of the allocation of existing employment uses. For this reason, as set out elsewhere in this representation, we consider it more appropriate to cover the requirements for site 101A within the Policy 8.2 and cover site 101B within the general employment allocations within the plan. Whilst the sites will have a complementary role this better reflects the role that these sites will play in meeting employment needs and the strategic employment provided at Junction 29. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15014 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | Policy 8.2 should expand the proposed Green Travel plan to allow for a coach transfer station on part of the site. The strategic context for the Lower Thames Crossing will be part of the recommendations of the Thames Estuary growth Commission. It seems inevitable that the Lower Thames Crossing will bring forward a proposal for an additional Motorway Service Area ("MSA"), co-ordinated lorry parks and interchange facilities to maximise growth from ports and railways infrastructure in the Thames Estuary. A coach transfer station can be combined with a Green Travel Plan and share parking spaces on site. The hours of use for coach use and connections depend on demand but other than parking space only require toilet facilities and communications. The site is within close proximity to railway stations on the C2C, Upminster to branch lines, and Crossrail stations as well as the motorway network. A coach transfer station at the site could become a useful and popular project in achieving to sustainable transport policies, and that should be included in the Local Plan. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15885 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | Codham Hall Lane is poorly located in terms of access by non-car modes and employees will make trips by car. Given the presence of existing uses, this site is likely to be slow to come forward as these uses will need to relocate in advance of redevelopment. The two largest identified employment allocations are not well located. A development strategy which focuses development in and around the primary urban areas is more sustainable and provides greater opportunities for reduced trip lengths and accessibility by non-car modes. | Noted. The A127, A12 and M25 have been referred to as they would be appropriate roads for B class uses. This would reduce the transport impacts on unsuitable roads or within environmentally sensitive areas. | Consider accordingly |
| 15980 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | Criteria a is currently superfluous and could potentially lead to a degree of unnecessary uncertainty or potential delay of delivery of jobs and employment land on the Brentwood Enterprise Park site. The employment uses considered appropriate on the Enterprise Park site are already detailed within the policy and therefore it is considered that criteria (a). should be removed from the plan in order to produce a predictable and efficient planning policy in line with the NPPF. | Disagree. Criteria a is considered necessary and is more likely to clarify future use for employment. | No action. |
| 16001 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | Paragraph 8.19 should use "enterprise park" rather than "business park" given the intended nature of the uses. Paragraph 8.20 amendments should be made to cover the strategic employment allocation and the allocation of the existing employment sites separately within the plan. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16337 - London Borough of Havering [85] | Object | Object to the Enterprise Park for potentially significant transport implications and adverse impact on Havering's section of the A127 which is already at or close to capacity in the peak periods in both directions. Concerned about the adverse impact on the green belt. Whilst it is noted that the site has been previously developed, the proposal will significantly increase the quantum of development on the site and therefore impact on the function of the green belt and its openness. | The Council agree that the A127 should be considered across local authority boundaries to consider wider development impacts on capacity. The cumulative impacts of development are being considered through the Duty to Cooperate and evidence base including identification of necessary mitigation. There is no requirement for Local Authorities to undertake full Green Belt reviews; however the Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13441 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] 13492 - Mr Richard Massett [4341] 14265 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14267 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 15268 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] 15426 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 16212 - S Walsh and Sons Ltd [2635] 16482 - CPREssex [210] | Object | The area lies entirely within the green belt area. The Council have allowed their two "quadrants" to be degraded by creeping industrialization both north and south of the A127 on land owned by Codham Hall Farm. Site should have been returned to green field as is in the Green Belt. Should development go forward, a scheme of permanently evergreen screening tree species and landscaping will need to accompany this. | There is no requirement for Local Authorities to undertake full Green Belt reviews; however the Council is undertaking proportionate evidence to assess impact on Green Belt. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 13916 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14058 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14355 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 15945 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Whilst it is noted that the creation of Brentwood Enterprise Park could create important replacement employment land to help offset the proposed loss of nearly 19 hectares of employment land, WHPC note that the redevelopment of the local industrial estates (sites 020 and 021) would result in a material loss of employment within West Horndon village. Appropriate travel needs to be put in place to ensure that local residents are able to travel to alternative local employment in a sustainable manner (Enterprise Park and wider employment area is not accessible by train, bus or foot from West Horndon at present). Whilst this is mentioned in the Local Draft Plan, no specifics are detailed and it is not clear whether any proposed transport would cover West Horndon. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15265 - London Borough of Havering (Ms Lauren Miller) [5343] | Object | Object to the Enterprise Park because of the potentially significant transport implications and adverse impact on Haverings section of the A127, which is already at or close to capacity in the peak periods in both directions. | The Council agree that the A127 should be considered across local authority boundaries to consider wider development impacts on capacity. The cumulative impacts of development are being considered through the Duty to Cooperate and evidence base including identification of necessary mitigation. | Consider accordingly |
| 15696 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] | Support | The allocation of Brentwood Enterprise Park is strongly supported. A further distinction should be made between the main Enterprise Park site at 101A and the Land at Codham Hall 101B. The land at site 101A provides for new employment development to meet strategic needs. The site at Codham Hall North 101B consists of existing employment uses and they will continue to meet different types of employment need. For this reason it may be more appropriate for the site at 101B to be included within separate policy allocations such as within Policy 8.4 which allocates employment land within the Borough rather than within Policy 8.2 dealing with the strategic allocation. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------------------------|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13547 - Mrs Andrea Wilkes [2489] | Support | I think that this option could have a beneficial effect upon employment opportunities in the area but i have a concern about the increase in traffic on the already congested A127 and M25. | The Council agree that the A127 should be considered across local authority boundaries to consider wider development impacts on capacity. The cumulative impacts of development are being considered through the Duty to Cooperate and evidence base including identification of necessary mitigation. | Consider accordingly |
| 13122 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Support | Traveller site provision should also be located and centralised in this area. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

Figure 8.2: Brentwood Enterprise Park

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 16004 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | There is inconsistency between this figure shown within the plan document itself and the plans included within the supporting document "Site Allocation Maps". | Noted. The plans will be checked for their accuracy and corrected where necessary. | Consider accordingly |
| 15697 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] | Comment | There is presently an inconsistency between those areas included within Figure 8.2 and those areas included in the supporting document 'Site Allocations Maps'. It is clearly important that areas for allocation are consistent to avoid confusion in the adopted Plan. In order to accurate reflect existing uses on site we consider that the allocated area should be extended to include the area of existing use. | Noted. The plans will be checked for their accuracy and corrected where necessary. | Consider accordingly |
| 16002 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | The allocation area does not fully reflect the details discussed previously and submitted. The following changes should be made: The allocated area currently includes some smaller areas of land outside of the client's control hence boundary amendments are needed. Some part of the site is currently constrained by gas pipelines and associated easements. Other parts currently include highway embankments and other non-developable land. Suggest to exclude these areas where possible and include adjoining land to ensure that a full 23.5 ha of deliverable and developable. Allocation area should be extended to include land for structural landscaping purposes to an area totalling 35.4 ha. If required it is suggested that the wording of the plan should acknowledge that no more than 23.5 ha of the larger site is anticipated to be used for employment purposes with the additional area being included to facilitate landscape and levels works. This will ensure the development can be appropriately mitigated in landscape terms as well as ensuring that the site can be practically delivered given engineering constraints. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| Employment Development and Allocations | | | | |
| 15253 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | There is a clear relationship between the delivery of employment land and the delivery of land for housing as existing employment land needs to be released for housing but the employment space needs to be reprovided. It is considered that the council has failed to address this in the draft allocations of employment sites. The Economic Futures Report (2014) suggests that the Council complete an employment trajectory to determine the availability and likely delivery of sites. The advice has not been followed by the Council and it's therefore unclear whether the proposed employment allocations will come forward in a period that reflects the need for housing on the employment sites that are to be redeveloped. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16064 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Paragraph 8.26 - Reference to 'within environmentally sensitive areas' should be deleted. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15213 - Spire Hartswood Hospital [6074] | Comment | Existing location of Spire Hartswood Hospital is relatively small and is constrained despite various granted planning permissions to extend the hospital, therefore Spire Healthcare proposes to relocate to a site within the proposed Gateway Area. The proposed site presents a more accessible location via sustainable transport modes. The hospital would operate a Green Travel Plan to promote a car sharing for staffs, as well as electric car charging points. The proposed hospital can be delivered within 5 years and will provide a vital service to the residents of the Borough. Since the site is within the Green Belt, the design and layout will mitigate, as far as is practical, harm to the openness of the Green Belt by incorporating landscaped areas around the hospital. | The Council will be assessing further sites which have come forward during this plan consultation. These will inform the next iteration of the plan, its allocations and policies. | Consider accordingly |
| 15804 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | There are areas around the urban area of Brentwood that are covered by a MSA for sand and gravel. A high level assessment concludes that some proposed allocations in the Draft Local Plan are within MSAs for sand and gravel. However, these are either located within the defined urban area or are less than the 5ha threshold, as stated in Policy S8. However, ECC withholds the right to review any allocations which will be included in the Pre Submission Plan. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15233 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | - Request that land at East Horndon Hall (site ref. 187) is allocated to deliver a new Industrial Park which will provide a range of new flexible commercial space to respond to market demands and provide an appropriate choice of sites. - The site will increase the employment land supply in the Borough, improve the choice for operators and assist the Council in meeting the requirements of National Planning Policy and Guidance and the address the recommendations in the Economic Futures Report. - Following discussions with Council officers, the site is being promoted for employment use only within Class B2, B1c and ancillary B1a use. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15225 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Object | - The proposed strategy regarding Enterprise Park rely on one site to deliver a large proportion of employment requirements across the plan period. Additional sites should be allocated to provide more choice and respond to market requirements. - The policy and supporting text regarding the amount of floorspace and land required to meet future employment needs is very unclear and the figures on need should be reassessed to increase the employment land requirement to ensure an appropriate supply of sites. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Policy 8.3: Employment Development Criteria | | | | |
| 13897 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14057 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | I disagree with the part of point e regarding proximity to the A127, A12 and M25. This wording could mitigate again employment proposals some way removed from those roads. It is far more sustainable both in terms of transport and in developing communities for employment to be embedded within or close to existing development than simply being close to these major roads. The clause is also superfluous considering point f requires the proposal to be covered by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. This is the place for assessing travel impacts not a prejudged blanket assumption. Finally it is somewhat ironic that the A128 is not included in this list considering the massive increase in traffic this would receive were the Dunton Hills Garden Village development to proceed. | The A127, A12 and M25 have been referred to as they would be appropriate roads for B class uses. This would reduce the transport impacts on unsuitable roads or within environmentally sensitive areas. | Consider accordingly |
| 15760 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | A key employment development site is Brentwood Enterprise Park, which is located to the east of M25 J29. We consider that this could have a significant effect on the operation of the junction, due to the size of the development and its proximity to the junction. The Local Plan indicates that public transport will be encouraged at the site to encourage employees to make use of alternatives to private car use. However, the extent of the public transport provision, access by cyclists and pedestrians is unclear at this stage. It is important that this provision is extensive and covers long distance as well as short distance trips, to try and minimise the impact of the development on the Strategic Road Network. The access and egress arrangements to this site are also potentially challenging and it is recommended that the proposals for these are discussed with Highways England to provide reassurance that safe and acceptable operation can be achieved at an early stage. It is important that all out of town sites are well connected to the public transport network, both in terms of bus provision and access to nearby rail stations to ensure longer distance strategic trips have an alternative to private vehicle use. Whilst this approach is supported through Policy 8.3, the Local Plan does not provide specific public transport details and therefore the extent of the intended public transport provision is unknown. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15807 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Provision of Industrial Land in Essex plays an important role in providing locations for waste management facilities and aggregate recycling plants. ECC considers the existing policies are too restrictive and the provision for "any associated employment generating sui generis uses" within these policies and respective employment areas should be permitted. ECC recommends the following Draft Local Plan Policy be amended accordingly: 'Development for employment uses (Class B1, B2 or B8) and any associated employment generating sui generis uses will be encouraged provided the proposal' Criterion d), this criterion is too restrictive and is not supported by ECC, as highway authority. | Disagree. Site allocations for waste management use are considered by the County Council working closely with the Essex boroughs and districts. Current proposal reflects appropriate policy required locally in Brentwood. | Consider accordingly |
| 16037 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | This should be amended to include reference to representation site at Brook Street/Nags Head Lane. | Site specific comment noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16008 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Support | The encouragement provided for new employment proposals that provide new jobs and boost the local economy is supported. We consider that clarity should be provided within the plan as to whether these policy criteria will also apply to strategic employment allocations. If this is the case the criteria should be carefully worded so as not to prejudice or delay the delivery of such strategic sites. | Noted. These criteria apply to all development. Masterplan work should consider these. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 14600 - Childerditch Properties [2642] | Support | Proposed Policy 8.3 is supported on the basis that the proposed allocation for the Range will be able to fully meet the criteria set out. In particular an extension of 2.34 hectares to the Childerditch Industrial Park would satisfy the Employment Development Criteria as follows: a) The proposed extension by 1/10th is of a scale that would not have a significant visual or impact upon the locality as indicated by supporting documents. b) Supporting documents confirm that the development on The Range North would not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. c) The Childerditch Industrial Park is exceptionally well located on the road network as indicated in the AA. | Noted | No action |
| 15887 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Support | The criteria set out in this Policy are supported. Site 175B at Brook Street/Nags Head Lane complies with these criteria and the site is particularly well located in terms of the main arterial routes of the A12 and the M25. The site is more accessible by public transport, walking and cycling than the draft allocations at Brentwood Enterprise Centre to the south of the Borough. | Site specific comment noted | Consider accordingly |

Policy 8.4: Employment Land Allocations

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15675 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Comment | Anglian Water has made an initial assessment of the impact of the proposed housing, employment retail and leisure allocation sites on existing water and water recycling infrastructure located within Anglian Water's area of responsibility. This will need to be revisited when planning applications are submitted to the District Council and we are approached by developers as part of the planning application process. A copy of the initial assessment made by Anglian Water is included with this consultation response. In relation to the strategic sites identified in the Local Plan it would be helpful to cross refer to the requirements of Policies 10.13 (Flood Risk) and (Sustainable Drainage) to ensure that these development proposals which are of strategic significance provide sufficient evidence relating to foul drainage and surface water management and the timing of any required improvements. | Noted. All planning applications would need to be in accordance with policies 10.13 and 10.14, cross referencing of these would not be necessary to ensure they are complied with. | No action |
| 15256 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | As a result of the infrastructure requirements associated with the Brentwood Enterprise Park it is unlikely that this will be delivered in the first five years of the plan period. Similarly, the employment land at Dunton is unlikely to come forward prior to the housing because of the associated infrastructure and the funds required, as such the delivery of this is unlikely to come forward in the first five years, if this strategic allocation is progressed. Without the delivery of sufficient employment land, the existing operators at West Horndon will have no reasonable alternative site. The sites at East Horndon (187) are immediately available and provide a reasonable alternative for the existing operators at West Horndon, allowing the West Horndon site to come forward within the identified timeframe for housing. | Site specific comments noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15808 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The draft Local Plan contains limited reference to waste management facilities, and in particular advice for their provision in the proposed Development Management Policies. In particular, ECC recommends reference is made in Policies 8.3 and 8.4 to enable the provision of waste management facilities in employment areas, by referring to 'any associated employment generating sui generis uses' in these policies. In addition we recommend that cross reference is made to Policy 10.2 - Parking; and welcome reference to the ambition to achieve and retain a wide range of employment opportunities on employment sites. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|-----------------------|
| 13644 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | There is no point allocating new employment land when there are so many vacant lots/plots in existing retail units and industrial estates. Notably, the Baytree Centre has *never* had full occupancy, despite its prime location. This suggests that creating new employment land would be a bad idea. | Employment growth will be encouraged in the existing main centres as well as other suitable locations which utilise brownfield land. | No action |
| 15252 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | The Council has identified the provision of additional land for employment uses at Codham Hall and Childerditch Industrial Estate, however, these sites are small employment sites in the countryside rather than purpose built facilities, and are significantly constrained by their accesses. The Local Plan fails to consider whether these sites are suitable for certain businesses and this needs to be addressed in the next iteration of the Local Plan. Therefore even though the quantum of land identified at Brentwood Enterprise Park meets the quantitative need of replacing West Horndon Industrial Estate, the Brentwood Enterprise Park will not provide for small and medium sized businesses or non confirming green belt uses. The site at East Horndon could provide immediately deliverable employment land which will accommodate the uses not provided for in the current version of the Local Plan. | Site specific comments noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15678 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Comment | For a number of the allocation sites there is a pumping station located on the site or within close proximity of the site. A 15 metre distance between the boundary of the pumping station and the curtilage of any new dwelling should be maintained in order to reduce the risk of nuisance or loss of amenity. The design layout for these sites should take this into account. | Site restriction noted. Information will be used to further develop the local plan site assessment, working with Anglian Water to identify which sites affected. | Consider accordingly |
| 15257 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | The Council needs to identify reasonable alternative sites that meet the needs of displaced operators at West Horndon as well as delivering in time to allow for the release of housing in line with the trajectory. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16215 - S Walsh and Sons Ltd [2635] | Object | Site 038A&B at East Horndon can form a new business park, providing a mix of B-uses together with a leisure use as a feature building on the corner of the A128 and A127 roundabout. Whilst the site is heavily screened from the west and north, further landscaping and planting can be provided. This site: - Is in a strong location for accessibility where country lanes and residential roads are avoided, but easy access to the main arterial. - Requires limited landscaping and screening on the eastern boundary. - Is of a size that allows for a comprehensive development, whilst being of a scale and nature appropriate to the locality. - Readily constrained by the A128, A127 and Tilbury Road, and thus makes a logical release from the Green Belt. - Has a strong defensible boundary. This site is ideally located to make up the loss of an existing employment location. | Site specific comment noted. | Consider accordingly. |
| 16214 - S Walsh and Sons Ltd [2635] | Object | It is a logical decision to seek to allocate existing employment sites in the Green Belt that are close to the strategic highway network and away from the higher populated areas of residential development, for employment use. The Company requests that its site 038A&B at East Horndon Business Park is allocated as a general employment site. It comprises previously developed land, providing an excellent opportunity for new employment land to form a business park, incorporating some leisure opportunities. The site has been assessed having a low to moderate contribution to Green Belt purposes within the Council's assessment. | Site specific comments noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|----------------------|-----------|
| 15166 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | CEG supports the allocation of 5 hectares for employment uses as part of the Dunton Hills Garden Village proposal. The precise size and siting of the allocation will be determined during the master planning process and will have regard to site layout and design. | Noted | No action |
| 13538 - PERI Ltd [5615] | Support | The policy for the allocation of the existing employment site is therefore wholly supported. | Noted | No action |

Figure 8.3: Employment Land Allocations

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15259 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | Both the lands at Codham Hall and Childerditch Industrial Estate suffer serious issues over access to and from the sites which not only makes them unsuitable in terms of highways but will also make them undesirable to prospective occupiers. They are already developed and it is questionable to what extent new employment floorspace can be accommodated on the sites in a sustainable way which retains the existing operators in situ. | Site specific comments noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15892 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Emerging Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan does not allocate any strategic waste management allocations in the Borough. However, the Waste Plan identifies two areas of search within Brentwood Borough. These Areas of Search are existing industrial estates at Childerditch Industrial Estate and West Horndon. The Replacement Waste Local Plan would seek to focus any new proposals for waste management facilities, which support the local housing and economic growth, within these Areas of Search. | It is not considered that the identification of Childerditch Industrial Estate as an Area of Search in the Essex and Southend Waste Local Plan would be in conflict with its allocation in the Brentwood Local Plan as an employment site. The West Horndon Industrial Estate has been identified as a proposed housing allocation site. Once the plan is adopted this would not be suitable for waste management uses. However, the Local Plan does identify new employment land which subject to appropriate assessment, may be suitable locations for future waste facilities. | No action |
| 15734 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] | Comment | Request to include Ongar Garden Centre for development allocation sites. Although the site does not immediately adjoin a settlement boundary, it is within easy reach of an established centre hence reducing the impact of traffic on the character and amenities of the locality. | Site is not considered to fulfil the requirements of the Brentwood Spatial Strategy. | Consider accordingly |
| 15235 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] | Comment | The Council has previously assessed site 187 East Horndon Hall for residential development and found it to be unsuitable as a result of its green belt location but we are not aware of the Council undertaking any assessment of the site's suitability for redevelopment for commercial uses. The Employment Land Review (2010) did not include an assessment of site 187 and neither did the Assessment of Employment Land in 2014 (Economic Futures Report (NLP) 2014). | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15888 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | This should be amended to include reference to site 175 B at Brook Street/Nags Head Lane. | Site specific comment noted. Opportunities and constraints will be considered accordingly. | Consider accordingly |
| 15231 - MM Properties Ltd [6076] 16007 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Support | The summary provides helpful clarity to the plan and highlights that new employment land provided is limited to 32.81 ha and therefore it is clear that delivery of sites such as the Brentwood Enterprise Park early within the plan period will be required in order to support jobs and employment within the borough. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 101A Brentwood Enterprise Park (M25 Junction 29 works site) | | | | |
| 15552 - Rochford District Council (Natalie Hayward) [6094] | Comment | A127, A130 and A13 forms part of the strategic road network for South Essex. Any development proposed in proximity to these corridors should be accompanied by adequate mitigation measures. Two strategic development sites are proposed within the vicinity of the A127 corridor to the south east and south west of the Borough. Unclear from the Draft Local Plan what mitigation measures would be required to accompany significant development in this location. Strongly recommended that any future iterations of the Local Plan are clearly accompanied by appropriate mitigation measures. This will ensure proposals would not detrimentally impact the A127. | Further work is being carried out in consultation with Essex County Council in order to clarify impact and therefore potential mitigation of proposed development. | Consider accordingly |
| 13987 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] | Comment | Brentwood Enterprise Park (Policies 101A and 101B) - we request that this park is planned appropriately so that the existing bridleway network in this vicinity is protected; the current enforcement issues with regard to the bridleways in this area are regularised, and a safe crossing of both the M25 and A127 is provided as part of this development, linking the bridleway networks either side of the M25. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways and multi-user paths, are considered an important part of the Boroughs Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 14796 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540] | Object | The siting of a new industrial estate at J29 on M25 is pure stupidity it is totally reliant on road which is well known gridlock blackspot. Some retention of the West Horndon industrial estate is a better idea keeping its rail links. | The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing and employment needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options and are using modelling to consider transportation impact and therefore mitigation, working closely with Highways England and Essex County Council. | Consider accordingly |
| 13962 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] | Object | Object to further encroachment into green-belt, protected and rural landscape at Codham Hall south of the A127. Although, I recognise the need for further business sites as explained by Planners, I question the logic of this as increasingly business is conducted on-line and there are various sites with long-term vacant offices in Warley (Regis, Warley Business Park, Old Pump Works). If there is to be development here then buildings should be of very high specification, low-rise, screened by trees and have as low an impact on the rural nature of this area as possible. This is green-belt land and should have been returned to that status once Highways England finished using it. | Comments noted. Potential mitigation methodology will be considered for development, particularly at this location. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13676 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] 14180 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] 14825 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | The land in the vicinity of J29 of the M25 is NOT a brownfield site. It was a temporary works compound which the Council had promised to restore to its previous (greenfield) condition upon the conclusion of the widening works to the M25. This is illegal, unethical, and a betrayal of trust, and I fear that this 'Trojan horse' strategy for re-labelling a site as brownfield is about to be done again at Officer's Meadow, a 'temporary' works compound for Crossrail. | The history of the site is acknowledged by the Council. The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the identified employment and housing needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 14666 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] 14826 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | The redevelopment of the local industrial estates (sites 020 and 021) would result in a material loss of employment within West Horndon village. Appropriate travel needs to be put in place to ensure that local residents are able to travel to alternative local employment in a sustainable manner (Enterprise Park and wider employment area is not accessible by train, bus or foot from West Horndon at present). Whilst this is mentioned in the Local Draft Plan, no specifics are detailed and it is not clear whether any proposed transport would cover West Horndon. | The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing and employment needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance, with consideration of infrastructure needs and services. | Consider accordingly |
| 15997 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Support | Supported subject to amendments. Concern with regards to the current wording on market led needs and suggest amendments to clarify acceptable uses on site. Policy should be worded as follows: "...with business floorspace (PRINCIPALLY use class B1, B2 and B8) TAKING INTO ACCOUNT market needs along with ancillary uses...". Current policy wording regarding attractive site frontages is unclear in how this would apply to the site. The wording should be amended to state that "The proposals will GIVE CONSIDERATION TO RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN BUILT FORM AND KEY VIEWPOINTS FROM THE SURROUNDING HIGHWAY NETWORK". | Support noted | Consider accordingly |
| 079C Land adjacent to Ingatestone by-pass (part bounded by Roman Road) | | | | |
| 13754 - Ms M Giles [567] | Comment | Good idea if restricted to light, non-polluting (air and noise) industry. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13656 - Simons Developments Limited [5643] | Object | In so far as Site Reference 079C is concerned the removal of the site from the Green Belt is supported however the allocation solely for uses within Class B of the Use Classes Order as set out in Policy 8.4 represents a sub optimal land use allocation strategy. Rather a wider allocation for a mix of uses would be more sustainable over the plan period to 2030. Such acceptable uses - in addition to those within Class B - should include retail within Classes A1 to A5 and Residential Institutions within Class C2. All of which provide significant employment opportunities. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13145 - Mrs Jean Sleep [5373] 13292 - Mrs Jan Wootton [5479] 13718 - Mrs Brenda Hennessy [5684] 13820 - Mrs O Witney [5742] 13825 - J Kemble [5743] 13880 - Mr A.M. Witney [5757] 14150 - Mrs Jaqueline Craythorne [5824] 14167 - Mr and Mrs T and J Gladwin [5840] 14218 - Mrs Denise J. Sowerbutts [5860] 14240 - Mrs James Sowerbutts [5869] | Object | Object as GPs are full, primary schools are full, sewerage is at capacity, impact will change the village forever, traffic will get even worse, there will be problems with light and noise pollution, road safety issues particularly for old people and children, parking will be a problem, there will be problems from construction traffic, will destroy local views, exacerbate existing potholes, trains are already overcrowded and this is contrary to policy 9.8 | Noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. Furthermore, the Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. In addition Essex-wide evidence is to be published soon, which the Council has been involved in preparing. | Consider accordingly |
| 14004 - Steve Undrill [2496] 14864 - Jan & Graham Wootton [2891] | Object | Is this an appropriate site for such development? Green fields create space, homes for wildlife and are aesthetically essential to the well being of current residents. It appears that all of the sites have been placed in a very small area causing a complete change in appearance to our village. With the proposed development in Shenfield one long urban conurbation will link the villages of Ingatestone, Mountnessing and Shenfield. | Objection noted. Potential impacts of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 13319 - Mrs Evelyn Prince [5500] | Object | The roads in and around Ingatestone would be inadequate to deal with increased traffic. This area is particularly busy and accidents on the A12 cause huge volumes of cars and lorries to come up the slip road. I don't see how putting more houses and industrial units can help this situation. I am also concerned about light pollution, pollution and noise in particular regarding the employment aspect which I believe would be out of keeping with Ingatestone. | Objection noted. Impact of new development will be considered in line with the NPPF and other national guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 15936 - CALA Homes [5237] | Support | Support the identification of Site 079C for employment, this is a particularly suitable location with respect to transport connections, and it will benefit both new and existing residents of Ingatestone with respect to providing jobs and boosting the local economy. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 12D Childerditch Industrial Estate (the Range) | | | | |
| 13961 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] | Object | Object to further encroachment into green-belt, protected and rural landscape at Childerditch Industrial Estate. Residents of Little Warley Hall Lane have, in the past, suffered from noise generated by the Childerditch Industrial Estate from early in the morning until 6.00pm six days a week. The proposal to extend to the north-west further towards those houses, is a step too far. This is greenbelt land and should remain as a buffer between the homes in Little Warley Hall Lane and the rest of the industrial site. As a Councillor I've supported residents battling with the threats of increased noise and light pollution at this site and am therefore opposed to further development. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14659 - Mr Kevin Mate [2849] | Object | I question whether BBC have considered all available and suitable brownfield sites. Whilst this is noted throughout the Draft Local Plan, I note that for example, the Childerditch Industrial Estate within the A127 Corridor has not been considered despite it being brownfield land in what is BBC's stated preferred transport corridor for development. | The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing and employment needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options. The Childerditch site is considered suitable to retain as employment land in line with the spatial strategy. | No action |
| 14602 - Childerditch Properties [2642] | Support | The proposed allocation of The Range in the Draft Local Plan is considered to meet an identified market need and provide the type of employment land required to assist meet the objectives of the Draft Local Plan for the Plan period. The Range site is able to providing a deliverable site that can assist in BBC's overall strategy for the relocation/reallocation of existing employment uses/sites. | Support welcomed. | No action |
| 200 Dunton Hills Garden Village strategic allocation | | | | |
| 13834 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13845 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13857 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] | Object | Development here will not be able to provide for new employment land, any more than housing, at building there is in strict contravention of the NPPF for Green Belt, as it would create urban sprawl spreading from the London Borough of Havering to Southend. The so called strategic highway network is the heavily congested A127, and poor C2C service, which hasn't had the investment like the A12 and Crossrail have had, so transport infrastructure for employment is better North of the Borough. | The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing and employment needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|---|
| 101B Brentwood Enterprise Park (land at Codham Hall) | | | | |
| 13988 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] | Comment | Brentwood Enterprise Park (Policies 101A and 101B) - we request that this park is planned appropriately so that the existing bridleway network in this vicinity is protected; the current enforcement issues with regard to the bridleways in this area are regularised, and a safe crossing of both the M25 and A127 is provided as part of this development, linking the bridleway networks either side of the M25. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways and multi-user paths, are considered an important part of the borough's Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 14181 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] | Object | The proposed development at Dunton Hills Garden Village would overwhelm the village of Dunton Waylett. If Policy H10/E7 proposed by Basildon Council were also implemented, these will 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. Removing so much land from the Green Belt would be unlawful. | The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 13576 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] | Object | Object to further encroachment into green-belt, protected and rural landscape at Codham Hall north & south of A127, particularly north and Childerditch Industrial Estate. This area has been developed regardless of green-belt policies. The unlawful development has been going on for around 15 years and should be stopped in its tracks. I have grave concerns that fields are increasingly being encroached on for increasing array of businesses and that Planning enforcement has been non-existent here. This is green-belt land and should be protected. The site maps show a far bigger area will be implicated than already is. | Noted. This will be considered in line with the implementation of the Spatial Strategy. | Consider in line with spatial strategy. |
| 15703 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 15999 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Support | Support the allocation of existing employment uses at Codham Hall. Suggest that the allocation at Codham North (101B) is set out elsewhere within the plan such as within Policy 8.4 and Figure 8.3. This would allow Strategic Policy 8.2 to focus exclusively on the larger new employment site to the south of the A127 (101A). The uses at Codham Hall are existing uses and appear to have been treated as such within the Highway Modelling. This is support given that the formal allocation will allow the existing use to continue and will therefore not result in significant numbers of potential new trips as is the case with those sites newly allocated for employment. It is in our view correct that the highway modelling focuses on these sites. We would, however, continue to emphasise the need for any future highway proposals to continue to allow the successful operation of the site at Codham Hall in order to support the businesses and employment opportunities provided on site. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15698 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 15699 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 15701 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] | Support | The site supports good accessibility from the wider area by car due to its proximity to the M25 and A127. There is also a potential for the site to be accessed using proposed green transport links such as the Green Transport Route detailed in policy 10.1 of the Brentwood Draft Local Plan, further boosting the green credentials of the site. The area of land proposed for allocation however is considered to be incorrect and does not reflect either the areas previously proposed for allocation, the allocated area should be amended and extended to include the area of existing use, totalling approximately 9.2 ha to ensure there is no loss of employment land. In order to deliver a net increase in employment provision as requested by the NPPF and set out in the Council's Economic Futures Study | Support noted | No action |
| 112 Childerditch Industrial Estate | | | | |
| 14824 - Mrs Sandra Mate [2826] | Object | I question whether BBC have considered all available and suitable brownfield sites. Whilst this is noted throughout the Draft Local Plan, I note that for example, the Childerditch Industrial Estate within the A127 Corridor has not been considered despite it being brownfield land in what is BBC's stated preferred transport corridor for development. | Brownfield sites are being considered with regard to housing allocations. However, the Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing and employment needs of the Borough and therefore the Council is considering development options. | Consider accordingly |
| 14603 - Childerditch Properties [2642] | Support | The proposed allocation of Childerditch Industrial Park is a full recognition of the role that this industrial area has in providing employment and jobs for the Borough. | Support welcomed | No action |
| 117 Ford Offices, Eagle Way, Brentwood | | | | |
| 15339 - Ford Motor Company [3768] | Object | Policy maintains the existing employment designation across Ford's landholdings at Eagle Way, Warley. Ford acknowledges the requirement for policies which afford protection to existing employment sites. However, Ford notes that the plan period runs until 2033. Whilst Ford's offices south of Eagle Way are currently operational and form an important location for Ford's finance operations; in the interest of protecting the long-term value and robustness of its operations, Ford requires flexibility in future planning policy to respond to its business needs. As currently drafted, Policy 8.4 does not afford a great level of future flexibility for Ford's landholding. Ford encourages Brentwood BC to consider a separate policy within the Local Plan which is specific to Ford's site. As such, an appropriate policy should be included within the Brentwood Local Plan that affords a level of flexibility for future employment, residential or mixed-use development should the site become surplus to Ford's operational requirements during the Plan period. | The Council must consider development within the Borough in the strategic context. Piecemeal site development can lead to inappropriate and unsuitable communities with minimal infrastructure and services which is not the sustainable communities envisaged by the NPPF. The Council will work with Ford should the site become surplus to their operational requirements to develop sustainable communities as required by the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| Policy 8.5: Supporting the Rural Economy | | | | |
| 15897 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Support the Councils objective to enhance economic growth in the rural area. Recommend reference is made to the 'Essex Rivers LEADER programme'. Policy 8.5 should be more reflective of SO8 in relation to providing new homes and businesses with telecommunications, including superfast broadband and an additional criterion should be added to encourage the provision of telecommunications, which are essential for rural businesses. 'Include provision for connection to broadband and mobile phone coverage across the site.' Criterion f) - refers to having 'no unacceptable effect' on water quality or flooding, watercourses, biodiversity or important wildlife habitats. However it is not clear what would be considered unacceptable. ECC recommends the policy refers to the SuDs Design Guide with regards appropriate standards. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15513 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Support | We support this policy, in particular point f, which ensures that rural development will only be supported where it has no unacceptable effect on water quality, flooding, watercourses, biodiversity or important wildlife habitats. However, it is not clear from the policy wording or supportive text what is meant by 'unacceptable effects'. Ideally, this should be made clearer to ensure the policy is properly enforced. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Borough Centres | | | | |
| 14979 - Miss Susan Maclean [4252] | Comment | Business in the area are mainly fast food outlets and bars - the terms "quality independent" and "wide range" really do not apply in Brentwood. If correctly modelled the transport links could suggest Brentwood as a possible hub for business in financial services and other mediums but the tired appearance, transport problems and simply overcrowding would surely put any sensible firm off. I would hope that any business you may manage to attract might be steered in the direction of the empty spaces in our high street but the plan seems keen to build more regardless of what stands empty. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14972 - Sue Marigold [2267] | Comment | The Council removed the small free parking bay at the end of the High Street, which allowed for 30 minutes of shopping - very appropriate for the types of shops directly next to this bay. A number of these have now shut - the shoe repairers, the florist, the fruit and veg shop etc which were independent shops. The Council claims to encourage these in section 8.37. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 8.6: Brentwood Town Centre | | | | |
| 14934 - Mr Rob Marigold [6030] 14970 - Sue Marigold [2267] | Comment | The best place to build a cinema complex for Brentwood is at the Brentwood Leisure Centre. There is already ample parking there. This would avoid building at the William Hunter Way car park. So the town centre would avoid the vehicle traffic from cinema goers. In fact, if the cinema were built in William Hunter Way, the increased traffic in William Hunter Way, Western Avenue and Weald Road, including the crossroads junctions with the High Street would be worse. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14052 - The Theatres Trust (Mr Ross Anthony) [302] | Comment | <p>Welcome Policy 8.6 for Brentwood Town Centre, as these do support culture, however, there is not a clear policy to safeguard and support existing community and cultural facilities. The content of Policy 10.9 alludes to it, but has a focus on recreation. Therefore recommend a new policy is created, or Policy 8.6 or 10.9 are amended to also safeguard existing facilities. Recommend a policy along the lines of:</p> <p>Community and Cultural Facilities. The council will resist the loss or change of use of existing community and cultural facilities unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the need of the local population, or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision, and it has been demonstrated that there is no community need for the facility or demand for another community use on site.</p> | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 14923 - Mrs Karen Jewers [6026] | Comment | Brentwood High Street is dying unless you do something to support businesses that already exist it will get worse. | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | No action |
| 13595 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | The town centre is fine how it is - it does not need any changes. (Aside from the fact that the Co-op should return instead of that dreadful cheap shop there now). However, although I don't like the idea of developing the Baytree centre and William Hunter Way car park, both of which I use regularly, building here is much, much better than destroying precious green belt, forests etc. Although, if you build on William Hunter Way car park, where is everyone going to park for this trendy new town centre?? The car park is jam packed on a Saturday as it is! | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 13814 - Mr Michael Jarvis [5739] | Comment | No mention of how the following will be effectively embraced: Parking issues that will result by building a large number of flats in and around the town centre and on existing parking spaces. How to revitalise the High Street - it is currently suffering from decay in quality shops. I see no attempt at upping the quality. How will "Night Time Economy" will be radically improved. The High Street is regarded as a "no go" area at night. The report has a great deal of hyperbole and wishful thinking- I see little hard evidence on some of the claims. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16486 - CPREssex [210] | Comment | The green space around Chapel Ruins provides a visual area of green tranquility, it is far from being "little used" and "impediment". Ensuing all paved area would exacerbate the potential "urban hardness" of the town centre. Converting this area into a public square or piazza is ignoring the fact that the area is already a well used central public space where day time public gathering take place. The Council's "Night time Economy" presages more alcohol outlets which would have impacts on the quality of life of residents. | Noted. Improvement to the vicinity of the Chapel ruins would not preclude green space as a facet of a public square or piazza, with a mixed night time economy. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14968 - Sue Marigold [2267] | Comment | Section 8 discusses that the town apparently requires more retail units and section 5.74 states that the existing vacant units are not sufficient to provide for the requirement. There are currently at least 20 empty units in the High Street, Bay Tree Centre, Kings Road and Chapel Ruins area. Why can these not be filled first? Can these be adapted for use by retailers, with their advance agreement, so that shopping in Brentwood is an attractive proposition. The current empty units are unattractive, and the choices of retailers who have recently taken some of the larger spaces are not conducive to an interesting and up-market shopping experience. | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 14932 - Mr Rob Marigold [6030] | Comment | Use of existing empty shop units. There are a number of empty shopping units in Brentwood. I counted over 20 empty and there is a very high percentage of empty units in the BayTree centre. These units should be considered first before building new units to supply the niche shopping towards the vision. | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Design Plan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | No action |
| 14971 - Sue Marigold [2267] | Comment | What is happening with the space that has been boarded up since the demolition of the Grade 11 listed building that was the Sir Charles Napier pub? It is very ugly at the moment, and a waste of development space that is sorely needed. | The site currently has planning permission for 17 x 1 bedroom flats which is yet to be implemented. | No action |
| 14940 - Mr Robert Boad [6032] | Comment | The night-time entertainment facilities in Brentwood are already adequate and further development of them should not be encouraged otherwise they will lead to further social issues, damage to the reputation of the town and destroy the attractive character of the town centre and surrounding areas. | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 14122 - Mr Nigel Mellors [5812] | Object | While I am also concerned that it will further reduce a much needed car park that actually benefits the main High St. shops, this is an opportunity to create something with more vision and culturally more rewarding than simply creating more shops or worse still, a cinema complex. Why can't the Borough council create a contemporary library or centre for performing arts or a much needed theatre instead - this would far more befitting for both residents and non-residents of Brentwood. I urge you to re-consider your views and look beyond another Romford style shopping and night time cattle market. | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13965 - Ms Linda Jarvis [1850] | Object | Over the years I have lived in Brentwood, the high street has slowly become an uninteresting place to shop. The retailers we used to have are gone, most of them because of the high rents, and have been replaced generally by charity shops and a ridiculous number of restaurants, bars and cafes - how many does one small high street need ?! Now with the development of the Baytree Centre looming, it will fast become a housing estate too ! Before any consideration is given to a completely new retail development in William Hunter Way, which we have heard about so many times before, surely it would be intelligent to want to fill the empty units first by at least lowering the rents even by a small amount and getting some interest back into the high street so that we can have good quality shops that we and visitors to Brentwood really want to look at. Surely this isn't rocket science. It would be really nice to have some shops that don't just cater for the youngsters ! This really has been a lesson on how to ruin a high street ! | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | No action |
| 14621 - Ms Christine Berner [5954] | Object | The plan is contradictory in that you aim to develop High Street retailing facilities through investment, but you do not evidence how you will attract consumers if there are no parking facilities. The park and walk scheme focuses on commuters, there appears to be no such facility for shoppers and consequentially the success of the High Street. | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 13442 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | None of this is possible without radical changes to access and parking. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14121 - Mr Nigel Mellors [5812] | Object | I wish to convey my disappointment and objection to Brentwood Councils proposed retail / commercial development plans for William Hunter Way car park. The planned proposal lacks any imagination or individualism and if pushed through will completely take away the heart of what Brentwood town centre has become synonymous for - different, appealing, valued, charming but above all habitual and charismatic. The Borough Councils plan is bombastic and will just turn the town that is respected by residents of other neighbouring towns who when I talked to them will often say that they wish they could live somewhere like Brentwood, into another 'retail park' that will obviously benefit the revenue of the Council but will go against what most residents of Brentwood would prefer given a real choice. | The Council is committed to improving and enhancing the Town Centre and encouraging new development that complements the existing retail offering. The production of the Town Centre Masterplan will set out the guiding principles to assist in enabling this. | Consider accordingly |
| 15777 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Brentwood Economic Futures Study 2015-2030 welcomed. Welcome the commitment to progress a Brentwood Town Centre Masterplan, which will consider options to boost the Town Centre offer and improve the linkages across the wider area. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| Figure 8.4: Brentwood Town Centre Links | | | | |
| 13596 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | We do not need any more retail or leisure facilities in Brentwood! It will NOT improve the centre for local residents, it will make it much busier!! The people who live in Brentwood now chose to do so because they like the way of life and how it is at the moment. If they (us included) had wanted to live somewhere busier we would have chosen to live somewhere else, like Romford!! Don't make Brentwood like Romford!!!!!!!!!! | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 8.7: Local Centres | | | | |
| 16072 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | In the case of Shenfield's retail offer as the terminus for Crossrail (Paragraph 8.47), it is recommended that flexibility is allowed for concerning point h. (subdivision of large retail units), in case it is found at a later date that Crossrail leads to a number of consumers travelling elsewhere due to the range of services available. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15543 - Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093] | Comment | With regards to retail we would support a town centre first approach and the need to work closely with neighbouring authorities including London on the potential impact of new larger-scale retail development on the vitality and viability of neighbouring centres. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13494 - Mr Richard Massett [4341] | Object | The proposed housing and retail development in West Horndon will more than double the existing population and change the village into more of a small town which would be against the wishes of the vast majority of local residents. The development would harm the local environment by increasing noise, air pollution and traffic levels. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14693 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Object | Para 8.48 - This paragraph acknowledges that West Horndon will be a similar order village centre to Ingatestone once new housing development provides sufficient investment in community, service and retail facilities. However, it then goes on to state "This will need to be considered as part of future Local Plan review". Our client is concerned this could be construed by future decision makers to slow the redevelopment of the Horndon Estate, which is at odds with the spatial strategy of the emerging LDP and there is no justification provided at all. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16329 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Support | Support the change of use of upper floors from commercial to residential use in line with these criteria. | Noted | No action |
| 14691 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Insofar as it allows for a local retail come forward as part of the redevelopment of the industrial estate. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| Retail Development | | | | |
| 16076 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Reference to the adopted Shopfront Guidance DPD is supported. Brentwood Borough Council could investigate possible grants available to improve shop fronts to assist improving the appearance of the high street. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 8.8: New Retail and Commercial Leisure Development | | | | |
| 16078 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Recommend reference should be made to the need to prepare a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for new development, as referenced in Policy 8.3, criterion f. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15676 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Comment | Anglian Water has made an initial assessment of the impact of the proposed housing, employment retail and leisure allocation sites on existing water and water recycling infrastructure located within Anglian Water's area of responsibility. This will need to be revisited when planning applications are submitted to the District Council and we are approached by developers as part of the planning application process. A copy of the initial assessment made by Anglian Water is included with this consultation response. In relation to the strategic sites identified in the Local Plan it would be helpful to cross refer to the requirements of Policies 10.13 (Flood Risk) and (Sustainable Drainage) to ensure that these development proposals which are of strategic significance provide sufficient evidence relating to foul drainage and surface water management and the timing of any required improvements. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15730 - Highways England (Ms Janice Burgess) [6105] | Comment | Policy 8.8 relates to retail and commercial development. The policy calls for mitigation to the transport network where travel demand cannot be accommodated satisfactorily. Again, this approach suggests that any impacts are examined on an individual development basis. There is a risk in adopting this approach downstream for two reasons. Firstly, the full impacts of the local plan will not be considered, rather assessment of the larger developments only. Secondly, full impacts should be assessed within the Local Plan rather than at planning application stage, otherwise mitigation may be required that for whatever reason may be undeliverable. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15735 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] | Comment | Although the policy reflects the 'town centre first' approach advocated within the NPPF, however we request that regard is also had to para. 23 of the Framework which states (inter alia) that LPAs should "set policies for the consideration of proposals for main town centre uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres". This is applicable to specialist uses, such as garden centres, where the high bulk, low value of the goods sold, together with a need for access by private vehicle, renders a town centre location generally inappropriate and unviable. As such, the retail policies of the emerging Local Plan should recognize the need for such retailers to be located in out of centre locations and the inappropriateness of applying the sequential test in their regard. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13443 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | You need to make more of the concern for private transport and its parking. I have an infrequent bus service and it doesn't go to Shenfield even though I live on a main road. So I have to use my car and I rarely go to Brentwood because of the congestion and poor parking facilities | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|----------------------|----------------------|
| 13660 - R M Gaymer [5664] | Object | Insufficient provision is made for new retail floorspace at Ingatestone. The above market share of available convenience goods expenditure from the Ingatestone local area is very low and not characteristic of a district centre which serves a significant catchment beyond the immediate area. The result is an unsustainable pattern of main and bulk food shopping with predominately car based trips to large format out of centre food stores further afield. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15168 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Support the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as an appropriate location for new retail allocations as part of the integrated new community. | Noted | No action |
| 14694 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Support | Support noted | No further action |

Figure 8.5: Retail Land Allocations

| | | | | |
|---|---------|---|-------|-----------|
| 15169 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Support the note in fig 8.5 that the amount of retail will be confirmed through Masterplan work. The new garden village affords a unique opportunity to ensure the delivery of the most appropriate amount and location of new retail uses in accordance with providing a genuinely sustainable and inclusive community | Noted | No action |
| 14695 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Support | Support | Noted | No action |

Policy 8.9: Non-Retail Uses

| | | | | |
|---|---------|---|-------|----------------------|
| 15427 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Comment | Changes set out within Schedule 2, Part 3 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 has resulted in the permitted change of use from A1 to either A2, A3 or mixed use without requiring planning permission. Whilst it is accepted that there is no guarantee that permitted development rights will remain throughout the course of the plan period, it is at least expected that the Policy acknowledges the existing rights. The plan also fails to comply with the criteria within the NPPF and appears to be based upon the existing Replacement Local Plan policy, which is overly restrictive. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
|---|---------|---|-------|----------------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|

Chapter 9. Environmental Protection and Enhancement

Environment, Landscape, Wildlife and Conservation

| | | | | |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14777 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] | Comment | Note that two of the DLP's strategic objectives are environmental protection and enhancement (SO9 & SO10). I regard it as important that to boost housing and to create jobs, that every effort is made to safeguard the environment and improve it wherever possible. Particularly the natural environment. I enjoy many of the locations known for their natural beauty in the Borough, eg: South Weald, Thorndon Park and Warley Place. Generally speaking. Satisfied that the DLP is well-founded in terms of its overall vision. Noted reference to the leadership role which the English Wildlife Trust has played in the area of conservation and concept of the "living landscape" is one which is given express recognition in the DLP. The Borough of Brentwood does not and will not exist in isolation and, therefore, as far as the natural environment is concerned, appreciation of the inter-connectedness with neighbouring boroughs and with Essex as a whole is rightly given support in the DLP. | Considered reference will be made to Living Landscapes and the interconnectedness of green infrastructure with neighbouring boroughs. | Amend accordingly |
| 15854 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The overall strategy is supported, however further suggested changes are recommended on specific policies in respect of ecology and biodiversity issues to improve consistency with national biodiversity conservation policy and best practice. To assist in reviewing the policies, see ECC Place Services latest revised version of "Model Policies for Local Plans". | Noted. Policies were drafted using the ECC Places Services model policies. A review in light of this and the local evidence base will be carried out. | Review accordingly |
| 14002 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] | Comment | West Basildon's and South West Brentwood's greenbelt land is land that we must save and preserve. Not just for our wildlife, health and wellbeing but with the proposed Lower Thames Crossing; the London sprawl and housing development will bring the end of Essex as a community and Brentwood and Basildon as towns. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of wildlife and the Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 15514 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Support | Environment, Landscape, Wildlife and Conservation: We are pleased that this text highlights the environment as an attraction for visitors. This in turn can bring great economic benefits to the area. | Support welcomed | No action |

Policy 9.1: Historic and Natural Environment Landscape Character

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|---|--|
| 13612 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | Para 9.8: "The council is committed to protecting Brentwood's special and valued historic environment and natural landscape." You also say that protecting it is "high priority". If this is the case, don't destroy ANY of it! If you want to protect something, protect it properly! Do what you say! | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 15856 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | To assist in reviewing the policies, see ECC Place Services latest revised version of "Model Policies for Local Plans". | Reference to model policies noted | Consider accordingly in light of Local Context |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16161 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | Countryside Properties also independently commissioned Rumney Design to look at Green Belt and landscape issues in relation to strategic options for growth, including Dunton (written when the joint proposals were being considered) and West Horndon. The report prepared by Rumney Design forms part of Appendix 2. The land to the east of West Horndon affects 3 of the 5 purposes of GB, compared to other strategic growth locations these would be low. Benefits could offset the relatively minor harm it would cause. | Site specific reference noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 13157 - Woodland Trust (Ms Ellie Henderson) [2463] | Object | Ancient woodland should be protected and buffered from development. [With only 2.4% of the land area in Great Britain covered by ancient woodland, it is essential that no more of this finite resource is lost. This means that ancient woodland must be protected absolutely from permanent clearance, but also that it must be protected from damaging effects of adjacent and nearby land-use that could threaten the integrity of the habitat and survival of its special characteristics.] | Noted. Local policy is is drafted in line with section 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. "Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss;" in order to manage development to ensure the quality of our environment is valued and sustained. | Consider accordingly |
| 16164 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | Noted that land adjacent to Dunton is designated as a Historic Environment Zone, Dunton has a low landscape capacity to accommodate development without landscape impacts and would be visible from extensive transport networks surrounding the site. The development would lie closer to West Horndon than the Dunton Garden Suburb and would contribute to a perception of urban sprawl. | Comment on historical designation within Basildon Borough and landscape is noted. Brentwood Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this alongside issues such as the importance of protecting Green Belt and the assessment of impact on historical assets as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 15170 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | CEG supports policy 9.1 and its aims to safeguard the diversity and local distinctiveness of the Borough, including its varied landscapes, heritage, biodiversity and habitats. CEG are also supportive of the aim that development should foster a sense of place and local identity and respect, and where possible, enhance the character of the area. The allocation of Dunton Hills Garden Village affords a unique opportunity to achieve these aims. The early evidence prepared by the Promoters illustrates how the site can successfully deliver these aims. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15515 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Support | We are very supportive of this policy, which gives regard to conserving and enhancing biodiversity and habitats, including the creation of new habitats. | Support Noted | No action |
| Landscape | | | | |
| 13445 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | More should be made about mature trees, without a Tree Preservation Order, as it can be seen that many potential developers start by cutting them down "quickly whilst they can" and that ruins the local landscape. Could all trees automatically have TPOs applied when they have reached, say, 20 feet tall. | Noted. There is a formal process to be followed when making and confirming a Tree Preservation Order. (Described with the National Planning Practice Guidance). Brentwood policy is in line with this. | No action |
| Historic and Archaeological Heritage | | | | |
| 13446 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Shouldn't the landscape surrounding these historical or archaeological sites receive more emphasis on protection. | Noted. Policy 9.1 in the Draft Local Plan considers these impacts. | No action |
| 13970 - Cllr Roger Hirst [4386] | Object | The Draft Local Plan has a clear omission in relation to the special character of the area of Hutton Mount. This area plays a specific and key role in the economy of the Borough, providing the majority of the executive housing available in the entire area, and hence enabling the Borough to attract and retain national business headquarters, and the concomitant inward investment from the private sector. The beneficial consequences in terms of employment creation, ancillary businesses and NNDR and Council Tax income to support the more deprived residents of the Borough are transparent. The special character Hutton Mount has enjoyed the protection of a specific policy H15 of the 2005 Replacement Local Plan, which has been effective in ensuring the estate remains leafy and semi-rural and has not been urbanised through excessively dense development. The benefits of protecting the special character of Hutton Mount should be brought out in SO3, SO7 and SO10. The existing protections include a density of no more than 10 dwellings per hectare; a minimum frontage of 18.3m; a minimum space to the next building of 1.2m; and retention of the leafy and semi-rural character. These protections should be afforded Hutton Mount in the relevant policy sections of the new Local Development Plan, and reference should be made to a Supplementary Planning Document where the special nature and character of Hutton Mount and the requirements of development on the estate are laid out in detail. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| Policy 9.2: Wildlife and Nature Conservation | | | | |
| 15239 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Comment | We have therefore examined the Draft Local Plan and Interim Sustainability Appraisal in the light of the concerns expressed in our previous response, dated 16 February 2015, at the Strategic Growth Options stage. Both the Draft Local Plan and the Interim Sustainability Appraisal now include several references to the three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within the district and to the potential threats to them arising from increased recreational pressure. We also note that there is now an explicit reference to the need for the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan to include consideration of the potential impact of the Plan's policies on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) as a result of increased road traffic and the associated air pollution. | Reference to SSSI and HRA noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13616 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | Think small scale - something you think is doing no harm may be extremely damaging to a specific animal in that area. The excuse of "mitigating circumstances" is not acceptable. NO protected species should be disturbed. Do not rely on the applicant to tell you the truth about the wildlife in the area they are interested in. | Noted. Consideration to impact on wildlife will be consistent with paragraph 118 of the NPPF and legislative protection of Protected Species. | No change |
| 13470 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] | Object | [The Local Wildlife Site review recognises the woodland along the Mar Dyke Tributary as ancient woodland. The NPPF gives protection to ancient woodland and veteran trees from developments. The site is an important Green Corridor linking the Country Parks of Langdon Hills and Thorndon. Local residents have reported the presence of Greater Crested Newts and bats which are also protected. I believe that the species and habitats already identified are sufficient to prevent development of the area but If the Dunton garden Suburb proposal is to be continued it is vital that a detailed year round habitat assessment be carried out to get an accurate picture of the impact it will have on biodiversity in the area.] Loss of Biodiversity at Dunton Hills. Read full comment as the details are important and no longer than necessary. | Noted. Consideration of any development within the borough will be required to consider impacts on biodiversity and protected species, in line with legislative requirements and the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 13448 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | The policy should also conserve small pockets of wildlife/nature that have arisen because of the undisturbed nature of the land over many years. | Noted. Habitat surveys will be required where wildlife may be affected and the Council acknowledge the importance of Green Infrastructure. | No action |
| 13650 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 13705 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13848 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13860 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] | Object | I object to any development at Dunton, as this will adversely affect the wildlife in this area, that is extremely close to the Essex Wildlife Trust site at Langdon Hills, and provides a wildlife corridor to the Thorndon Park, which would be lost if this development went ahead. | Noted. Consideration of any development within the borough will be required to consider impacts on biodiversity and protected species, in line with legislative requirements and the NPPF. | No action. |
| 15516 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Support | We are also very supportive of this policy, which provides a lot of detail on the requirements for development proposals affecting wildlife and nature conservation sites. We are pleased that this policy references Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves, as these are not explicitly afforded protection through the National Planning Policy Framework. We are also pleased to note that river corridors and wetlands are listed as features which could be used as mitigation or compensatory measures. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15172 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | CEG supports the aims of policy 9.2 to protect valuable wildlife and nature assets and, where appropriate to mitigate and bring net gain to the provision of biodiversity. Early evidence prepared by the Promoters of the Dunton Hills Garden Village demonstrates the unique opportunity to provide substantial gain in the provision of new habitats and the enhancement of existing habitats. | Support noted | No further action |
| 16510 - CPREssex [210] | Support | Support where the object of tree planting is for conservation purposes, but where primary objective of tree planting is screening of industrial/commercial and housing sites then we do not agree at all. Suggest to include the planting of evergreen so that even in the winter, the screening remains. | Support noted. Mixed species planting to be considered in order to improve screening. | Consider accordingly |

Figure 9.1: Environment and Biodiversity

| | | | | |
|--|--------|---|--|------------|
| 13159 - Woodland Trust (Ms Ellie Henderson) [2463] | Object | All ancient woodland should be protected from development. [All ancient woodland should be on this map. With only 2.4% of the land area in Great Britain covered by ancient woodland, it is essential that no more of this finite resource is lost. This means that ancient woodland must be protected absolutely from permanent clearance, but also that it must be protected from damaging effects of adjacent and nearby land-use that could threaten the integrity of the habitat and survival of its special characteristics.] | The Council acknowledge that the protection of ancient woodland is important and policy is drafted in line with the NPPF. The Council further acknowledges the importance of Green Infrastructure and the linkages between. The Green Infrastructure policy is included within the Plan accordingly. | No action. |
|--|--------|---|--|------------|

Policy 9.3: Landscape Protection and Woodland Management

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15110 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Comment | Recommended change: Additional criteria should be added requiring that applications are also accompanied by a detailed landscape assessment which includes information sufficient to assess the potential impact of the proposal on the immediate and wider landscape character. While reference is made to a Landscape Assessment commissioned by the Council and the existing Mid Essex Landscape Character Assessment, such documents will consider broad landscape patterns and characteristics. When dealing with smaller individual sites, the contribution they make in landscape terms, both locally and to the wider area, are often very specific. This requirement will enable a more informed decision to be made that reflects the landscape value of individual sites within the wider landscape character, allowing for a judgement to be made on any impact that will arise from development and balancing this against other planning objectives/material considerations. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13160 - Woodland Trust (Ms Ellie Henderson) [2463] | Comment | Ancient woodland should be protected from development. Amend wording to add that native trees should be planted. [Where feasible, proposals should promote the use of NATIVE trees, hedges, wildlife gardens, allotments, ponds, green roofs/walls, roosting boxes and wider habitat creation.] | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 13513 - Helen Jackman [745] | Object | It is of utter importance that the health of natural and historical wildlife areas be protected against quasi agricultural destruction as well as from residential destruction. An area identified as a wildlife area lying between Dagwood Lane and Church Lane in Doddinghurst has already been reduced since the preparation of the Draft Local Plan. | Noted. Biodiversity policy is developed in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Government legislation. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 13339 - Mr. Michael R. M. Newman [1823] | Object | Object to the statement: "In line with the NPPF, planning permission will not be permitted for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss." In my view and I'm sure that of many others, "the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland" cannot be "outweighed" by the benefits of any development. | Objection noted. Consideration of any development within the borough will be required to consider impacts on biodiversity and protected species, in line with legislative requirements and the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 13621 - Anne Clark [4973] 13651 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] | Object | Dunton Hills project goes against what you are saying here. Young trees take years to reach maturity and the effects will be felt in the area for years. If you leave the trees as they are, you won't need to replant them! Once gone, irreplaceable habitats such as ancient and veteran woodland are lost forever. Object to any development at Dunton, as this will adversely affect the wildlife in this area, that is extremely close to the Essex Wildlife Trust site at Langdon Hills, and provides a wildlife corridor to the Thorndon Park, which would be lost if this development went ahead. | Noted. Consideration of any development within the borough will be required to consider impacts on biodiversity and protected species, in line with legislative requirements and the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 13514 - Helen Jackman [745] | Object | One look at the minute area of "wildlife area" in the Doddington parish will show the need for protection from agriculture and quasi agricultural destruction. The source of the River Wid which is a tributary of the River Chelmer, is now threatened by unhealthy "agricultural" practices. | Noted. The Council is supportive of the work within Essex to meet the Water Framework Directive. Consideration of any development within the borough will be required to consider impacts on habitat, biodiversity and protected species, in line with legislative requirements and the NPPF. | Consider accordingly |
| 15173 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | CEG supports policy 9.3 in its aims to protect existing significant landscape heritage or a feature of ecological importance, including trees, woodlands or hedgerows. CEG also supports policy 9.3 in its aims to provide new planting and landscapes. Early evidence prepared on behalf of the Promoters of Dunton Hills Garden Village demonstrates the unique ability of the development to respect and retain existing important landscape features and enhance further the aims of providing new features as part of creating a sense of place. | Support noted | No action |
| 15517 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Support | We support this policy and welcome the third paragraph in particular, which promotes the importance of smaller scale contributions to landscape and biodiversity, such as wildlife gardens, ponds, and green roofs and walls, as well as wider habitat creation. | Support noted | No action |
| Policy 9.4: Thames Chase Community Forest | | | | |
| 16079 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Supports reference to the Themes Chase Community Forest and the Thames Chase Plan, to which ECC actively engages with its preparation and implementation. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| Built Heritage | | | | |
| 16330 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Para 9.35 we would like to see a statement which says that "the council will introduce a procedure for locally listed buildings of historical and architectural interest which can be quickly triggered should a building of consequence be threatened with demolition". Important buildings have already been lost in our Parish because no local list has been compiled and no procedure exists. | Noted and agreed. The Council are working towards the compilation of a list of building for consideration for Local Listing and will work with key stakeholders with detailed local knowledge, such as Parish Councils, in order to produce and adopt a Local List. | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 9.5: Listed Buildings | | | | |
| 16331 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Concerned that criteria a, b, c, d is not being implemented as a recent and ongoing example of this is the re-development of the Grade 11 listed Crown Public House in Ingatestone High Street. | Concern noted. Listing is not a preservation order, preventing change. It does not freeze a building in time, it simply means that listed building consent must be applied for in order to make any changes to that building which might affect its special interest. Listed buildings are to be enjoyed and used, like any other building. Listed buildings can be altered, extended and sometimes even demolished within government planning guidance. The local authority uses listed building consent to make decisions that balance the site's historic significance against other issues, such as its function, condition or viability. | No action |
| 15662 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Policy 9.5 current wording is not 'Consistent with national policy'. The Policy advises that proposals for development affecting or within the vicinity of a Listed Building will only be permitted where these are sympathetic to its character and setting. National policy directs that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, a LPA should refuse consent unless the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or if the following apply: The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and, No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and, Conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and, The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use. Alternatively, where a proposals leads to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset's significance, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. | Noted. The Council consider policy in light of national policy. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|------------------------------|--------|--|--|-----------|
| 13449 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | This policy statement doesn't seem to cover the detrimental effect to a listed building of a planned change/development to a property alongside that building. | Noted. Listed buildings can be altered, extended and sometimes even demolished within government planning guidance. The local authority uses listed building consent to make decisions that balance the site's historic significance against other issues, such as its function, condition or viability. Policy to be considered in line with consultation comments from Heritage England. | No action |

Policy 9.6: Conservation Areas

| | | | | |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15869 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756] | Comment | The boundary of the Brentwood Town Centre Conservation Area currently includes the southern frontage of William Hunter Way. This boundary should be amended to exclude this area as there are no factors of special architectural or historic interest in this area that merit protection. | Noted. Since adoption of the Replacement Local Plan in 2005 changes have been made to several conservation area boundaries. These changes have been approved by the Council following consultation on the proposed amendments, which followed from recommendations made in the above appraisals. Changes were made to the boundary of: Brentwood Town Centre, Ingatestone Station Lane and Ingatestone High Street Conservation Areas (13 January 2010). | Consider accordingly |
| 16332 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Support | Agree that protection of conservation area is paramount, recommend to put in place Parish Council's Conservation Area Appraisals report. | Support noted. The Council have published Conservation Area appraisals, written by accredited experts, in line with Government Guidance. | No action |

Archaeological Heritage

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--|---|------------|
| 13450 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | This should be stated more strongly. The historic development of our Borough, eg. field boundaries, is why we love it. Do not let developers destroy it. | Noted. The policy refers to the requirement for historic and architectural evaluation, within a Conservation area. This would include field boundaries. | No action. |
|------------------------------|--------|--|---|------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Green Belt | | | | |
| 15404 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15405 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | The following provides an assessment of "exceptional circumstances" for the release of Green Belt land within BBC's emerging local plan: i) the acuteness/intensity of the OAN; ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development; iii) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt; iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); V) the extent to which the consequent impact on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent. The DLP provides the context of Green Belt as a constraint to available development land (para 9.51) and proposes the removal of land from the Green Belt, however it does not make explicit reference to "exceptional circumstances" and does not set out whether BBC considers that the test for "exceptional circumstances" has been met. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14908 - Sue Lister [2269] | Comment | I am against development of Green Belt land and I believe that the Green Belt around West Horndon is particularly important because of our proximity to Havering and through them, London. I believe that as suggested in the latest LDP the outline of West Horndon should be preserved. | Noted | No action |
| 15903 - Kitewood [6116] | Comment | Green Belt protects Brentwood's high quality environment and at the same time constrains development opportunities, making it difficult to meet development needs in full. However, there are likely to be many sustainably located sites that do not fulfil the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in Para 80 of the NPPF, and should therefore be considered for released as part of the plan-making process. The Council should also consider the release of reserve sites for release beyond the plan period or in the event that the proposed allocations fail to deliver. | Noted. The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and accordingly the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 14109 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Comment | The Draft Plan recognizes that there is a need to release land from the Green Belt however there is a reluctance to accept that for the Borough to grow and develop there needs to be a more flexible approach to taking land out of the Green Belt and develop it. The long held view that the Green Belt is sacrosanct reflected in the Draft Plan makes it miss the opportunity to identify areas capable of taking development whilst minimizing the effect on the Green Belt. In a previous report the Council recognized that the best way to maintain the Green Belt was to do smaller developments in and around villages, thereby minimizing damage to the existing landscape. But the Draft Plan recommends concentrate building at Dunton on Green Belt land and around West Horndon. The Draft Plan's approach does not allow for growth throughout the Borough and does not recognize the need to move away from the blanket designation of Green Belt over the whole Borough. | Disagree. The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritise urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | No action. |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|---|--|-----------------------|
| 13974 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] | Object | Building on Green Belt. All possible options to utilise brownfield land and should be considered before putting forward proposals to utilise the Green Belt. | Noted. The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | 0Consider accordingly |
| 14564 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | With 89% of the Borough Green Belt it is difficult to understand the Council's approach to protecting the Green Belt over the aims of meeting the housing and other requirements of the population, particularly through a reliance on windfall, few allocations and a new Garden Village which is questionable in its delivery. Circular for the Council to seek to protect the Green Belt while allocating a site on its boundary, which will conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt to a much more significant degree than any other allocation in the Borough. | Noted. The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 14132 - Saffron Hawkins [2589] 14135 - Jasmine Hawkins [2588] 14221 - Mr A.M. Witney [5757] 14538 - A. Burton [1628] 14721 - Gary Hurlock [4655] | Object | Object to any proposals to build on Brentwoods Greenbelt. There is plenty of room for the people of Brentwood so we do not need to build housing or anything else on Greenbelt. Greenbelt can only be built on in exceptional circumstances. Circumstances regarding over population from another area are not valid. A situation could never ever come into existence that could be considered as 'very special circumstances' (unless we were to find ourselves at war.) Greenbelt land is home to thousands of living, respiring organisms. It is not right to take their homes which will more than likely lead to individual deaths. Once 'Officers Meadow' is built there will be houses linked from Brentwood Town Centre to Ingatestone, making this area look like a suburb of London. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 13365 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] | Object | Use existing small plots of derelict ground in the green belt that are near to existing residential areas | Noted. The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14714 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] 14716 - Mr Brian Worth [2475] | Object | The allocation of 2000 houses at Dunton is on Green Belt land adjacent to the A128, despite various statements in the Local Plan about preservation of the Green Belt. Nearly all of the 1% of the amount of Green Belt land of the 89% in the Borough will be lost from West Horndon Parish. This represents a huge amount from the total Green Belt land in the West Horndon Parish. The plan conflicts with the NPPF on Green Belt and seems to encourage more than just this "one-off" release of Green Belt with West Horndon Parish. The Draft Local Plan goes so far as to hint that more Green Belt land around West Horndon village could be a prime candidate at a later point in time - 7.10 of the Draft Local Plan states that "Land around West Horndon village remains a reasonable alternative because it can provide for similar development numbers forwards local needs" despite the fact that West Horndon flood issues have been identified in paragraph 10.68. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 14415 - Valerie Godbee [4943] 14422 - Keith Godbee [4942] | Support | Welcome that there are no plans to alter the Green Belt boundary adjoining the smaller villages within the plan which will help to avoid the urban spread of our smaller villages which have so much character and which need protecting for the longer term and for all to enjoy. | Support noted | No action |
| 14589 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 14783 - Mr & Mrs Gary & Elisabeth Taylor [2918] | Support | Green belt around all existing villages should be protected otherwise our countryside will be lost forever and we will end up with no rural space at all between villages. Villages such as Blackmore have existed for hundreds of years and would be completely spoilt if over developed. Protect Green Belt around the village of West Horndon to avoid urban creep. | Support noted. However, the protection of the Green Belt has to be balanced with the requirement to meet the Brentwood Objectively Assessed Housing Need | No action |
| Figure 9.2: Green Belt in Brentwood Borough | | | | |
| 15889 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | This should be amended to include reference to representation site at Brook Street/Nags Head Lane. | Disagree. The Green Belt boundary will not be amended except for sites specifically considered to fulfil the Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan and are brought forward for housing, employment or mixed used development in the Local Plan. | No action |
| 16038 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | This should be amended to include reference to our representation site at Bayleys Mead. | Disagree. The Green Belt boundary will not be amended except for sites specifically considered to fulfil the Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan and are brought forward for housing, employment or mixed used development in the Local Plan. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 13672 - Mr Stuart Wilks [5666] | Object | This will need re-drawing to reflect the development on greenbelt at Mascalls Park. | Disagree. The Green Belt boundary will not be amended except for sites specifically considered to fulfil the Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan and are brought forward for housing, employment or mixed used development in the Local Plan. | No action |
| Policy 9.8: Green Belt | | | | |
| 13625 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | You cannot justify that any development "outweighs" the harm to the Green Belt. We are, sadly, not able to communicate with the wildlife to ask them what harm your developments will do, so you cannot possibly measure if it "outweighs" it or not. To you, the loss of an animal's home might not seem much, but to that animal you are destroying their whole world! Put yourselves in the position of the wildlife in those areas, see it from their point of view before you make any judgements on what constitutes whether something is worth harming or not. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt and wildlife. | Consider accordingly |
| 13688 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | There must be a presumption that ALL development in the green belt would be 'inappropriate' /ipso facto/. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 16115 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Comment | It is noted that the policy considers the NPPF's five purposes of the Green Belt. We consider that each site should be considered on its own merits, and whether they meet the purposes of the Green Belt. | Noted. Each site is being considered on its own merits and constraints in accordance with the Councils Spatial Strategy. | No action |
| 14565 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Comment | Para 9.51 - Agree the delivery of land in the Green Belt is required in order to grow the borough. The Council must provide adequate land for housing and employment, and that failure would undermine the prosperity of the Borough. | Noted. The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 13114 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Comment | Infill's in GB should be permitted especially where surrounded by existing development. GB sites should be graded and consider existing use, habitat and aesthetics. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 13532 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] 15720 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | We note in paragraph 9.50 that the Council acknowledges the importance of the Green Belt and that it provides an important network of public rights of way; however, no mention is made within this document that these rights of way will be extended or enhanced or protected from development, even if it is development deemed to be allowed in 'exceptional circumstances'. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways, are considered an important part of Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 13671 - Mr Stuart Wilks [5666] | Comment | It is difficult to understand how the map for greenbelt can be squared with the current development on Mascalls Lane on the site of the former hospital. Presumably the map and policy will need to be re-written? | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14090 - Zada Capital (Mr. Jonathan Chaplin) [306] | Comment | The Draft Local Plan concedes that there is pressure to release Green Belt land to meet development needs in full and yet throughout the draft Plan they seek to restrict development in the Green Belt. There is no balance shown between the need for new development and the protection of Green Belt. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 15954 - Collins & Coward Ltd (Mr Brown) [6119] | Object | The Draft Local Plan at Policy 9.8 seeks to introduce a further purpose of the Green Belt which is not present in National Policy in the NPPF, namely 9.8(a) which should be deleted. Likewise, draft Policies 9.9 and 9.11 go beyond the NPPF and should be deleted. | This issue will be reviewed in line with the NPPF 5 Green Belt purposes. | Consider accordingly |
| 13652 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 13838 - Mr Joe Gabell [5676] 13850 - Mr Harry Gabell [5677] 13862 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] | Object | If Development within the Green Belt will only be permitted if it maintains the Green Belt's openness and does not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt or harm its visual amenities, then the development at Dunton should definitely not go ahead as this conflicts with the purposes of green belt by loss of some of the limited visual green space in the area south of the A127, and it is going to encourage urban sprawl by removing one of the main sections separating the London borough of Havering from Southend. | Noted. Strategic site allocations is being done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | Consider accordingly |
| 15295 - Brentwood School [2575] | Object | There is a failure to consider wider strategic objectives, to review Green Belt boundaries in order to address the long term needs of the Borough. It is critical for education provision to correspond with population growth. In much of London, Planning Authority have recognised the need to provide greater flexibility with their existing School sites to remove Metropolitan Open Land and Green Belt designations to replace with Urban Open Space or adjusting the Green Belt boundary completely. The Council should review with greater flexibility its Green Belt boundaries, particularly within the urban areas | Noted. Further strategic assessment of Green Belt is being carried out. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15941 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Object | Policy 9.8b and c of the Draft Local Plan states that "The Metropolitan Green Belt boundaries within Brentwood Borough will be maintained in order to continue to serve its key function, and be protected from inappropriate development, and to b) Check the growth of London and prevent ribbon development and urban sprawl, and c) Prevent the coalescence of settlements". The level of proposed development along the A127 Corridor, particularly on Green Belt is contradictory to this policy. It is well observed that all authorities along the A127 are allocating adjoining land for development, with the Basildon Dunton Extension a perfect example. The policies proposed within the Draft Local Plan will actually contribute to urban sprawl and ribbon development within the area. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 13527 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024] 13561 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] 13564 - Ms Alison Bazzali [2454] | Object | Green Belt in and around villages must be protected at all costs. Too many villages have been swallowed up by indiscriminate development. This applied to local development of existing buildings where a change of use is recognised and/or planning permission. Buildings have been bought and been allowed to rot, this has and is happening in Blackmore. | Noted. Under the Duty to Cooperate Brentwood will be seeking all opportunities to minimise impact on Green Belt, however it is acknowledged that Brentwood is seeking to meet its own currently identified OAN | No action |
| 13997 - Ms Daljit Hawkins [2717] | Object | I object to the Brentwood local development plan this is not required in my opinion for new housing in Brentwood as we have many empty properties in the Basildon area that are newly built but not used. Why do we need more housing it is certainly not for local housing needs and no building on greenbelt should be allowed, it is illegal. | Noted. Under the Duty to Cooperate Brentwood will be seeking all opportunities to minimise impact on Green Belt, however it is acknowledged that Brentwood is seeking to meet its own identified OAN. | No action |
| 14136 - Jasmine Hawkins [2588] | Object | As I have seen from my own personal experience after spending the entirety of my schooling in Brentwood, they are already majorly oversubscribed. There are no plans to build a new secondary school. Having been a patient of Highwood Doctors surgery in Brentwood my whole life, I have experienced very long waiting times when being referred to consultants (at least 2 months.) There is no plans to build new hospitals to cope with the increase of the population. I object to any building on any greenbelt land in the UK. | Noted. The Council is working with infrastructure providers and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 13451 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] 13977 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] | Object | Councils should be made to build on brownfield and not Green Belt. Once the land is gone it is gone forever. From the National Planning Policy Framework it states 'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.' I implore you to honour this policy. | Noted. The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 15216 - Spire Hartswood Hospital [6074] | Support | The Council should apply the national policy position in relation to proposals for Green Belt development. This is however should be considered in the context that Brentwood is extremely constrained by Green Belt, and that part of the Council's Growth Strategy includes the limited release of Green Belt sites, and also the development of Key Gateway sites, many of which fall within the Green Belt designation. | Noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|-----------------------|
| 14629 - Mr Thomas Lennon [747] | Support | It was noted that there are no intentions to vary Green Belt boundaries, this is reassuring. | Noted. The Council are proposing limited release of the Green Belt in order to facilitate limited new development which will require variation to the Green Belt boundary. The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| Policy 9.9: New Development, Extension and Replacement of Buildings in Green Belt | | | | |
| 15721 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] 15797 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | We note that the Council wishes to encourage the beneficial use of the Green Belt to improve outdoor recreation, although no mention is made of rights of way or that the Council will be pro-active in enhancing the rights of way network - something that would be a beneficial use of the Green Belt. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways, are considered an important part of Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 14593 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] | Comment | I accept with great reluctance the concept that if Green Belt development has to take place as set out in the NPPF section 83, then it should be as separate discreet village developments and not wide spread small incremental additions. They must be big enough to be self-sustainable and generate sufficient CIL &106 money to provide appropriate infrastructure, but not so big as to become small towns. Only the absolute minimum amount of Green Belt should be reclassified in order to prevent further development at some time in the future | Comment welcomed. | No action |
| 13115 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Comment | Conversion of redundant or under utilised agricultural buildings should be permitted to minimise the requirement for new builds in the GB. Ancillary buildings to facilitate the use of open space for sport and recreation should be permitted. ie. to play football one needs CHANGING FACILITIES and TOILET FACILITIES and a place to PARK. The council cannot provide football/Rugby/cricket fields without providing these vital ancillary buildings. By doing so the council will effectively be permitting unworkable facilities that are not fit for purpose. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14411 - Doddington Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | The Parish Council support the preservation of Bungalows but this particular clause relates only to the redevelopment of dwellings in the Green Belt. | Noted. | Consider accordingly. |
| 15428 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Comment | Repetition of the bullet point e, whilst 'm.' appears under bullet point l. | Typing error noted. | Amend accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13533 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] | Comment | We note that the Council wishes to encourage the beneficial use of the Green Belt to improve outdoor recreation, although no mention is made of rights of way or that the Council will be pro-active in enhancing the rights of way network - something that would be a beneficial use of the Green Belt. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways, are considered an important part of Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 15434 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15436 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Object | In regard to the 30% of the habitable floor space referred to throughout the Policy, there is no justification either within the Policy or the subtext as to how this figure has been calculated, or why this is considered an acceptable figure in the definition of disproportionate, as set out within the NPPF. | Noted. This issue will be considered in line with the NPPF Green Belt policy. | Consider accordingly |
| 13452 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Absolutely no new development in the green belt | Noted. The Council is required to prepare a Local Plan which must be done in accordance with National Guidance. This sets out that Local Authorities are required to meet the housing needs of the Borough and thus the Council is considering development options and will weigh this against the importance of protecting Green Belt as set out in National Guidance. | No action |
| 15955 - Collins & Coward Ltd (Mr Brown) [6119] | Object | Policy 9.9 goes beyond the NPPF and should be deleted. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15432 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Object | No requirement within the NPPF to provide justification for the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport & recreation, only that it "preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it". Such a provision is considered as appropriate development in the context of the NPPF. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15435 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Object | Policy refers to the removal of permitted developments rights through the use of conditions to prevent the habitable floorspace limitation from being exceeded. However it has been made clear through an appeal decision (Ref: APP/ Q5300/A/ 14/2217664) that in light of the Government's growth agenda and in the absence of Government advice to restrict PD rights within the Green Belt it may be the case no exceptional circumstances justify the continued prohibition of PD. | Noted. This issue will be considered in line with the NPPF Green Belt policy. | Consider accordingly |
| 13210 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | Objection is made to the wording of the second paragraph of the policy as it implies that the principle of small scale facilities required for outdoor/sport recreation needs to be justified because such proposals are considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, as set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF, appropriate facilities for outdoor sport should be regarded as an exception to the general approach to the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt and are therefore not inappropriate development. Consequently, justification for the principle of such uses should not be required. | Noted. Whilst acknowledged that new buildings for "provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries" are listed as exceptions to Green Belt, it is only within the context that the buildings should "preserve the openness of the Green Belt" and they should not "conflict with the purposes of the land with it" [the Green Belt]. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14475 - Asphaltic Developments Ltd [2664] 15431 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15433 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15736 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] 15740 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] | Object | It is requested that Policy 9.9 be fully revised so as to be consistent with national Green Belt policy. It is not clear what is meant through the Policy wording; "expansion or intensification (including extensions) of existing inappropriate development within the Green Belt will not be permitted". The NPPF allows for the "extension or alteration of a building providing that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building" and "the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction". It is not understood how a building can be an "existing inappropriate development" unless it itself is unlawful and requires planning permission. In which case, unless it met the exceptions of Paragraph 89 or the other forms of development in Paragraph 90, it would need to demonstrate 'very special circumstances'. An existing lawful building should be able to be extended or re-used, in accordance with Paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF and would not be considered as inappropriate development. | This issue will be reviewed in line with the NPPF Green Belt policy. | Consider accordingly |
| 16333 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Support | Support to replace a bungalow with a bungalow. Concerned that a 30% increase in the size of a property will in case of very large properties have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Many properties in our parish are very large with relatively small plots. Suggest to consider an upper maximum on the size of extensions in the Green Belt. The Policy could then read "The total size of a dwelling as extended does not exceed the original habitable space by more than 30% to say a maximum of 60sqm" This particular clause relates only to the redevelopment of dwellings in the Green Belt. LDP reflects on the fact that the population is aging but the need is not simply for specialist housing for the elderly. There is a need for more bungalows in the village to give elder people the opportunity to downsize, not affordable or sheltered houses. Can the LDP perhaps reference appropriate approved Neighbourhood Plans as evidence of such requirement as well as the Council's SHMA and local housing strategy? | Noted. The Council will make reference to approved Neighbourhood Plans and evidence base as relating to the policy. Stage 2 of the Brentwood SHMA further considers housing need. Expansion of existing properties and proposals for replacement properties are considered to require a proportionate policy rather than maximum as the original properties are of varying sized therefore impact on the openness of the Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| All Development | | | | |
| 14407 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | Paragraph 9.58 on Page 142 is being interpreted by many as meaning the whole of the area of the Parishes listed (they are called settlements in the document) are urban when it is the established residential areas that are being referred to as an urban classification and excluded from the Green Belt. Clear understanding is not helped by the fact that the proposals map (Fig 9.2) isn't referenced in 9.58 and you have to read the glossary to understand what a proposal map is. | Noted. Reference to the Proposals map will be made and further clarification text on the role of the Proposals map will be considered. | Amend accordingly |
| 13453 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | I want confirmation that you have not included Havering's Grove within the area of Hutton that you say is no longer green belt is needed. | The Green Belt designation of the 2005 Brentwood Replacement Local Plan is being continued with only minor amendment being proposed by the 2016 Draft Local Plan. The sites that are being proposed for Green Belt amendment are listed in Figure 7.2 Housing Land Allocations (Page 78) and Figure 8.3 Employment Land Allocations (Page 106) only. | No action. |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| Policy 9.10: Established Areas of Development in the Green Belt | | | | |
| 15439 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] 15479 - Mr Martin Morecroft [6091] 15503 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15602 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15666 - Tony Hollioake [5618] | Comment | The policy effectively removes those frontages from Green Belt designation, in which case there should be no need for the policy and they should be removed from the Green Belt. The principle or basis behind this policy is not supported within the NPPF. The Green Belt boundary should be established on a strong defensible line. Drawing the boundary across the middle of fields or gardens is totally unsatisfactory and even field boundaries may not be sufficiently permanent to form a reliable long-term boundary. At the very least, the Green Belt boundary should exclude existing residential development and this exclusion must extend to the whole of the residential curtilage. What is required is not a straight line but a clearly defined and readily defensible boundary. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15668 - Tony Hollioake [5618] | Comment | Sites, such as that at Coxie Green Road (see supporting site location plan), should be considered by the Local Planning Authority as smaller windfall development, which meet the criteria of infill development and combined with other similar sites, can provide considerable housing numbers to help the Council achieve their objectively assessed needs. | Disagree. This site is not considered to meet the requirements of the Spatial Strategy. | No action |
| 15442 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Comment | Paragraph 89 is very clear in regard to the development of infill plots and considers that limited infilling in villages is appropriate development. The relevant frontages set out above are not defined areas of a village. The Council do not have a justified case to "continue to resist strong(ly) pressure to allow new development". | Noted. The Council acknowledge Paragraph 89 and reference to LIMITED infilling in VILLAGES (the Councils highlights) and will consider windfall planning applications accordingly, as referenced by the Spatial Strategy. | No action |
| 15480 - Mr Martin Morecroft [6091] | Comment | This submission seeks to support an extension of the frontages set out within the Policy, particularly at Rayleigh Road. Whilst the northern side (nos. 554-664 Rayleigh Road) is considered a relevant frontage to meet the policy, it is requested that the ribbon development located on the southern side, including 741 Rayleigh Road should also be incorporated within frontages identified. | Disagree. The Council do not consider this a relevant frontage and development along the southern side is considered to result in a detrimental impact on the Green Belt. | No action. |
| 15199 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Object | Whilst the Spatial Strategy Policy 5.1 identifies that limited development in villages will be acceptable to sustain services, Policy 9.10 sets out the areas in which limited infill only will be acceptable. These are restricted to short frontages of ribbon development and does not include any areas within Blackmore. It is therefore considered that by following only this approach, the Council will put at risk the future sustainability of services within Blackmore. | Noted. Paragraph 89 refers to "limited in infilling" ... "in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan"; and it refers to "limited infilling which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development." The future needs of villages will be addressed by such development. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13454 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | "...new residential development on genuine infill plots, replacement of existing dwellings, or extensions to existing dwellings will be allowed" "554-664 Rayleigh Road". This is my area - I don't want this. | Noted. This policy has been continued from the 2005 Local Plan as these locations are established clusters of dwellings and it is considered that there are a very few limits, well defined areas within the Green Belt where ribbon development already exists which is sufficiently urban in character to allow some limited infilling. | No action |
| 15504 - Mr Richard Lunnon [4220] 15603 - Robert Mulholland & Co Ltd [4691] 15667 - Tony Hollioake [5618] | Object | Paragraph 89 of the NPPF is very clear and considers that limited infilling in villages is appropriate development. The relevant frontages set out above are not defined areas of a village. The Council do not have a justified case to "continue to resist strong(ly) pressure to allow new development". | Noted. Paragraph 89 refers to "limited in infilling" ... "in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan"; and it refers to "limited infilling which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development." The future needs of villages will be addressed by such development. | No action |
| Policy 9.11: Previously Developed Land in Green Belt | | | | |
| 15738 - Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd [4714] | Comment | Draft Policy 9.11 provides in part for the redevelopment of brownfield sites within the Green Belt, however no provision is made for the expansion of existing businesses through the limited extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building or limited infilling within a previously developed site. | Expansion, alteration or replacement and limited infilling within a previously developed site will considered under the proposed policies and be in line with the five NPPF Green Belt purposes. The Council do not consider additional policy is required to reflect this. | No action |
| 15956 - Collins & Coward Ltd (Mr Brown) [6119] | Object | Policy 9.11 go beyond the NPPF and should be deleted. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 14763 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Object to criteria (a) there are other types of developments, such as showmen's plots or travellers pitches, which may also be suitable to be listed in the policy. Furthermore PPTS clearly indicates that the Council should attach weight to, among other things, the effective use of previously developed land in considering applications for plots and pitches, which may also be located within the Green Belt. Coupled with the NPPF which indicates LPAs should plan to use derelict land positively, but does not specify or restrict it to specific uses such as housing. As such, we request that the policy be changed to allow for all suitable uses to be encouraged in the Green Belt. The Green Belt at Chequers Road which would be suitable for redevelopment as a showmen's yard, and respectfully request its allocations for such in Policy 7.10 in accordance with Policy 9.11. | Noted. Potential for consideration to have the policy to include plots and/or pitches. Review in line with relevant evidence base. | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 13455 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | What was (c) - it is missing. | There are a number of typographic errors in the numbering sequence of this policy, including the omission of (c) on the list. There is no text nor policy missing. | Amend list numbers accordingly |
| 14765 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975] | Object | Para 9.72 & 9.74 - These only reference the ability to developed housing on previously developed land, whereas the Council should set criteria to allow for any suitable development on previously developed land, including pitches and plots to ensure it is in line with PPTS. We request that the paragraphs also refer to other suitable uses being acceptable in the Green Belt. Should the Council wish to target housing on PDL in the Green Belt, additional paragraphs should be added to that effect without hindering other suitable uses from re-using PDL in the Green Belt. | Noted. Potential for consideration to have the policy to include plots and/or pitches. Review in line with relevant evidence base. | Consider accordingly |
| 15443 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Object | NPPF provides that "the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development" can be appropriate development in the Green Belt. Where the draft policy is generally consistent with this guidance it needs to introduce warranted and justified additional criteria (particularly relating to 'sustainability'). Policy is contradictory to the Brownfield Register, which is currently progressing through the House of Lords, and the intentions of the Government to ensure that 90% of brownfield land is redeveloped for housing by 2020. | Noted. Brownfield register requirements are noted. Policy review will consider the impact of this on policy. | Consider accordingly |
| 16009 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Support | We support the redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield) within the Green Belt. Strategic brownfield sites such as the Brentwood Enterprise Park will of course also be removed from the Green Belt as part of the plan and therefore we consider the policy and/or supporting text should make clear that the more detailed criteria within this policy will not apply to such sites. | Support noted. clarification to be provided within next draft of the Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15266 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Support | Support Policy 9.11, as this policy direction recognises latest Government announcements and consultation of the NPPF which recognise the important role that brownfield sites will play towards accelerating housing delivery. Any brownfield opportunities in the Green Belt should be maximised. Therefore it is recommended that the Council acknowledge the fact that the site at Sawyers Hall Lane is a part brownfield site in the Green Belt. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|-----------|
| 13614 - Mr Colin Robert [5654] 13618 - Miss Lucy Hinwood [5656] 13622 - Mr Nick Pain [5657] 13628 - Mrs S. Walker [5659] 13633 - Mrs Rhoda Jopson [5660] 13638 - Mr Michael Nicholls [5661] 13706 - Mr Paul Sharpe [5678] 13709 - Mrs Shirley Fraser [5679] 13713 - Mr Mehmet Doru [5680] 13724 - Mr Paul Watson [5689] 13728 - Mr Tim Murray [5690] 13731 - Miss Clare Dubbin [5691] 13733 - Mr Ian Sweetlove [5692] 13736 - Mrs Elizabeth Jones [5693] 14335 - Mr Venon Thomas [5875] 14344 - Mr Zak Harvey [5877] 14353 - Mr Andrew Watson [5878] 14364 - Miss Tilly O'Leary [5880] 14373 - Mr Dan Morrow [5881] 14416 - Mr Stanley Jopson [5890] 14427 - Mrs Rosa Dwyer [5891] 14429 - MBE Roy Dyer [5894] 14434 - Mr Robert Grey [5895] 14441 - Mr Mital Patel [5896] 14446 - Miss Lois Whitehead [5897] 14453 - Mr Stephen Bunton [5899] 14458 - Mrs Judith Wright [5901] 14463 - Asphaltic Developments Ltd [2664] 14468 - Mr Jason Paisley [5902] 14478 - Miss Deana Adansi [5905] 14485 - Mr Chris Edwards [5907] 16223 - Landmere Carwash (Administrator) [6173] 16236 - Mr Paul Day [6181] 16250 - Time 4 pets (Administrator Time 4 Pets) [6183] | Support | Policy 9.11 for redevelopment of brownfield land in the Green Belt is supported with explanatory paragraphs. | Support for the redevelopment of brownfield land is noted. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| Policy 9.12: Site Allocations in Green Belt | | | | |
| 14481 - Asphaltic Developments Ltd [2664] | Comment | Policy 9.12 states that the sites allocated for housing development in Green Belt will be de-allocated from Green Belt and provide new defensible boundaries to protect open countryside for future generations. Our client's Site [the Brentwood Leisure Park at Warley Gap] is suitable for housing development as it is brownfield land, close to and well connected to the existing urban boundary of Brentwood. The site can sustainably accommodate residential development, without adversely affecting the openness of the Green Belt. As such, the Site should be allocated under Policy 9.12, as it offers significant potential to contribute to the Borough's housing requirements. | Noted. This site does not currently fulfil the Spatial Strategy for development within the borough. Furthermore, development would result in a significant loss of leisure provision. | Consider accordingly |
| 15355 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | In order to ensure consistency with Policy 7.2 we suggest that the wording of Policy 9.12 is amended to allow the housing mix provided to not only be based on the range of needs indicated by evidence, but also on negotiation, site constraints and development viability. We therefore request that Policy 9.12 is amended to reflect this, and consider this could be achieved through the following wording in the first paragraph: "There will be a mix of housing on site to provide for a range of needs as indicated by evidence. The final housing mix, type and tenure will be subject to negotiation, account will be taken of the nature, constraints, character and context of the site and development viability." | Disagree. There is sufficient flexibility within the policy to ensure consideration of site specific issues. | No action |
| 16039 - Countryside Properties [250] | Comment | This should be amended to include reference to our representation site at Bayleys Mead, which is deliverable early in the plan period, unconstrained, adjoins Brentwood urban area and can provide a high quality residential development | Disagree. This site is not considered to be in line with the Brentwood Local Plan spatial strategy. | No action |
| 15890 - Sammi Developments Ltd [6107] | Comment | This should be amended to include reference to sites 175B at Brook Street/Nags Head Lane, which is deliverable early in the plan period, unconstrained, adjoins Brentwood urban area and can provide a mixed-use development. | Disagree. This site is not in line with the Spatial Strategy. | No action |
| 16010 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Comment | Whilst the requirements of the policy may only apply to housing sites it is considered that the policy should also make reference to employment sites allocated such as Brentwood Enterprise Park that will also be released from the Green Belt and will play a crucial role in meeting employment needs and providing jobs throughout the plan period. | Noted. Employment sites are being considered within the site assessment work of the Council in line with the evidence base, and are not considered to be appropriate for inclusion within this policy as it aims to consider housing only. | No action. |
| 15681 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Comment | Policy 9.12 states that the sites allocated within the Green Belt will be expected to provide "significant" community benefits. In addition, the DLP (para 9.75) seeks to justify this requirement by stating that the loss of Green Belt is to be "repaid" through significant benefits to new and existing communities. This wording is not considered appropriate. Circumstances in which planning obligations should be sought are set out in the NPPF. It is necessary that policies and criteria are provided for each allocation site. This will assist both the Applicant (in providing an appropriate development proposal) and decision makers (in considering a subsequent application). With regard to the above, such policies can identify new community benefits (including Use Classes) sought as part of new residential developments, to provide certainty on what deliverability expectations are. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14056 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | I disagree that the extent of development at Dunton Hills Garden Village should be set by a separate masterplan. This development is proposed to be a key part of the Borough Plan and should be dealt with at this stage as opposed to being deferred to a later stage in the planning process. | Noted. Strategic sites, as with all development, will still be assessed using the Local Plan policies. A masterplan will ensure a strategic design framework for the site which then is developed to provides more details and proposals for delivery on the site. | No action |
| 14419 - Doddinghurst Parish Council (Mr Roger Blake) [2451] | Comment | Para 7.65 reflects on the fact that the population is aging but the need is not simply for specialist housing for the elderly. Para 2.34 explains that there is a growth in numbers of the elderly in the Borough and Para 9.76 expressly mentions giving older people the opportunity to downsize. This is no less so than in the villages, where there is a need for more bungalows for conventional retail purchase - not affordable or sheltered homes, to allow for the "churn" of people in the villages. With the emphasis on affordable housing everywhere in the LDP the need for new bungalows has been somewhat squeezed out and there is no clear pathway in the policy document to facilitate this key provision - but with all the Green Belt safeguards that the Borough Council have rightly included. Can 9.76 perhaps reference approved Neighbourhood Plans as evidence of such requirement as well as the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment and local housing strategy? | Noted. The Council notes that a variety of homes are needed within the borough, of different types, sizes and tenure and policies within Chapter 7: Housing reflect this. The specific need for free-market bungalow homes within the Parish of Doddinghurst could be approached by restricting expansion of the current bungalow stock, alternatively new sites within the area that fulfil the five purposes of protecting the Green Belt would need to be considered in full. The Council wish to continue working with the Parish on this matter. The Borough Council has limited ability to protect bungalows from roof-space alterations as this is allowed nationally through permitted development rights. This means in many cases that planning permission is not required. To prevent alterations an Article 4 direction would be required, which would need to be more specific to an area rather than applied borough-wide. Local community groups could consider the neighbourhood planning process should this be deemed a particular local character or need worthy of retention and would need to have suitable evidence to support it. Parishes joining to draft a neighbourhood plan is also an option where issues are across Parish boundaries. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|--|---|----------------------|
| 16157 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | 9.12 is confused and an assessment of Green Belt is required, an assessment of landscape is required to advise on the most appropriate land to release for development. The assessment by Crestwood draws a key conclusion that Dunton makes a high contribution to Green Belt contribution. This evidence base document is in full contravention to the DLP. There is no evidence base in place to have influenced the selection of the DLP's proposals, nor rejection of alternatives, from a Green Belt or Landscape perspective. Countryside Properties has commissioned a GB review and identifies areas where GB performs less well, including around Shenfield/Brentwood town, north of Blackmore and to the east and west of West Horndon and at Herongate. The land to the east of West Horndon is not visually connected to Basildon and avoids coalescence. | Noted. Identification of sites is a process that considers a number of issues and is not solely based on impact on Green Belt, in line with the Spatial Strategy. | No action |
| 15445 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Object | The Green Belt boundary should be established on a strong defensible line. Drawing the boundary across the middle of fields or gardens is totally unsatisfactory and even field boundaries may not be sufficiently permanent to form a reliable long-term boundary. Green Belt boundary should exclude existing residential development (except, where acknowledged, the Green Belt 'washes over' an entire village) and this exclusion must extend to the whole of the residential curtilage. The Council should be de-allocating smaller sites. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16119 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Object | The Council has not undertaken appropriate forms of assessment to determine whether the proposed de-allocations from the Green Belt are justified and whether the sites would continue to fulfil their role. Given the perceived high quality of the landscape in the Borough, we consider the Council has not properly assessed the effects of releasing land within the Green Belt for a garden village concept. Fundamentally, a Green Belt Review has not been undertaken that determines which areas of the Green Belt do not fulfill the functions of the Green Belt designation. The latter proposal of the policy to release land for Dunton Hills Garden Village is considered to be unjustified and ineffective in seeking to meet the objectively assessed needs of the Borough due to the Council's failure to fully assess the impact of development. | Noted. Identification of sites considers many issues and constraints, including Green Belt, in line with the NPPF, Government Guidance and local evidence. The Council have commissioned appropriate evidence and is being published. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13626 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | You CANNOT just reclassify something to suit your needs. The land you are wanting to destroy for the Dunton Hills monstrosity IS GREEN BELT and is PROTECTED. You can't just stick your head in the sand and pretend it isn't. You say you want to protect it, then declassify it to protect yourselves! How will you make up losing green belt land to the wildlife whose homes and lives you destroy??? Unlike humans they are not governed by money so you can't use that! You should NOT be allowed to declassify PROTECTED green belt land - it's protected for a reason! | Noted. the National Planning Policy Framework states that "Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period." The Council is required to meet the housing needs of the Borough in accordance with National Guidance and will be weighed against the importance of protecting Green Belt and other evidence. | Consider accordingly |
| 13896 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 15354 - Countryside Properties [250] | Support | Welcomed that selected sites will be de-allocated from Green Belt to allow development to take place and provide new defensible boundaries to protect open countryside. This approach is in accordance with the NPPF. We therefore consider that Policy 9.12 is 'sound'. | Support noted | No action |
| 16156 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Support | Agree with the policy insofar as it relates to the proposed de-allocation of the land east of Nag's Head Lane from the Green Belt and allocation for residential development of approximately 150 dwellings. We would assure the Council that its general approach to the release of land from the Green Belt in order to accommodate OAHN is justified. | Support noted | No action |
| 16249 - Time 4 pets (Administrator Time 4 Pets) [6183] | Support | Support the section land release from Green Belt including the explanatory paragraphs. | Support noted | No further action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|-----------|
| 13615 - Mr Colin Robert [5654] 13619 - Miss Lucy Hinwood [5656] 13623 - Mr Nick Pain [5657] 13629 - Mrs S. Walker [5659] 13634 - Mrs Rhoda Jopson [5660] 13639 - Mr Michael Nicholls [5661] 13707 - Mr Paul Sharpe [5678] 13710 - Mrs Shirley Fraser [5679] 13712 - Mr Mehmet Doru [5680] 13725 - Mr Paul Watson [5689] 13727 - Mr Tim Murray [5690] 13730 - Miss Clare Dubbin [5691] 13734 - Mr Ian Sweetlove [5692] 13737 - Mrs Elizabeth Jones [5693] 14336 - Mr Venon Thomas [5875] 14345 - Mr Zak Harvey [5877] 14354 - Mr Andrew Watson [5878] 14365 - Miss Tilly O'Leary [5880] 14374 - Mr Dan Morrow [5881] 14417 - Mr Stanley Jopson [5890] 14428 - Mrs Rosa Dwyer [5891] 14430 - MBE Roy Dyer [5894] 14435 - Mr Robert Grey [5895] 14442 - Mr Mital Patel [5896] 14447 - Miss Lois Whitehead [5897] 14454 - Mr Stephen Bunton [5899] 14459 - Mrs Judith Wright [5901] 14470 - Mr Jason Paisley [5902] 14479 - Miss Deana Adansi [5905] 14486 - Mr Chris Edwards [5907] 16222 - Landmere Carwash (Administrator) [6173] 16234 - Mr Paul Day [6181] | Support | Para 9.12 is supported for land release from the Green Belt with explanatory paragraphs. | Support noted | No action |
| 15175 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | The allocation of a new garden village at Dunton Hills affords a unique opportunity to provide substantial improvement to green belt assets and public access. The scale of development on a site which will have clear and recognisable long term boundaries will allow the promotion of beneficial improvements to the green belt environment. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Policy 9.13: Agricultural Workers Dwellings | | | | |
| 16509 - CPREssex [210] | Comment | Request Business Viability to be publicly demonstrated in planning applications for new homes under this provision. Request that a Business Plan to be submitted to the Council as a part of the planning application and be available for public scrutiny, and this cannot be withheld from public scrutiny for any reason, including business confidentiality. When a dwelling with an agricultural worker's condition attached is built owners should not be able to apply for the condition to be removed for 10 years. | Requirements for viability will be considered in line with government guidance and financial regulation. Agricultural workers condition removal will be consider in line with government policy and the current permitted development rights. | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 9.14: Re-use and Residential Conversion of Rural Buildings | | | | |
| 13456 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Do not allow conversion of a non residential building, in the green belt, to residential. | Noted. This policy considers the potential impact from such conversions and has an underlying presumption in favour of employment generating uses. | No change. |
| 15447 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Matthew Driscoll) [2054] | Object | The principle of this policy is supported. However, in regard to the conversion to residential, the criteria requiring evidence to business or alternative uses is not supported. - Reference is made to Paragraph 90 of the NPPF, which states that "the re-use of building provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction" is appropriate development. It does not set out the criteria as stated within Policy 9.14 and as such, is considered inconsistent with the NPPF and unsound. - Recent changes to PD for the change of use from agricultural to residential sets out the Government's intentions in regard to the re-use of such buildings. In addition, the Government has introduced temporary PD rights for the conversion of light industrial to residential. Given the need for housing within the Borough, this policy appears heavily restrictive and not in the best interests or Government intentions. | Noted. The current Government Permitted Development rights will be considered. | Consider accordngly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Chapter 10. Quality of Life and Community Infrastructure | | | | |
| Sustainable Transport | | | | |
| 13816 - B. Impey [1308] 14973 - Sue Marigold [2267] | Comment | More car parks would need to be built. Parking is expensive. More people would presumably need to use buses. Services now seem to be cut rather than the other way round. | Concerns noted. Draft Policy 10.1 and 10.2 aim to provide a sustainable transport strategy to support new development. The Council are working with Essex County Council on infrastructure provision. | Consider accordingly |
| 15786 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | For all stations (not just Brentwood and Shenfield), park and walk, or park and ride sites, are potential tools that could form part of an overall parking and access strategy. | Noted. We will consider potential feasibility and viability for new infrastructure including park and ride/walk facilities. | Consider accordingly |
| 16508 - CPREssex [210] | Comment | a) We believe more public transport through Ingrave and Herongate is likely to slow traffic and even cause holds up, with the consequential increase in pollution that arises from stationery vehicles, or those in a low gear. (b) A pedestrian bridge needs to be provided to cross the A127 in the vicinity of Thorndon Park. It would be irresponsible of Brentwood Council to take the view that pedestrians can cross the A127 on foot, pedestrian deaths have occurred crossing the A127. | Concerns noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15062 - Christine Blythe [4718] | Comment | The bias of the current plan is again evidenced by the lack of a proposed Green Travel Route linking villages to the north of the Borough to Brentwood and/or train links. Figure 10.1 Proposes a Green Travel Route to support the proposed development in the south, while ignoring linkages and benefits for those villages in the north of the Borough. Ensuring a viable bus service, maintaining current road networks and implementing a Green Travel Route to the north of Brentwood would be in line with S011 & S012. | Concerns noted. The Local Plan seeks to ensure the delivery of sustainable development. The need for infrastructure, provision of public transport included, is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 13457 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | We live on the main road - not rural - between Billericay and had an infrequent bus service that doesn't even go to Shenfield. So we have to use a car for all of our transport. Road access and parking are dreadful | Noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The Council are working with Essex County Council on infrastructure provision. | Consider accordingly |
| 15787 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Para 10.9: ECC supports the aspiration to improve the public realm and circulation arrangements around Brentwood and Shenfield. In addition similar improvements may be necessary at Ingatestone and West Horndon stations. | Support noted. We will consider potential improvement and provision of public realm and circulation arrangements at Ingatestone and West Horndon stations. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Policy 10.1: Sustainable Transport | | | | |
| 14989 - Mrs N. Blake [1602] | Comment | Some development is proposed in Pilgrims Hatch along the Doddinghurst Road where it intersects with the A12 - site ref 023 for 250 homes. The majority of the traffic generated from these homes will go south into Brentwood along the Ongar Road and perhaps along the Doddinghurst Road. This area is already at gridlock in the mornings and evenings, not helped by lorries off-loading outside the shops. Similarly, Western Avenue traffic moving towards the London Road/ Kings Road traffic lights is very heavy with delays at the traffic lights backing up to William Hunter Way roundabout. More houses and hence more traffic in this area will be unacceptable unless major improvements to the traffic management are made in some way that has not been defined. | Concerns noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15763 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Whilst we support a public transport strategy for the strategic development sites, it is unclear what the exact provision may be. It is recommended that further details regarding the specific public transport provision is outlined within the Local Plan and how BBC consider this could affect mode share for residents and employees at the development sites. | Noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 16088 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Paragraph 3 - Reference to residential travel plans should be amended to refer to 'travel plans'. Paragraph 6 - Recommend the deletion of 'where appropriate' as cycle improvements will be necessary in the majority of new development. Paragraph 7 - The paragraph refers to new development close to schools/early years facilitating a public realm. In addition, the development of new schools/early years facilities also need to consider walking and cycling connectivity. Reference to 'school run traffic' should be deleted. | Comments noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 13689 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Comment | Crossrail is almost irrelevant, since it will not shorten journey times to Stratford, central London, and beyond. It will continue to be quickest to get the fast trains from Shenfield (even if starting at Brentwood station) and then change at Stratford/Liverpool Street. The main benefit would be for journeys to Harold Wood to Maryland inclusive, destinations of lower relevance to most Brentwood residents. | Concerns noted | No action |
| 13534 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] | Comment | Ensure routes for equestrians are included within developments; Ensure multi-user crossings are provided over trunk roads and railway line | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15580 - Castle Point Borough Council (Steve Rogers) [4643] | Comment | A significant proportion of the new housing sites are planned for locations outside the current urban areas of the borough. It is a laudable aim of the Plan is to protect the character of the suburban areas and villages; however, by directing new developments outside of these areas it is likely to give rise to issues concerned with sustainability. Travel and transport become significant issues, and there are no proposals within the plan for significant improvements in transport capacity to support dispersed growth, which in turn could have implications for the accessibility of neighbouring areas. | Concerns noted. The Local Plan aims to locate new development in sustainable locations where public transport is more accessible reducing the need to use the car. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to work with Highways England in promoting the importance of improvements to the M25/A12 junction. Any potential impacts of additional development in the Borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. | Consider accordingly |
| 14942 - Mr Robert Boad [6032] | Comment | Whilst the Crossrail development is to be welcomed I wonder how much capacity it will add because there will be no additional tracks laid towards London and I suspect that some existing services may end up being cancelled to make capacity for the Crossrail trains on the already congested lines. Increasing goods trains as a result of the London Gateway and other ports around the Essex coast mean further risk of delays and disruption to passenger services. What we really need is the development of new rail routes - connecting from Shenfield directly to Stansted (not via Liverpool Street) and across the Thames to Gatwick as these would do a lot to reduce congestion and stimulate development in the outer London area. This is in addition to the proposed additional road development and tunnels across the Thames at Tilbury linking the A2 to the M25. | Concerns noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Transport for London is reviewing the Crossrail patronage forecasts and these numbers and the underlying assumptions behind them should provide greater insight on possible wider impacts and mitigations. | Consider accordingly |
| 15301 - Transport for London (Mr Oscar Wong) [6078] | Comment | In terms of the station capacity and upgrade proposals (policy 10.1), Elizabeth line stations in the borough will be owned by Network Rail but TfL will be responsible for the train operating company (TOC) concession. Both Network Rail and TfL should therefore be consulted in regards to any proposed station capacity upgrade/ improvements. TfL would welcome the securing of s.106 or CIL monies to fund these improvements. | Noted. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 15931 - West Horndon Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [381] | Comment | Policy 10.1 of the Draft Local Plan states that a Green Travel Route will be created to link the strategic allocations in the A127 Corridor with Brentwood Town Centre. This statement is too vague and more detail is required to assess whether this supports sustainability or not. | Concerns noted. This is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15766 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | It is stated that the Council will consider the scope for 'park and walk' schemes. Depending where the 'park and walk' sites are located, this could result in an increase in vehicle trips in certain sections of the highway network. It is important that any implications for the Strategic Road Network are fully considered by Brentwood Borough Council. | Noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 16081 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | In order to help limit impact on the local public transport networks, rail and bus providers will need to be involved in the identification and planning of any new or improved services. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15731 - Highways England (Ms Janice Burgess) [6105] | Comment | Policy 10.1 covers sustainable transport. We are pleased to see a dedicated policy covering sustainable transport measures in addition to Policy 8.3 stating the need to locate development in accessible areas close to the arterial corridors M25, A12 and A127. To marry the two policies there will be a need to develop sustainable transport measures that manage down the private vehicle demand to and from these accessible developments. Policy 8.3 also states the need for employment development to be accessible by walking and cycling. Therefore, we will be keen to see what measures are to be adopted under your Local Plan to ensure that these policies are compatible. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15762 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | Whilst specific details of the potential public transport provision at individual sites or locations are limited, there is discussion of a proposed Green Travel Route. This route is intended to provide better Borough links for strategic development allocations outside the Brentwood urban area, which is welcomed as the existing public transport provision to these locations is likely to currently be limited. Without a step change in provision these strategic development locations could result in a significant increase in vehicles on the highway network. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 13895 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14055 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | The policy should go much further in explaining how the Green Travel Route is to be delivered. It should be planned with land acquisition as necessary to create a safe and pleasant route for walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The A127 represents a severe block to north-south recreational routes. There is no crossing from Great Warley Road to the East Horndon junction. This limits the value of Thorndon Park as people have to drive to their local Country Park. It also creates a block to recreational users wishing to traverse north-south. To rectify this, at least 2 crossings are needed, the most obvious locations being at Footpath 41 West Horndon to Thorndon Park and Footpath 60 by Friern Manor Wood although in total there are 5 footpaths in Brentwood Borough severed by the A127. | Concern noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 14961 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Our client would support a comprehensively planned solution to the movement network in this area [Dunton Hills Garden Village] and the proposed Masterplan should include improved east-west links as a key principle. It's currently envisaged that the principal access would be off the A128 but new links to H10a and H10b could be provided as alternative access points to the development. It is vital that any development within Brentwood to the west of Basildon is fully integrated across the Borough boundary which in transport terms is an arbitrary distinction. To be sustainable a new residential-led development would need to be linked in terms of sustainable transport modes, walking, cycling and public transport, allowing links to local facilities. Scope to improve bus services and include ancillary facilities to minimise transport demand. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15722 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | Para 10.6, this policy aims to ensure that development reduces the need to travel, and to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists to reach facilities including recreational facilities and open space. We request that equestrians are included within this policy to ensure that this vulnerable user group is not ignored. There appear to be no plans within this document to incorporate any strategic trunk road or railway crossings as part of new developments. Access across is essential and we request that at the Masterplan planning stage of new developments that multi-user crossings for the A127/A12 and the railway line are incorporated into the scheme at an early stage and developer contribution is obtained to enable this to happen. Safely access areas across what are effectively major barriers, unless they are travelling in a car is not sustainable. | Concerns noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15765 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] | Comment | We acknowledge that Crossrail could have an impact on the mode share of residents and employees within Brentwood and that the scheme may encourage a greater rail mode share, which could reduce the reliance on private vehicle use. | Noted. Brentwood Borough Council and Essex County Council are working together to gain more knowledge of the impacts Crossrail will have on the Borough once fully operational. Transport for London is reviewing the Crossrail patronage forecasts and these numbers and the underlying assumptions behind them should provide greater insight on possible wider impacts. | No action |
| 15690 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | A number of DLP policies set out specific requirements for planning applications, for example Policy 7.2, Policy 10.1, Policy 10.3, Policy 10.13 and Policy 10.15. LPAs are required to publish a list of information requirements for planning application, proportionate to the nature and scale of the development proposals and reviewed on a frequent basis. National policy notes that local information requirements have no bearing on whether a planning application is valid unless they are set out on such a list. Such requirements should not therefore be included within policies. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13302 - Mrs Fiona Trott [2458] 13477 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 15269 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | Traffic implications of the proposed Dunton Development will be catastrophic for the area unless outside funding in the order of a billion pounds is found to upgrade road networks before the suburb is built. In contrast, the A12 corridor is benefiting from huge investment in Crossrail and widening of the A12 over the next few years. Relatively little new housing development has been proposed for the A12 corridor in the Borough of Brentwood. It would make much more sense to plan for new development along the A12 corridor where infrastructure is already being improved than the A127] | The potential impact of future development on the road network will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure provision. Employment growth are prioritised in the existing main centres as well as other suitable locations which utilise brownfield land. Given housing needs cannot be fully met on these sites the Council has considered appropriate and sustainable locations within Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13458 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Current infrastructure needs improving - not just related to new developments. You can encourage me to walk/cycle all you like but my side affects from illness treatment means my lungs are permanently damage. Cycling or walking would likely kill me so don't condemn me to never being able to leave my house please. | Concern noted. The Council will continue to work with Highways England in promoting the importance of improvements to current infrastructure, alongside developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. In addition, any potential impacts of additional development in the borough on the road network will be assessed through transport modelling. | Consider accordingly |
| 14325 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] | Object | The Draft Local Plan makes reference to a "Park and Walk" scheme but contains no specifics strategy or policies to direct and support growth at Shenfield. | Noted. The option for this is currently site 034. Ongoing work will inform future policy on the potential for park and walk within the borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 16169 - Countryside Properties [250] | Object | A range of issues need to be considered when planning form new infrastructure and so a Infrastructure delivery Plan is essential. Transport being a critical one. The key findings of Odyssey Markides (OM) support the view that there has been a lack of consideration of transport as a topic in the evidence base and SA. Transport as a topic should include the assessment of links to public transport and in particular to railway stations. It should consider travel by all modes including walking and cycling, public transport as well as vehicles. Detailed assessment of the land at Dunton by OM, demonstrates that it would be difficult to deliver a safe and suitable access strategy, and that this would be prohibited by cost and environmental considerations. There is insufficient land to create access from the A127 to the north. Whereas West Horndon already has a station and could become a transport hub. | Concerns noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council is undertaking detailed highways modelling to provide necessary evidence on impact of the Plan. Initial results have been published. This is being undertaken working with key partners such as Essex County Council and Highways England. Mitigation options will be considered as appropriate. Updates to this will be published alongside the next version of Local Plan consultation and kept under review as the plan-making process progresses. | Consider accordingly |
| 15296 - Brentwood School [2575] | Support | Policy 10.1 sets out that future developments will be located in accessible locations to help reduce the need to travel. It also requires that major generators of travel demand should be located in Brentwood Town Centre. The Schools fall under that category and as a policy it is supported. | Support noted, the Council's proposed allocations are informed by a number is assessments and identified constraints. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 16012 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] | Support | This will form an important part of the transport strategy and travel plan for the Enterprise Park. The details of this proposal will be a matter for further work and it should be acknowledged that this may require input from Brentwood Borough Council, Essex County Council and others in terms of delivering a coordinated strategy for this route. The plan should acknowledge that strategic allocations such as Brentwood Enterprise Park will be located outside of Brentwood town centre. We therefore would request the wording of this policy is amended to make clear that "Major generators of travel should be located in Brentwood town centre, in district centres, AND WITHIN STRATEGIC ALLOCATIONS". | Support noted | Consider addition accordingly |
| 13111 - Mr. Michael R. M. Newman [1823] 14933 - Mr Rob Marigold [6030] 15796 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] 16082 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Brentwood still does not have a dedicated cycle route or markings along the main route towards London. If you are to encourage cycling and reduce the vehicle road use, you need to have purpose built paths and markings. There are road markings and dedicated cycle paths from the M25 into central London. The paths/markings stop abruptly at the M25 towards Brentwood. Reference to providing an attractive public realm at schools and early years facilities that is safe for children and encourages walking and cycling is supported. | Concerns and support noted. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to establishing cycling within the borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 16122 - EA Strategic Land LLP [279] | Support | The Council is correct to seek new development in accessible locations. However, the approach to site allocations does not seem to follow this rationale. E.g. DGS is not located adjacent to any existing (sustainable) transport links and instead growth should be focused in locations that seek to ensure existing public transport networks are fully utilised to avoid expensive, unjustified infrastructure improvement works in locations which cannot be considered sustainable in transport terms. We do not consider the Council has approached this in a sequential way which would unlock the potential of sites surrounding underutilised public transport hubs. | Concerns noted. Development is encouraged in brownfield sites and within existing urban areas as well as other suitable locations which utilise brownfield land. However given development needs cannot be fully met on these sites, the Council has considered appropriate and sustainable locations within Green Belt. | Consider accordingly |
| 15176 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | A self-sustaining new village built on the principles of garden city design presents a unique opportunity to build into the design a full range of measures to encourage sustainable forms of transport. Unlike with extensions to existing settlements, the master plan approach can be used to ensure that the mix of uses are located such to maximise the use of modes of travel other than the motor car. | Support noted | No action |
| 15682 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Support | Policy 10.1 seeks developer contributions for improvements to links from new development to key destinations and the wider network. Reference should be made to the NPPF (para 204) and the tests of planning obligation to ensure that the Policy is 'Consistent with national policy'. | Support noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13548 - Mrs Andrea Wilkes [2489] 15544 - Greater London Authority (Mr Jörn Peters) [6093] 16086 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | From a transport perspective Brentwood has a very high level of car ownership compared to the national average. Without alternative means of transport the use of cars will continue to be an essential factor in access to services, employment and leisure. Therefore the delivery and encouragement of sustainable transport alternatives is essential. Consider further measures that contribute to sustainable travel as part of a Travel Plan for larger development sites, including, car sharing schemes, creation of car clubs, shuttle bus services, Cycle Point/Hub at Brentwood Railway Station [see full representation for complete list]. | Noted. Measures that contribute to sustainable travel will be considered. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|----------------------|----------------------|
| 15784 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | ECC supports proposals promoting sustainable transport. ECC would support the consideration for passenger transport in large scale developments at the earliest opportunity, which should be considered to be the responsibility of the developer. | Support noted | Consider accordingly |

Figure 10.1: Green Travel Route

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|--|--|---|
| 14917 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] | Comment | This Plan advocates adding public transport to the already congested A127 and A128. The A128 is a very busy, narrow trunk road carrying passenger and commercial vehicles. At present, when stopping for passengers, buses cause hold ups particularly during school times and where there are no lay-bys. Adding more buses will slow traffic and create more noise and pollution for residents close to the road. People do cycle along the A128 however it is a dangerous exercise as drivers have difficulty in overtaking and can become impatient. A cycle path would improve the situation. Installing a 'Green Travel Route' would be a retrograde step, adding to the existing congestion and pollution and should not be actioned. | Noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The Council is working with Essex County Council to establish a cycling grid in the borough, including route identification, infrastructure provision and access via mobile phones and signage. The Local Plan seeks to balance economic, environmental and social objectives to ensure the delivery of sustainable development, part of this includes securing public transport improvements and better provision for walking and cycling, locating new development in sustainable and accessible locations to reduce the need to use the car. | Issue is being considered as part of the Local Plan process |
| 13630 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | You only want to stop people using their cars so much as you know that the roads will not be able to cope with more people using them! The roads are already really congested at the weekends. I walk 40 minutes every day and go the gym regularly - I don't need you telling me not to use my car to go into town at the weekend to stay healthy! | Comment noted. The potential impact of future development on the road network within the Borough will be considered through transport modelling that will inform the overall site assessment work. The Local Plan seeks to balance economic, environmental and social objectives to ensure the delivery of sustainable development, part of this includes securing public transport improvements and better provision for walking and cycling, locating new development in sustainable and accessible locations to reduce the need to use the car. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|---------------------------|
| Policy 10.2: Parking | | | | |
| 15018 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | Policy 10.2 should be amended and outline the scope and parameters of a strategy that allows to combine the use of car parking spaces by both residents and shoppers at different times of the day and week, but careful management and monitoring of the spaces is required. This is presumably the intention behind the inclusion of the Coptfold Road Multi-storey car park in the Baytree Centre policy area. Policy 10.2 accordingly should be changed to allow a "smart city" approach to car parking so that parking for visitors, shoppers and commuters where available is communicated electronically and enforced by financial measures. Until such a strategy is worked out, the new car park proposals by Sainsbury, the Ongar Road Lidl Mixed use development, the Baytree Centre redevelopment and the William Hunter Way Car Park redevelopment should not proceed. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15785 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Policy 10.2 refers to the adopted Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA) Vehicle Parking Standards. These are currently being reviewed, and will be subject to public consultation in March 2016 for a period of 6 weeks. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15017 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | So far as Shenfield is concerned, despite the decking on Mount Avenue Station car park it is very difficult to park. Parking provision for commuters is supplemented by parking in householder drives and forecourts arranged by on-line agencies such as yourparkingspace.co.uk, parkingmyspace.com and justpark.com. In 2013, the Secretary of State issued guidance that no express planning permission was required for renting out driveways for parking. It seems that in advance of Crossrail approximately 80 driveways in Shenfield are let for commuter parking. This should be mentioned in the Local Plan text for this policy when amended. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15015 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406] | Comment | Policy 10.2 does not take account of increasing parking stress in the Brentwood Town Centre and Shenfield areas. The proposals in the Plan with respect of Chatham Way car park, and the inclusion of the Coptfold Road multi-storey car park in the Baytree Centre policy area require an explanation on achieving a feasible overall strategy of planned car parking provision and use, and not just referring to standards as the current draft policy proposes. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13133 - Mr Simon Wyatt [5359] | Object | Provide enough parking for new developments! [Just about every new multiple dwelling development appears to provide inadequate parking for the modern lifestyle and car ownership trends. Parking provision should be revised and be more generous.] | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and inline with the Essex County Council Parking Standards. | Issue is being considered |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|---|
| 13690 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | Since Crossrail is almost irrelevant (unless travelling to Harold Wood-Maryland inclusive) as it would still be slower than the fast trains from Shenfield in all cases (that is to say, it is faster to get a fast train and then change at Stratford/Liverpool Street), there is no case for providing more parking than the already very generous amount in the vicinity of Shenfield station. Should more parking be required, turning one of the existing car parks into a multi-storey structure would be a preferable solution. | Concerns noted. Brentwood Borough Council and Essex County Council are working together to gain more knowledge of the impacts Crossrail will have on the Borough once fully operational. This includes work to invest in and improve the surroundings of Brentwood and Shenfield stations. Transport for London is reviewing the Crossrail patronage forecasts and these numbers and the underlying assumptions behind them should provide greater insight on possible wider impacts. Until these revised numbers are published it is difficult to assess any specific local economic impact and so this position remains under review. | Issue is being considered as part of the Local Plan process |
| 15813 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | This approach is supported to create consistency between local planning authorities however Brentwood should be flexible in their approach to how these standards are met and the layout in which spaces are provided as part of a development and have regard to the sites location and proximity to existing public transport, with highly sustainable locations being allowed to provide reduced levels of car parking. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Figure 10.2: Crossrail Park & Walk Option | | | | |
| 13459 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | I can't walk so will there be a park and ride for me | Noted. The Local Plan seeks to ensure all development deliver an inclusive, accessible environment throughout. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|----------------------|--|
| Policy 10.3: Sustainable Construction and Energy | | | | |
| 15689 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15870 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756] | Object | A number of DLP policies set out specific requirements for planning applications, for example Policy 7.2, Policy 10.1, Policy 10.3, Policy 10.13 and Policy 10.15. LPAs are required to publish a list of information requirements for planning application, proportionate to the nature and scale of the development proposals and reviewed on a frequent basis. National policy notes that local information requirements have no bearing on whether a planning application is valid unless they are set out on such a list. Such requirements should not therefore be included within policies. The requirements of Policy 10.3 in relation to Sustainable Construction and Energy are overly prescriptive. Whilst sustainability should be encouraged, policy should not be so prescriptive that it could compromise the viability of new developments. Smaller scale developments such as extensions and small refurbishments are unlikely to be able to achieve these targets. As such, a flexible approach should be applied. The requirement to submit a Water Sustainability Assessment should be deleted as it places yet another unnecessary burden on developers. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15525 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Support | We support this policy, which requires all proposals to maximise energy efficiency, incorporate water conservation measures, and include details of measures to improve resilience to climate change. We are pleased that paragraph 10.27 of the supporting text references the Brentwood Scoping and Outline Water Cycle Study 2011 and recognises that the Borough lies within an area of Serious Water Stress. It also recognises the generally poor water quality of the Borough's watercourses and that, in some areas, sewage infrastructure is already operating at capacity. | Support noted | No action (retain text). |
| 15810 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Supports positive policy approach. Supports reference to renewable energy schemes and sustainable construction in Policy 10.3. ECC as Waste Planning Authority will continue to work with BBC to ensure closer working between the two local planning authorities on waste issues. | Support noted | The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council on infrastructure issues and provision |
| 15589 - Castle Point Borough Council (Steve Rogers) [4643] | Support | The Plan's policy regarding renewable energy infrastructure is also supported, as is its commitment to reduce CO2 emissions by 20%. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|---|
| Climate Change and Emissions | | | | |
| 13632 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | Yes, ignoring climate change will indeed have adverse affects; on the whole planet. Building on land that is currently green land will contribute significantly to climate change - more buildings = more emissions and less green land that can absorb rainfall! The more you build, the more likely we are all to suffer from flooding! Stop the developments to help stop climate change! | Environmental constraints comment noted. The Council seeks to ensure that development is directed to appropriate locations to meet need within the Borough over the Plan period, whilst minimizing the negative impacts of development on people, the environment and resources. The Local Plan will apply a sequential, risk based approach to the location of development to avoid flood risk areas where possible as per the NPPF. | No action |
| Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development | | | | |
| 13460 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Needs to strengthen that you'll be looking for south facing roofs for solar panel and massively insulated north facing roofs, walls and windows | Comment noted. The Council supports renewable, low carbon or decentralized energy schemes in line with National Planning Policy Framework | Issue is being considered as part of the Local Plan process |
| Water Conservation | | | | |
| 13635 - Anne Clark [4973] | Comment | You say that Brentwood is lying within an area of serious water stress, where underground water levels are potentially low, so we need MORE green spaces to take in rainfall NOT less!!! Building on current green land will mean even less water reaching the underground water reservoirs! "Water conservation measures of 110 litres per person per day"?? And you want to bring MORE people into the area?? More people will mean more demands on water and sewage facilities! Have you lost leave of your senses?? | Concerns noted. The Council seeks to ensure that development is directed to appropriate locations to meet need within the Borough over the Plan period, whilst minimizing the negative impacts of development on people, the environment and resources. | Consider accordingly |
| 15683 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | It is noted within this paragraph that the Code for Sustainable Housing has been withdrawn, however water conservation measures are sought. As per the Written Ministerial Statement in Section 6.0, Local Plans should not set any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the performance of new dwellings. This requirement should therefore be removed to be 'Consistent with national policy'. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 10.4: Design | | | | |
| 15356 - Countryside Properties [250] | Support | Agree that a high quality design is required for all developments, as it is an integral part of ensuring the delivery of sustainable development, as set out in the NPPF. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 15815 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | Support the inclusion of this Policy however the Council must have regards to site specific and viability, this can be overcome through the Council actively working with the developer to progress masterplans and applications. This should begin at this stage to ensure sites can be delivered within the specified plan period, particularly in the early years of the plan period. | Support noted. Site specific constraints are being considered and the masterplanning process considered where appropriate. | Consider accordingly |
| 15179 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | The allocation of Dunton Hills Garden Village presents a unique opportunity to design a vibrant new community with a real sense of place and local distinctiveness. The achievement of high quality design and layout can be more easily achieved where there are few constraints imposed by existing development and limited road and infrastructure capacity. The circumstances and context of the Dunton Hills site will enable designers to create a form of development with the appropriately high standards of design. | Support noted | No action |
| Policy 10.5: Public Realm | | | | |
| 13535 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] 15723 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | We note that in paragraph 10.34 that it is intended that the public realm will encourage walking and cycling. We request that, where practical, the inclusion of equestrians is specified within new developments rather than ignoring this specific user group. It should be noted that Bridleways are the best-value multi-user path that can be created as they can be legally used by pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. By only creating cycle paths, a large user group (which contributes considerably to the local economy) is ignored, and equestrians are the most unprovided for when it comes to safe off-road riding. Many riders do not venture onto the ever-busy roads because of the volume and speed of traffic - after all over 3000 accidents occur within the UK with horse riders and motor vehicles. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13462 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Not sure if this is covered under this heading but the ongoing maintenance and upkeep of street furniture (eg lamps and bollards) and drains is quite poor at present. This is not only unsightly but dangerous and should be included in the plans | Noted. The Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of both existing and new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. In addition Essex-wide evidence is to be published soon, which the Council has been involved in preparing. | Consider accordingly |
| 15180 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | The allocation of a new village creates the opportunity of designing public realm as an integral part of the community. Unlike with extensions to existing settlements where the existing public realm is already established and may have been designed and conceived of to serve a limited size of community, the new village, built on principles of garden city design can be sized, located and designed to achieve the appropriate scale and function for a village of an identified scale. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Policy 10.6: High Quality Design Principles | | | | |
| 13211 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | In view of the importance attached to promoting and enhancing health and well-being in the plan's strategic objectives (SO11), an additional criterion should be added to the policy which expects new developments to promote active lifestyles (through being designed to encourage physical activity and sport) and thereby contribute to the wider health and well-being objective. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15181 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] 15684 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15871 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756] | Support | Policy provides sufficient flexibility for the design of development to be guided through individual circumstances rather than being dictated by strict policy requirements. However, we consider that justification in respect of certain criteria, such as f) and g) should only be required by proposals for new development where the particular issues are material to the application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 59 of the NPPF. It is considered that requirements contained within Policy 10.6 are sought to be addressed elsewhere in the DLP, and therefore can be removed for this Policy wording. Notably: - Part (g) - Policy 9.5 addresses designated heritage assets - Part (n) - Policy 10.4 considers the quality and design of new developments; and - Part (p) - Policy 10.3 concerns sustainable construction and energy requirements. | Support noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 15357 - Countryside Properties [250] | Support | Agree that a high quality design is required for all developments, as it is an integral part of ensuring the delivery of sustainable development, as set out in the NPPF. Policy provides sufficient flexibility for the design of development to be guided through individual circumstances rather than being dictated by strict policy requirements. However, we consider that justification in respect of certain criteria, such as f) and g) should only be required by proposals for new development where the particular issues are material to the application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 59 of the NPPF. | Noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 13606 - Historic England (Mr Michael Stubbs) [5648] | Support | Historic England would recommend additional policy text at the bottom of criterion (f) that sensitive use of heritage assets consistent with their most appropriate conservation use (the optimum viable use) (policy continues)will be encouraged'. | Support noted. Additions to policy to be considered. | Amend accordingly |

Infrastructure and Community Facilities

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15468 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | Before further progression and amendment of policies are undertaken, the Local Planning Authority should have reference to the most up-to-date strategy documents from NHS England which currently constitute The Five Year Forward View and the Emerging CCG Strategic Estates Plan & Primary Care Plan. Care should be taken to ensure that emerging policies will not have an adverse impact on healthcare provision within the plan area and over the plan period. In instances where major policies involve the provision of development in locations where healthcare service capacity is insufficient to meet the augmented needs appropriate mitigation will need to be sought. | Comment noted. The NHS will continue to be consulted throughout the Local Plan process and considered where proposed development would have an effect on the provision of healthcare facilities. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | Consider accordingly |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15800 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The Draft Local Plan should make reference to the early years and childcare requirements arising from the planned growth. A high level assessment has identified the need for up to 2 new 56 place facilities in the Brentwood urban area; a new 56 place facility at West Horndon; and up to 4 new 56 place facilities at Dunton. ECC will undertake a further assessment of the potential delivery and resource requirements for accommodating anticipated childcare requirements to inform the pre submission Plan, and its supporting IDP. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council to determine what additional education facilities will be needed as a result of planned future development. | Consider accordingly |
| 15801 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The emerging Local Plan and supporting evidence clearly needs to address the viability and deliverability of the Local Plan, including the provision, commitment and timing of infrastructure. It is imperative that the costs of providing infrastructure as a direct result of development proposals, particularly those related to early years and childcare, primary and secondary schools, and highways, for which ECC has a statutory responsibility, are included in the viability assessment from the outset, to ensure provision is guaranteed. It would not be acceptable to only secure land for education purposes without the necessary and full financial contributions to supply the infrastructure as it is deemed unviable. The mitigation should not be at the cost of ECC as a service provider. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15794 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | There is significant surplus capacity at secondary schools in the Brentwood urban area. Further assessment is needed on the impact of opening Ongar Academy on this capacity. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council as Local Education Authority to determine what education facilities will be needed as a result of planned future development. | Consider accordingly |
| 15429 - Diocese of Chelmsford (Mrs Carol Richards) [6086] | Comment | Concerned there was no mention of places of worship in paragraph 10.40. Although it states the list is not exhaustive the NPPF includes reference to places of worship under paragraphs 28, 70 and 171. The Brentwood Local Plan should be amended to reflect this. | Concern noted | Amend accordingly |
| 15791 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | ECC will continue to work with BBC to ensure education needs are appropriately and adequately assessed as preparation of the new Local Plan continues. ECC will undertake a further assessment of the potential delivery and resource requirements for accommodating anticipated pupil growth to inform the pre submission Plan, and its supporting IDP. Sustainable home-to-school travel and transport and the location of development sites to ensure viability to fund schools will need further consideration. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15793 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Existing primary schools, especially in the Brentwood urban area are close to capacity, with limited space on site to expand. As a minimum a new 2 form entry (420 place) primary school will be required. It is presently unclear if a suitable site could be made available given the location and relatively small scale of proposed site allocations in the A12 corridor. Temporary classrooms will need to be replaced with permanent accommodation. Growth at West Horndon and Dunton will require 4-4 1/2 form entry (900 places) and further consideration will need to be given to the number/size/timing of the expansion of primary schools in this area. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council as Local Education Authority to determine what additional education facilities will be needed as a result of planned future development. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13344 - The Theatres Trust (Mr Ross Anthony) [302] | Object | The Local Plan should be amended to safeguard community and cultural facilities to reflect guidance in Para 70 of the NPPF. | Comment noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development will be considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15444 - North East London NHS Foundation Trust [6087] | Object | Request amendments are made to Section 10 of the draft Local Plan to reflect that, in certain circumstances, healthcare facilities can be redeveloped for alternative uses or amalgamated with other facilities if they are no longer required or fit for purpose. It is acknowledged that any such policy would need to incorporate criteria requiring any such proposal to provide evidence that the facility is not required and that its loss will not undermine the provision of services in the Borough. The disposal of facilities no longer required for alternative uses is key to overall strategy for the provision of new modern facilities that meet the ongoing requirements of community. This will ensure a joined up approach to delivering the necessary infrastructure in parallel to the forecast growth, ensuring that the plan is effective, justified and sound. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16089 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Paragraph 10.40 - Welcome the definition of 'infrastructure' and reference to utilities and waste; transport; social and community; and green infrastructure. | Support noted | No action |

Policy 10.7: Infrastructure and Community Facilities

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13389 - Mr. Michael R. M. Newman [1823] | Comment | The provision of new GP practises may well be catered for but employing GPs to fill them is another matter entirely, as there is a national shortage of GPs in NHS England. | Concern noted. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough | Consider accordingly |
| 15455 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | In terms of optimal space requirements to encourage a full range of services to be delivered within the community there is an overall capacity deficit, based on weighted patient list sizes, within the 8 GP Practices providing services in the area. Of the 8 Practices in the area 2 currently have the capacity for growth and development. Optimal space standards are set for planning purposes only. This allows us to review the space we have available and identify the impact development growth will have in terms of capacity and service delivery. Space capacity deficit does not prevent a practice from increasing its list size, however it may impact on the level and type of services the practice is able to deliver. The weighted list size of the GP Practice based on the Carr-Hill formula, this figure more accurately reflects the need of a practice in terms of resource and space and may be slightly lower or higher than the actual patient list. | Noted. The NHS will continue to be consulted throughout the Local Plan process and considered where proposed development would have an effect on the provision of healthcare facilities and to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|---|--|
| 15508 - Mountnessing Church of England (Voluntary Controlled) Primary School (Mrs Holly Obank) [6092] | Comment | Our school is sited on a large plot of land with space to build and expand. We are excited by the prospect of new housing and new families joining the village, but have concerns that our current building and school would not accommodate pupils from new developments. There is potential to expand and hope that when the planning applications are considered, it is understood that we are eager to expand but would need significant support financially to be able to do this. Consultation with Essex Education department would be vital and developers would need to work closely with all stakeholders. | Concerns noted. The Council will continue to work with as Local Education Authority to determine what additional education facilities will be needed as a result of planned future development. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | As part of the plan review we will consider the issue. |
| 15477 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | Plans and policies should be revised to ensure that they are specific enough in their aims, but are not in any way prescriptive or binding on NHS England to carry out certain development within a set timeframe, and do not give undue commitment to projects. Notwithstanding this, there should be a reasonably worded policy with the emerging LDP that indicates a supportive approach from the Local Planning Authority to the improvement, reconfiguration, extension or relocation of existing medical facilities. This positive stance should also be indicated towards assessing those schemes for new bespoke medical facilities where such facilities are agreed to in writing by NHS England. New facilities will only be appropriate where they accord with the latest up-to-date NHS England and CCG strategy documents. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 15747 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Reference to site/off-site related infrastructure being secured through planning obligations/section 106 agreements in Policy 10.7 is welcomed. At present the Draft Local Plan does not identify where necessary primary and early years and childcare infrastructure will be located or funded in relation to particular allocations. This will be essential. Reference should be made, in Policy 10.7, to the adopted ECC Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions (2015), in relation to the level of contributions required from new development for the provision of essential infrastructure by ECC. | Comment noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13536 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] 15724 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | We note in paragraph 10.40 that the various types of green infrastructure are specified and the list includes footpaths only; no mention of any other type of right of way is made. We request that this is amended to include all designations of public rights of way. We note that in paragraph 10.43 that 'appropriate access to, and linkages between, these assets need to be maximised'. This we agree with but we would like to see the inclusion of bridleway access made within this Policy. | Comment noted. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15481 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | For the smaller proposed housing allocation sites: One or more of the following will be necessary for mitigation: Contribution towards increasing capacity for local Primary care facilities, by means of extension, reconfiguration, refurbishment or possible relocation of an existing practice. (With the exception of the West Horndon sites). | Comment noted. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 15449 - Basildon and Brentwood Clinical Commissioning Group (NHS) (Mr Dave Fazey) [6088] | Comment | BB CCG is seeking to support a reduction in need, through the development of services that help our population to take greater control of their own health and also by working with partner organisations that can have a positive impact on health and wellbeing. Therefore, BB CCG recognises that, whilst on one hand the increase in population projected within the Local Plan is likely to increase pressure on services, on the other these pressures could be more than offset by the opportunity, outlined in the Plan, to address some of the wider determinants of health, including employment, education, housing and the local environment. BB CCG will welcome the opportunity to work with Brentwood Council and other local partners to support these developments. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with the NHS and other partner organisations as the plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough as well as to seek delivery of a sustainable approach that contributes to positive impacts on health and wellbeing. | Consider accordingly |
| 15454 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | In reviewing the context, content and recommendations of the LDP Document and its current phase of progression, the following comments are with regard to the Healthcare provision on behalf of NHS England - Midlands & East (NHSE) and NHS Property Services (NHSPS). Within Brnetwood Borough, healthcare provision incorporates a total of 9 GP Practices, 13 pharmacists, 10 dental surgeries, a community clinic and 2 community hospitals. These are the healthcare services available that this Local Development Plan must take into account in formulating future strategies. Growth, in terms of housing and employment, is proposed across a wide area and would likely have an impact on future service provision. Existing GP practices do not have capacity to accommodate significant growth. | Noted. The NHS will continue to be consulted throughout the Local Plan process and considered where proposed development would have an effect on the provision of healthcare facilities. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 15471 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | 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 NHS England will be calculated at an appropriate time as and if schemes come forward over the plan period to realise the objectives of the LDP | Noted. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15448 - Basildon and Brentwood Clinical Commissioning Group (NHS) (Mr Dave Fazey) [6088] | Comment | CCG is acutely aware that simply expanding capacity to accommodate ever increasing demand is neither possible nor desirable. CCG is seeking to support more effective provision of services, by driving greater collaboration and integration between local health and social care providers working across the primary, community and acute hospital sectors. It is recognised that the delivery of more coherent services to our population requires the establishment, or re-establishment, of more effective working relationships between professional teams and organisations. A key element in facilitating this approach will be the direct alignment of community health and care teams with specific GP practices. In this way the practice becomes a hub around which the care provided to the registered population is coordinated. Brentwood Community Hospital represents a significant resource situated within the Borough, and the CCG is committed to ensuring that it is fully utilised to strengthen the community-based provision of healthcare, including sub-acute inpatient facilities, for our population. | Comment noted | No action |
| 15446 - Basildon and Brentwood Clinical Commissioning Group (NHS) (Mr Dave Fazey) [6088] | Comment | We believe that there is a clear alignment between the vision for vibrant and thriving communities outlined in the Local Plan and BB CCG's strategic objectives of commissioning high quality and sustainable healthcare services which will support the local population to optimise and maintain their wellbeing and independence, and to reduce the inequalities in health outcomes evident between populations in different parts of our area. We acknowledge that achieving these objectives is not without its challenges, given the pressures that the local health economy, in common with many other areas nationally, is currently facing. The challenge is essentially increasing demand for services, primarily driven by demographic change (both more people requiring services and increasing complexity of needs), and significant constraints on the resources - financial, workforce and the physical capacity available to meet these demands and needs. | Noted | No action |
| 15451 - Basildon and Brentwood Clinical Commissioning Group (NHS) (Mr Dave Fazey) [6088] | Comment | BB CCG welcomes this opportunity to contribute to the consultation on the Brentwood Borough Local Plan, and will continue to work in partnership with Brentwood Council in order to ensure that our strategic plans are aligned as closely as possible in order to deliver the best possible outcomes for our population. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with Basildon Borough Council and adjoining local authorities under the Duty to Cooperate in the development of the Local Plan. | No action |
| 15482 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | Redevelopment of the two West Horndon Industrial sites and the Dunton Hills Village: New primary care facility required with potential to expand to accommodate the second phase of the Dunton development, outside of the plan period, as contained within the Basildon Borough Local Development Plan. Should the option of developing a Garden Suburb at the Dunton site, in conjunction with Basildon Borough Council, be the option adopted it would be expected that joint mitigation would deliver infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the whole site and that of West Horndon Industrial Estates, Childerditch Lane and Station Road, phase to meet the housing trajectory for the developments. | Comment noted. . The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The NHS will continue to be consulted throughout the Local Plan process and considered where proposed development would have an effect on the provision of healthcare facilities. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13214 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Comment | Concerns are raised however about how the proposed policy will make provision for community sports facility infrastructure to be provided by new development in practice. This is pertinent because for the majority of developments proposed in the plan, it will only be practical and appropriate to make provision for indoor or outdoor sport through developer contributions being secured towards off-site projects rather than direct on-site provision being made. There are concerns because at present no specific priority sports facility projects have been identified and the conventional standards based approach for outdoor sport is no longer considered robust. | Noted. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. The need for infrastructure provision is being considered in greater detail by the emerging Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to work with Sports England in the development of the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15478 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | NHS England note the requirement for Brentwood Borough Council to deliver a plan for increased levels of housing growth for their area, resulting in approximately 7,240 new dwellings during the plan period 2013 - 2033 and have identified the anticipated impact on infrastructure arising from these proposals. 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 over the plan period to realise the objectives of the LDP. | Noted. The NHS will continue to be consulted throughout the Local Plan process and considered where proposed development would have an effect on the provision of healthcare facilities. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | Consider accordingly |
| 15456 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | NHS England and the Basildon & Brentwood CCG (CCG) are currently working together to help plan and develop new ways of working within our primary care facilities, in line with the Five Year Forward View, to increase capacity in ways other than increasing physical space. We also endeavour to develop sustainable solutions through a proactive coordinated care approach, including hubs, not individual replacement of surgeries. With focus on premises for training and increasing capacity through technology. The CCG's emerging Strategic Estates Plan will contain further detail on this and the 3 year Primary Care Transformation Funding programme, due to commence in April 2016, will help to provide funding solutions for existing capacity issues. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with the NHS and other partner organisations as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough as well as to seek delivery of a sustainable approach that contributes to positive impacts on health and wellbeing. | Consider accordingly |
| 15458 - NHS England (Kerry Harding) [3791] | Comment | Existing health infrastructure will require further investment and improvement in order to meet the needs of the planned growth shown in this LDP document. The developments contained within would have an impact on healthcare provision in the area and its implications, if unmitigated, would be unsustainable. It should be noted that the CCG are currently working with stakeholders to assess utilisation at Brentwood Community Hospital in order to establish future plans for the facility to ensure appropriate and effective utilisation. | Comment noted. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. The NHS will continue to be consulted throughout the Local Plan process and considered where proposed development would have an effect on the provision of healthcare facilities. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|--------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15440 - North East London NHS Foundation Trust [6087] | Object | As drafted the Local Plan does not identify an effective strategy to promote / require the delivery of adequate social infrastructure for the forecast growth within the Borough. It is requested that a specific policy seeking to promote and support, in principle, the provision of healthcare facilities is incorporated into the Local Plan. The policy should ensure that new and improved facilities are provided in light of assessment of the need for such facilities in the area and support the co-location of health and social care services where this would bring about improvements in access for the community. In addition, the policy should seek to secure the provision, enhancement and maintenance of health and social care facilities through planning obligations. | Noted. The Council is working to identify infrastructure requirements of new development through supporting work alongside the Local Plan. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be published to inform the Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy, allowing us to provide greater detail on needs, costs, development contributions, and any shortfalls to identify alternative funding streams. | Consider accordingly |
| 15450 - Basildon and Brentwood Clinical Commissioning Group (NHS) (Mr Dave Fazey) [6088] | Object | CCG believes that there is a real prospect of using emerging technologies to provide new and effective ways for the local population to access health care advice and support from the place and at the time that is convenient for them. In this way we are expecting to both improve people's experience of health services, and deliver new approaches to provision that will allow projected increases in demand to be accommodated without placing unsustainable pressure on physical capacity. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with the NHS and other partner organisations as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough as well as to seek delivery of a sustainable approach that contributes to positive impacts on health and wellbeing. | Consider accordingly |
| 14546 - A. Burton [1628] | Object | We do not have schools, doctors, hospital facilities to cope. Local hospital is on Black Alert most of the time. With no extra funding to be able to cope with this ludicrous development. Our local roads are congested already causing both noise and air pollution. Our water drainage goes back to Victorian times therefore as much greenbelt as we can keep is advisable to soak up excess water. Road Infrastructure is insufficient, further road building will cause more pollution. The A127 is overcrowded and is the only road leading to the east. As a public Governor or Basildon hospital I can safely say the hospital is at breaking point and already has major financial problems and over subscription problems. | Noted. The Council is working with the Highways Authority, service providers to develop an IDP (Infrastructure Development Plan) for new development within the borough. The IDP will identify the need for infrastructure for new development and identify funding sources. | Consider accordingly |
| 15438 - North East London NHS Foundation Trust [6087] 15441 - North East London NHS Foundation Trust [6087] | Object | North East London Foundation Trust; NHS England and Basildon and Brentwood Clinical Commissioning Group commented separately. (NEL NHS provides community health and mental health services in Essex and NE London. The Clinical Commissioning Group is responsible for planning, designing , buying and the performance management of NHS services. Object to the plan as collaborative working with NHS is not evident and specific strategic policy for provision of healthcare facilities is needed. | Noted. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the Plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. A record of Duty to Cooperate will be published alongside the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 13526 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024] 13815 - B. Impey [1308] | Support | Any further development, no matter where, must have the infrastructure to support well this development. It is almost impossible to get a doctors appointment if one is needed quickly so new surgeries will need to be built. Having more doctors at the present surgeries will not solve the problem, it would almost impossible to ring for an appointment on the day. Also surgeries have limited car parking. Could utility services cope as they do at present if all the proposed houses are built. | Comment noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to work with the NHS as the plan progresses to determine the future healthcare needs of the Borough. Utility providers are consulted throughout the Local Plan process and as part of the planning application process to identify where existing infrastructure may be affected and where new provision is needed. | Issues are being considered |
| 15182 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | CEG supports the requirement of policy 10.7 for all new development to meet on and off-site infrastructure requirements necessary to support development proposals and mitigate their impacts. The substantial advantage of allocating a new self-sustaining village is that by definition the majority of infrastructure and community requirements will be provided and integrated on site. | Support noted | No action |
| Environmental Wellbeing | | | | |
| 15518 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | Quality of Life and Community Infrastructure. It is recognised in principle that sustainable development is being promoted in this chapter of the Plan. It is good that the Local Plan will tie in and adhere to the recommendations of the Brentwood Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the South Essex Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) which is currently being reviewed. In the near future, there could be additional recommendations highlighted in our emerging Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs). | Comment noted. The Council will consider emerging flood risk management plans. | Consider and amend accordingly |
| Policy 10.8: Open Space in New Development | | | | |
| 14963 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | It is not clear if the open space standards include for semi natural space and playing pitches. It is also unclear if these standards have been fed into the Borough's viability modelling for the site i.e. whether the land take has been factored into the net developable area assumptions for this strategic greenfield site. Nor is it clear what evidence these standards are based upon, the most up to date open space study is from February 2008 which cannot be considered up to date and robust. | Clarification and evidence update will be provided for the next iteration of the Local Plan and considered in review of the policy. | Consider accordingly |
| 13217 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | While the policy is welcomed in principle but concern is raised about the restrictive approach proposed for the use of commuted sums if applied to outdoor sport and in relation to the use of quantity standards for securing all forms of open space provision including outdoor sport. Suggestions for addressing these concerns are set out in full text. | Comment noted. A sports strategy is being commissioned by the Council and the policy will be considered in light of best practice and local evidence. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13463 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Doesn't mention disabled access, parking and routes within the amenity | Refer to Policy 7.2, 10.2 and 10.6. Draft Policy 7.2 requires specific needs of disabled people to be integrated into proposed development. Draft Policy 10.2 seeks to ensure an appropriate level and location of car parking provision that also contributes to the public realm. Draft Policy 10.6 sets out that the design of all development will need to be informed by an analysis of the context, together with an explanation and justification of principles that have informed design rationales. | No action |
| 15685 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15867 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756] | Object | The supporting paragraph (para 10.45) to the DLP states that BBC will seek at least 15% of a development site to be set aside for public open space. However, no justification or relationship to evidence work is provided in relation to this and therefore is required before the Policy can be deemed to be 'Justified'. policy suggests that all development will be required to make some provision regardless of what type of development is proposed. Provision of open space or recreational amenities is not always appropriate or necessary in order to make development acceptable. As such, this policy should be re-worded to make clear that in the provision of open space will be required where Regulation 122 compliant. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15183 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] 15819 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Anna Davies) [4053] | Support | This policy allows for flexibility with the amount and type being determined by the size, nature and location of the proposal and therefore is supported. A key principle of healthy living is the provision of appropriate open space within easy access of new development. The unique holistic design opportunities available at Dunton Hills provide opportunities to deliver, design and locate such facilities so as to create the greatest possible encouragement for their use by new residents of the community. | Support noted | No action |

Policy 10.9: Open Space, Community, Sport and Recreational Facilities

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 13124 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Comment | Welcome SO11 & Policy 8.6 for Brentwood Town Centre, as these do support culture, however, there is not a clear policy to safeguard and support existing community and cultural facilities. The content of Policy 10.9 alludes to it, but has a focus on recreation. Therefore recommend a new policy is created, or Policy 8.6 or 10.9 are amended to also safeguard existing facilities. Recommend a policy along the lines of: Community and Cultural Facilities. The council will resist the loss or change of use of existing community and cultural facilities unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the need of the local population, or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision, and it has been demonstrated that there is no community need for the facility or demand for another community use on site. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy 10.7 seeks to secure necessary on and off site infrastructure, including community and cultural facilities. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|---|----------------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14053 - The Theatres Trust (Mr Ross Anthony) [302] | Comment | Welcome SO11 & Policy 8.6 for Brentwood Town Centre, as these do support culture, however, there is not a clear policy to safeguard and support existing community and cultural facilities. The content of Policy 10.9 alludes to it, but has a focus on recreation. Therefore recommend a new policy is created, or Policy 8.6 or 10.9 are amended to also safeguard existing facilities. Recommend a policy along the lines of: Community and Cultural Facilities. The council will resist the loss or change of use of existing community and cultural facilities unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the need of the local population, or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision, and it has been demonstrated that there is no community need for the facility or demand for another community use on site. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy 10.7 seeks to secure necessary on and off site infrastructure, including community and cultural facilities. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 14482 - Asphaltic Developments Ltd [2664] | Comment | There are exceptions to the presumption under this policy, where it can be demonstrated that there is an excess provision or where alternative facilities of equal or better quality and convenience will be provided as part of the development. On this point, any alternative open space provision which could be brought forward as part of redevelopment should be considered alongside other sustainable benefits associated with recycling of the brownfield site for housing development, and this should be reflected in the Policy. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15725 - British Horse Society (Sue Dobson) [6096] | Comment | We note that this policy aims to 'maximise opportunities for the creation, restoration, enhancement, expansion and connection of Green Infrastructure and ... major development proposals should seek to include elements of Green Infrastructure and Ecological Networks'. We request that the enhancement of the public rights of way network is included in this Policy and that the connectivity of the bridleway network is promoted. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15284 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Comment | In relation to the site at Sawyers Hall Lane, the proposals to bring forward the site would secure the long-term future of Hopefield Animal Sanctuary, which is recognised as an important community facility in the Borough. Therefore the site should be allocated for development to achieve this purpose. | Noted. The site will be assessed for availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF, as well as whether it fulfils the requirements of the Brentwood Spatial Strategy. | Consider accordingly |
| 14642 - Stonebond Properties Ltd [5948] | Comment | Re. land between 38-50 Crescent Road for residential allocation. The NPPF confirms exiting open space of public value and recreational land should not be built on unless criteria are met. Assessment of open space/surplus to requirements - There is land close to site which offers functional and accessible open space. The land was dealt with and declared surplus to requirements as part of ECC's sale of the land in 2003. Loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision - A financial contribution to the improvement of nearby play areas could be provided. The Open Space is of Amenity Value - The space has little or no public value. Against this background, there would be no merit in retaining an allocation of the land at Crescent Road identified on the accompanying site plan for open space purposes from the 2005 Replacement Local Plan. | Site submission noted. The site will be assessed for its availability, deliverability and sustainability as required by the NPPF, as well as whether it fulfils the strategic Spatial Strategy for development within the borough. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 14620 - Stonebond Properties Ltd [5948] | Object | The DLP does not contain a Proposals Map or include an updated supportive Open Space Assessment to supersede the current 2007 PPG17 Open Space Assessment. We have some concerns that BBC may continue to show the site [land between 38-50 Crescent Road] as Protected Open space as a repeat of the out of date 2005 Replacement Plan without a full and proper assessment of the suitability of such an allocation at this site. | The Council will publish technical evidence relating to open space assessment when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 13691 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] | Object | The Council must always oppose any compromise to public open spaces. It is not enough for open spaces to merely exist -- they must also be within easy walking distance, since not everybody has cars, and it should not be necessary to drive or to cross lots of roads to reach an open space. As a child, I grew up in a household without a car, so I feel strongly that open spaces must be local, not in some far-flung periphery. | Concerns noted. The Council will be considering potential for improvements to existing open spaces as well as the need for new open spaces in strategic development locations. Access and infrastructure for open space will be considered in the next iteration of the Plan. The Council will continue to work with partner organisations as the plan progresses to seek a sustainable approach that contributes to positive impacts on health and wellbeing. | No action |
| 14075 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | For consistency with paragraph 70 of the NPPF and to reflect the recognition in the plan of the important role that education facilities play in meeting the sports facility needs of the community the policy should explicitly support the principle of shared use facilities such as the dual use of education facilities for sport and other community uses in appropriate locations. | Comment noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15297 - Brentwood School [2575] | Object | Policy 10.9 is restrictive in terms of school development where the policy has a presumption against any development that involves loss of open space, community, sport, recreation or play facilities, etc, except on two basis: 1. There is an excess of provision. 2. Where alternative facilities of equal or better quality. The Schools would like to see a third exception: 3. Where the needs of other community infrastructure is more pressing. | Comment noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 14072 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | Policy does not take a positive approach to development proposals for new or enhanced open space, sport, recreation facilities etc which meet an identified need. The Council's emerging evidence base (Sport and Leisure Study and Open Space Study) should inform such needs and provide the basis for assessing which proposals could be supported in principle. This will be pertinent if new facilities are proposed in the Green Belt or in out of centre locations where there may be conflict with other plan policies. In such scenarios, a positive approach to the principle of such proposals supported by the evidence base will help inform such decisions. This approach would be consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF. An additional paragraph should therefore be added which supports proposals for new/enhanced open space, sport, recreation, play etc facilities where it would meet an identified need. | Comment noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 13646 - Mr Stuart Clark [4266] | Object | In 10.51 you say 'The creation of new LEAPs will be prioritised at the Newham Estate, in line with the Borough's Play Area Strategy.' I am deeply concerned about the loss of the tiny amount of existing green space in the Newham Estate only to be replaced with play equipment especially with the King George's Playing Fields so nearby. | Noted. Evidence on green infrastructure and open space will be set out within the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Open Space, Leisure and Sports Studies which will inform policies within the Local Plan. | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 13219 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | Concerns are raised about the need for policy guidance supporting the principle of new open space/sports facilities which meet a need, the need for the plan to make provision for addressing community sports facility needs that are identified in the emerging evidence base, the wording of the policy in relation to the loss of facilities (in order to allow new open space/sport facilities on existing sites) and the need for support for the principle of shared use facilities. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15111 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Object | A judgement as to whether the requirements of Policy 10.9 cannot be made without having knowledge of what land has been allocated as Protected Open Space or Local Green Space, and the basis for doing so. In the absence of the Proposals Map, and any further supporting background studies which set out the basis for the allocation of land under this policy, support cannot be given to this policy. | The Council will publish technical evidence relating to open space assessment when available and this will further inform future stages of the plan-making process. | Consider accordingly |
| 13464 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Doesn't emphasise need for disabled access, parking and routes throughout the amenity. | Refer to Policy 7.2, 10.2 and 10.6. Draft Policy 7.2 requires specific needs of disabled people to be integrated into proposed development. Draft Policy 10.2 seeks to ensure an appropriate level and location of car parking provision that also contributes to the public realm. Draft Policy 10.6 sets out that the design of all development will need to be informed by an analysis of the context, together with an explanation and justification of principles that have informed design rationales. | No action |
| 16317 - Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall Charitable Trust [4558] | Object | Object the allocation of the Trustees of the Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall Charitable Trust's property as a protected Open Space. Request that the Council advise us of: - The powers the Council is relying on to allocate Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall Charitable Trust's property as a protected Open Space - Which Act of Parliament the Council is relying on to grant it the powers to allocate Kelvedon Hatch Village Hall Charitable Trust's property as a protected Open Space. | Noted | Consider amendment accordingly |
| 14074 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | The third paragraph should be added to allow the principle of loss of facilities where the proposal is for new open space/sports/recreation facilities where the benefits outweigh the impact. As well as allowing consistency with Government policy in paragraph 74 this would provide those that own/manage/use open space/sports facilities with flexibility to provide facilities which respond to community needs and improve facility sustainability e.g. proposals for the conversion of grass pitches to artificial pitches. | Amendment proposal noted | Consider amendment accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|--------|---|--|----------------------|
| 14073 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Object | Unlike housing, employment and retail, there are no specific proposals in the plan for meeting existing or future community sports infrastructure needs e.g. any new leisure centres, playing fields etc. While this is likely to be due to the current status of the emerging evidence base, the pre-submission local plan should address this by setting out proposals for addressing identified needs e.g. allocations for new or enhanced facilities which are consistent with the strategy and action plan that emerge from the evidence base. | Noted. The need for infrastructure supporting new development is being considered in greater detail by the Local Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Policy 10.7 seeks to secure necessary on and off site infrastructure, including community and sport facilities. The Council is developing a Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule which will stipulate the level of contributions required for infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |

Figure 10.4: Fields in Trust Children's Play Space Standards

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|--|---|------------|
| 13642 - Anne Clark [4973] | Object | 10:51: VERY STRONGLY OBJECT. There are enough children playing outside on the Newham Estate as it is - creating an intolerable environment for the residents there. We DO NOT want actual play areas, this will attract even more children! During the summer months, there is the constant noise of footballs being kicked and children screaming. Not to mention the damage from balls hitting residents' property. There is a perfectly large park in the area - children should be encouraged to go there to play! | Disagree. The standards given in Fig. 10.4 apply to new major development. Policy to consider the provision of infrastructure, including playspace, is in line with the NPPF. | No action. |
|---------------------------|--------|--|---|------------|

Policy 10.10: Green Infrastructure

| | | | | |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13537 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] 14918 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] | Comment | We note that this policy aims to 'maximise opportunities for the creation, restoration, enhancement, expansion and connection of Green Infrastructure and ... major development proposals should seek to include elements of Green Infrastructure and Ecological Networks'. We request that the enhancement of the public rights of way network is included in this Policy, especially increasing the connectivity of the current Bridleway network. | Noted. Public rights of way, including bridleways, are considered an important part of Green Infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 15242 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Comment | We have also looked at, and are generally supportive of, the Strategic Objectives, Spatial Strategy, General Development Criteria, and the various policies covering the environment, Green Infrastructure, air quality, lighting, flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage. We also note that the Plan has been informed by the Brentwood Green Infrastructure Strategy (2015) and recognises the need, as highlighted therein, to better link formal and informal open spaces in the Borough to improve their wider use and value. | Comment of GI linkages noted. | Consider accordingly |
| 15529 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | In reference to paragraph 10.46 of the plan, even where a site is constrained due to its urban nature or for other reasons, environmental gains can still be achieved through de-culverting, creation and management of ecological buffer strips, or new wetland areas. Even these smaller gains can help to reduce pollution and help to reconnect people to nature. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 15526 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | It is encouraging to see the emphasis on protecting green belt land and the promotion of green infrastructure. It is extremely positive that the proposed development allocations will only reduce the Borough's proportion of green belt from 89% to 88%. | Noted | No action |
| 15528 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | We fully support this policy, which promotes an integrated approach to providing green infrastructure, including using it for open space, recreation, flood risk management, habitat creation, climate change mitigation and water quality improvements. This should be expanded to make reference to realising opportunities to meet the objectives of the Thames and Anglian River Basin Management Plan (RBMPs), for example through protecting and enhancing river corridors or networks of wildlife habitats. It is disappointing that no reference is made to either of the RBMPs as part of the evidence base. | Reference to the Thames and Anglian River Basin Management Plan to be added. | Amend accordingly |
| 15531 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | The plan is very land centric and only mentions water bodies or waterways in passing. We would like to see further detail regarding the rivers within the Borough and specifically the headwaters of the Rivers Wid and Mardyke for our area. Given the improvements suggested above, we consider that this could be addressed through a completely separate policy, which should address water quality, the requirements of the WFD and RBMP objectives. We would like to see a new policy on the protection, enhancement and buffering of watercourses to help in the achievement of WFD objectives. This should include the provision of ecological buffer strips and corridors, native tree planting and the new wetland areas to help manage flood risk and reduce diffuse pollution whilst connecting people to nature. This could also include de-culverting, removal of redundant structures, alien species removal where appropriate. The need for this is supported in paragraph 21.1.4 of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal. | Agreed | Consider accordingly |
| 15532 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | We support this policy but consider it would benefit from a reference to applying a sequential approach within sites, as well as them passing the requirements of the Sequential Test. This will ensure that more vulnerable development is directed to lower risk areas of a site, especially on mixed use development sites. It also can direct open space to higher risk areas, allowing an integrated approach to open space, recreation and flood risk management. More emphasis should be placed on enhancing existing flood management systems rather than focussing purely on managing flood risk to and from new development. We would encourage you to liaise with Essex County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority to identify potential opportunities to reduce and manage surface water flooding. This policy could be improved by having some supporting text that further explains what is meant by resistant and resilient design means. It could also benefit from mentioning (if not within a new policy) the need to ensure that development does not prevent flood risk management now or in the future. This is particularly important to us, as we often access to watercourses for example to exercise our permissive powers. In addition, space should be safeguarded for future defence raising. | Noted. The Council agree that further work with ECC as the Lead Local Flood Authority, to identify potential opportunities to reduce and manage surface water flooding and use of a sequential approach to flood issues, is appropriate. | Consider accordingly |
| 15530 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | We would recommend that more detail is included in the Local Plan with regards to the rivers within the borough, their ecological status and potential opportunities for improving these through drivers such as the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and Eel Regulations. Several of the water bodies are all currently at less than good ecological status (e.g. Wid) and need to be a good status or potential status by 2027 in order to meet the requirements of the WFD. Any development proposals need to be compliant with the WFD in ensuring no deterioration and where possible seek enhancements. | Agreed | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 15527 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | We would like to see further information on the development of the proposed enhanced green wedges. | Support. Acknowledge the need to clarify role of green wedges. Particularly between Shenfield and Brentwood town centres. | Consider accordingly |
| 13465 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | Once again disabled access and facilities haven't been mentioned | Agreed. Policy to be considered in light of comment. | Consider accordingly |
| 15184 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | The allocation of a new village scale of development and particularly on the Dunton Hills site affords a unique opportunity to enhance, improve and extend the provision of Green infrastructure. Early evidence prepared on behalf of the Promoters identifies extensive opportunities to use the existing natural topography and landscape features as an integral part of the village design and then to improve and extend them into the site and beyond. | Support noted | No action |
| 13220 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] | Support | The policy is supported on the basis it seeks an integrated approach to the provision of Green Infrastructure which would include sport and recreation facilities plus seeking new development to make appropriate provision either directly or through financial contributions. | Support welcomed. An integrated provision of Green Infrastructure should include sport and recreation in consideration of the NPPF five Green Belt purposes, other constraints and opportunities. | Consider accordingly |
| Policy 10.11: Air Quality | | | | |
| 15244 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Comment | We have also looked at, and are generally supportive of, the Strategic Objectives, Spatial Strategy, General Development Criteria, and the various policies covering the environment, Green Infrastructure, air quality, lighting, flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage. | Support welcomed | No action |
| 16099 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The policy does not make explicit reference to traffic congestion, which is often the leading contributor to local air pollution. ECC supports the recommendation of the Interim SA (para 10.1.6) that reference is made to Policy 10.1: Sustainable Transport, to encourage this link. | Agreed. A reference to Policy 10.1 Sustainable Transport to ensure explicit reference to traffic congestion will be added. | Amend accordingly |
| 15686 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | Policy 10.11 states that BBC will expect development proposals to "reduce" sources of air pollution. NPPF (para 204) requires planning obligations to be necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development, and fair and reasonable in scale and kind. It is therefore considered beyond the remit of a planning application, for air pollution to sought to be reduced. Development proposals should mitigate against its own adverse development impact only. The Policy as currently worded is therefore not considered 'Justified'. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| 13975 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] | Object | Pollution. I have not seen any information on the local pollution from vehicles. Studies should be in place to measure the current levels which I would guess exceed permitted European emission levels. An increase in traffic will further exacerbate the issue. | Noted. The borough does assess air quality and has areas that are designated Air Quality Management Areas. Policy is drafted to reflect consideration of the impact of new development on Air Quality. | No action |
| 15311 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Object | The A12 is a principal route for large lorries running to and from the port of Felixstowe, it also carries high volumes of car traffic. It is bad planning to allocate land for new housing in such close proximity to a major source of air pollution in Brentwood. Among the recommendations made in "Every Breath We Take" is the following: "Protect those most at risk. Children, older people, and people with chronic health problems are among the most vulnerable to air pollution. Public services must take account of this disproportionate harm through local tools such as planning policies for housing and schools ..." | Noted. Potential for impact on Air Quality is being considered by the Local Plan. | No action |
| Flood Risk and Drainage | | | | |
| 16334 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council [90] | Comment | Although the plan refers to fluvial flooding in the Ingatestone area nowhere is the Chelmsford Flood Alleviation scheme to be built in Margarett mentioned (Application No 12/01320/FUL). The impact of this scheme will mean closures of roads in the vicinity of the river Wild will last longer and traffic disruption will be greater. In view of this this impact should be recognised in the plan. | Noted. Reference to proposed flood alleviation schemes will be considered. | Consider accordingly |
| 16092 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Paragraph 10.70 - Where a flood risk assessment is required for development within flood zone 1, specifically looking at surface water and ground water flood risk, the Flood Risk Assessment should be approved by the Lead Local flood Authority(LLFA), namely ECC, as part of our role as a statutory consultee to the planning process. Furthermore, a drainage strategy should be approved for all major development within the borough to ensure that development will not increase flood risk to the site or surrounding areas. | Agree | Amend accordingly |
| 15519 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | In the near future, there could be additional recommendations highlighted in our emerging Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs). Areas within key urban growth areas of Brentwood, Warley, West Horndon, Ingatestone, Pilgrims Hatch, Dunton and Shenfield, including their communities, are dependent upon effective fluvial Flood Risk Management infrastructure (flood embankments, flood and surface water storage areas) to maintain their sustainability and viability both now and into the future. | Noted. The Council will consider the information as it becomes available. The potential for fluvial flood risk in these areas is noted and considered accordingly. | Consider accordingly |
| 14995 - Mr and Mrs Simon and Jeanie Hughes [4739] | Comment | There is an underground stream under the Courage Fields that runs under the housing onto Chelmsford Road and leads to some flooding when rain is heavy (noticeable on the corner by the Vets). It is not yet a major problem but should be noted and nothing done to make it worse. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15814 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | ECC supports the reference to flooding and surface water management issues, as well as the need for proposals to incorporate sustainable drainage systems. The approach and use of supporting evidence is considered to be consistent with ECC's requirements in its role as the Lead Local Flood Authority. ECC welcomes reference to the Brentwood Surface Water Management Plan. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|----------------------|
| Policy 10.13: Flood Risk | | | | |
| 15245 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Comment | We have also looked at, and are generally supportive of, the Strategic Objectives, Spatial Strategy, General Development Criteria, and the various policies covering the environment, Green Infrastructure, air quality, lighting, flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage. | General support noted. | No action |
| 15523 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | The DEFRA document "Flood and Coastal Resilience Partnership Funding DEFRA policy statement on an outcome-focused, partnership approach to funding flood and coastal erosion risk management" is another useful document to support evidence base with regard to funding deliverability of new and replacement flood defence infrastructure. This is attached. Any new proposals relating to flood defence schemes should draw on the guidelines highlighted in the attached documents. | Noted. Evidence and guidelines regarding the potential for flooding and prevention of flooding of existing and new development are considered by the Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 15520 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | To ensure the successful and most efficient delivery of the programme we want to work with partners to maximise 3rd party investment and optimise our investment, in line with DEFRA's flood and coastal resilience partnership funding policy statement. We can't afford to maintain the assets alone and need 3rd party investment to sustain current levels. We also want to deliver integrated flood risk management solutions, including potential habitat creation schemes, that reflect partners' and other parties' aspirations for the riverside. This will require close partnership working between Thurrock, Brentwood, Basildon Councils, the London Borough of Havering as well as ourselves and other key stakeholders as we appraise the options. | Noted. The importance of integrated flood risk management solutions and the potential for habitat creation is acknowledged. The Council will continue to work with the Duty to Cooperate partners on this. | Consider accordingly |
| 15524 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | We would encourage you to also liaise with Essex County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) to identify potential opportunities to reduce and manage surface water flooding. | Noted and agreed. The Council are working with ECC on matters including the potential opportunities to reduce and manage surface water flooding. | Consider accordingly |
| 15521 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | There are many challenges such as future rise in river levels (climate change), highlighted in the consultation, and structural deterioration of existing flood defence assets that the Council should fully appreciate along with the funding challenges to deliver these important infrastructure assets to support viability of these communities. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 16091 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Paragraph 1 - Reference to Internal Drainage Boards should be removed as there are none in Essex. Paragraph - 'Where development is permitted within.....' - Recommend that in addition to the categorization of developments into different flood risk zones as outlined in the Brentwood SFRA, development proposals should also be viewed in terms of the location of the proposed development within a Flooding Hotspot as identified in the Brentwood SWMP. | Noted. Reference to IDB to be deleted. Amend accordingly. Reference to flooding hotspots as identified in the Surface Water Management Plan will be made. | Consider accordingly |
| 15522 - Environment Agency (Miss Lizzie Griffiths) [4075] | Comment | The new Brentwood District Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), which is currently proposed for review is a useful supporting document to understand the potential impacts that the flood risk management infrastructure that all Flood Risk Management Authorities including Brentwood District Council and ourselves will need to managed into the future. | Noted. Evidence regarding the potential for flooding of existing and new development are considered by the plan. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 15688 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | A number of DLP policies set out specific requirements for planning applications, for example Policy 7.2, Policy 10.1, Policy 10.3, Policy 10.13 and Policy 10.15. LPAs are required to publish a list of information requirements for planning application, proportionate to the nature and scale of the development proposals and reviewed on a frequent basis. National policy notes that local information requirements have no bearing on whether a planning application is valid unless they are set out on such a list. Such requirements should not therefore be included within policies. | Noted. Work to update the Councils validation list is ongoing and is likely to precede the Local Plan. | Consider accordingly |
| 13473 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] | Object | Dunton Hills Garden Village is a critical drainage area. Removal of trees and other vegetation will reduce the ability of the area to absorb rainfall. Most of the surface water will be drained towards the South and West via the Mardyke tributary and into the Mardyke. Development will multiply the amount of water entering an area that is already the scene of many past floods. Mitigation will require an extensive system of flood defences and pumping stations at enormous cost. The cost and uncertainty over the ability to control the flood risk makes this development unacceptable in its own right.] Please read the full objection as the details are important and it is no longer than necessary. | Noted. Strategic development is required to consider and address the potential for flooding and where necessary implement SUDS and flood protection systems. | Consider accordingly |
| 13653 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 13976 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] 14000 - Mr Marc Godfree [4322] | Object | Development of Dunton Hills and West Horndon will pose a very high risk of flooding especially through its onward effect on the Mardyke River. Removal of trees/vegetation will reduce the ability of the area to absorb rainfall. The altitude of the land is mostly around 40m. The A127 presents a barrier to drainage systems because it is lower lying land of approx. 20m. Therefore, most of the surface water will have to be drained towards the South and West via the Mardyke tributary and into the Mardyke itself. The development of the Dunton Hills area would dramatically increase the risk of flooding. The cost to implement the necessary flood defences would be astronomical. | Noted. Strategic development such as Dunton Hills Garden Suburb is required to consider and address issues such as flooding. | Consider accordingly |
| 15453 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Support | Sewerage infrastructure cannot be delivered through CIL or S106 contributions therefore this policy is necessary to ensure any sewerage upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development. To clarify the policy requirement suggest additional supporting text could be included: "The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to adverse amenity impacts for existing or future users in the form of internal and external sewer flooding or pollution of land and water courses. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate appraisals and reports to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing waste water infrastructure. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered." | Agreed. Sewerage infrastructure is essential and this text clarifies requirements for developers. | Add text to plan |
| 15679 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Support | Anglian Water is supportive of Policy 10.13 (flood risk) which requires applicants to consider all likely sources of flooding as part of flood risk assessments to be submitted with planning applications. In particular the requirements for applicants to obtain confirmation from the relevant sewerage provider that there is sufficient capacity within the (foul) sewerage network and that any required improvements to the sewerage network have been completed prior to the occupation of development is fully supported. | Support noted | No action |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|-----------------------|
| Policy 10.14: Sustainable Drainage | | | | |
| 15248 - Natural England (Mr Gordon Wyatt) [6077] | Comment | We have also looked at, and are generally supportive of, the Strategic Objectives, Spatial Strategy, General Development Criteria, and the various policies covering the environment, Green Infrastructure, air quality, lighting, flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage. | General support welcomed | No action |
| 16095 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Paragraph 10.74 - a drainage strategy should be submitted for any site over 0.1 ha. Paragraph 10.76 - updates to the legislation mean that schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act (FWMA) was not implemented, and therefore the LLFA did not become the SuDS approval body. Instead the LLFA was made a statutory consultee to the planning process and will provide advice to the local planning authority about the suitability of proposed drainage schemes. | Noted | Amend accordingly |
| 16093 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Criterion a) - allowable brownfield discharge rates are confusing. Reference to discharge at current brownfield rates should be deleted. Criterion b) - a drainage strategy should be submitted for any site over 0.1 ha. Criterion c) - current best practice now requires developers to use an index based approach when managing water quality rather than requiring a specific number of treatment. This section of the policy should be updated and should refer developers to chapter 26 of the updated CIRIA SuDS Manual for more information about this approach. In addition, ECC would expect only the first 4-5mm of any storm event to be managed within the site. A requirement of 10mm may be considered too onerous for many developers to achieve especially onsite where infiltration potential is very low. | Noted | Update accordingly |
| 13466 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Object | This should include something along the lines that not additional hard standing/non draining surfaces will be allowed from original occupation without substantial automatic draining systems. | Noted. National planning regulation addresses this issue once development is built. It is considered that the proposed local policy addresses the need for sustainable drainage systems in new development. | No action |
| 15185 - Commercial Estates Group [5050] | Support | Early evidence prepared on behalf of the Promoters confirms that the site is capable of incorporating SuDS and this will be confirmed in the master planning process. | Support welcomed. SuDs will be necessary at this location. | No action |
| 13113 - Mr Chris Hossack [5349] | Support | We have a sufficient drainage infrastructure in place for the existing developments and highways, this is also considered effectively for new development. However, the reason we face flooding problems is that the existing drainage infrastructure is not maintained properly and most gulley's, ditches and culverts are invariably blocked. Even drainage points on main A roads into Brentwood such as A129 Ongar Road are blocked. | Noted. The Council will work with ECC, the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency to ensure the identification of potential opportunities to reduce and manage surface water flooding, in line with the areas identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Brentwood Surface Water Management Plan. | Consider accordingly. |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| 14696 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] 15680 - Anglian Water (Ms Sue Bull) [411] | Support | Anglian Water is supportive of Policy 10.14 (Sustainable Drainage) which requires the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage the disposal of surface water. In particular the requirement for applicants to demonstrate that the surface water hierarchy has been followed and to demonstrate that there is capacity within surface water sewers to accommodate the development (following the consideration of alternatives) is fully supported. | Support noted | No action |
| 15457 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089] | Support | Thames water will seek to ensure that SuDS are prioritised and implemented for developments of all sizes, and support policies on surface water flow reduction from brownfield sites will ease pressure on the sewer network regardless of the size of the development and type of SuDS implemented. Recognising that SuDS are only one of a number of competing considerations for developers when drafting their designs, and for local planning authorities when determining applications, we have reviewed the approach we take with local planning authorities and developers. A copy of the Thames Water policy on SuDS is attached. | Welcome support and provision of copy of the Thames Water policy on SuDS. | Consider accordingly |

Policy 10.15: Contaminated Land and Hazardous Substances

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|--|-----------------------|
| 16096 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | The policy refers to 'no unacceptable adverse impacts' effect on water quality or flooding, watercourses, biodiversity or important wildlife habitats. However it is not clear what would be considered unacceptable. ECC recommends the policy refers to the SuDS Design Guide with regards appropriate standards. | Noted. ECC SuDS water quality standards will be considered along side other standards, particularly the CIRIA SUDS manual 2007 and updates. | Consider accordingly. |
| 13467 - Mrs Jean Laut [4271] | Comment | Contaminated land mustn't be able to be suggested as way to move from brownfield development to greenfield. | Noted. The Draft Local Plan spatial strategy addresses the use of brownfield land. Remediation of contamination may affect viability of sites and will be considered in the development of the plan and identification of sites. | Consider accordingly. |
| 15687 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Object | A number of DLP policies set out specific requirements for planning applications, for example Policy 7.2, Policy 10.1, Policy 10.3, Policy 10.13 and Policy 10.15. LPAs are required to publish a list of information requirements for planning application, proportionate to the nature and scale of the development proposals and reviewed on a frequent basis. National policy notes that local information requirements have no bearing on whether a planning application is valid unless they are set out on such a list. Such requirements should not therefore be included within policies. | Noted | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Institutional Buildings | | | | |
| 15298 - Brentwood School [2575] | Comment | As a section for such an important area of development it is considered it should be strengthened with some additional text and paragraphs following: "Established Schools and other educational facilities make a major contribution to community use and provide essential support to increased housing growth." "This plan recognises that such education providers will continue to improve facilities and such Institutional users will be encouraged to made efficient use of their assets and landholdings. Where feasible such providers will be encouraged to share their assets with the wider community to improve health and social wellbeing." | Noted. The Council acknowledge the need to make efficient use of institutional assets, this must however be considered inline with site specific impacts, such as impact on Green Belt and Green Wedges, for example. | Consider accordingly |
| 15299 - Brentwood School [2575] | Comment | After Paragraph 10.86 there should be additional words: "It is recognised that such uses provide an important contribution to community facilities as well as benefitting the local economy. There will be a general presumption in favour of such developments where located in the right place." | Disagree. The Council acknowledge the need to make efficient use of institutional assets, this must however be considered inline with site specific impacts. | No action |
| 16097 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Support | Paragraph 10.16 - Supports reference to providing institutional uses close to where people live and work. | Support noted | No action |

Policy 10.16: Buildings for Institutional Purposes

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---|-------|-------------------|
| 16098 - Essex County Council (Mr. Kevin Fraser) [1908] | Comment | Should include reference to ensuring that children and young people can walk or cycle to school safely on designated safe routes through new developments. Such routes should be planned from the outset of development and not retrofitted into a scheme's design; Regard should be given as to how residents will access the nearest primary and secondary school provision by foot, ensuring that the route is safe and convenient.' | Noted | Amend accordingly |
|--|---------|---|-------|-------------------|

Appendix 1 - Retail Hierarchy

Appendix 1 - Retail Hierarchy

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|--|---|-------------------|
| 13667 - Mr Stuart Wilks [5666] | Object | It is difficult to see how, given that "Warley Hill" extends to the junction with Eagle Way and Mascalls Lane, this area could reasonably be classed as "Town Centre" - the definition is too vague and needs better consideration. I doubt very much that the residents of Eagle Way would consider themselves to be living in the town centre! | Noted. The town centre is not considered to extend as far as Eagle Way. The Council will clarify this in the text and illustrate this on the Proposals Map. | Amend accordingly |
|--------------------------------|--------|--|---|-------------------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| Appendix 2 - Proposed Housing Delivery | | | | |
| Appendix 2 - Proposed Housing Delivery | | | | |
| 13952 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Comment | Discrepancies between the phasing contained in Appendix 2 and housing trajectory contained in Appendix 3. The timescales for delivery do not correlate. Appendix 2 gives a "Phasing estimate" for each site but does not state whether this is from adoption of the Plan or the start date of the Plan. These phasing estimates do not always match the deliveries in the housing trajectory. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 13951 - Mr Anthony Field [5636] | Comment | Policy 5.2 sets out a housing requirement of 7,240 new dwellings over the 20 year plan period, equating to 362 dwellings per annum. Appendix 2 lists deliveries totalling 5,555. This falls well short of the 7,240 housing requirement. This shortfall is partly made up in the housing trajectory by extant permissions, class C2 completions, permitted development allowance and a significant windfall allowance. However, whilst the housing trajectory claims to demonstrate 7,240 deliveries, the totals at the bottom of the trajectory add up to only 7,121 which is below the housing requirement. | Noted | Consider accordingly |
| 15951 - CALA Homes [5237] | Comment | A development of 57 dwellings (41 dph) is considered to represent a more appropriate density for Site 079A, taking account of existing development in the local area; the site's sustainability and accessibility and the Council's aspiration to ensure the most efficient use of land is made. [Current proposed number is 42]. | Noted. The densities considered for each site are based on current evidence. Opportunities and constraints are therefore considered for each site and the proposed densities considered accordingly. An update to the SHLAA will give further information on this for each site considered. | Consider accordingly |
| 13894 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 16962 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | Housing densities at West Horndon should be greater than the 29 dwellings/hectare in order to retain a greater proportion of land for business use thus reducing proposed release of Greenfield sites for business elsewhere. The site at West Horndon are ideally placed for such higher densities having a rail link and being close to the centre of the village. | Noted. The densities considered for each site are based on current evidence. Opportunities and constraints are therefore considered for each site and the proposed densities considered accordingly. An update to the SHLAA will give further information on this for each site considered. | Consider accordingly |
| 15081 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Comment | Recommended Change: The Phasing Estimate within the table at Appendix 2 to the Draft Local Plan should be amended to show delivery within the 0-5 years time period, at least for that part of the allocation within the Ursuline Sisters ownership (Site Ref: 044). The site is unused and unoccupied with no barriers to it being made available immediately. It would, thus, be deliverable within the 0-5 years phasing estimate. | Noted. Phasing to be considered accordingly. | Consider accordingly |
| 14990 - Ursuline Sisters [28] | Comment | Reference to Site Ref: 044 - Land at Priests Lane, appendix 2 identifies this combined site as being able to deliver approximately 130 dwellings. This is at a density stated in the Table to be 96dph. However as both sites making up this allocation total 5.35 hectares in area, density to achieve 130 dwellings would equate to approximately 24.3 dph. Recommended correction: the table contained within Appendix 2 to the Draft Local Plan, should be corrected to read 24 dph. | Noted. The density will be considered in relation to opportunities and constraints. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14054 - J M Gillingham [4596] 14258 - Mr Ian Blackburn [5325] 14259 - J M Gillingham [4596] | Comment | Should the plan conclude that the Dunton Hills Garden Village development be allocated Housing densities should be greater than the 30-40 dwellings/hectare proposed. The name and density proposed is further indication that the solution is not the right one to justify sacrificing Green Belt. To minimise Green Belt loss the Plan should be setting a far more aspirational vision than simply replicating a development type that has led to urban sprawl in the first place. | The densities considered for each site are based on current evidence. Opportunities and constraints are therefore assessed for each site and the proposed densities considered accordingly. An update to the SHLAA will give further information on this for each site considered. | Consider accordingly |
| 15262 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856] | Object | Notably the five year housing land supply assessment does not include the Strategic Site as it is planned to come forward in years 5 to 10 (not the first five years). The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply and therefore the Draft Local Plan is not sound. | Noted. Site phasing to be considered accordingly. | Consider accordingly |
| 14689 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Object | Objection related to the Council's new requirement that the phasing of development of Horndon Estate referred to in appendix 2. The Council has two incompatible positions in respect of phasing the housing delivery on the Horndon Estate: The first is the housing contribution of the Horndon Estate identified as part of the current 5 year housing land supply; The second is set out in the latest draft LDP, where appendix 2 shows the housing coming forward in the medium term i.e. after 5 years. Our client has been working for some time on a planning application for the redevelopment of Horndon Estate. The new phasing requirement set out in the draft LDP does not appear to be underpinned by any assessment/ evidence and is unjustified. Consequently, our client objects to this policy and appendix 2. | Noted. Phasing to be considered accordingly. | Consider accordingly |
| 14697 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Object | Horndon Industrial Park. The allocations are welcomed, but as with previous drafts of the local plan the allowance of 500 dwellings continues to be unjustified. This figure is based on a simple density calculation that does not take account of the design constraints affecting the sites. The supporting documents attached to this representation include draft masterplans and schedule of accommodation which have been subject to robust analysis of design, site and viability constraints - this has resulted in 324 houses and 63 flats. | Noted. Densities will be considered with the opportunities and constraints for each site. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| 14158 - Mrs Elizabeth Jones [5693] 14339 - Mr Venon Thomas [5875] 14347 - Mr Zak Harvey [5877] 14357 - Mr Andrew Watson [5878] 14366 - Miss Tilly O'Leary [5880] 14375 - Mr Dan Morrow [5881] 14418 - Mr Stanley Jopson [5890] 14426 - Mrs Rosa Dwyer [5891] 14431 - MBE Roy Dyer [5894] 14436 - Mr Robert Grey [5895] 14444 - Mr Mital Patel [5896] 14448 - Miss Lois Whitehead [5897] 14455 - Mr Stephen Bunton [5899] 14460 - Mrs Judith Wright [5901] 14471 - Mr Jason Paisley [5902] 14480 - Miss Deana Adansi [5905] 14487 - Mr Chris Edwards [5907] | Support | Page 185 Appendix 2 is supported where the Sow n Grow site is listed no. 010 Approx. dwellings could be higher. | Noted. Densities will be considered with the opportunities and constraints for each site. | Consider accordingly |
| 16318 - Barwood Land and Estates Ltd [2704] | Support | Support the inclusion of Land at Honeypot Lane. Appendix 2 identifies Honeypot Lane as providing a total of 250 dwellings in the first five years of the plan period and BLEL welcomes this identification of the opportunity to deliver housing on the site early in the plan period. BLEL suggests that there should be some flexibility to the housing delivery phasing shown in the Draft Local Plan at Appendix 2 and 3 given the need to achieve detailed planning permission for the site in 2017 in order to allow time for the first phase of development to be completed in 2018. | Noted. Phasing will be considered with the opportunities and constraints for each site. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|---|---------|---|--|---|
| Appendix 3 - Housing Trajectory | | | | |
| Appendix 3 - Housing Trajectory | | | | |
| 15316 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] | Comment | Appendix 3 sets out projected housing completions on a year by year basis. However, Appendix 3 only includes 18 of the 22 allocated sites listed in Appendix 2. Missing in the hard copy are: Dunton Hills Garden Village - 2500 dwellings; Victoria Court, Victoria Road, Brentwood - 40 dwellings; Baytree Centre, Brentwood - 200 dwellings; and Ingatestone Garden Centre - 60 dwellings. | The Council apologises for these omissions. This was an error made during the process of laying out the Plan in its final form for publication and printing. | Ensure publication of all site information is correct across all sites before publication of the next draft plan. |
| 15952 - CALA Homes [5237] | Comment | Site 079A is capable of delivering homes sooner and at a higher rate than currently anticipated by the Council. | The proposed reduction in delivery time and decrease in housing density at this location has been noted. The Council will consider evidence relating to each site. | Consider accordingly. |
| 13301 - Mrs Fiona Trott [2458] | Comment | Our site would be suitable for development of 250 houses, which would reduce by over 25% the Council's reliance on windfall sites in the later years of the local plan | Site noted | Consider accordingly |
| 14946 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509] | Comment | Request that the next iteration of the plan takes account of the sites [Crest Nicholson's land interests within the allocation for Dunton Hills Garden Village] potential to deliver a substantial number of homes which will contribute to the Borough's five year supply in the early years of the plan period. Our client's land is available now, offers a suitable location for development now, and is clearly achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. | Noted. Phasing will be considered with the opportunities and constraints for each site. Dunton Hills Garden Village is of a scale that Masterplanning and infrastructure provision may not make provision within 5 years feasible. | Consider accordingly |
| 14698 - Hermes Fund Managers Limited [3737] | Object | Re. Horndon Industrial Park. The allocations are welcomed, but as with previous drafts of the local plan the allowance of 500 dwellings continues to be unjustified. This figure is based on a simple density calculation that does not take account of the design constraints affecting the sites. The supporting documents attached to this representation include draft masterplans and schedule of accommodation which have been subject to robust analysis of design, site and viability constraints - this has resulted in 324 houses and 63 flats. | The proposed decrease in housing density at this location has been noted. The Council will consider evidence relating to each site. | Consider accordingly |

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|--|---------|--|--|----------------------|
| 14548 - Mr C Lonergan [5926] | Object | It is recognised that the Council is deficient in providing a five year supply of housing land. It is therefore important to balance the strategic allocations with smaller sites, as these will generally have fewer constraints and can be delivered quickly to assist with meeting the persistent undersupply of housing in Brentwood. | The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | Consider accordingly |
| 13980 - Bulphan Community Forum (Mr David Gilbane) [5626] | Object | I would like to see the smaller developments take place first. Organic growth will be much less intrusive and will allow the area to slowly digest the changes. Only when these options have run out should larger developments on Green Belt land be considered. The used of Green Belt should be a last resort. | Noted. The evolution of the Spatial Strategy leads to the preferred option in the context of the existing transport corridors and the Green Belt. The sequential land use prioritises urban areas and brownfield sites to minimise the impact on the Green Belt with larger scale development to provide new self sustaining community with new services, facilities and infrastructure. | No action |
| 15558 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 15571 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] | Support | BBC has sought to be realistic about the likelihood of sites coming forward within the housing trajectory. This seeks to deliver development within urban locations in the short term (p47). Such an approach is supported. We support the proposed housing trajectory in Appendix 3, and the identification of the Site's short term delivery (0-5 years) in Appendix 2. | Support noted | No action |
| 16319 - Barwood Land and Estates Ltd [2704] | Support | Confirm the ability to bring forward new housing on the Honeypot Lane site in the five-year period. BLEL suggests that there should be some flexibility to the housing delivery phasing shown in the Draft Local Plan at Appendix 2 and 3 given the need to achieve detailed planning permission for the site in 2017 in order to allow time for the first phase of development to be completed in 2018. | The Council welcome the confirmation that new housing is feasible within the first five year period. Delivery phasing will be considered further. | Consider accordingly |

Appendix 4 - Policy Changes Since Preferred Options (2013)

Appendix 4 - Policy Changes Since Preferred Options (2013)

| | | | | |
|---|--------|---|---|-----------|
| 13607 - Historic England (Mr Michael Stubbs) [5648] | Object | Summary of sites not preferred are found against previous representations | Objection information noted in site specific records. | No action |
|---|--------|---|---|-----------|

| Representation | Nature | Summary of Main Issue | Council's Assessment | Action |
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|
|----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------|

Appendix 5 - Glossary

Appendix 5 - Glossary

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------------|-----------|
| 13271 - Mr Colin Downey [4243] | Support | Support | Support noted | No action |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------------|-----------|

Appendix 2: Site Representation Summaries

(Received from the 2016 Draft Local Plan Consultation. Proposed Housing Sites).

Please note that the description of the sites reflects the information contained within the 2016 consultation document, including the number of dwellings. The Employment sites are considered in Appendix 1.

| 2016 Site Description | Comment | Council's Response |
|--|---|---|
| Urban Area | | |
| 001A & 001B Land north of Highwood Close including St Georges Court, Brentwood [redevelopment to include replacement of lost sheltered housing] 52 Dwellings Ward Shenfield Area 0.47 and 0.81 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area. Owned and managed by Brentwood Borough Council Housing Dept. | <p>ECC surface Water Comment: Not in flooding hotspot Within ES UFMrSW Yes Vacant site Use adopted SuDs guide NE portion at risk 1in30 and 1in 100 Surface water Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>Thames Water concerns over waste water reaching capacity. New infrastructure needed, planning condition recommended. 18 month - 3 year lead in.</p> <p>Residents of St Georges want a different access as Greenshaw and Highwood provide parking. Access road too narrow.</p> <p>Other comments Parking very limited in area; Need to keep mature trees; Other locations such as Ingrave Road derelict site; Concern over more road traffic fumes; Construction traffic impacts: emergency vehicle access and current residents; Council Members should be respectful to come to St Georges Court and iron out issues with tenants.</p> | <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. These housing include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. Small extensions to villages are also being considered in line with the Housing White Paper (2017).</p> <p>The density levels were proposed with consideration of the opportunities and constraints of each location. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan feeds into this assessment and densities are being considered accordingly.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and includes education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space, etc.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects', including cumulative impact, which are developed alongside the Spatial Strategy for the borough. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan site considerations. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and undergoes further drafting and consultation. Comments received on the SA are fed back and are considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk and maximise environmental / habitat options.</p> <p>Consideration of issues such as parking and highways impacts will be required as part of any planning application. The Council will work with existing residents to keep them informed of proposals as they develop.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>003 Wates Way 80 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Brentwood North Area 0.96 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Lidl UK GmbH Agent: Lidl UK GmbH</p> | <p>ECC surface Water Comment: Not a flooding hotspot N/A existing properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation</p> <p>Thames Water concerns over waste water, reaching capacity. New infrastructure needed, planning condition recommended. 18 month - 3 year lead in.</p> <p>Other comments Prefer family houses rather than flats, good example at Sawyers Grove. Lidl are not known for providing residential, what are the housing numbers? Infrastructure issues at this location; safe access, current use already a hazard. Are some of existing units to remain? Need SuDS, School places, GPs, starter homes, family homes, homes for elderly/disabled.</p> | <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. These housing include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. Small extensions to villages are also being considered in line with the Housing White Paper (2017).</p> <p>The density levels were proposed with consideration of the opportunities and constraints of each location. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan feeds into this assessment and densities are being considered accordingly. Further work is being done to ensure smooth delivery of suitable and timely infrastructure. This work is being done with utility providers, health services, as well as Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate SuDS mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> |
| <p>005 Essex County Fire Brigade 50 Dwellings Ward Shenfield Area 1.26 ha Parish - This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Hallmark Care Homes Agent: Woolf Bond Planning</p> | <p>ECC surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot Brent-H Within ES UFMfSW Yes 6 existing properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation at risk 1in30 and 1 in 100 Surface water Avoid exacerbation</p> <p>Thames Water concerns over waste water, reaching capacity. New infrastructure needed, planning condition recommended. 18 month -3 year lead in.</p> <p>Other comments 40 dpha not possible as already have mature trees on site, conflict policies: 7.3; 6.3; 6.16a and e and 6.4d. flood management infrastructure</p> | <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. This include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. Small extensions to villages are also being considered in line with the Housing White Paper (2017).</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues.</p> <p>The density levels were proposed with consideration of the opportunities and constraints of each location. Work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan feeds into this assessment and densities are being considered accordingly. Further work is being done to ensure smooth delivery of suitable and timely infrastructure. This work is being done with utility providers, health services, as well as Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate SuDS mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to avoid the exacerbation of current identified surface water risk implement appropriate flood management infrastructure.</p> |
| <p>013B Warley Training Centre, Essex Way, Warley 50 Dwellings Ward Warley Area 0.66 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Bellway Homes Ltd Agent: Savills</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot no Within ES UFMfSW Yes N/A existing properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation Centre of site at risk 1 in 100 Surface water Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> | <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. This include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. Small extensions to villages are also being considered in line with the Housing White Paper (2017).</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues.</p> <p>The density levels were proposed with consideration of the opportunities and constraints of each location, including veteran trees. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan feeds into this assessment and densities are being considered accordingly. Further work is being done to ensure smooth delivery of suitable and timely infrastructure. This work is being done with utility providers, health services, as well as Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate SuDS mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues by Essex County Council highlighted for part of the site. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk</p> |
| <p>020,021 & 152 West Horndon Industrial Estates, Childerditch Lane and Station Road, West Horndon, [mixed use with</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot Horn - C Within ES UFMfSW Yes 159 properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation Site at risk 1 in 30 1 in 100 Surface water</p> | <p>The Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>a range of supporting local services], 500 Dwellings Ward Herongate & Ingrave and West Horndon Area 6.39, 9.84 and 0.83 ha Parish: West Horndon</p> <p>020 Owned by: Threadneedle Properties Agent: Barton Wilmore (Eastern site)</p> <p>021 Owned by: Agent: Hermes Chris McGough 152 Owned by: Agent:</p> | <p>Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>CPRE agree in principle but need to ban construction traffic from using Station Road and Thorndon Avenue should be via Childerditch Lane or A127. Higher density should be considered.</p> <p>Other comments Current transport needs a rethink, C2C at capacity, roads at capacity at rush hours, exacerbated by Dunton Garden Suburb. Need further health and education facilities. Need more infrastructure detail. Access point very dangerous without a security gate to slow traffic, needs layout improvement, a second access point is advisable. Need to link design to existing village. Need full highways transport appraisal. Mixed development some of the more modern industrial units to remain. Starter homes. Family homes. Homes for elderly/disabled residents mix needed. Development that is compatible with the current village style not too dense, 30 homes per ha maximum if possible somewhat less. Maximum housing density of 30 homes per ha (pro rata down if as probable some of the smaller industrial units remain).</p> <p>LDP remains too focused on the A127 corridor. Brentwood council needs to reconsider A12 corridor and North of the Borough. A12 being upgraded to three lanes. Shenfield has 4 track railways with the coming of Crossrail, West Horndon has a 2 track railway and no room for more tracks here. Transport network will not support proposed development of Dunton Garden Village. A127 already at full capacity. Green Travel Route detail needed, policing, road repairs. Less heavy goods but more private vehicles though village. Need guarantees for infrastructure. Infrastructure insufficient - roads, rail, schools and travel to schools, GPs, buses, shops, playing fields, leisure facilities. Flooding in area needs to be addressed, SuDs needed. Reject that current boundaries will prevent urban sprawl need greater buffer between this site, the A128 and Thorndon Country Park to improve existing leisure and environmental resource. Limit</p> | <p>services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the two industrial estates at West Horndon as both sites were put forward for consideration by the Local Plan process for housing by the land owners. The sites are currently split with a separate access point for each site and are not on allocated Green Belt land. These proposal sites reduce the need for development on Green Belt allocated land.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. These include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. Density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the sites and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge that up to 500 new homes will impact upon West Horndon, an increase in resident number will be able to support existing service industry businesses and retail, encouraging more to develop. Furthermore, development should lead to a greater financial input into local infrastructure both directly and via the Parish Council and the draft Neighbourhood Plan. An increase in the number of homes and provision of a village centre and greater retail offer could move West Horndon village from Settlement Category 3 to Category 2.</p> <p>Development of the West Horndon sites will be required to consider issues such as flooding, transport congestion and safety impacts. Infrastructure provision on site and contributions to infrastructure facilities off site will be required as part of any development application.</p> <p>The Council will assist current businesses to identify alternatives for relocating and it is also possible that some businesses will remain. Additional employment locations are available in the Borough and the new Enterprise Park allocation may also offer appropriate facilities.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified, and mitigation measures proposed, by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to reduce the identified surface water risk.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. These options have developed over a number of years and in light of evidence and consultation. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of</p> |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>housing number. Impact of Dunton Hills Garden Village on West Horndon. 50% of new housing will be in A127 corridor.</p> <p>Proposed Dunton Garden Village will link London to Basildon and create ribbon development. Loss of Green Belt. Very low support for development at Dunton but the Council continues to ignore this. Takes away local jobs Almost doubles size of the village, too many. Will destroy the community. Build on Timmerman site and only smaller development on the Industrial Estate at West Horndon. Use other sites such as the fields opposite Running Waters, spread the allocation around Borough. Want West Horndon to remain a village and not become a town. Would change nature of West Horndon village, would become a Settlement Category 2. Does mixed use mean higher density to reach current housing number for this site? Use other locations not in Green belt. Blackmore, Shenfield and Doddingtonhurst would be better. This site would not help to meet 5 year housing supply.</p> <p>Need to address freehold and leaseholders need. 100 current businesses are B1c/B2 with ancillary offices and will be displaced. No suitable alternatives in the borough so will leave. Need to ensure choice at Enterprise Park to ensure local jobs retained.</p> <p>Long term lease holders (Charles Fox) conclude not suitable to move and detail needed, will work with Council to ensure workforce have high degree of certainty.</p> <p>Greater strategic development should be located at West Horndon to accommodate both homes and jobs and would support public transport to the Enterprise Park. West Horndon highly accessible and sustainable location, benefits from village services, public transport links and quick access to A127. 29dph is too low, should be 50-60 dpha making the most of previously developed land in line with national policy.</p> <p>Hermes Fund Managers Ltd</p> | <p>the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | SA assessment for sites 021 and 152 contains inaccuracies. If this is also found for other site assessment then the whole document would be undermined. | |
| <p>039, Westbury Road Car Park, Westbury Road, Brentwood, [could retain parking as part of redevelopment] 22 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward: Brentwood West Area 0.27 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Brentwood Borough</p> | <p>ECC surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot Brent H Within ES UFMfSW Yes N/A properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation Site at risk 1 in 100 Surface water, 1:20 internal flooding risk Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>Thames Water: No infrastructure concerns</p> <p>Other comments Surrounding homes have been flooded. Develop site where Charles Napier pub was. Parking in Brentwood town centre is already difficult, removing them is a mistake and will affect shop viability. Particularly need disabled parking. Will encourage people to other retailers with free parking. There will be a light and noise impact for which a Council Tax reduction should be considered.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk.</p> <p>The Council are considering the potential for Brentwood Town Centre in the Town Centre Design Guide which it aims to feed into a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the area. The existing parking can be re-provided as part of new development. Additional locations in the Town Centre for development are also being considered. The site former Charles Napier Pub has previously had planning permission for new homes and retail. A compensatory payment/tax reduction</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | as a result of perceived impact from new development is not being considered and may be beyond the power of the Local Authority. |
| <p>040 Chatham Way/ Crown Street Car Park, Brentwood, [could retain parking as part of redevelopment] 26 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Brentwood South Area 0.33 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Brentwood Borough Council</p> | <p>ECC surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot No Within ES UFMfSW No N/A properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation</p> <p>Thames Water: No infrastructure concerns</p> <p>Other comments Will encourage people to other retailers with free parking. Parking in Brentwood town centre is already difficult, removing them is a mistake and will affect shop viability. Area congested, new homes will add to this and parking problems. Need additional infrastructure, particularly health and education. This is short sighted. Surrounding homes have been flooded. Particularly need disabled parking. With 200+ cars needed for Crown Street this is short sighted.</p> <p>Retain car park as area forms part of diminishing attractive character of central Brentwood.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Council are considering the potential for Brentwood Town Centre in the Town Centre Design Guide which it is hoped will feed into a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the area. The majority of existing parking can be re-provided as part of new development</p> |
| <p>041 Land at Hunter House, Western Road, Brentwood 22 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Brentwood North</p> | <p>ECC Flooding hotspot Brent H Within ES UFMfSW Yes N/A properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Area 0.22 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Waterstone Land and New Homes Agent: The Planning and Design Bureau Ltd</p> | <p>Site at risk 1 in 100 Surface water, 1:20: 6 properties internal flooding risk Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>Thames Water do not envisage infrastructure concerns</p> | <p>corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk</p> |
| <p>042 Land at Bell Mead, Ingatestone 16 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Ingatestone and Fryerning Area 0.22 the ha Parish: Ingatestone and Fryerning</p> <p>Owned by: Marden Homes Ltd Agent: Strutt & Parker</p> | <p>ECC Flooding hotspot No Within ES UFMfSW Yes N/A properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation Site at risk 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 Surface water, flooding risk Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>EA: site is adjacent to a tributary of the River Wid. Fluvial flood risk likely so requires flood risk assessment. Any work within 8m of the River Wid required an Environmental Permit from the EA. It is adjacent to River Wid tributary, currently no modelled data so fluvial food risk must be modelled. Any works in,</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space, water supply and sewerage services, amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>over or under or within 8m the River Wid will need an Environmental Permit.</p> <p>Other comments Will impact on infrastructure – schools, GPs, poor roads, traffic. Known historical flooding (surface water). Might cause sewage pipe overflow. Permission granted new development in the area not providing enough infrastructure, this will exacerbate it. Parking not addressed and impact on village and station. Engineered flood protection not enough. Must retain wood on site as Open Space, will also separate development from Fairfield flats.</p> <p>Good idea if mixed development</p> | <p>development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk</p> |
| <p>044 & 178, Land at Priests Lane, Brentwood [to include provision of open space and/or sport facilities for public use] 130 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Shenfield Area 4.45 and 0.9 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>044 Owned by: Ursuline School Agent: The JTS Partnership LLP</p> <p>178 Owned by: Mr & Mrs Fleming</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot Brent E Within ES UFMfSW No 1 property at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation Site at risk 1 in 20 year internal flooding risk Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>Thames Water has concerns regarding wastewater network capacity, Detailed drainage strategy recommended from developer. New infrastructure needed, planning condition recommended. 18 month - 3 year lead in.</p> <p>Sport England Object as it would involve permanent loss of land last used as playing fields which could meet community need. Contrary to Sport England playing fields policy. Contrary to Government planning policy para 74 of NPPF.</p> <p>Other comments An up to date open space audit is needed to show whether the area is deficient in public open space or sports facilities</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing within Brentwood borough. These include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document and it is anticipated that further detail will be added prior to</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>to meet an identified need. Delete “to include provision of open space and/or sports facilities for public use” or at least change to “potential for the provision of open space and/or sports facilities for public use”.</p> <p>Site 044 and 178 should be considered separately as objections put forward for 044 may not apply if only 178 (the smaller of the two sites) is considered independently.</p> <p>Petition “strongly object to development at Priests Lane because it will cause problems Including access, small lane, narrow, non-continuous pavements, road safety, congestion, speeding, pedestrian and cyclist safety, parking, impact on emergency services response, any road widening will ruin the attractiveness of the road, detrimental to visual amenity. Infrastructure over capacity - schools, GPs, dentists, waste collection, shops, and other civic amenities. Air quality, noise, drainage inadequate, will damage underground pipes, will affect utilities. Too dense, flats are out of character, other areas should be developed - especially where new infrastructure can be added, too close to railway line. Object to building on sports field / Protected Open Space, damage to wildlife, quality of life, no bus service along this road and liable to flooding. “</p> <p>Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association letter from Sir Eric Pickles MP: “Thank you for sending me a copy of the responses you have sent to Brentwood Borough Council as part of the Local Development Plan consultation. The Local Development Plan and the related consultation are the responsibility of Brentwood Borough Council. I think you have made some very reasonable points on planning grounds, and I am sure your views will be noted by the Council as they work to plan for the future needs of Brentwood.”.</p> <p>The SHLAA (Oct 2011) considered this site unsuitable because it contributes to open space in the area. Sir Eric Pickles supported the protection of green spaces when CLG Minister.</p> | <p>publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk. Further work on transport modelling, accessibility and safety is ongoing with ECC to inform mitigation requirements for new development. Specialist older person accommodation maybe suitable at this location, reducing the impact on the existing residents and highways.</p> <p>Land at Priests Lane is a schools’ former private sports field with gated access from Priests Lane. The sites are being considered (178 and 044) together as both are available. An Open Space, Sport and Leisure Needs Assessment was published in 2016, however changes to the assessment process by Sport England means that the Council are commissioning an up to date assessment which will inform further inform the plan making.</p> <p>The letter from the former MP Sir Eric Pickles is noted.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>The 2015 SA does not review this site in detail. More detail for this site should be provided.</p> <p>Support development of this site as it is in urban area, Council should promote similar sites.</p> <p>Owners of site 044 state this site makes no contribution to public open space or sports provision, it just contributes to the outlook of a small number of properties</p> | |
| <p>081 Council Depot, The Drive, Warley, CM13 3BH 68 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Warley Area 1.71 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Brentwood Borough</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot No Within ES UFMfSW No N/A property at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation</p> <p>Other comments Object to the footprint of the Imperial Youth Band Hall being included in proposed site at the Warley depot.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The retention of key community facilities will be considered in relation to this location. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document and it is anticipated that further detail will be added prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>098, Ingleton House, Stock Lane, Ingatestone [redevelopment to include replacement of lost sheltered housing], 10 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward: Ingatestone, Fryerning and Area Parish Ingatestone and Fryerning Area 0.26 ha Mountnessing Owned by: Brentwood Borough Council</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot No Within ES UFMfSW No N/A property at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation</p> <p>Other comments Concerned that current residents will not be re-housed in new housing, will they have first refusal? Negotiation with residents is essential. Parking would be an issue. Assessment of parking here, in the village and near the station needed.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues.</p> <p>The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds. Consideration of the needs of existing residents will be made and parking will be considered in light of the Essex County Council parking standards. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate SuDS mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> |
| <p>099, Victoria Court, Victoria Road, Brentwood, [redevelopment to include replacement of lost sheltered housing] 40 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Brentwood West Area 0.5 ha</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot Brent D Within ES UFMfSW No 15 properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation 15 properties at 1 in 20 year internal flooding risk Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services risk and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Brentwood Borough Council</p> | <p>Thames Water have no infrastructure concerns</p> | <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk.</p> |
| <p>100, Baytree Centre, [residential units provided above retail redevelopment] 200 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Brentwood South Area 1.34 ha</p> <p>Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Threadneedle Properties</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot No Within ES UFMfSW No N/A properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation</p> <p>Thames Water concerns waste water, reaching capacity. New infrastructure needed, planning condition recommended. 18 month to 3 year lead in.</p> <p>Other comments Concerned about losing the existing retail providers at this location. Important thoroughfare to the library. Keep residents informed. 200 homes here seem optimistic, work needs to be done to confirm whether this is viable. 200 homes is overdevelopment here. Traffic and parking problems exacerbated. Congestion exacerbated. Increase</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>in noise and pollution. Directly affect neighbours. Prevent quiet enjoyment of property. Overshadowing Noise and vibration from library plant room. Curtailment of natural light. Noise emissions</p> <p>Support plan generally, look forward to Town Centre masterplan. Forecast drop in retail demand future retail in Brentwood should be looked at closely. Improvement needed around the chapel ruins. Should consider more the role of Coptfold car park. Enhance green space to the south to make it more of a magnet for those entering High Street from the south.</p> | <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate SuDS mitigation measures.</p> <p>Development of the Chapel Ruins area would consider options for the Baytree Centre. Improvement to the public areas, particularly the historic square surrounding the ruins are an important consideration of development in this area. Options being explored by the Town centre Design Plan include minimal intervention and changes to the Baytree centre that would improve north south connections. The importance of the retail offer is acknowledged as well as the retention of and access to the Library, where there is the potential for new homes above the public facility.</p> <p>A reduction in the number of new homes at this location is being considered alongside an increase and diversification the portfolio of homes in the town centre on the sites already identified in the 2016 Draft Local Plan, including William Hunter Way.</p> |
| Brownfield Green Belt Urban Extensions | | |
| <p>010 Sow and Grow Nursery, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch 37 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Pilgrims Hatch Area 1.2 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Mr Armiger Agent: Alan Wipperman & Co. Property & Town Planning</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot No Within ES UFMfSW No N/A properties at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation</p> <p>Other comments Site may still be a viable business option. Site is clearly definable employment site, loss is counterintuitive to sustainability principles. Object as Pilgrims Hatch is already overdeveloped. Increase in traffic, greater congestion, more damage to poor roads, loss of Green Belt land. Impact on GPs; primary school. Priority for small units or low rise flats/maisonettes to encourage downsizers to stay in area.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>Ongar road is congested, particularly when M11/M25 problems. Shaded area on map includes the access to allotment plots and part of the garden of the adjacent house, needs correcting. Roundabout at the Larchwood Garden/Ongar Road junction is recommended.</p> <p>Support the Brownfield Green Belt urban extension, Density could be higher. Pilgrims Hatch needs more homes. Well serviced by public transport and services and facilities in walking distance. Won't take Greenfield land away from agricultural use. Development could give amenity and visual improvement to the locality. Right place – Most good – least harm.</p> | <p>proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds, with a mixture of size considered with identified need.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. The site is considered a brownfield site that adjoins the urban area in line with the Spatial Strategy. Only a limited release of sites is being considered around Pilgrims Hatch to minimise the impact on the area and in particular the identified congestion. The Council are working with the Highways authority to consider the need for road safety improvement. The proposed site does not include the allotments and will ensure access to the allotment remains open.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate SuDS mitigation measures.</p> |
| <p>128 Ingatestone Garden Centre, Roman Road, Ingatestone 60 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Ingatestone, Fryerning and Mountnessing Area 3.25 ha Parish: Ingatestone and Fryerning</p> <p>Owned by: Redrow Homes Ltd Agent: Pegasus Group</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot No Within ES UFMfSW Yes N/A property at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation Eastern portion of site at risk 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year surface water flooding risk Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>Other comments Not clear why housing is proposed for this site and a new employment site is proposed at 079C land adjacent to Ingatestone by-pass (part bounded by Roman Road), Why not just use 128 for the 79C employment use and keep 79C as Green Belt? Site is clearly definable employment sites, loss is counterintuitive to sustainability principles. Concern over 60 homes in place of poor air quality, sewage disposal</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>capacity. Inappropriate development in Green Belt Impact on openness of the area. Object to the impact on green belt; schools; GPs; traffic; amenity; concern over access and traffic safety; loss of trees; construction impacts; impacts on drains and sewerage; A12 would make this a poor site for new homes; proposal too dense; not sufficient parking in village already; transport insufficient (bus, rail and car); need further infrastructure information; loss of garden centre business; Council should refuse change of use; drainage and flood issues, particularly as there is a stream on site; protection of wildlife behind site needed; site is green belt not brownfield; loss of privacy'; protect trees with TPOs; merges Shenfield and Chelmsford. Trees on Burnt Lane site boundary must be retained to protect from flooding. Infrastructure Delivery Plan is needed. Proposal makes a mockery of a refusal for an individual house extension in the area.</p> <p>Density of 18.5dpha too low and not reflective of nearby homes at 20dph. 90-100 units would be more appropriate.60 units will undermine social infrastructure needed to facilitate development.</p> <p>Site capacity reduction to ensure separation between Mountnessing and Ingatestone through the provision of a green buffer on the site. Council's Assessment of Potential Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Sites in the Green Belt (2016 draft) identifies the site as making a low to moderate contribution to the five purposes of including land within the green belt and the 'moderate' contribution is partly as a result of the assessment concluding that the two settlements (Ingatestone and Mountnessing) would no longer be separate and there is a risk of coalescence. The assessment states that the site has a countryside function, but since the Garden Centre has stopped trading and much of the site being previously developed land so it has no countryside function. A12 provides a strong physical barrier to prevent coalesce and therefore this should not be a 'moderate' classification but a 'low' contribution.</p> | <p>Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. The site makes a low contribution to the Green Belt, it is not located within an Air Quality Management Area and it adjoins an existing residential area. Site layout and design would need to consider impact upon neighbouring properties and existing on site facilities such as mature trees. All planning applications are considered on their own merits.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk</p> |
|--|--|---|

| Strategic Sites | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>200 Dunton Hills Garden Village 2,500 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Ingrave & Herongate and West Horndon Area 237.49 ha Parish: West Horndon</p> <p>Owned by: Commercial Estate Group CEG (5050) (Land Option) Agent: CODE Development Planners Ltd</p> | <p>Minimal Green Belt use, pleased there will be job opportunities, good to concentrate homes in one area. Basildon should benefit from this, scale will facilitate infrastructure, impact less than many smaller sites, rail and road proximity appropriate, needs proper development to create real community, does not impact adversely on existing residents. Noted that Dunton GS and Basildon has scaled back, hope this doesn't remove the potential benefits.</p> <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Flooding hotspot No Within ES UFMfSW Yes N/A property at risk Use SuDs design guide for mitigation Significant portion of site at risk 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year surface water flooding risk Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>Environment Agency. Dunton does not lie fully in flood zone 1. Previous comments made and should still be considered: Dunton Hills Garden Suburb Strategic Allocation offers possible sustainable benefits of extending an existing urban area on the east side of Basildon. New settlements and urban extensions provide an opportunity to design-in the greenest of technologies and infrastructure from scratch, in ways that are not possible in smaller infill schemes. The proposed scale of development would lend itself well to the use of technologies and construction methods that underpin the principles of high quality sustainable development. Such development should aim to be designed along the lines of Eco-town standards and Garden Suburb attributes envisaged by the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA). The creation of a high quality sustainable development would provide an excellent opportunity to uphold the development as an exemplary to the planning world. Site development should consider: water cycle study;</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>In order to meet the OAN for housing it is necessary to consider the allocation of locations within the Green Belt. The impact on Green Belt, along with other constraints, is considered alongside site opportunities. Consideration of site availability, viability and suitability is in line with the NPPF. Development proposed in Basildon also affects the impact on the Green Belt in the A127 corridor and therefore Brentwood are engaging with Basildon to determine the best approach to this location with regard to the long term impact on Green Belt through the placement of development in line with the Brentwood Spatial strategy that is based along the identified transport corridors. The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing with employment within Brentwood borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds. Public rights of way, including bridleways and multi-user paths, are considered an important part of the Boroughs Green Infrastructure.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>river basin management plans; overall sustainability, resource efficiency, net gains from nature, sustainable energy use; water efficiency; blue & green infrastructure: biodiversity, attenuation, shading; SFRA.</p> <p>Diocese of Chelmsford. A church should be central to the village. Good example at Greater Beaulieu Park, Chelmsford. The developer providing a building as part of the planning obligations, Parish Council and local churches have set up a trust to run the centre on behalf of the whole community. It will be a church and a community facility.</p> <p>Will impact on Fords operational facility and strategic site at Dunton technical Centre. Therefore continue to object.</p> <p>Anglian Water. Will need to revisit details when detailed planning application submitted for foul drainage and surface water management. Needs cross reference from DHGV to Flood risk and SuDS</p> <p>Thurrock Council: Concerned about the proposed Dunton Hills Garden Village concept and has objections: impact on the landscape at this location, to settings of historical assets and to existing development. Green Belt impacts. Lack of Technical Evidence. Case for a strategic development at Dunton Hills has not been made, West Horndon has capacity and infrastructure as a reasonable alternative. Masterplan approach: more evidence should be provided on the suitability of the project as part of the Local Plan process. Further information on viability; deliverability and phasing; partnership working with other local authorities and developers; infrastructure and public expenditure; road traffic and transport evidence (and mitigation proposals), Green Travel Route; design and layout needed. Unknown impact on Thurrock housing market. SA of Dunton should have a reduced score to reflect the distance that Dunton HGV is from main centres, services and other residents in Brentwood.</p> <p>Basildon Borough object to Dunton Hills Garden Village. Lower Thames crossing may affect location of DHGV. Further consideration would be required on a revised location. Insufficient evidence for this has been provided.</p> | <p>The on-going Duty to Cooperate work with adjoining boroughs is considering the strategic issues raised by this consultation.</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>No evidence of assessment of land availability provided as required by PPG. SHLAA update needed. Connectivity with surrounding area isn't clear, impact on highways and infrastructure is unknown. Need economic land availability update</p> <p>Castlepoint: further work on transport impacts and mitigation is needed.</p> <p>Havering: It is recognised that the option to join the separate allocations in each borough to form a cross boundary urban extension is still being explored, but this does not form part of the current plans as they cannot be fully justified by evidence at this point in time. Havering welcomes this decision but strongly opposes any consideration being given to this option now or in the future. London Borough of Havering oppose development due to negative impact on Green Belt and adverse effects on traffic flows and impact on A127.</p> <p>Essex County Council notes that proposal is at an early stage, but there is limited evidence and information available to comment on its appropriateness, including Strategic Green Belt Review; Transport modelling and highway impact assessments; Infrastructure requirements (including education/early years and childcare); Environmental issues (ie landscape impacts; surface water management). Must consider that, given the proximity of the site to Policy H10 (Basildon Borough New Draft Local Plan), both local authorities should be in discussion concerning the potential synergies between development, potential for shared evidence base, and the consideration of the cumulative impact on primary and secondary education, and early years and childcare provision, key highway junctions and the wider network. Further consideration of cross boundary issues is needed with Basildon. Essential that joint working between relevant partners is progressed to ensure that the appropriate economies of scale can be achieved. Would seek early consultation regarding any proposal to consider any impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets, as identified in the Historic Environment Record (HER). Need project level assessment</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>of ecology and country parks with further work into enhancement measures as location is between three living landscape areas, to ensure positive contribution to local ecology network. Consider impact on historical assets. Increase in demand for school places must be considered.</p> <p>Growth at West Horndon and Dunton Hills GV the minimum to sustain a secondary school and is unlikely to be delivered until later in the Plan period. Proportionate school provision must be considered. Waste management areas and waste management hierarchy will need to be considered. Potential for integrated land uses and low carbon heating / power systems. Commercial and industrial development needs to consider provision of waste management uses. Should apply Garden City principles, refer to TCPA Creating garden cities and suburbs today (2013).</p> <p>Other comments</p> <p>Mitigation measures unclear and must be provided in future iteration/s to ensure roads not detrimentally impacted. Use brownfield first; <i>More evidence of appropriateness of location. Lack of cross boundary cooperation.</i></p> <p>2015 Dunton Garden Suburb consultation, 84% against. Why still considered? Won't make contribution to 5 year supply. West Horndon will have 60% of borough new housing, 43% up on 2013 consultation.</p> <p>Won't make contribution to 5 year supply. 200 homes density too high for a Garden Suburb.</p> <p>Development proposed does not make any use of Crossrail, it has poor access. Develop along NE corridor instead. Few footpaths, cycleways and bridges spanning A127 and A128 to access north and west.</p> <p>Connections to the east for employment is important. Concern that DHGV will amalgamate with Basildon. A new station is not deliverable therefore the site is unsustainable. Phasing suggested unrealistic. Plan is too reliant on this site and other sites should be identified adjoining Brentwood and Shenfield; Further transport assessment needed to identify issues and mitigation; Green Links needed</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>particularly accessible to all – cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians. New facilities are unlikely if Laindon and Basildon shopping centres are anything to go by, maintenance and improvements here are non-existent. More suitable locations in the A12 corridor. scale is disproportionate; will service Basildon housing need not Brentwood.</p> <p>Residents may prefer a more historical backdrop to their new homes. Negative impact on Basildon particularly infrastructure. Need to protect Basildon's Green Belt, heart and lungs. Doubt that DHGV of 2,500 is deliverable.</p> <p>Need urban and village character studies. Must be a sustainable community and so will need strong planning control which are not in evidence. Should have an Urban Development Agency with local representation like Ebbsfleet Garden City. Risk of Route 4 of Thames Crossing not considered.</p> <p>Object to scale of garden suburb and urban extension to the west of Basildon Town (PADC 5 in Basildon's Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options) represents a more suitable and deliverable approach. The scale of the Garden Suburb currently proposed would unduly restrict the remainder of Brentwood and Basildon's towns and villages to meet local, settlement - specific housing and socio-economic needs. Will overwhelm Dunton Waylett.</p> <p>Should develop Timmermans instead. Why is this ignored? Green Belt impact less, close to A127, has been put forward. Green Belt impact less. it is contrary to policy 5.1 Green Belt impact.</p> <p>Impacts specific to adjoining property needs to be considered. Need development details as soon as possible. Options for adjacent properties need the clarity of a Masterplan. Expect yearly cost of major developments to be self-financing after 15 years, therefore can expect Council Tax to increase to cover them, is this correct? Laindon regeneration would be adversely affected;</p> <p>200 homes density too high for a Garden Suburb. Dunton HGS may be the least harmful option and accept that self</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>sustaining villages may prevent urban creep in the future but question the size at 2,500. West Horndon proposals would result in village being 1100-1200 homes in total. Dunton should be of the same size. Might accept slightly more if it could be proved that a larger number was absolutely necessary to generate the required infrastructure. Needs an environmental barrier between DHGV and West Horndon to prevent developmental creep in the future. Piecemeal proposals imply this will lead to a town. Need to confirm Dunton and local area will be completely safe and risk free soil and water contamination, flooding, surface water, gas explosion, gas leaks, gridlock, ring fenced finance, roads.</p> <p>New employment will cause pollution and nuisance, no benefits to the existing residents. Existing employment not fully occupied. Why more? Housing will only be for newcomers, not evidence for local need here,</p> <p>The delay in preparing a strategic allocation and securing infrastructure means its important housing need is met through a more dispersed allocation of sites, particularly early in Plan. Council should consider alternatives that support larger villages.</p> <p>Need infrastructure plan. More detail needed, particularly infrastructure which must be in place before houses built. Infrastructure issues need to be resolved include: Road access, Schools - junior & senior, GP m& medical facilities, Access to the railway station, A127 capacity, C2C rail capacity. A128 gridlocked, pinch points Hanging Hill Lane and Wilson's corner. Few footpaths, cycleways and bridges spanning A127 and A128 to access north and west. Infrastructure should be improved in south Essex first. Traffic problems in area already, will severely exacerbate congestion A127 and Westmayne / Lower Dunton, bottle neck at A127 and A128 junction. A127 needs widening. Who will pay? Impact on A128 junction with A127; rail at capacity; Secondary School, Primary School, Nursery Care, Police, Electricity, Internet, Water and Sewerage; Broadband. Mitigation measures unclear and must be</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>provided in future iterations to ensure roads not detrimentally impacted.</p> <p>Negative impacts will include: Loss of Green Belt; loss of wildlife; flood risk; pollution; too close to gas transmission line; detrimental to Grade 1 listed building and other heritage assets; bisect a wildlife corridor; affect badgers, Great Crested Newts and barn owls; too close to Thorndon SSSI; land is good for agriculture; damage to Eastland Springs woodlands and Mardyke Valley landscape; Surface water means site is not suitable, noise and air quality must also be considered. Loss of golf course noted and need for sports facilities.</p> <p>Gypsy and Traveller provision for this site is too high. 15 pitch max is recommended. Must be taken into account within school place provision. No transit site is proposed so Travellers may settle permanently. Concerned about Gypsy and Travellers on site as It is contrary to policy 5.1 Green Belt impact. No transit site is proposed so Travellers may settle permanently. Gypsy and Traveller provision for this site is too high. 15 pitch max is recommended. Must be taken into account within school place provision.</p> | |
| Greenfield Green Belt | | |
| <p>022 Land at Honeypt Lane, Brentwood, CM14 250 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Brentwood West Area – 10.9 ha</p> <p>Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Barwood Land and Estates Ltd. (2704)</p> <p>Agent: Chilmark Consulting Ltd</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment:</p> <p>Not in flooding hotspot</p> <p>Within ES UFMrSW Yes</p> <p>Vacant site, N/A properties at risk</p> <p>Use adopted SuDs guide</p> <p>Portion at risk 1in30 and 1in100 Surface water</p> <p>Avoid exacerbation</p> <p>Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>EA</p> <p>Site is bisected by a large/non main river watercourse. Full consultation with ECC should occur as it is the Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough which was 360 new homes per annum in 2016 and is likely to rise. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development. The issue of development of schools that are located within Green Belt is being considered along with Essex County Council. Exception</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Thames Water concerns waste water, reaching capacity. New infrastructure needed, planning condition recommended. 18 month -3 year lead in.</p> <p>The Council failed to inform residents of this site. Proposal not detailed enough. Condemn the Council for even considering further housing. Current levels of service should be maintained for existing residents. The Council should improve its own and ensure that all other parties supply a standard of service up to an acceptable standard before even considering taking on further challenges. Examples of the Council currently not fulfilling its social and moral duties include health, communications (transport), recycling, flooding, education, shopping and allied services. Need to avoid local divisive party politics on this site and consider on merit.</p> <p>Safety (as no pavements); Issues with speeding; Any access will carve up Honeypot Lane and Weald Road. Parking is already a problem. No public transport in the area. The proposed site is already on the community assets list.</p> <p>Contradicts refusal to expand St Peters school onto Green Belt; Traffic; Narrow lane; Increase rat running; Road capacity; Road safety, pedestrian; Flooding, particularly due to water course on site; impact on private roads of the Homesteads; Impact on surrounding residents, including noise and light impact; Air pollution; Biodiversity; Historical factors; Infrastructure including schools, GPs, Water and sewerage; Impact on allotment holders; Construction disruption; Site is already used for recreation; Density proposed is too high; Increase in crime; Other areas offer better opportunities for development; Site better suited to being public amenity space, allotments, GP surgery, small scale development. 50 homes would be more suitable.</p> <p>Brentwood had a target for new build of 174pA but has built in excess of 200 units for the last 10/12 years. Has the borough therefore already exceeded its target?</p> | <p>Implementation issues such as timing of waste water facilities will also be considered. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds. Further work is being carried out with the Highways Authority with regard to access, highways impact and safety of new development in the borough.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. This site was contained within the Strategic Growth Options 2015 as well as the draft Local Plan 2016, the responses to which have confirmed local awareness of the issues. Further detail will be part of the next iteration of the Draft Local Plan and greater detail on the layout and design etc, for new homes on the site will within a planning application.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version (Regulation 19) of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the catchment and flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of surface water risk.</p> <p>The site is being considered as part of the consideration of drafting the Local Plan. The assessment of sites is through the planning policy process which is a formally prescribed process with public consultation in light of published evidence. Where allegations of illegality or misconduct are made, the Council have a formal complaint process which should be used or issues should be taken directly to the police.</p> <p>The site was not successfully registered as a community asset.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Object due to impact on their house value. Will move out of Brentwood if this goes ahead. Don't want change to the area.</p> <p>This deal is backhand central. They will be exposed.</p> <p>Site is readily deliverable now, can contribute to the 5 year land supply; proximity between jobs, homes and open spaces; access by public transport, foot and bicycle; development opportunity that will support and reflect distinctive character of Brentwood and the contribution of the wider Green Belt to Brentwood's quality of life, biodiversity and environment; opportunity to refine and realign the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Petitions Received:</p> <p>No to housing development at land off Honeypot Lane.</p> <p>South Hill Residents Association Ltd members face a continual financial burden to maintain the estate roads which are not constructed to adoptable standards. The estate currently suffers through traffic accessing London road via Hill Road, South Weald Road and Hillside Walk. The increased volume of traffic accessing Honeypot Lane from a 250+ housing estate in Honeypot Lane would see a significant increase in traffic wanting to use our private roads putting an increased financial burden on SHRAL members.</p> <p>Object to the potential development at land off Honeypot Lane. Traffic in this area is already at its maximum and there is no easy access to this land that will not carve up Honeypot Lane and Weald Road. Parking is a real problem and we can take no more. Our local facilities and schools are already oversubscribed and at breaking point. A development here will have a detrimental effect on those homes in Honeypot Lane, Weald Road, the Homesteads and historic South Weald. Please remove this site from the potential developments identified for Brentwood.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>023 Land off Doddinghurst Road, either side of A12, Brentwood 250 Dwellings</p> <p>Wards: Brentwood North and Pilgrims Hatch</p> <p>Area 7.2 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Countryside Properties Agent: Countryside Properties</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Not in flooding hotspot Within ES UFMrSW Yes Vacant site, N/A properties at risk Use adopted SuDs guide Southern tip at risk 1in30 and 1in100 Surface water Avoid exacerbation Needs flood management infrastructure</p> <p>Thames Water have not raised any water supplies or sewerage issues with this site.</p> <p>Hope priority given to small units, low rise flats/maisonettes suitable for social housing and downsizing to encourage local people to stay in the area.</p> <p>Parking and traffic problems exacerbated. Doddinghurst road becomes very congested. Object as the land lies astride a major trunk road (A12). With the proposed widening of the A12, will access/egress to the Brentwood Centre be included in the plan from the A12? This land would be better used to form new A12 access to reduce town centre congestion and open up Pilgrims Hatch for development. Schools full; impact on GPs public transport is poor; wildlife damaged. Would damage fields already used for children playing; Services already stretched. Density of 30 homes per hectare too high and does not compare with surrounding area. Areas of open space and green field need to be retained. Object to building on Green Belt and heritage; increase in traffic; impact on amenity; impact on Viking Way especially if used for access; impact on Sandpit Lane and Ongar Road; drainage issues; loss of wildlife; Wilsons corner is already gridlocked; construction impacts; drains and sewerage; impact on horses on the site; loss of grazing land; A12 noise would make this a poor site for new homes; there is a large sewer pipe across the site; loss of privacy; devaluing existing homes; loss of Green Belt "wedge"; increase in air pollution; increase in anti-social behaviour.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels and mixture of sizes of new homes will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds and after consideration of the evidence base. Highways England have confirmed that whilst widening of parts of the A12 continues to be under consideration, there are no proposals to create new access to/from the A12 along the Brentwood by-pass section. Further work with Essex County Council as the Highways Authority is being carried out to consider congestion and the potential for mitigation.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of these urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough. The sites are located within Green Belt, but are not considered to be green wedges and their contribution to the purpose of the Green Belt is low. Planning applications on these sites would consider the site specific issues such existing uses, as noise and existing infrastructure on the site and will be reflected in the proposed design. Viking Way is not being considered for access to the site and retention of the public footpath to the west would be required.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council in a small part of this location. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Viking Way would make terrible access point. Parking and access already a problem here. Use of Viking Way violates the Article 8 of the Human Rights Act. (Protection of the Countryside) and private and family life.</p> <p>Countryside Properties: Allocation of site welcomed. Site provides a logical extension to the existing urban area without encroaching into the countryside beyond well-defined and defensible boundaries. The site is identified for approximately 250 dwellings, which is considered appropriate. The level of flexibility provided in respect of the number of units to be delivered is also welcomed. The site is within a single ownership, with no known constraints to its deliverability and is developable within the first 5 years of the plan period. It is therefore considered that the phasing estimate for the delivery of the site (5-10 years, as set out at Appendix 2 of the Plan), sets a longer timescale than required.</p> <p>Pilgrims Hatch support: Greenfield sites comprise urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area. Including Shenfield, Pilgrims Hatch and the Brook Street Area, and one site in Ingatestone. These each have defensible boundaries and are within reach of existing services and infrastructure.</p> | |
| <p>032 Land east of Nags Head Lane, Brentwood 150 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward South Weald Area 5.8 ha Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>Owned by: Mr & Mrs Johnson Agent: Crest Nicholson (Eastern)</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment: Not in flooding hotspot Within ES UFMrSW No Vacant site, N/A properties at risk Use adopted SuDs guide</p> <p>Thames Water doesn't envisage infrastructure problems regarding waste water.</p> <p>National Grid: Nags Head Lane site 032 has been identified as being crossed by or within proximity to high pressure gas transmission apparatus. HSE rules apply. (PADHI guidance).</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>Contradictory to state South Weald is a settlement Category 4 when 370 new homes are proposed in the Parish.</p> <p>Don't build in the Green Belt, impact on services, impact on infrastructure, impact on schools and GPs, train station is 30+mins walk, increase urban sprawl towards Havering</p> <p>Support proposed allocation of site 032 - land east of Nag's Head Lane for 150 dwellings. Site is wholly in accordance with the spatial strategy, the site selection criteria and the Sustainability Appraisal: Highly accessible; defensible Green Belt boundaries; highly sustainable: it would balance the strategic growth of Brentwood town providing much needed residential development at this western gateway location. No significant ecological constraints. Low flood risk. No significant noise constraints. It would provide significant planning benefits. Early delivery would be ensured.</p> | <p>the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds including HSE rules (PADI guidance) on high pressure gas pipelines.</p> <p>Settlement category 4 includes the homes located around St Peters School, South Weald. Nags Head Lane, and Honeypot Lane, are considered to be located as part of or adjoining the Brentwood Urban Area, as opposed to South Weald. Therefore, the settlement category of South Weald (4) would remain unaffected by the identified greenfield, Green Belt sites. Development of Nags Head Lane would redraw the boundary of the Green Belt at this location, with a strong, defensible permanent boundary of Nags Head Lane itself.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this urban extension site for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate SuDS mitigation measures.</p> |
| <p>034, 087 & 235 Officer's Meadow, Shenfield [potential for open space / sport uses and/or Crossrail park and walk facility] 600 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Shenfield Area 20.4; 1.73; 1.36 ha</p> <p>Parish: This site is not within a Parish area.</p> <p>034 Owned by: Croudace Strategic Ltd (2656) Agent: Barton Wilmore</p> | <p>ECC In SW flooding hotspot Brent - A Within ES UFMrSW Yes Vacant site, 13 properties at risk Use adopted SuDs guide Western and northern portions at risk of flood. Sites 087 and 235 fall entirely within Brent – A hotspot where 13 homes are at risk of 1 in 20 event. Avoid exacerbation Flood management infrastructure required</p> <p>EA:Site 034 087 235 are adj. to Wid tributary. No modelled data for this but likely to be fluvial flooding. Development will require fluvial modelling for flood risk assessment. Any works within 8m of River Wid will need an environmental permit.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds. The Council acknowledge that these sites present complex issues to be considered; including Article 4 area; playing fields, water management</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>087 Owned by: Brentwood Borough Council</p> <p>235 Owned by: The Thomas Family Agent: John H Bayliss & Co.</p> | <p>Sport England: Need to protect the playing fields not build on them; Must provide evidence of overprovision before acceptable to build on this; (refers to site 087).</p> <p>Other comments: Will destroy valuable Green Belt; Lead to more congestion; Out of proportion with existing development in the area; Detrimental effect on Priests Lane and Alexandra Lane; Roads are dangerous for pedestrians; Infrastructure at capacity – especially GPs, hospitals and schools; Should be a Country Park instead; Detrimental to existing residents; Changes to Alexandra Lane would alter its rural nature; Better for a car park or less dangerous pedestrian access - should provide a pedestrian tunnel under the railway to Long Ridings Meadow; Density should be agreed only after need for new classrooms and sports fields are assessed for the additional children at Shenfield School. These should be in place before new homes occupied.</p> <p>Should come with a detailed plan for services. Plan to build football pitches nearby should also include a year round facility with cricket, tennis and bowls.</p> <p>This is a better option for homes than Priests Lane.</p> <p>Close to excellent road links, near the school; potential pedestrian link to station; boarded by a railway line reducing impact on local community.</p> | <p>and local wildlife sites. The combined size of the sites offers flexibility to consider and address these challenges. The Council consider that there will be secure new homes of differing types and tenures with the potential to provide areas of public open space and to community facilities and to enhance landscape and biodiversity.</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the catchment and flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk. Development will require fluvial modelling for flood risk assessment and works within eight metres of the River Wid will require an environmental permit.</p> |
| <p>079A Land adjacent to Ingatestone by-pass (part bounded by Roman Road) 42 Dwellings</p> <p>Ward Ingatestone, Fryerning and Mountnessing Area 1.39 ha Parish: Ingatestone and Fryerning</p> | <p>ECC Surface Water Comment:</p> <p>In flooding hotspot Ingate -B</p> <p>Within ES UFMrSW Yes</p> <p>Vacant site, 17 properties at risk</p> <p>Use adopted SuDs guide</p> <p>Site falls entirely within Ingate – B hotspot where 17 homes are at risk of 1 in 20 event. Avoid exacerbation. Flood management infrastructure required</p> <p>No specific comment from the Environment Agency.</p> | <p>Brentwood Local Plan Strategic Spatial Strategy aims to achieve a balance between retaining local character and meeting development needs. The Council is required to meet the objectively assessed development need for the borough and in consideration of the evidence base. Potential sites are being assessed in the awareness that the finite capacity of brownfield land is not sufficient to provide for all identified development need. The limited release of Green Belt has been focused on transport corridors, in strategic locations to deliver sustaining communities with accompanying local services and urban extensions with clear defensible boundaries to minimise urban sprawl. The Spatial Strategy considers the overall impact on Green Belt and Landscape of new development.</p> <p>The Council are working to consider the impact of development on services and facilities available to maintain local amenity and local distinctiveness and is working closely with infrastructure providers to</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Owned by: CALA Homes (North Home Counties Ltd) Agent: JB Planning Associates</p> | <p>Flood issues. Site is very noisy; Next to the A12 not a good place for new homes. Policy 6.3d states development should have no unacceptable effect on the environment or amenity. These conditions will be experienced by residents if properties are built on site 079A next to the A12 in Ingatestone as proposed. Safety and pollution issues. Traffic and safety problems; Parking; Not sufficient buses; Exacerbate potholes; New slip road would be needed, safety of access. Garden centre was a much needed resource and viable business. Will change a village into a town. Need to share development throughout borough and use brownfield land. Local schools are oversubscribed; Sewerage is at capacity; impact on Green Belt and scenery; Impact on infrastructure including GPs, dentists, rail and schools, sewerage.</p> <p>Suspicious that the Garden Centre closed on publication of the Local Plan. Does this indicate wrong doing in the Council?</p> <p>Site ideal for affordable homes, ideally in perpetuity, preferably for local people.</p> <p>Site supported by 2011 SHLAA and new homes possible within 5 years. Site can deliver homes sooner and faster and with higher density rate than currently anticipated by the Council. Site can be developed at a higher density than 30 dph, 57 dwellings possible and supported by the SHMA. Site does not contribute to any of the five purposes of Green Belts and is consistent with NPPF and Council Spatial Strategy, with clear defensible physical boundaries. Walking distance rail and bus and the allocated employment land on site 079C. Technical work demonstrates that site can deliver 57 dwellings. For efficient use of land, developed at higher density than 30 dph.</p> | <p>consider need and contributions toward infrastructure provision as appropriate. This is being considered in the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan and refers to education, road and public transport, health, leisure facilities, Green Infrastructure, retail, open space amongst other issues. The proposed site density levels will be appropriate for a development in this location taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site and surrounds.</p> <p>The Council is working to identify and address appropriate mitigation for highway impacts and will work to improve safety with Essex County Council and Highways England. Parking provision will be considered in-line with the current Essex County Council parking standards. There will need to be secure new homes of differing types and tenures</p> <p>The Council are proposing the allocation of this location for housing. Other sites being proposed include other brown field sites, urban extensions to the Brentwood urban area as well as the strategic Dunton Garden Village proposal in the south of the borough.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal considers and compares a number of alternative strategic development options and appraises and evaluates 'likely significant effects'. The information from this appraisal feeds back into the draft Local Plan and site considerations. Cumulative effects are also considered. The SA is an iterative document that considers appropriate options and it is anticipated that another iteration will be drafted and consulted upon prior to publishing the SA for the submission version of the Local Plan. Comments received on the SA are fed back and considered in drafting the next iteration of the Local Plan and the SA.</p> <p>The Council acknowledge the surface water flooding issues identified by Essex County Council. The use of the ECC SuDS design guide will be required to implement appropriate flood management infrastructure and to avoid exacerbation of current identified surface water risk.</p> <p>Any decision to continue trading or closing the business down was made by the operator of the business and was not made by Brentwood borough Council. The site is being considered as part of the consideration of drafting the Local Plan. The assessment of sites is through the planning policy process which is a formally prescribed process with public consultation in light of published evidence. The Council have a formal complaint process which should be used or issues should be taken directly to the police.</p> |
|--|---|---|