

Preferred Site Allocations 2018

Public Participation Report

Introduction

Plan-Making

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Introduction				
Plan-Making				
19126 - Mrs s Powell [6970]	Comment	I tried to reply on the consultation but the links do not appear to be working correctly. I assume this is to discourage feedback or objections.	Noted. The consultation portal was checked and the links were working. The document was also available at the reception next to the Town Hall (Seven Arches Road) in libraries and as a PDF to download. The Council accepted email and hardcopy comments.	No further action
20171 - Mr Ionut Ionescu [7977] 20172 - Mr Ionut Ionescu [7977]	Comment	There is no glossary and the use of acronyms is hard to understand	Noted	Glossary to be put into the next version of the plan and consider writing out terms rather than using abbreviation/acronyms.
18362 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18365 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Response from Essex County Council - ECC interests in specific sites and the Duty to Cooperate.	Please refer to details responses in Consultation Report 2018.	Confirm that this has been considered in full and is reflected within the Drat Local Plan.
18632 - Wycombe Council (Planning Policy) [4219]	Comment	No comment to make	Noted	No further action
21240 - Mrs Alison Ratcliffe [5040]	Comment	Question. Why is it that something as major as an LDP is not planned and written in conjunction with local people/ the Parish Council?	The plan is drafted in line with Government legislation and guidance taking into account local considerations with a strategic viewpoint for the borough. Parish Councils are involved in consultation and there are also Parish Councils drafting Neighbourhood Plans.	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20069 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927] 20070 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927] 20071 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927] 20072 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927] 20073 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	to understand, design and deliver local network upgrades can take around 18 months and Sewage Treatment & Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 3-5 years. Implementing new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to 10 years.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19312 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Comment	Whilst there may have been a review of representations, there has been no formal, detailed response to representations made by PLNRA since March 2016.	Responses to the 2016 consultation were published and made available prior to this consultation.	No further action
18510 - Mr Geoffrey Town [3982]	Object	Object to the whole plan as it is quite clear as the whole of the area is already over populated.	The Plan reflects the predicted changes in population over the period of the Plan, this is taken into account by the standard calculation of the local housing need as prescribed within the Governments National Planning Policy Framework..	No further action.
19699 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]	Object	WHPC also notes that once again responses to previous consultations have not been acted on; in particular 84% of people who responded to the consultation in 2015 opposing Dunton Garden Village.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18099 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] 18222 - Mrs Wendy Taylor [7036] 18541 - Mr and Mrs Williams [6158] 18748 - Ms Lise Spicer [7210] 18841 - Sue Marigold [2267] 19085 - Miss Dale Rutherford [5912] 19107 - J. S. and R. Mack [6055] 19329 - Mr & Mrs John and Marian Long [7289] 19494 - Ms Linda Hurlock [7310] 19559 - Ms Linda Cearns [5013] 19730 - Countryside Properties [250] 19882 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] 22112 - TE May [8034]	Object	Needs are not being met as there are problems still outstanding: For example traffic pollution levels in several areas of Brentwood exceed government limits. People are being poisoned. There are other examples particularly to do with infrastructure capacity - roads, schools, public transport.; Need more social housing and allocate for local people; it doesn't protect the Green Belt; there are sites that shouldn't be in the plan; the spelling mistakes show no care has been taken overall; there was a lack of publicity and communication by the Council about this plan; it took Government threat of intervention to get a green belt review and requisition of sites formerly not considered suitable for development; object that there are no policies within this document and it needs this to justify choices; Green Belt review should have been carried out earlier; the Council don't carry out their basic roles such as cleaning the streets in and around Warley Hill, there are potholes everywhere.	The Council are considering the issues raised and will be reflecting this within the Regulation 19 submission draft of the local plan.	Consider accordingly
17918 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18513 - Mr Geoffrey Town [3982] 18803 - Carolyn Harris [7215] 19073 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19138 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19152 - Mr John Lester [4396] 19172 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420] 19232 - Mr Mark Phillips [5753] 19587 - Lisa Atkinson [2991]	Object	I expect there will be less responses to this plan than previous ones. You should not conclude from this that this means there is less concern or opposition to it. People have simply become weary of being asked to repeatedly comment on similar proposals and also do not believe that their representations are listened to or taken into account. A tick box exercise.	Each comment is noted and considered. The Local Plan is a strategic document that must consider a broad view across the borough in line with the Governments National Planning Policy Framework which means that not every viewpoint will be satisfied by the outcome.	Considered within Plan drafting.
19598 - Mr George Tuck [7341]	Object	The Conservatives who are in charge of the Development Plan need to clearly address this to the public in a debate. Furthermore, be open to any concerns and change the plan accordingly around the ideas and input from Brentwood residents. Please Brentwood Council hear our ideas as we are not all in a wealthy position like many Conservatives and their supporters. We need diversity in our housing system again and how we put forward plans that involve us the residents.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19644 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Davey) [2442]	Object	Whilst there is an imperative on the Council to progress, and adopt, a new Local Plan as quickly as is practicably possible - and the publication of the Preferred Site Allocations document is, therefore, welcomed - a general concern has to be raised that, in its attempt to progress matters as quickly as possible, much of the evidence base, upon which the spatial strategy and individual site allocations are based, are still a 'work in progress' and have yet to be made public, in anything but a draft summary form. The absence of key 'evidence base' difficult to comment.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20064 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Support	Havering officers have worked closely with Brentwood officers on the preparation of their respective Local Plans and there have been positive discussions informally and through the formal mechanism of the Duty to Cooperate process. This has included a number of key strategic matter. The preparation of a Statement of Common Ground commits a number of authorities to continuing to work together on highways and transport matters pertinent to their respective Local Plans. Havering officers strongly support this approach and will be pleased to work closely further with Brentwood officers as the Brentwood Local Plan is progressed further.	Support welcomed	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>An Evolving Evidence Base</i>				
18358 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18359 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	ECC advises that the Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy (SMOTS) produced by ECC should be included within the evidence base. This strategy outlines the steps the authority are taking to enable accessibility to places of employment and education for all, including other neighbourhood services such as retail and leisure; with the associated health, social and economic benefits to them and their communities. The adoption of this Strategy provides the framework for the Council and its partners to co-ordinate the provision of services and infrastructure to achieve its objectives. ECC recommends that the Essex Design Guide 2018 is referenced within the Draft Plan, and consideration given to embedding its principles into any design policies and supporting text, as the Draft Plan progresses to its pre-submission stage.	Please refer to the details response in the Consultation Statement.	Considered accordingly.
19836 - AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]	Comment	Green Belt - the removal of Parcel 17 from the Green Belt is supported, however, it is considered that the assessment of Parcel 17 overstates the lands contribution to a number of the Green Belt 'purposes'.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19682 - Catesby Estates Plc. [7463] 19693 - Marden Homes Ltd. [7465]	Comment	Local Plans should have regard to their long term permanence and that new boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. In short, it would not be appropriate for the Local Plan to review the Green Belt in such a way that it would require review again in - or before - 2033.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20048 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20050 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20051 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20052 - 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. Further discussion of this will take place in the Evidence Base section below. 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. We consider that the current methodology could result in a robust impact on the SRN and therefore may be reasonable to take forward. However, if 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 to date suggests very high impacts to the SRN. Junction capacity assessments of the SRN 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 and agreed	Further work on highway modelling is being carried out and will be considered and reflected within the local plan

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17955 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]	Comment	We note within the Open Space, Sport and Leisure Needs Assessment (one of the evidence base documents) that there is a recommendation that the Council works with such stakeholders as Essex Bridleways Association to look at opportunities to connect Brentwood District's fragmented network. This we welcome and look forward to discussions with the Council at an appropriate stage in the planning of the new allocations.	Further work on open space has been commissioned to inform the plan and will be published.	Consider accordingly
19965 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965]	Comment	The GTAA and wording within the LDP: There is concern that no acknowledgement has been made of the fact that there may be unmet needs arising from Greater Essex authorities for the provision of accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople within the Brentwood Preferred Site Allocations Report, which is considered to be a shortcoming that could be rectified with appropriate wording.	Noted.	Consider accordingly
19957 - Rochford District Council (Daniel Goodman) [7964]	Comment	Rochford District Council raises no objection to Brentwood's fulfilment of the Duty to Co-operate, but would highlight the need to continue to work collaboratively with all other South Essex authorities on cross-boundary strategic planning matters, further to the intentions of the South Essex 2050 Memorandum of Understanding.	Agreed	Continue South Essex work
19903 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962] 19908 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	Although we note that flooding has been considered in the SA, there is nothing within the Preferred Site Allocations draft Local Plan in regards to flood risk. Need to communicate the risks and consequences of flooding arising from all sources of flood risk. The sequential approach should be applied within specific sites in order to direct development to the areas of lowest flood risk. If the whole site is at high risk, an FRA should assess the flood characteristics across the site and direct development towards those areas where the risk is lowest. We strongly advise that proposals for "more vulnerable" development, as defined in Table 2 of the Flood Risk and Climate Change section of the PPG. We are likely to raise an objection where this is not achieved in line with Paragraph 060 of the NPPF's PPG.	Noted and agreed	The council have commissioned an update to the SFRA and WCS to facilitate the flood risk assessment of potential development locations within the borough and identify need for mitigation.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19959 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965]	Comment	DtC issues surrounding Basildon's unmet housing need: Basildon Borough Council formally requests that Brentwood Borough Council considers whether it can assist in meeting some of Basildon Borough's unmet need in the Brentwood Borough Local Plan.	Brentwood, as Basildon, is entirely within the Green Belt. With a high quality natural environment and areas that are severely restricted by their locational constraints, Brentwood Borough is unable to meet the unmet housing need of any other borough.	No further action
19949 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	GI: Landscape, parks and open space often have heritage interest, and it would be helpful to highlight this. It is important not to consider 'multi-functional' spaces only in terms of the natural environment, health and recreation. It may be helpful to make further reference in the text to the role GI can have to play in enhancing and conserving the historic environment.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19901 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	It is encouraging to see the emphasis on protecting green belt land and the promotion of green infrastructure in the Local Plan. We 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 EU Regulations. Any development proposals need to be compliant with the WFD in ensuring no deterioration and where possible seek enhancements.	Noted and agreed	Further detail and policies will be included within the local plan
19687 - Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]	Comment	The Green Belt Assessment Purposes document for parcel 48 states that the parcel 'abuts a large built up area'. This shows Wyatt Green as a sustainable settlement, and the assessment goes on to state that the development type should constitute 'urban extension'. The development of this site would provide a modest extension. The reduced landscape sensitivity of the site means that potential effects on landscape fabric and biodiversity resulting from a development would be limited. Development can come forward without undermining the qualities and contribution to the openness and permanence to the Green Belt whilst delivering significant public benefits.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19630 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Mr David Moseley) [6707] 19834 - AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]	Comment	Further evidence is needed in regard to the exercising of the Duty to Co-operate and the extent to which Brentwood should assist London meet its needs both prior and post 2029.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19962 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965] 19969 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965]	Comment	It is not clear how the proposed housing allocations have been put forward, and how the sites are justified as being suitable, without the availability of crucial supporting evidence including land supply, Green Belt, landscape, ecology, transportation and infrastructure. In the absence of this evidence base, it is not possible for Basildon Council to comment on whether the forthcoming evidence will be comprehensive and appropriate for what the Local Plan will cover.	Noted. Evidence is being published and will be made available publicly.	Consider accordingly
19847 - Icen Projects Limited (Ms Charlotte Hutchinson) [5043]	Comment	It is acknowledged that Green Belt is required to be released to meet the housing demand in the Borough. However, to justify any release, a thorough assessment of "exceptional circumstances" is required to clearly and unambiguously identify those sites which are the most sustainable to be released. It is not explicit within either the consultation document or supporting evidence base that this has been undertaken.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19783 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Comment	The site at Codham North has also scored 'amber' under the criteria of Green Belt in the SA. We consider that this aspect as not given consideration to the detailed assessment work undertaken by Crestwood Environmental and the current status of the site. The supporting work undertaken by Liz Lake Associates alongside this representation is also very relevant in this regard. Similarly, the site is also scored 'amber' with regard to effect on Agricultural land despite the existing businesses and previously developed nature of the site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18704 - Mr Darren Williams [5311]	Comment	Section 12 - Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) "evidence base is increasing including masterplan work" and Section 64 e - "Developing a comprehensive masterplan for the new garden village at Dunton Hills, to engrain the core garden village design principles"; how can an objective view be made on site selection before this masterplan detail is presented and made available to the public?	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19996 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 19997 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	Elements of the evidence base do not appear to have been produced or published to support the site proposals in the draft plan such as the HELAA, transport and other infrastructure assessments. The South Essex Authorities are considering the commissioning of additional elements of evidence base to support the preparation of the joint strategic planning including a review of the South Essex SHMA, a spatial options study including a high level housing land and capacity assessment and further infrastructure studies. The outcome of these studies and the preparation of the joint strategic planning will have implications for the nature and scale of housing provision across South Essex including Brentwood and the approach to be taken in the Local Plan.	Noted. The evidence base available to Brentwood Borough has and will be considered for the drafting the Brentwood Local Plan. Further evidence produced for the South Essex grouping will be available at a later stage and will be considered accordingly	Note
19950 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	Setting: Site allocations which include a heritage asset (for example a site within a Conservation Area) may offer opportunities for enhancement and tackling heritage at risk, while conversely, an allocation at a considerable distance away from a heritage asset may cause harm to its significance, reducing the suitability of the site allocation in sustainable development terms. We would expect to see this reflected in the policy wording and supporting text.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20245 - Mrs Wendy Garnett [7999]	Comment	Please have a viable study done of all roads/crossing light phases in the town to help the traffic flow due to the tremendous increase in dwellings in the town centre which will grind to a halt once all the residents are in place - if not before with the interim contractor's vehicles.	Noted	The Council is working with the highway authority, Essex County Council on transport issues.
19992 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	Brentwood Draft Local Plan and supporting evidence base will require further revision and consultation with ongoing duty to cooperate with adjoining local authorities. In particular the preparation of the draft Plan should be reviewed to take account of the outcome of testing of other spatial options being considered by the South Essex authorities as part of the preparation of a Joint Strategic Plan.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18076 - Mrs June Barrett [7033]	Comment	Whilst I agree housing is needed in Brentwood it is important each development has social housing. Most youngsters cannot afford 'affordable housing' and houses for sale should be first for local residents	Noted	Consider accordingly
19839 - Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]	Object	Green Belt assessment: Site 146 is within Parcel 19 which was assessed as making a high overall contribution to the Green Belt. However, Parcel 19 is 682.28 ha whilst site 146 is 0.74 ha or 0.1% of the Parcel. Impact of the development of Parcel 14 would have a very different impact on the Green Belt than development of site 146. Impact of development within Parcel 14 would have varying impacts on the Green Belt depending on its location and scale. As such, the Green Belt assessment does not provide robust justification for the rejection of the site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19862 - Rapleys LLP (Miss Chloe Ballantine) [6603]	Object	The Brentwood Leisure Park at Warley Gap should have been included in the Plan. In our opinion the Site Selection Methodology is misguided in regards to this site for the following reasons: The site is brownfield land, close to and well connected to the existing urban area; can sustainably accommodate residential development without adversely affecting the openness of the Green Belt; Residential use on the site is in principle supported by Planning Officers in respect of the pending outline application, subject to meeting all relevant requirements of the Development Plan.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19770 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931] 19771 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931] 19772 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931] 19773 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931]	Object	<p>Green Belt Study: disagree that Parcel 9a is 'Part Contained'. The assessment states that 'Part Contained' sites have weak/degraded/unclear boundaries. Site 078 has clear natural boundaries at the east and to the south. Furthermore, further planting at the boundaries of the site is feasible. Parcel 9a is defined by the Council as an 'Important Countryside Gap' (ICG). The analysis states that parcels of this type are unsubstantial but functional; and that the development of the site would result in the physical narrowing of the gap and potential visual coalescence. As per the accompanying Landscape and Visual Issues Scoping Report, it is considered that site 078 would result in a coherent infill development between two existing areas of developed land. The proposed development would not result in bringing the two settlements of Margaretting and Ingatestone any closer together.</p> <p>Parcel 9a is defined as a 'Functional Countryside' (FC) and as having a 'moderate' contribution to the 5 purposes of Green Belt.. Site 078 adjoins existing residential development and the proposed development would constitute infill development. A new Green Belt boundary would be robust and would ensure that development would encroach into the countryside. The review recognises that this assessment is not necessarily reflective of the qualities of every site within the parcel. It is considered that development of site 078 has limited environmental value and offers minimal contribution to the Green Belt when assessed against its five intended purposes.</p>	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18102 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] 18543 - Mr and Mrs Williams [6158] 18745 - Ms Lise Spicer [7210] 18785 - Neil Amor [4672] 18945 - Mr Francis Lai [5946] 19313 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215] 19727 - Countryside Properties [250] 19732 - Countryside Properties [250] 19734 - Countryside Properties [250] 19806 - Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948] 19820 - Diocese of Chelmsford [6085] 19822 - Plainview Planning (Mr Andrew Ransome) [5233] 19846 - Icen Projects Limited (Ms Charlotte Hutchinson) [5043] 19856 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 19857 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 19859 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]	Object	Where are the demographics? More site specific evidence should be available such as flooding. Where is information on communication with transport and utility providers? Where is environmental impact information? More evidence is needed to justify the preferred sites. The Green Belt work should be more detailed and site specific. Need to amend the SA particularly with specific site assessment as disagree with conclusions. Where are the HELAA, viability assessment, detailed site assessments?	Noted. Evidence will be published as soon as available	Continue to publish evidence base

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19746 - Countryside Properties [250] 19747 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	The 2016 Green Belt Study concluded that Dunton is one of 7 sites that makes a 'high' contribution to the Green Belt. Now 'updated' work on the Green Belt by Crestwood Environmental, November 2017 and January 2018, reaches different conclusions on the contribution to the Green Belt made by land at Dunton Hills. The draft working study continues to confirm that it is not intended to provide evidence of exceptional circumstances to revise the Green Belt nor can it be used to justify proposed allocation of land for development. Latest Green Belt study has downgraded the importance of the parcel of land at Dunton Hills in terms of its contribution to Green Belt purposes from a 'high' status to a 'moderate to high' without explanation of this change in the latest published report. Examination of individual site assessment tables in the 2016 study and that undertaken in late 2017, indicate that the results in terms of overall contribution to the Green Belt, are contrived. They have been prepared retrospectively to justify the Council's wish to promote DHGV.	Noted. The independent assessment of the impact of parcels and of sites is explained within the evidence base	Consider accordingly
18109 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] 19784 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Support	Welcome comments in the evidence base including the SA	Support welcomes	No further action

Fig. 2. Representations (2016)

17866 - Dr Richard Bristow [6818] 18149 - - - - [4031]	Comment	I wish to comment on your current local plan with regard to building all these houses and removing car parks. We now have to wait four to five weeks to get a doctors appointment, this will increase as more families come to town. Reducing car parks will only kill off the High St. I consider this plan to be unacceptable.	Confirm that this has been considered in full and is reflected within the draft Local Plan.	Noted
17984 - Mr Andrew Pallet [1313]	Comment	This is a rural community with enough pressure on local services, schools and roads without increasing such pressure by building too many new houses. Those built should be for the local community not developers wanting to make a fast buck. In the wake of Brexit, I would think that the country would need to retain its food producing farmland not build on it.	Confirm that this has been considered in full and is reflected within the draft Local Plan.	Noted

Fig. 2. Representations (2016)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18029 - Mr John Daly [7013]	Object	The plan shows no clear correlation between the housing needs (ie 1 bed , 2bed , 3 bed , 4 bed, flats or houses) in given areas verses the proposed use of site in particular the Brentwood town centre sites	Work within the Councils SHLAA has considered this with the sites requirements further detailed within the Draft Local Plan	Confirm that this has been considered in full and is reflected within the draft Local Plan.
18004 - Mr N McCarthy [6988]	Object	The LDP is doubly-flawed. In both its overall strategy and site specific detail, it fails to deliver proposals that satisfactorily meet the needs of the most important constituents in the process: existing residents.	Confirm that this has been considered in full and is reflected within the draft Local Plan.	Noted
18018 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18476 - Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635]	Support	The document states that there has been a review of representations there has been no detailed or formal response to representations made by the Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association or others. Nor is there any evidence in the draft Plan that PLNRA responses to the plan have been taken into account. Sustainability and technical evidence submitted has not been analysed and given consideration. There is not an up-to-date document detailing the representations made in 2016, other than a reference to the number of responses made.	Confirm that this has been considered in full and is reflected within the draft Local Plan.	Noted
18110 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560]	Support	Its good to be able to review and comment on the draft plan and hope my comments make a difference	Support welcomed.	No further action
<i>Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment</i>				
19314 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Comment	To what extent is there a specific Sustainability Appraisal of sites 044/178? How will environmental, social and economic conditions be improved in Priests Lane and how will the impact of development be mitigated? There is no evidence provided as answers to these questions.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19951 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	We would recommend that the term "historic environment" is used instead as it encompasses all aspects of cultural heritage and would achieve a more robust assessment of impact to a wider spectrum of relevant variables. The Interim SA contains no information on monitoring and indicators. In preparation of the forthcoming local plan, we encourage you to draw on the knowledge of local conservation officers, the county archaeologist and local heritage groups.	Noted	Consider different reference
19765 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931]	Comment	The land to the South of the B1002, Ingatestone (ref 078) is not allocated for residential development through the Preferred Site Allocations Consultation document on grounds of potential impact on the Green Belt. It is however allocated for residential development through the Habitats Regulations Assessment (2018), which forms part of the technical evidence base for the Regulation 18 Consultation. The rejection of the site is not considered justified and the Council should look to update the Regulation 18 Document to state that the site is allocated for residential development, in line with the Habitats Regulation Assessment (2018).	Noted	Consider accordingly
19971 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965]	Comment	HRA: It should however be noted that the assessment does identify the potential for growth in Brentwood Borough to cause recreational disturbance to European sites on the Essex Coast. Brentwood Borough Council, like Basildon Borough Council, has signed the Memorandum of Understanding for the Essex Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS), and is therefore actively engaged in the Essex wide project to address this issue. Basildon Borough Council welcomes the positive working arrangement that now exists in relation to the Essex Coast RAMS.	Noted	RAMS work to continue

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19781 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Comment	On review of the site options appraisal, we do however have some concerns as to the assumptions made. In some cases the site at Codham North appears to have been scored down based on broad assumptions when any impacts would instead depend upon implementation. The site also appears to have been scored down in relation to educational facilities, which, whilst clearly of relevance to a housing allocation, is not directly applicable and should not be weighted in the same way in relation to employment land.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19659 - Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr. Mike Taylor) [2703]	Comment	Paragraphs 10.5.4; 10.10.2; and the SA Honeypot Lane. The number of dwelling has been changed from 250 to 200 - not aware of any site specific reason why there should be a reduction. There is an opportunity to support enhanced pedestrian links through St Faiths Country Park. The site's design and specific technical measures respond to the context of the site, the emerging scheme design includes appropriate buffers and mitigations for noise and air pollution accordingly. The SA should be updated. The RAG scoring used for the site sustainability appraisals has no green scores.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18257 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18258 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Comment provided on the Sustainability Appraisal	Response noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.
19804 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]	Comment	The Sustainability Appraisal objectives themselves cover a wide range of issues including biodiversity, economy and employment. The assessment work carried out to date, however, is general in nature and founded on a number of assumptions. In a number of cases we would suggest there is either evidence available that the site will not result in adverse impacts or that any impacts would depend upon implementation. In this case we believe it more appropriate for the sustainability appraisal to note that effects will depend upon implementation rather than setting out potential for negative impacts.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18052 - Gerald Downey [4671]	Comment	It's stated that the Sustainability Appraisal is a "systematic process". Note that the "Site Options Appraisal Findings Table C" from the original AECOM Interim SA (Ref: AECOM Interim SA Report, Feb 2016; http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/pdf/12022016101306u.pdf) contained "24 Appraisal Criteria". The updated AECOM Interim SA (January 2018), now contains just "17 appraisal criteria". What has happened to 7 of the criteria in this systematic update; including removal of "Protected Urban Open Space" of which some sites performed poorly in 2016 (sites 044 & 178). Suggest to delete the word "systematic" unless justification for the change in criteria is provided.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19875 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	Section 4.5 Table 5: Enterprise Park is listed as 1.9-km from Epping Forest, this should be 19km. The other distances for this site and for other allocations are also incorrect and need amending. The effects on designated nature conservation sites (including increased traffic, construction of new roads, and upgrading of existing roads), and the impacts on vulnerable sites from air quality effects on the wider road network can be assessed using traffic projections and the 200m distance criterion followed by local Air Quality modelling where required.	Typo noted	Amend and consider accordingly
19795 - Wincer Kievenaar Architects Limited (Mr Craig Western) [7035]	Comment	On page 15 of the SA, 'North of Brentwood' is described as a potential strategic site allocation. We would welcome the sites inclusion as part of a strategic site allocation, should this not be a preferred option. We would request that in the absence of a strategic site allocation, that the site is considered as part of the Green Belt site selection process (sites on edge of urban areas), and is considered for its short term delivery potential.	Noted	Consider accordingly
22098 - B. & G. harvey & Pyle [8032]	Comment	The SA should evaluate sites within Ingrave and Herongate. Without the allocation of sites within larger villages we consider the emerging local plan to be unsound.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19913 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	We welcome the inclusion in the SA of the appraisal of the 2016 Draft Plan, regarding the issue of waste water capacity at Ingatestone and Doddinghurst. It should be ensured that there is capacity for the disposal of treated effluent. We would place caution on development proposed in the catchments of Ingatestone and Doddinghurst Water Recycling Centres (WRCs), unless Anglian Water agree to accommodate further growth in these catchments.	Noted	Further work on waste water capacity is being carried out including an update to the Water Cycle Study as well as further work with utility providers
19668 - Childerditch Properties [2642]	Comment	The SA fails to fully consider the nature of each proposal or the likelihood in practice of effects in sustainability terms, where a 'broad brush' approach has instead been taken to sites regardless of their intended use. Childerditch Industrial Park, the site has not scored well in relation to the criteria that has data available. It is considered that the SA, could be too sensitive when it comes to assessing sites against the criteria. No site performed 'particularly well' - many sites appear unsustainable, with limited opportunity to score 'green' in many of the objectives.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20122 - Charles Smith [4130]	Comment	Plot 250: 1. There has never been any surface flooding nor accumulating/ponding of surface water on site or adjacent properties some 60years. Land is on high ground. 3. The only place flooding has occurred is around the pond some distance away down Chelmsford Rd, much lower land. 5. The stream along Chelmsford Road side of Plot 250 is unmaintained so even if there were any flooding issues, it can be mitigated. 6. It's similar to Proposed plots 076 and 077. 7. The SFRA Report 2011 makes no reference to any flooding in the area. Plot 250 is suitable for development.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19782 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Comment	The SA includes the relation to Local Wildlife sites as an issue for sites 101C and 101D . Despite the supporting text of the performance categories stating that the thresholds have been set to reflect an understanding that County Wildlife Sites and ASNWs have relatively low sensitivity, 400m, when any impact would again depend on implementation.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22174 - CODE Development Planners (Mr G Heal) [8046]	Comment	Report considers how the 2018 Interim SA, the Green Belt and the Landscape evidence base relates to Dunton Hills Garden Village	Noted	Consider when drafting Dunton Hills Garden Village masterplan/policy
19858 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]	Comment	Whilst the SA considers reasonable alternatives, these relate to the distribution of growth across the Borough with the only variables being the potential strategic allocations. As such, the SA does not provide further assessment or clarity of individual sites.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19686 - Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]	Comment	GIS-led: invariably tends to not account for a number of site specific and setting related factors. The site has scored 'red' (secondary schools and GP surgeries). The assessments methodology: GP is >800m away, and a secondary school is >3.5 km. The NPPF and PPG both make allowances for more rural locations. Green Belt- binary approach- If a site falls within the defined Green Belt, it will be given an 'Amber'. We consider further assessment of site's individual effect on openness and permanence at the early plan-making stage needed. Site 071, performs well when compared to other sites, sequential method needed.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19902 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	The Local Plan is very land centric and only mentions water bodies or waterways in passing. It is disappointing to see no specific mention of rivers and waterways in the biodiversity section of the SA. We would like to see further detail regarding the rivers and specifically the headwaters of the Rivers Wid and Mardyke. This could be addressed through a completely separate policy, addressing water quality and WFD and RBMP objectives. A new policy on provision of ecological buffer strips and corridors, native tree planting and the new wetland areas to help manage flood risk and reduce diffuse pollution.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19876 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	10.3. Biodiversity: We note the review of allocations which includes reference to Thorndon Park SSSI and The Coppice, Kelvedon Hatch SSSI. If it is likely that there will be impacts on SSSIs, we advise that the SA should undertake more detailed assessments and recommend any site specific mitigation that is required to inform the site allocation policies. Soil and contamination: We note that the current soil data does not allow an assessment of BMV land. We advise that further agricultural land classification surveys are required to inform decision-making.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19815 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	The SA states that the site is within an "amber" distance to the Green Belt, the assessment is binary in its approach - if a potential site falls within the Green Belt it will be given an "amber" score. Whilst the methodology notes that the Green Belt is not specifically a landscape designation, and as such potential effects on the setting have not been appraised, a blanket "amber" score on anything seems arbitrary. With Brentwood being predominantly Green Belt, further assessment on the site individual effects on the openness and permanence would provide a more useful and fair assessment.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19733 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	The evidence base document "Site Assessment Methodology and Summary of Outcomes" (January 2018) is also a working draft and to date contains no individual detailed site assessment. This document can have made no contribution to the selection of preferred development sites. Strategic sites are identified as DHGV, Brentwood North and West Horndon. Reference is made to Appendix 7, which simply comprises a table of sites and accompanying site location plans. No assessment is made of the individual sites. This document defers instead to the SA. The purpose of the technical document (Site Assessment Methodology and Summary of Outcomes) is unknown.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18651 - Mr Colin Foan [2992]	Object	The consultation document proposes a large number of possible sites for the development of residential and business properties. The supporting evidence on critical strategic infrastructure is poor; indeed they are described as "interim" and leave many issues not assessed. Of these the flood risk assessment for the area of West Horndon is a key missing assessment. The NPPF is clear that flood risk must be taken into account (para 94 & 100-103). Lack of detailed flood risk assessment therefore flood risk is unknown.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19554 - Mr Lawrence Morrisson [1862]	Object	The suitability of site 191 should be reassessed. It was rejected on grounds of: - Isolated Green Belt site. Disagree. It's in the Green Belt, but not isolated. The land comprises part of an existing building plot and the Government has suggested lifting restrictions on building in the Green Belt. - Site being not connected to an existing urban area. Disagree. The land is a 5 minute walk to a bus stop, 10-15 minute walk to Kelvedon Hatch which is connected to Chelmsford. Frog Street is a pleasant semi-rural location, not everyone wants to live in a built up area.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19742 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	The SA identifies 10 'reasonable spatial strategy alternatives' for growth. It maintains that land to the east of West Horndon would only be suitable in conjunction with land to the west. It could not be allocated in addition to DHGV. It is also described as a 'more constrained site' but no reasons are given. Table 6.2 on page 26 includes land to the east of West Horndon in 4 out of 10 options (option 1,6,9,10). Between 500 to 1000 homes are proposed in these options, all are capable of exceeding OAHN. Appraisal of these alternatives are inaccurate and misleading.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19707 - Jon Pimblett [601]	Object	No supporting detail for allocation 022. There is no clarity is provided on how the proposal now meets the spatial strategy. The site is also not the most obviously sustainable.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19766 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931]	Object	Object. The SA indicates that the site 078 'performs poorly' in terms of location to a Primary School. The site is located within 0.5 miles of both an infant school and a junior school. It is considered that the primary school provisions within Ingatestone are within walking distance to the site and therefore should not be defined as 'performs poorly' within the SA.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19840 - Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]	Object	The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) takes a very simplistic approach to assessing the sustainability of potential development sites. The Interim SA Report focuses on physical distance between sites and various designations / facilities. The Interim SA Report also fails to acknowledge the social and economic benefits of providing additional homes for the village, in terms of the helping to sustain local facilities and services, and its vitality. The Interim SA Report should be updated to ensure these are given due consideration, particularly for site 146.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19970 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965]	Object	SA needs to address the following: highlights the importance of functional linkages currently fail to address this linkage in a planned fashion; It is concerning that in the Interim SA, the level of local support appears to have been factored into the SA, as this is inappropriate; Section 7.2.1 covers Air Quality and incorrectly informs the Local Plan that there are no air quality issues on the A127 - the approach to the Fortune of War junction, 1-1.5km to the east of the edge of the location for DHGV is identified within the UK Plan: 'Tackling Roadside Nitrogen Dioxide Concentrations'	Noted	Consider accordingly
19817 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	In the 2018 Working Draft Green Belt Study, site 030 is within Parcel 14 which is a large area which extends beyond Hutton and is assessed as having a 'high' contribution to the 5 purposes of the Green Belt. The review of Site 030A recognises that this assessment is not necessarily reflective of the qualities of every site within the parcel. There should be a finer grain level of assessment of land within these parcels. There remains small scale opportunities for sustainable development within the wider parcels and the Local Plan should give consideration to the allocation of such sites.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19757 - Mrs A. Topham [5111]	Object	The SA through its analysis states that site 202B is an "Amber" distance from a designated Local Wildlife site. The scoring is considered to be highly assumptive and rules out the potential of sites being landscape-led and providing opportunities for the enhancement of such features and local biodiversity. Being within a moderate proximity to a Local Wildlife site doesn't necessarily mean there will be direct impacts on it.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19768 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931]	Object	The SA states that site 078 'performs poorly' in terms of proximity to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA.) The site is located approximately 1 mile from AQMA BRW6 at the A12/Fryerning Lane. It is considered that the AQMA will not be adversely impacted by the site, given the distance between the two.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19814 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	Disagree with the SA analysis which states that the site at Bayley's Mead is in an area that 'performs poorly' in respect of its proximity to Ancient Woodland, Local Wildlife Site, Woodland and Green Belt. This scoring is considered to be highly assumptive and rules out the potential of sites being landscaping led and providing opportunities for the enhancement such features and local biodiversity. Being within 400m of a local wildlife site does not necessarily mean that there will be direct impacts on the site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19758 - Mrs A. Topham [5111]	Object	The SA states that the site is within an "amber" distance to the Green Belt, the assessment is binary in its approach - if a potential site falls within the Green Belt it will be given an "amber" score. Whilst the methodology notes that the Green Belt is not specifically a landscape designation, and as such potential effects on the setting have not been appraised, a blanket "amber" score on anything seems arbitrary. With Brentwood being predominantly Green Belt, further assessment on the site individual effects on the openness and permanence would provide a more useful and fair assessment.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19813 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	Disagree with the SA analysis which states that site 030A is in 'red' proximity from a GP surgery and a primary school. Willowbrook Primary School is located within 1 mile of the site. Mount Avenue Surgery is located 1.5 miles from the site; it has an average of 0.58 GPs per 1,000 patients, which is the national average. Mount Avenue Surgery also has a large catchment area, therefore it is considered that it would provide service to those living at the site. Brentwood Community Hospital is located less than 3 miles from the site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19760 - Mrs A. Topham [5111]	Object	In general, the Interim SA Report is simplistic in its approach to individual site assessment. The SA has used a predominately spatial or 'GIS' (use of Geographical Information Systems) approach to the assessment of each criteria, using the distance between the site and various factors to judge the extent to which it either achieves or opposes certain objectives. This represents a very simplistic assessment of sustainability, which should consider environmental, social and economic impacts.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20025 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Object	It is unclear that the options and sites have been comprehensively appraised in terms of access and sustainable transport; uncertain whether the benefits of Crossrail and A12 widening are taken into account; the housing appraisal skews the findings towards meeting the OAN but undermines the location of housing; housing along the A127 corridor would not meet housing needs in Brentwood/Shenfield as well as housing located along A12; a new strategic settlement at Dunton Hills would not be a self-sustaining community. There appear to be some value judgement about certain locations such as opposition to development at West Horndon.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19767 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931]	Object	The SA states that site 078 'performs poorly' in terms of proximity to a Conservation Area. Part of Ingatestone High Street is defined as a Conservation Area, however site 078 is not within this designation and is located at least 400m from the defined Conservation Area. As such, the proposed development of the site will not unacceptably impact on the Conservation Area. Being within an 'Amber' distance to the Conservation Area does not necessarily mean that there will be direct impacts on the designation.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18574 - Joshua Campbell [4572] 18580 - Mr Bartholomew Campbell [2498]	Object	These areas have inhabitants of precious Wildlife & will be adversely affected & lost forever -sites of SSI are in place for a reason as is protected Greenbelt - this can not be allocated	Noted	Consider accordingly
20015 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Object	Thurrock Council considers the approach set out in the Sustainability Appraisal is flawed and that a number of assumptions on the way that options have been scored is not supported by the available evidence. The SA appraises and scores 10 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 development at Dunton Hills. The information comparing options is limited as presented in the report and Thurrock Council would request more detail including a comparison table of scores for each option against the themes.	Noted	Further work on the SA will be carried out and published for the Regulation 19 Local Plan
18112 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] 18191 - MR Graham Clegg [5485]	Support	Every methodology has its weak points, however this approach is supported. As regards the Interim SA, Value the biodiversity objective highly and so, when balancing various competing objectives, I would like serious note to be taken of paras. 7.3, 10.3 and other allied references such as 10.10. Whatever the eventual outcome, the need to achieve net biodiversity gains will be important.	Noted	Government consultation proposals are considering net biodiversity gain and the Plan will aim to reflect this in line with Government requirements.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Infrastructure Planning</i>				
20010 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	The A127 is at capacity at peak times 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. Further work to understand the capacity and improvements required is being undertaken by the Local authorities and Highway England.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19855 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]	Comment	Whilst some evidence base documents have been published, others are outstanding. This raises some concerns in respect of the allocation of Sites 158 and 263 and the increase in housing within the immediate area. Whilst there are benefits to focusing development in an area, this does have a cumulative impact that must be considered and managed. This is particularly relevant in highway terms with the capacity of the surrounding roads and Mountnessing Roundabout. Similarly, the cumulative impact of development should be assessed in terms of landscape and community infrastructure requirements to ensure the Plan makes adequate provision for infrastructure improvements.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18813 - Mr Gary Duggan [7113] 18814 - Mr Gary Duggan [7113]	Comment	The planning LDP is dependent on other agencies to provide infrastructure improvements, so these agencies (Transport (roads trains etc), Healthcare (NHS), Police,) should have plans firmly linked to the Brentwood LDP and each preferred site location needs a linked plan of how its growth or new presence will affect residents and then how it will be solved. This will avoid objections at actual planning time.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19975 - Chelmsford City Council (Claire Stuckey) [4541]	Comment	Overall CCC supports Brentwood Borough Council's proposed approach to housing and employment allocations which are unlikely to have any obvious adverse cross-boundary impacts on Chelmsford. However, it is crucial that the allocations are supported by the appropriate infrastructure, in particular highway and transportation schemes due to Brentwood's location on the A12/Greater Anglia road and rail corridor. It is noted that the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a working document and transport requirements are yet to be specified. CCC expects that when the emerging Plan has progressed to Regulation 19 (expected late summer/early autumn 2018) the IDP will have been updated accordingly.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19290 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287]	Comment	Under Infrastructure Planning relating to schools it appears that responsibility is with Essex Council, this seems an abdication of responsibility. They may have final say but personally I think they are too remote from the ground level needs and have no confidence that they will get it right.	Noted	The Council will continue working with ECC on school provision
20001 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	Both the Preferred Site Allocations document and IDP only contain assessments of infrastructure focusing in particular upon education and health. Significant elements of infrastructure such as transport and Green infrastructure are not included. The assessments of infrastructure for Dunton Hills are not currently included and it is stated this work is still subject to ongoing options under master planning for the site. Significant elements of the infrastructure evidence base are still required in order to justify the overall level of growth, the approach to the spatial strategy and the sites allocations being proposed by Brentwood Council in the local plan.	Noted	Consider accordingly
22104 - C. Penn [858]	Comment	In the main the plan seems quite good and we know more home have to be built. However, we are concerned about GPS surgeries. The cottage hospital should have a walk in clinic, Harold Wood has one. It would take stress from GPs and main hospitals.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19666 - Childerditch Properties [2642]	Comment	Note that the IDP is currently being developed and we look forward to contributing. An Access Appraisal for the Childerditch site confirms that the proposed allocations are deliverable in the context of the existing and proposed highway infrastructure, and will not have a significant impact on the efficiency or safety of the local transport network. The Appraisal also confirms that, cumulatively, the allocation can be accommodated with other employment allocations along the A127 corridor, including those at Brentwood Enterprise Park and Codham Hall Farm, with the planned interventions proposed, as set out at in paragraph 3.21 of the Access Appraisal.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19396 - Mr. Paul A. Whyatt [1783]	Comment	Property development the past 40 years has significantly increased the number of residents, placing additional strain on the Health Service, other Public Services and Schools for all age groups, as well as creating traffic density and parking facilities shortage. It is therefore concerning that within the proposal there are potentially 4 current Car Park Sites ref: 002, 039, 040 and 102 which will be lost for development. Where is it proposed the thousands of residents currently using these essential parking areas on a regular basis are supposed to park their vehicles?	Noted	Consider accordingly
19315 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Comment	No evidence presented as to how this might be achieved. What is meant by 'innovative design' that would be in keeping with the Priests Lane environment? What design strategies are profit-making developers likely to adopt? How will this will be helped by removing a protected greenfield site? What is an Infrastructure Plan?	Noted	Consider accordingly.
19616 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	A number of the site allocations do not mention the opportunities to enhance the GIs, and ECC seek clarity on how GIs will be integral to all site allocations (including those for commercial and educational developments). ECC welcomes the opportunity to engage with BBC to ensure that GI is imbedded in its Draft Plan.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19966 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965]	Comment	Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) accompanying the Preferred Site Allocations 2018 consultation document, includes extensive information on the current levels of infrastructure provision and forecasts needs linked to development pressures, across a number of key topic areas and allows for a live update. This is the same principle and approach to the Basildon Borough IDP, and is supported by Basildon Borough Council. In regards to DHGV given the proximity to Basildon may need to support the upgrade of services and facilities in Basildon. We do not believe that enough work has been carried out to determine the relevant infrastructure requirements.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20101 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20102 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20109 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20110 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20113 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019]	Comment	<p>Responsibility for public health was moved out of the NHS into local government in April 2013. Health and Wellbeing Boards (HWBs) promote co-operation from leaders in the health and social care system to improve the health and wellbeing of their local population and reduce health inequalities. HWBs are responsible for producing a Joint Health & Wellbeing Strategies (JHWS), Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNA) and Pharmaceutical Needs Assessments (PNA) for the Basildon borough area.</p> <p>Infrastructure Costs: NHS England has advised against the use of standard cost estimates as costs can rise over time and can be out of sync when it comes to delivering the infrastructure on the ground. Whilst the IDP has used standard cost estimates in order to gauge the overall funding requirements to improve capacity in health services, the IDP is intended to be a 'living' document that will be updated over the lifetime of the Local Plan and therefore the costs contained in this section come with the caveat that they may be subject to change over time. CCG has provided details of optimal space requirements for a number of Practices, Clinics and other CCG Premises in Brentwood, including details of capital required to create additional floor space at each one. The cost averages out at approximately £2,300/m² to improve, reconfigure or build new primary care infrastructure. If all the space requirements to meet existing capacity deficits were to be completed, this would require approximately £4m. For the proposed Strategic Allocation, if we take the CCG's assumption that for every additional 1,750 people 120m² of additional space is required, the approximate costs for the upgrades are approximately £3m. NHS capital funding is extremely limited. For the provision of new healthcare facilities there are various non NHS capital funding options. Revenue consequences of any infrastructure works would need to be carefully considered and all primary care estates projects are subject to the NHS England prioritisation and approval process. Delivery of, or contributions to, new health care facilities will be sought from developers as part of mitigation and is a prerequisite to delivery of sustainable development.</p>	Response noted	Brentwood Borough Council will continue to work with the NHS representatives on facilitating services for the proposed new development

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19676 - ESFA (Dr Douglas McNab) [6718]	Comment	Recommend the council consider highlighting in the next version of the local plan that specific requirements for developer contributions to enlargements to existing schools and the provision of new schools for any particular site will be confirmed at application stage to ensure the latest data on identified need informs delivery and requirements to deliver schools on some sites could change in future if it were demonstrated and agreed that the site had become surplus to requirements, and is therefore no longer required for school use.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18840 - Mr Derek Barker [7219] 19153 - Mr. & Mrs. ARA & CR Jamieson [7263] 19224 - Mr Mark Ellul [7278]	Comment	Bus routes in Shenfield need review; parking around the stations is poor and discourages shopping in the area; Has transport modelling on capacity requirements been conducted? What were the outcomes, and specific plans to relieve the congestion? Are you considering further road building? What provision is being made for public transport? It would be useful to know the impact on parking in the High street area as well as impact on train commuters needing to park their car next to Brentwood station if all these sites were to be approved for housing. Have alternatives been earmarked already?	Brentwood is working with transport providers on improvements to local facilities and supporting proposals that could improve services.	Continue work with service providers
17947 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]	Comment	Page 7 Infrastructure Planning paragraph d: we welcome the fact that green infrastructure planning is one of the key strategic priorities; however, we would like to see the aspiration for access for all to such green infrastructure embedded within the key strategic priorities. We therefore suggest that this paragraph is reworded thus: 'improving the quality, range, connectiveness and accessibility of the Borough's natural green assets...'	Comment welcomed	Consider amendment accordingly
20056 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Comment	The commitment to supporting infrastructure growth through sustainable infrastructure planning (Priority b on page 7) is welcome. Nevertheless, in this regard, it is noted that paragraphs 84 and 92 of the document say that the issue of how education needs arising from the Garden Village are still being assessed. It is important that these matters are resolved and properly explained in the Proposed Submission version document.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18837 - Mr Dennis Cox [7218]	Comment	Consider the impact on the limited car parking in Shenfield. To maximise the value of Crossrail there is a need for a multi story car parking Shenfield which should probably be on one of the Railway existing car parks. This will allow Shenfield to be the successful transport hub it needs to be. There are already problems with the roads around the station and main street area and this must be addressed as part of the plan so build a multi story and then remove the main street parking bays. To get buy in from the local population to this, the first stage the car park should be free to local residents and that a residents voucher can be obtained. However out of town users will need to pay which will subsidise the project.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17939 - Chris Wain [620]	Comment	The A127 corridor is currently very heavily used, by increasing the housing and employment in this area will require very careful consideration	Noted	Consider accordingly
19291 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287]	Comment	There is no mention of highways, with such an increase in housing Road connections need proper assessment. This applies to the whole plan. You only need to look at road traffic information during rush hour and school pick up times to see there is a 'peek time' issue.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18286 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18293 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18296 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18298 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18299 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18300 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18301 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18356 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18357 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18369 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Education; highways and transportation; early years and childcare; post 16 education; minerals and waste; water; delivery of proposed development; green infrastructure; fibre to premises broadband opportunities.	ECC responses on infrastructure issues are noted	BBC are considering in full the comments from ECC and will continue to work with the Council to develop the Brentwood Local Plan regarding these issues.
18373 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Area/site specific policies in Pre-Submission Plan for preferred housing and employment sites - It is recommended that area/site specific policies are included in the Pre-Submission Plan for preferred housing and employment sites, including DHGV. This would provide a clear picture of where development is to be focused and enable specific policy requirements to be outlined. This would cover infrastructure such as the need to provide land for a new school/EYCC facility, highway/access requirements, flooding and surface water mitigation and other community infrastructure requirements such as health services, as well as housing mix.	Noted	Area/site specific policies are being drafted
19303 - Ms Liz Donald [7288]	Object	There have to be facilities for children to play: There have to be parks, sports facilities, community centres. Not enough of these exist at present, and with land being taken up by housing, where are they to go?	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17887 - Ms Ruth Carter [6891] 18192 - mr tim o'dowd [7074] 18383 - Mr Andrew Cook [6840] 18395 - Mr. & Mrs. Adrian & Julie Dunn [7140] 18407 - Amanda Bunn [648] 18544 - Mr and Mrs Williams [6158] 18809 - Mr Nicholas Ashton [4845] 19095 - Mr. Ian Waite [7256] 19127 - Mrs s Powell [6970] 19375 - Mr Julian How [6989] 19955 - Rochford District Council (Daniel Goodman) [7964] 21251 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828] 22100 - Ms Denise Kennedy [5191] 22105 - C. Penn [858]	Object	Need more infrastructure information on: parking provision; road provision and changes to roads/junctions; schools; doctors; NHS services healthcare; shops; supermarkets; car charging points; buses; trains; jobs; traffic calming measures; traffic lights; zebra crossings; footpaths; play facilities. Sport centres; community centres; emergency services; impacts on the A127, A128, A130, A13 and impact of Lower Thames Crossing; impact of development in other boroughs, particularly close to the borough boundary	Noted	Further work on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being carried out
22148 - Mrs Catherine Walker-Green [7170]	Object	This plan will detrimentally impact Billericay and area because the local infrastructure and services are already unable to cope with current population demands especially local roads, access roads in and out of Billericay, schools, hospital and doctor availability, train services in particular	Noted	Consider accordingly
18492 - Mrs. Carol Knill [7160] 18633 - Mr Lawrence Hood [7182] 18635 - Ms Gillian O'Sullivan [7183] 18749 - Mrs. jill brisley [7136] 18819 - Sue Marigold [2267] 18935 - Natalie Miller [6963] 19305 - Ms Liz Donald [7288]	Object	Particularly concerned about the loss of parking in the town centre and no information on replacement or alternatives	NOTED	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18060 - Jamie Bottono [3034] 18415 - Mr. & Mrs. T Llewellyn [7142] 18429 - Mrs Jill Saddington [2549] 18438 - Ms Jenni Parlour [6062] 18439 - Mr Peter Spicer [6441] 18455 - Mr Andrew Finlay [6972] 18460 - Anita Duxfield [7151] 18576 - Joshua Campbell [4572] 18579 - Mr Bartholomew Campbell [2498] 18586 - Lewis Campbell [4597] 18591 - Ms Linda Campbell [2454] 18678 - Ms Denise Armfield [7192] 18744 - Ms Lise Spicer [7210] 18774 - Mr. Keith Hodges [2610] 18779 - Graham Palmer [4725] 18800 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 18802 - Carolyn Harris [7215] 18812 - Mr Gary Duggan [7113] 18830 - Ms Denise Brien [1832] 18937 - Natalie Miller [6963] 19037 - Mr Gerry Jordan [4702] 19158 - Theresa Webster [2778] 19193 - Jean Gough [7271] 19216 - Lesley Emmett [7275] 19240 - Ms Julie Landragin [3958] 19310 - Mr Michael Fitzgerald [6050] 19368 - Ms Myra Harman [5927] 19372 - Lynda Goddard [687] 19403 - Mrs N. Jervis [1351] 19413 - Stephen Hill [612] 19436 - Mr Neil Chinniah [6924] 19612 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] 19934 - Mrs. Pamela Bennett [2539] 19935 - Mrs. Pamela Bennett [2539] 19936 - Mrs. Pamela Bennett [2539] 19937 - Mrs. Pamela Bennett [2539] 19946 - Mr & Mrs Ray [7955] 20022 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]	Object	Insufficient existing infrastructure to support the proposed number of dwellings within the borough. No new homes until this is addressed	Noted	Consider infrastructure accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22116 - Corrinne Bartell [8035] 22146 - Mr David Harman [4494]				
18636 - Mrs Ruth Bristow [6817]	Object	would like to comment on the Brentwood draft local plan. The housing is needed, however certain things must be protected in the plans. It is vital to protect all existing allotment sites, especially as the increase in housing will result in an even greater demand for allotments in the Brentwood area.	Noted. The borough are not proposing any development on allotments or changes to existing allotment boundaries. New allotment or similar growing space policy is being considered for strategic developments.	Consider accordingly
19244 - Steve Abrahall [666] 19245 - Steve Abrahall [666] 19246 - Steve Abrahall [666] 19251 - Steve Abrahall [666]	Object	Why are there no fast trains from Brentwood despite it being the main residential area? why no lift at Brentwood station? Why can't we have more Sunday buses? why don't the new crossrail trains have softer seats and loos ? Why is there a 4 zone difference between Brentwood and Harold Wood? Why is the fare from Brentwood to Harold Wood 4.5 miles £1,600/year, why do you allow TfL and the DfT to milk Brentwood residents? Why are there hardly any buses to get to Shenfield to access 14 trains/hour? Why can't Brentwood folks use oyster cards on all buses? Why is there not 2 hours parking in Brentwood like in Shenfield? Why no benchmarking on parking charges compared to nearby towns. For example Basildon and Romford have free parking on a Sunday so why doesn't Brentwood? Why do you still charge to park in the evening? Why are 20 mph speed limits not enforced on residential roads? Why is there no parking enforcement on those who park on double yellow lines after 6pm or on Sunday, yet you send out peaked cap people to put tickets on cars in the town centre? Why no footpath to Weald and Thorndon country parks? Why £5 to park in the above 2 parks? Why has the council done nothing to stop the re routing of 37 bus and cutting of other routes i.e, to Harlow, Lakeside, Stanstead Airport and Epping? Why no buses on the Weald Road to access Weald Country park and old Macdonalds farm, and why no hail and ride bus between Ongar Road and Weald Road for non drivers and disabled?	Noted. The Borough Council are working with facility and service providers to improve their offer to Brentwood residents where feasible and practical	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19307 - Ms Liz Donald [7288]	Object	The influx of people will require at least one new hospital, and GP surgeries and dentists are already overstretched. How is this going to be addressed and where are you going to build the new hospital? Care homes and retirement homes will need to be built. The current facilities will not be sufficient for any influx.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20038 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20042 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20043 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20044 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20045 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20046 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20047 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20049 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106]	Support	<p>1. 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. The LP 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, without this I can see the plan being challenged.</p> <p>2. The proposed development locations could have a notable impact on the SRN, particularly on M25 Junction 28 and Junction 29, as well as A12 Junction 12. The flow diagrams provided within the LP evidence base 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.</p> <p>3. 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 the LP does not provide specific public transport details and therefore the extent of the intended public transport provision is unknown.</p> <p>4. 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 LP and how the council</p>	Comments noted	Brnetwood Borough Council will continue to work with Highways England and Essex County Council regarding transport in the borough, with acknowledgement of the need for modal change and major proposals such as the Lower Thames Crossing.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>consider this could affect mode share for residents and employees at the development sites.</p> <p>5. 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. It should be noted 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.</p> <p>6. 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.</p>		
19652 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Davey) [2442] 19671 - ESFA (Dr Douglas McNab) [6718] 19777 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 19778 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 19802 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]	Support	<p>The need to plan for the level of infrastructure, needed to support housing and economic growth, is fully supported. Welcome the document's explicit recognition of the importance of "a comprehensive approach to infrastructure planning" and commends the approach taken by LB Ealing in their Planning for Schools Development Plan Document. We are not suggesting the Council produces a separate DPD, but we do believe that the systematic approach they have taken is informative for local plans. Engagement with highways authorities regarding sites such as Codham Hall is requested to link the employment site at Codham Hall with accessibility and connectivity enhancements work through the A127.</p>	Noted	Consider accordingly
18106 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560]	Support	<p>I support enhancing green infrastructure networks. However, today people cannot walk or cycle safely to Weald Park or Thorndon Park. Also crossing, either the A12 and A127 using footpaths is highly dangerous. Bridges should be considered in the light of increased population forecasts.</p>	Support noted	Consider issues accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

Part One: Our Strategy for Growth

Vision

17948 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855] 17949 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]	Comment	SO17: We would prefer to see the aspiration of access for all within such green infrastructure embedded within the Plan's Strategic Objectives and suggest this objective is worded thus: 'Establish a rich connected network of accessible Green Infrastructure across the Borough...' SO22: Access for all should be emphasised in the Plan as at present only walking and cycling are catered for. For the Plan to be fully inclusive, we suggest this objective is reworded thus: 'improve cycling, walking and horse riding facilities across the Borough and establish a network of green transport corridors, accessible to all vulnerable user groups...'	Noted	Consider accordingly
18260 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	ECC welcomes the inclusion of a clear and concise vision for the Draft Local Plan, but recommends that reference to health and wellbeing, and the encouragement of healthy active lifestyles should also be included.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19835 - AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031]	Comment	Deliverability of the Draft Plan - the stated delivery rates for Dunton Hills Garden Village are overly ambitious, especially if there were to be an over reliance on one developer. BBC should ensure the next iteration of the plan keeps the allocation flexible and open to delivery on the eastern side of site 200.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18061 - Jamie Bottono [3034]	Comment	How is all this growth being funded? What and how are priorities being set? You mention Crossrail but this is just the existing line being taken over and the cramped trains will remain. How can they cope with more users?	Noted	Consider accordingly
18087 - Mrs Susan Kortlandt [7039]	Comment	It sounds fine. Who could object. The problem is that young people brought up in Brentwood can no longer afford to live here. The majority of people living in Brentwood work elsewhere and workers live in cheaper towns. We need affordable housing for Brentwood youngsters.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18706 - Mr Darren Williams [5311]	Comment	Section 26 - "Committed to growth . . ." but in a way that maintains and enhances unique local character - whereas DHGV will completely destroy the unique local character of Dunton Village which is right on its border.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18144 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]	Object	You talk of green corridors but my understanding is that the idea of a green buffer on the Brentwood side of the border with Basildon at Dunton Hills has been dropped. This is unacceptable harm to the environment imposed on the people and wildlife on Dunton Village	Noted	Consider accordingly
18096 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560]	Object	Concerned that the statement 'We are committed to enabling new growth' subordinates the need for improving the quality of life for residents and the working population. It will result in a poorer place to live and work	Noted	Consider accordingly
19645 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Davey) [2442]	Object	Whilst the Council's vision for the Borough is generally supported, the evidence base does not yet support the conclusion that the Dunton Hills Garden Village is the most sustainable way of meeting the development needs of the Borough up to 2033 (and beyond). It is particularly noted that the 'Garden Village' strategy scores poorly in respect of a number of topics, and objectives, as set out in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report	Noted	Consider accordingly
18946 - Mr Francis Lai [5946]	Object	The Priest Lane site is the ONLY greenfield site in the plan	Noted	Consider accordingly
18230 - Uttlesford District Council (Mr Stephen Miles) [7105]	Support	UDC agrees with and supports the vision and supporting paragraphs (26 and 27) which sets out that Brentwood are "committed to enabling new growth in the borough that meets our development needs, but in a way that maintains and enhances our unique local character". UDC supports Brentwood's position of meeting its housing needs within the district, and its consideration of how to continue to do so if housing requirements are increased.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17940 - Chris Wain [620] 18247 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629] 18268 - Hermes Investment Management [7124] 19654 - Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr. Mike Taylor) [2703]	Support	The Vision contains a clear understanding of the characteristics of the borough and forms the basis against which the policies and preferred allocations can be assessed.	Support welcomed	No further action
<i>Strategic Objectives</i>				
18261 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	ECC welcomes a clear set of objectives but notes the increase in number and is concerned that this detail may be better raised in policy sections? Further detailed comments have been made on the objectives and policy sections and expects further conversations with Brentwood regarding their plan	Noted	The Council welcomes the comments on strategic objectives from ECC and the further joint discussions on the Brentwood Local Plan.
19316 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Comment	What represents 'sustainable' growth? Why are sites 044/178 the only identified greenfield sites? What evidence is identified for sites 044/178 being well served by existing infrastructure, local services and facilities - a set of statistics about schools and surgeries does not equal appropriate services? What proposals are there to enhance services? SO6 - What precisely does this mean for Priests Lane, one of the highest value housing areas in the borough? SO20 - What precisely does this mean? Which locations? Safeguards against blight?	Noted	Consider accordingly
19067 - Helen Jackman [745]	Comment	I acknowledge the commitment to providing powering stations for the electric cars of the future. I do hope the facilities will predate the necessary influx of theses eco cars!	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19952 - Rochford District Council (Daniel Goodman) [7964]	Comment	The Council supports Brentwood's identified strategic objectives, in principle, however would like to highlight the need to ensure that the impacts of the planned growth and wider strategy on other authorities in South Essex, including Rochford District, are considered in detail. It is expected that the collaborative work currently being undertaken at the sub-regional level, which includes both Rochford District Council and Brentwood Borough Council, will help to facilitate these cross-boundary considerations.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18707 - Mr Darren Williams [5311]	Comment	Section 28 - Strategic Objectives - S04 "A new well connected community at Dunton Hills": Please see fuller comments below - but how can it be well connected when it isolated from the rest of Brentwood, isolated from the railway and bound by already heavily congested roads.	Noted	Consider accordingly
22026 - Miss Sophie Skinner [5685]	Comment	The idea of new shops seems attractive, but Brentwood High Street is already struggling, so how will more shops make it better?	Noted	Consider accordingly
20058 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Comment	The document includes three new strategic objectives for transport and movement (page13) but these do not appear to be considered or explained elsewhere in the document nor for the specific allocations. It is unclear how they are relevant to the specific allocations nor how they have been taken into account. It's also unclear how Strategic Objective SO2 which sets out that growth will be directed to transport corridors has been considered. The document should explain how these have been addressed in the development of specific allocations given the importance of ensuring convenient movement in Brentwood and adjoining areas (including Havering).	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17950 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]	Comment	SO17: We would prefer to see the aspiration of access for all within such green infrastructure embedded within the Plan's Strategic Objectives and suggest this objective is worded thus: 'Establish a rich connected network of accessible Green Infrastructure across the Borough...' SO22: Access for all should be emphasised in the Plan as at present only walking and cycling are catered for. For the Plan to be fully inclusive, we suggest this objective is reworded thus: 'improve cycling, walking and horse riding facilities across the Borough and establish a network of green transport corridors, accessible to all vulnerable user groups...'	Noted	Consider accordingly
19060 - Mrs Hedy Lai [5774]	Object	SO5: Development of the Priests Lane site would add 1,000 houses in the Shenfield area, increasing congestion at the junction of Priests Lane/Middleton Hall Lane. It would also increase demand for surgeries within the Shenfield area. SO22: It is already terribly difficult and dangerous to cycle along Priests Lane, with very restricted space for vehicles and extremely narrow pavement for pedestrians. More vehicles from the new development would only exacerbate the current situation. Additional vehicles will increase air and noise pollution in the area.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19646 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Davey) [2442]	Object	General support of the strategic objectives the evidence base except in regards to Dunton Hills Garden Village as they do not support the conclusion that the Dunton Hills Garden Village is the most sustainable way of meeting the development needs of the Borough up to 2033 (and beyond). It is particularly noted that the 'Garden Village' strategy scores poorly in respect of a number of topics, and objectives, as set out in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report	Noted	Consider accordingly
18498 - Billericay Action Group (Mr Alasdair Daw) [4284]	Object	Object to development in Brentwood due to impact on "overstretched C2C line".	Noted	Consider accordingly
18545 - Mr Roland Lazarus [4908]	Object	I disagree with and object to SO4 and SO7	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19511 - Mr Richard Romang [4374]	Object	In regards to SO 3,5 and 6: The proposed development is not sustainable growth but is increasing the village housing stock by 28.6%, putting additional pressure on existing services and facilities which have been reduced over recent years and cannot be accommodated by existing infrastructure which is already failing.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18454 - Mr Andrew Finlay [6972]	Object	1) Green belt. The ever-increasing pressure for more roads and housing means it is vital the council should do everything it can to protect and invest in the Green Belts that we have. Development on Green Belt land is supposed to be tightly controlled - its purpose is to serve as a buffer between towns and between towns and the countryside. Green Belt land also brings social, environmental and economic benefits. They are responsible for food production, flood prevention, climate change mitigation and more. We should be protecting them and not recklessly building on them.	Noted	The Council are not able to fulfil the requirement for new homes with allocations on previously developed land alone and so have proposed minimal allocation on Green Belt land
18098 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560]	Object	S05 states 'Manage development growth to that capable of being accommodated by existing or proposed infrastructure, services or facilities'. This is a misleading statement - much as I would like to see it achieved. At present traffic exceeds capacity on all main roads. There are appear to be no plans to address this - therefore the objective cannot be achieved. The present Plan (adopted 25th Aug 2005) had a similar objective. There has been no significant road infrastructure introduced in years - Brentwood road network is essentially the same as 45 years ago.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18118 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294] 18153 - Malcolm Hepburn [7068] 18248 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629] 18514 - Mr Roland Lazarus [4908] 19159 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587] 19663 - Childerditch Properties [2642] 19775 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 19799 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]	Support	Support is offered for the proposed spatial objectives	Support welcomed	No further action

Fig. 3. Strategic Objectives

18820 - Sue Marigold [2267]	Comment	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. And if, as per s. 8.56 the Council "seeks to retain existing large retail units as they can be a major driver of footfall" why did it allow The Dairyman and Wildwood to take the larger retail sites when they became vacant?	Noted	Consider accordingly
18236 - Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]	Comment	Housing should be targeted at places where it can have a positive environmental impact to help achieve landscape restoration and recovery. This requires an up-to-date and well-informed ecological network map, which identifies existing natural features and habitats, alongside areas where new habitats are needed to restore ecosystems and help wildlife recover.	Noted	Consider accordingly

Fig. 3. Strategic Objectives

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18712 - Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]	Comment	Please reference to the Thames Chase Community Forest (TCCF); its importance to the area and the diverse range of benefits it has provided to date and has the potential to do so in the future. It would also be beneficial to see a map of the borough and its relationship, in terms of location, with the TCCF area / boundary. It is closely aligned with the Strategic Objectives identified in the Draft Local Plan i.e. Managing Growth, Sustainable Communities, Economic Prosperity, Environmental Protection and Enhancement, Quality of Life and Community Infrastructure, Transport and Movement.	Noted	The Council will continue to include a specific Thames Chase Trust policy
18062 - Jamie Bottono [3034]	Comment	How will you improve transport and movement?	Noted	Ongoing discussion with the Highways Authorities - Essex County Council and Highways England; bus and rail providers is ongoing.
18223 - Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]	Comment	The Strategic Objectives on Environmental Protection and Enhancement should include a commitment to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18103 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560]	Object	S022 objective - to improve cycling and walking facilities. This is misleading although I am support the intent. A similar statement was included in the present Plan (adopted August 2005) however there has been minimal investment. Cycling and walking has become more problematic as traffic volumes have increased and roads have deteriorated. No plans have been presented to satisfy this objective.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18088 - Mrs Susan Kortlandt [7039] 18133 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] 18273 - Hermes Investment Management [7124] 19620 - Redrow Homes (Sarah Kirk) [6670]	Support	Welcome strategic objectives generally	Support welcomed	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Spatial Strategy</i>				
19762 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931]	Comment	The allocation of land south of the B1002, Ingatestone (ref 078) for residential development would represent a sustainable and deliverable proposal to help meet local housing needs over the coming plan period. The site is approximately 1.8ha and could support the development of up to 50 dwellings. The site is located adjacent to the eastern edge of the settlement boundary of Ingatestone, on land, which is currently allocated as Green Belt.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19818 - Diocese of Chelmsford [6085]	Comment	Object to the decision to discount site 033 due to availability and heritage impact. Site is located directly adjacent to a built-up area of Hutton, relates well to the spatial strategy. The SHLAA 2011 states that site is suitable, available, achievable, and could deliver 13 dwellings, within 1-5 years. The SA indicates that the allocation of site 033 would have positive effects in relation to the SA objectives, although it also states that site performs poorly ('Red') against Conservation Area criterion. This is a blanket assessment based purely on the fact that it is located within Hutton Village Conservation Area.	Noted. Sites are considered in terms of opportunities and constraints. This site has not been bought forward as it not considered suitable.	No further action
19816 - Countryside Properties [250]	Comment	Site 030A/B represents a deliverable, sustainable and achievable site for residential development. Technical reports and associated documents demonstrate that it good access and connectivity to the surrounding area, there are no significant or major ecological impacts, there are no significant physical geo-environmental constraints (foundations, highways, drainage and contamination) to development on the site.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19710 - Simons Developments Limited [5643]	Comment	Welcome the additional housing proposed at Ingatestone which equates to 218 new dwellings over the plan period. However additional residential development will exacerbate the existing deficiency in local food shopping provision. According to the Brentwood Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 204, Ingatestone attracts only a small percentage of available convenience goods expenditure from the local area. Specifically, the Co-Op attracts only 8.2% and the Budgens 9.9% of that expenditure. This is very low and represents an unsustainable pattern of food shopping with a significant number of linked trips to large out of centre food stores further afield.	Noted.	Consider accordingly
19560 - Mrs Laura Read [6946]	Comment	Request for inclusion of Tooks Farm, Great Warley Street for development in the Local Plan. The yard, comprising a range of metal storage barns, stabling blocks and workshops, is now largely redundant, and as such presents an ideal location to develop the Council's stated aims to maximise the delivery of affordable housing; as well as to offer the possibility of innovative housing that will provide appropriate housing for older people, or mixed-age community. 'Amberfield' sites which already have basic services (water, electricity, transport links), unsightly dilapidated building, are effective to provide housing development opportunities without encroaching on green spaces.	Noted	Site assessment considered. All applications for sites not within the Draft Local Plan will be considered inline with policies.
19748 - Countryside Properties [250] 19749 - Countryside Properties [250] 19750 - Countryside Properties [250] 19751 - Countryside Properties [250] 19752 - Countryside Properties [250]	Comment	The evidence base has consistently supported growth in the A127 corridor, where land at West Horndon has proven to be the most sustainable option for new development. Land to the east of West Horndon is capable of being delivered in the short term, is within walking distance of numerous services and facilities within the existing settlement, including a railways station, is sustainably accessible. It is suitably located to connect to the good quality existing pedestrian network in the village. Development would be high quality, contribute to locality, minimal Green Belt impact.	Noted	Consideration of options is made according to evidence base and appraisal.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20175 - Mr Ionut Ionescu [7977]	Comment	Generally I support the plan with a few observations/provisos: Site 037 should be reduced to preserve the LoWS or plan around it. (Land west of Thorndon Avenue, West Horndon).	Site 037 and land to the west of West Horndon are not preferred sites and are not being brought forward in the local plan in light of the evidence base. Impact of development on wildlife and habitats is of importance and will be fundamental to the development of the plan	No action.
19754 - Mrs A. Topham [5111]	Comment	Object the decision to discount Site 202B on grounds of potential impact of development on the Green Belt. The site is suitable for short-term delivery, therefore has been actively promoted for residential development. The accompanying studies and plans provide further evidence for the availability, achievability and suitability of the site for development. When looking to provide dwellings in the areas which will not be effected by potential flood risks, the potential developable area of the site is approximately 2.1ha. As such, the site could provide circa 26 dwellings.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20224 - Mr Michael Juniper [5025]	Comment	There is no mention of any proposal for Stondon Massey and Doddinghurst. Are there no sites in these Parishes?	Noted.	Sites have been assessed in these areas but were not considered suitable as part of fulfilling the spatial strategy. Further details are available in the Councils Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.
19826 - Crest Nicholson Eastern (Mr Mark Bedding) [2510]	Comment	Support the Plan in principle but suggest a word change - remove "in addition we are introducing a limited..." and rather state "A sustainable level of growth in our larger villages is proposed to enhance the range and choice of local housing options but also to promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities."	Noted. A more detailed plan document will be published for the Regulation 19 stage of plan development. Consideration of the impact of this change will be made.	Consider accordingly
19828 - Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]	Comment	Land at land at Hillcrest Nurseries, Ingrave (site 146) is considered sustainable and deliverable to provide retirement flats to help meet an identified need within the Borough. Allocation of the site for retirement housing would be justified, effective, consistent with national policy and would help ensure the Local Plan is positively prepared.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19769 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931]	Comment	Site 078 represents a deliverable, sustainable and achievable site for residential development. It can accommodate 54 dwellings without adversely harming the landscape character of the area or the character of Ingatestone itself as demonstrated in the prepared Feasibility Layout, Landscape and Visual Issues Scoping Report and Landscape Advisory Plan. Dense planting and landscaping will ensure that the development proposal has no adverse effect on the listed building. Its high access and connectivity levels to the surrounding area represent a logical infill development to the village service centre.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19838 - Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]	Comment	Land at Hillcrest Nurseries, Ingrave (site 146) is located immediately adjacent to the existing settlement of Ingrave and should be allocated. Site was discounted; however, in respect of the concerns relating to harm to the character of area and lack of affordable housing, these are functions of the details of the specific proposal that was subject to appeal; as opposed to potential fundamental concerns as to whether the site could be suitable for development. In respect of the development being inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the Green Belt assessment doesn't provide robust justification for the rejection of the site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19755 - Mrs A. Topham [5111]	Comment	The proposed allocation of Site 202B at Land to the south of Blackmore, off Blackmore Road relates well to the Spatial Strategy, which directs proportionate growth to the Borough's larger villages. Although not within the defined settlement boundary of Blackmore, the site does lie adjacent to it. The allocation of the site provides an option of delivering a small extension to the existing residential area of Blackmore	Noted	Consider accordingly
18761 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]	Comment	Generally support the development of sites 002, 003, 039, 040, 041, 081, 102, 117A, 117B, 186, provided that they are developed in a manner that does not harm the woodland. Brentwood benefits from having woodland within very easy reach, and it is vital that this remains the case, including in the urban parts not designated as "green belt". The density proposed for these sites could be higher to obviate any alleged need to develop other sites.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18283 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Comment	The draft plan refers to the accompanying sustainability appraisal, which is part of this consultation, but does not appear to be within the listed documents on the website link. Even so, Hermes Investment Management broadly supports the Council's spatial strategy insofar as it relates to the redevelopment of the sites making up the West Horndon Industrial Estate and the new employment allocation on land south of East Horndon Hall.	Noted	Sustainability Appraisal of options and sites has been carried out and published.
19709 - Simons Developments Limited [5643]	Comment	Propose further allocations for Class B uses (Site ref 079B - 1.22ha). Site can be safely accessed, can be developed without adverse landscape and visual impact thanks to its proximity to the A12 and the existing urban edge combined with topography and vegetation. Site 079C could sensibly be allocated or safeguarded for employment uses to come forward during the plan period as and when required in response to market demand.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20039 - 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 proposals announced and the potential for the widening of the A12. Additionally, cross border impacts will need to be considered from adjacent local authorities local plans, as well as strategic rerouting as result of large schemes in the RIS such as the lower Thames Crossing. Note the potential for noise and air quality problems and recommend suitable consideration is given to ensure new occupants are not adversely affected.	Not. Transportation impact assessment work is being proposed and considered for the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan.	Consider accordingly
19893 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Comment	Land at Crow Green Lane, site 159, is immediately available. It would offer a clean, healthy environment, well related to existing community and commercial infrastructure, in which to create a living space where its residents would flourish. We have been promoting site 159 since 2009. We have seen other alternatives and "preferred" greenfield options come and go. Given the site's advantages, it must surely be time to give it serious consideration and acknowledge that it can be relied on in terms of its availability and achievability.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18152 - Malcolm Hepburn [7068]	Comment	We are putting forward representations in respect of a proposed village extension at Mountnessing. The site is in a sustainable location, served by existing and proposed services and facilities.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19713 - Clearview Homes Limited [6935]	Comment	Promote the allocation of BT Site (ref 118) and former St Faith's Hospital (ref 299). Land comprises of 21ha, a quarter of which comprises brownfield land, offers a strategic opportunity for new development and is capable of providing: -Enhanced green spaces for sport and recreation with improved connections to surrounding infrastructure. Approximately 750 new and deliverable homes; Integration of existing office building for BT or other businesses; Retail and leisure facilities to serve both new and existing communities.	Noted. The Council's site consideration reflects the opportunities and also constraints. This is reflected in the choice of site for allocations	Note
18770 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540] 19367 - Mr Martin West [5005]	Comment	Too large a percentage of the plan is south of the A127, not nearly enough near new cross rail infrastructure.	Noted	Development is proposed in the Crossrail corridor. Strategy includes other areas for development.
19810 - Countryside Properties [250]	Comment	Given that Site 030A at Bayley's Mead is located within Hutton, a 'main town' with facilities and services that could support sustainable growth along the A12 corridor, the allocation of the site would relate well to the Council's spatial strategy. Although designated as Green Belt, the site performs poorly in respect of the five functions of the Green Belt and the release of the land would therefore not result in an adverse effect on the Green Belt.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18262 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18266 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18267 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18269 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18272 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18274 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	ECC welcomes reference in Paragraph 37 of the consultation document to BBC working jointly with the South Essex LPA's to secure infrastructure investment and consider wider growth opportunities. ECC recommends that more detailed reference is made to this work, including the Memorandum of Understanding that has been signed by the South Essex Authorities to work together on strategic cross boundary matters, the establishment of the Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA), the work that has taken place on a South Essex 2050 Vision, and the work underway to progress a South Essex Joint Spatial Plan.	Noted	The Council will continue to work with ECC on the local plan

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19586 - Lisa Atkinson [2991]	Object	oppose most strongly the proposal for West Horndon to have over 50% of the new gypsy and traveller sites. This is a step too far. We should not have to accept over 60% of the housing, over 80% of the employment land allocations and over 50% of the new gypsy and traveller sites. This is too much for one small village and these sites would not be compatible with our community and way of life. An alternative site should be found elsewhere in the Borough.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19614 - P A Scott Associates [2063]	Object	Object. Site at Penny Pots, Ongar Road, Stondon Massey, Essex CM15 0EA was not included for housing development. Site is suitable as: it is adjacent to an existing built up area of Stondon Massey; it would form a natural boundary to the existing settlement; it was considered in the SHLAA as "suitable" and "achievable"; it would provide much needed housing provision for Stondon Massey; it would not change the character of the Green Belt or cause any damage to it.	Noted	Site proposal noted and considered

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18483 - Mr Bill Stanes [7156] 18797 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 18799 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 18810 - Mr Nicholas Ashton [4845] 18821 - Sue Marigold [2267] 18832 - Ms Denise Brien [1832] 18843 - Sue Marigold [2267] 18844 - Sue Marigold [2267] 18959 - Mr David Schuster [6889] 18961 - Mr Geoff Bland [7237] 18973 - D.J. & M.S. Sowden [659] 19030 - Mr Gerry Bender [7015] 19031 - Mr Gerry Bender [7015] 19077 - Mr Roger Fowers [2684] 19081 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880] 19109 - J. S. and R. Mack [6055] 19147 - Mr. & Mrs. ARA & CR Jamieson [7263] 19317 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215] 19326 - Mr Peter Snelling [6960] 19398 - Mr. Paul A. Whyatt [1783] 19399 - Mr. Paul A. Whyatt [1783] 19471 - Miss Rebecca Coppock [7118] 19544 - Mr Michael Wand [7041] 19552 - S Pazda [7089] 19585 - Lisa Atkinson [2991] 19636 - Ford Motor Company [3768] 19697 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381] 20132 - Mrs Susan Butler [7970] 20133 - Mrs Susan Butler [7970] 20134 - Mrs Susan Butler [7970] 20150 - Mrs Susan Walker [2825] 20190 - Mrs Frances Skeels [7982] 20223 - Mrs Patricia Veal [7995] 21258 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]	Object	There should be a focus on empty properties and improvement to the town centres, parking and transport and benefit to the current residents and protecting the Green Belt	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19888 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Object	Six of the twelve proposed greenfield sites adjoin the A12 main trunk road. Most of these sites represent "filling in the gaps" between the existing urban edge and the road. We remain bewildered by the continuing allocation of sites that have poor environmental conditions as a result of air and noise pollution from the A12 - nationally, 40,000 people die early every year as a result of outdoor air pollution. Five of the preferred allocations would be particularly prone to air and noise pollution from the A12: 023A/B, 106, 079A, 158, 263.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19028 - Martin Grant Homes (Martin Grant Homes) [6704]	Object	Over-reliance on Dunton Hills Garden Village; The lack of flexibility in the strategy to accommodate unmet need from neighbouring authorities; Limiting the housing requirement to just 380 dwellings per year prevents sustainable sites that are available now; does not acknowledge the changes to calculating housing need using a standardised methodology. The current approach is limiting to sustainable development opportunities. The inclusion of sites such as land at Heron Court in Herongate will provide Brentwood Borough with a range of sites that enable a flexible approach to housing delivery and ensure that land comes forward within the plan period.	Noted	The Spatial Strategy is a balance of opportunities and constraints for new development within the borough in line with Government policy

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18017 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18402 - Mr. & Mrs. Adrian & Julie Dunn [7140] 18403 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141] 18406 - Amanda Bunn [648] 18456 - Mrs Anne Smith [4540] 18459 - Anita Duxfield [7151] 18465 - Ashley Fearn [7153] 18466 - Mr barry scott [6896] 18469 - Bruno Giordan [636] 18487 - Mrs. Carlene Vine [7159] 18489 - Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909] 18494 - Billericay Action Group (Mr Alasdair Daw) [4284] 18572 - Joshua Campbell [4572] 18581 - Mr Bartholomew Campbell [2498] 18585 - Lewis Campbell [4597] 18589 - Ms Linda Campbell [2454] 18637 - Mr John Berry [2490] 18654 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 18762 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] 18766 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] 18772 - Mr Derrick Fellowes [4361] 18786 - Neil Amor [4672] 18804 - Carolyn Harris [7215] 18829 - Ms Denise Brien [1832] 18831 - Ms Denise Brien [1832] 18845 - Sue Marigold [2267] 18846 - Sue Marigold [2267] 18848 - Ms Joanne Dunne [7222] 18918 - Ms Emily Huzzey [7229] 18919 - Ms Emily Huzzey [7229] 18920 - Ms Emily Huzzey [7229] 18921 - Ms Emily Huzzey [7229] 18922 - Ms Emily Huzzey [7229] 18934 - Natalie Miller [6963] 18940 - Mr Gary Scott [7233] 18983 - Mr Dean Jordan [7243] 19032 - Mr Gerry Bender [7015] 19035 - Mr Gerry Jordan [4702] 19043 - Mrs Trudy Cannin [7247] 19044 - Mrs Trudy Cannin [7247]	Object	Object to the Spatial Strategy as it is for too much development, it shouldn't be on the Green Belt, it is too much along the A127 corridor, it will damage wildlife, will cause even more problems with infrastructure like roads, schools, GPs, will ruin the town and the village feel, impacts on road safety, the population will go down anyway because of Brexit, will destroy the retail of the town centre,	Objections noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19045 - Mr Dean Jordan [7243]				
19049 - Mr. Glenn Warren [7250]				
19051 - Sue Lister [2269]				
19054 - Sue Lister [2269]				
19063 - Helen Jackman [745]				
19064 - Helen Jackman [745]				
19128 - Mrs s Powell [6970]				
19151 - Mr John Lester [4396]				
19157 - Theresa Webster [2778]				
19234 - Miss. L. & Mr. D. Rice [1481]				
19237 - Mrs M.H. Giordan [1540]				
19243 - Ms Julie Landragin [3958]				
19277 - MRS LESLEY LYNN [5591]				
19281 - Mrs Anne Smith [4540]				
19301 - Ms Liz Donald [7288]				
19308 - Ms Liz Donald [7288]				
19309 - Mr Michael Fitzgerald [6050]				
19330 - Mr & Mrs John and Marian Long [7289]				
19331 - Mr & Mrs John and Marian Long [7289]				
19334 - Mr & Mrs John and Marian Long [7289]				
19346 - Mr Stanley Dwyer [7290]				
19347 - Miss Victoria Purkiss [7040]				
19360 - Mr John Berry [2490]				
19369 - Saffron Hawkins [2589]				
19370 - Lynda Goddard [687]				
19371 - Lynda Goddard [687]				
19400 - Mrs N. Jervis [1351]				
19405 - Mr Paul Hawkins [2959]				
19406 - Mr Peter Wiley [7298]				
19431 - Mr John Owen [7302]				
19441 - Malcolm Hurford [7304]				
19457 - Mr Philip Linsey [7307]				
19466 - Mr Philip Linsey [7307]				
19495 - Ms Linda Hurlock [7310]				
19517 - Mr Greg Roberts [7038]				
19518 - Mr Greg Roberts [7038]				
19519 - Mr Greg Roberts [7038]				
19520 - Mr Greg Roberts [7038]				
19553 - S Pazda [7089]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19584 - Lisa Atkinson [2991]				
19597 - Mr George Tuck [7341]				
19603 - Mr Martin Budgen [2387]				
19647 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Davey) [2442]				
19688 - Owners of Land at Sandpit Lane [7466]				
19695 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]				
19729 - Countryside Properties [250]				
19741 - Countryside Properties [250]				
19759 - Mrs A. Topham [5111]				
19837 - Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]				
19841 - Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]				
19883 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]				
19930 - Mrs. Pamela Bennett [2539]				
19932 - Mrs. Pamela Bennett [2539]				
19943 - Mr & Mrs Ray [7955]				
19944 - Mr & Mrs Ray [7955]				
20138 - Mr William Jones [7972]				
20140 - Ms Norma Jennings [5444]				
20143 - Ms Norma Jennings [5444]				
20149 - Mrs Alison Moore [7103]				
20170 - Mr&Mrs T&M Justins [7976]				
20176 - Mrs Patricia Jones [7978]				
20177 - Mrs Patricia Jones [7978]				
20189 - Mrs Frances Skeels [7982]				
20215 - Maureen Clark [7755]				
20230 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]				
21241 - Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]				
21242 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]				
21247 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]				
21972 - Maureen Laming [1039]				
22009 - Mr Adam Staples [8016]				
22013 - Mrs Hazel Town [4993]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22029 - Mrs Kim Smith [8021] 22031 - Mrs Kim Smith [8021] 22060 - Mr and Mrs David and Alison Bowyer [5055] 22117 - Corrinne Bartell [8035] 22147 - Mr David Harman [4494] 22152 - Mrs Catherine Walker-Green [7170]				
20002 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 20003 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 20004 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 20005 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 20006 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 20009 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461] 20037 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106]	Object	Thurrock Council objects to the elements of the spatial strategy, in particular limited growth at larger villages and the role of a new settlement at Dunton Hills Garden village including the potential for additional dwelling capacity. It is unclear to Thurrock why a free-standing greenfield settlement in the Green Belt should be the preferred location for development compared to existing settlement expansion or green field urban extensions around the A12 which are likely to be more sustainable and closer to existing transport and other existing infrastructure and services including Crossrail.	Noted.	Consider accordingly
19689 - Owner of Orchard Farm [7503]	Object	Object that Orchard Farm (site ref 303A,B) is not allocated for residential development. The Council has not had and does not currently have, at the time of writing, a 5-year housing land supply, in which case applicants can invoke paragraph 14 of the NPPF which takes a level of control away from the local planning authority. The 380 dwellings per annum figure is a challenging figure for the borough. Orchard Farm is a sustainable option being close to a range of shops and services, leisure facilities, primary school at West Horndon, as well as the proposed Dunton Hills garden village.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19898 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] 19899 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] 19900 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Object	Land at Crow Green Lane (site 159) should be allocated. It is well served by existing facilities, public transport services. adjacent to an established residential area, has clearly defined defensible boundaries, has an existing access point and can be serviced by utilities. With oneownership, it is readily available. It could have playspace incorporated on site, wont damage Green Belt function or purpose. Sites 158, 106 and 263 do not appear in the 2011 SHLAA, the 2013 Preferred Options document or the 2016 Draft Plan, so we assume they are being presented here for the first time as potential housing land allocations.	Noted.	Consider accordingly
19743 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	The SA concludes that all options have pros and cons: Option 1 (Land to the east and west of West Horndon) performs best from a landscape perspective. Option 3 (DHGV only) is said to have drawbacks in respect of biodiversity, landscape and housing. Despite the above conclusions, Option 3 DHGV only, is selected as the 'preferred approach'. The conclusion that this performs well in sustainability objectives is incorrect and ignores key issues such as landscape, in a borough juggling with the need to minimise impact on the Green Belt.	Noted. The Council considers opportunities and constraints that are within evidence for strategic allocation preferences.	Note
20181 - Mr Peter Sneddon [7979]	Object	No market trade on High Street anywhere, only Fri/Sat. Nothing drawing people to Brentwood, if I want to trade on market stall I have to physically drive to Epping (Monday) or Chelmsford during the week to earn a living back only Fri/Sat.	Noted.	Consider accordingly
19990 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Support	Thurrock Council supports in principle Brentwood's approach to accommodate its objectively assessed need within its boundary, whilst recognising this is an ambitious growth agenda. Concerned with regard to the spatial strategy and the levels of growth proposed in the A12 and A127 corridors and considers that Brentwood Council has not thoroughly tested all reasonable options.	Disagree. The Sustainability Appraisal has considered a number of alternatives that meet identified need. Work under duty to cooperate with Thurrock is ongoing and further discussion is warranted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19896 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Support	Support in principle the spatial strategy as described in paragraph 36 and figure 5, but have fundamental concerns with the proposed allocations for the A127 corridor.	Noted	Site assessment is available in the housing and economic land availability assessment (HELAA) 2018 which provides further site assessment detail, the Sustainability Appraisal considers strategic options to fulfil housing need.
19432 - Mr John Owen [7302] 19634 - Ford Motor Company [3768] 21250 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]	Support	Support brownfield sites initiatives and where green belt is within settlement boundaries, where services and infrastructure can be extended and utilised. Provided Open Space was maintained this would be more readily accepted by the community, be less disruptive to deliver and therefore more expedient and have financial benefits of being more affordable. Use of flats to raise densities to reduce impact elsewhere.	Support noted	No further action
18134 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] 18249 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629] 18960 - Mr Geoff Bland [7237] 19664 - Childerditch Properties [2642] 19761 - Mrs A. Topham [5111] 19763 - Barnoaks Management Ltd [7931] 19776 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 19788 - Countryside Properties [250] 19800 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124] 19811 - Countryside Properties [250] 20036 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20144 - Mrs. M. A. Montgomery [1772] 20159 - J.C. Ward [987] 20191 - Mr David Charlie [7983] 20194 - Miss Alison Goulding [7984] 22023 - Mr. David Sisley [8018]	Support	Support the Spatial Strategy as presented, with development in transport corridors, around town centres, larger villages and the new Garden Village	Support welcomes	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Fig. 4. Developing the Spatial Strategy</i>				
18067 - mrs zoe chambers [5634]	Object	There seems little reference in your consultation to the fact that to build Dunton Garden Village it will destroy 257 hectares of Green Belt. Your consultation appears to be leading residents to support the DGS project without making this fact clear. you emphasise that 100% of your housing requirements will be met, along with traveller needs if this option is supported. I find it pretty underhand in page 27 of 'our strategy for growth' (photo uploaded) that you state clearly "green belt land" in your list of areas.....other than 'Dunton Garden Village where you have labelled it 'strategic allocation'.	Noted	The Plan will be amended to clarify the Green Belt status of the Dunton Hills Garden Village site.
18516 - Mr Roland Lazarus [4908]	Object	This Draft Plan has lost sight of Green Belt fundamental aim. Much of the currently open Green Belt would be lost to housing despite NPPG advise. Unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm. The Council do not have sufficient grounds to believe that the unmet need for housing or any other very special circumstances should apply here or could in combination constitute the very special circumstances required.	Noted	Consider accordingly

Fig. 5. Spatial Strategy

19685 - Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]	Comment	It is considered that the land at Wyatts Green Lane, Wyatts Green, relates well to this spatial strategy. The Assessment concludes the site would be suitable for development as it would follow the existing build line and would form a logical boundary. The development of this site would not lead to coalescence and it would not encroach on the open countryside. We welcome the change to the assessment of Wyatts Green, which now sees the village categorised as a Category 3- Large Village, and consider Wyatts Green Lane is suitable for inclusion. We urge the review of the Site Selection Methodology.	Noted	Consider accordingly
-------------------------------------	---------	---	-------	----------------------

Fig. 5. Spatial Strategy

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19691 - Marden Homes Ltd. [7465]	Comment	Generally supported and ensures the majority of development is focused in locations most accessible to services, employment and the transport network. It is considered that the strategy does not allocate sufficient smaller opportunity sites for residential development, in particular in Hutton. Hutton is a sustainable settlement with excellent links to transport, facilities and services, it should be considered for development. The site is designated as Green Belt, however preforms poorly in respect of the five functions of the Green Belt (NPPF, Para. 80). The release of the land would not result in an adverse effect on the Green Belt.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18917 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]	Object	More assessment should be carried out on brownfield land or within larger settlements which are more accessible with better facilities, or within the larger new Dunton Hills Garden village settlement.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19609 - Mr Jon Nicholls [5202]	Object	We object to the strategy to rely on a new settlement to deliver a large proportion of growth. We suggest greater variation in the portfolio of land available for residential development and in particular a greater number of smaller site allocations. We support the spatial strategy, as set out at paragraph 31 - prioritises using brownfield land. The capacity of brownfield sites has been fully explored and needs further work. This has resulted in site 183 being discounted. Site is already serviced by infrastructure and would support sustainable development and transport.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18285 - Hermes Investment Management [7124] 19656 - Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr. Mike Taylor) [2703] 19665 - Childerditch Properties [2642] 19801 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]	Support	The Spatial Strategy shows a realistic overall distribution of growth. It focuses on sustainable urban locations and the best opportunities for Green Belt release in/adjacent to existing higher order settlements in order to meet identified housing and economic growth objectives of the Local Plan.	Support noted	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Housing Need</i>				
18231 - Uttlesford District Council (Mr Stephen Miles) [7105] 18440 - Mrs. Jane Winter [7146] 18725 - Mrs Sylvia Kwan [7202] 19660 - Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr. Mike Taylor) [2703] 19953 - Rochford District Council (Daniel Goodman) [7964] 19972 - Chelmsford City Council (Claire Stuckey) [4541]	Support	supports Brentwood's position of meeting its housing needs within the district, and its consideration of how to continue to do so if housing requirements are increased. Welcomes Brentwood Borough Council's decision to adopt a higher OAHN of 380dpa in light of the latest evidence and in anticipation of MHCLG introducing a standardised approach to calculating OAHN using the 2016 household projections when published. Supports, in principle, approach to meeting housing needs, but would like to raise the need to consider the impact of its proposed housing allocations within the wider context of South Essex.	Noted and considered in full.	Consider accordingly - and will be reflected in Regulation 19 draft local plan.
<i>Summary of Proposed Housing-Led Allocations</i>				
18705 - Mr Darren Williams [5311]	Comment	Section 12 - Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) "evidence base is increasing including masterplan work" and Section 64 e - "Developing a comprehensive masterplan for the new garden village at Dunton Hills, to engrain the core garden village design principles"; how can an objective view be made on site selection before this masterplan detail is presented and made available to the public?	Noted	Masterplanning work for the Dunton Hills Garden Village will be developed for later stages of the local plan, with further detail being provided at the detailed stage of a planning application.
18255 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629]	Support	The Promoters of DHGV support the identification of DHGV as the principal strategic housing led allocation and believe that the site is both suitable and deliverable. See additional documents and representations under Part 2 of the Plan.	Support noted	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Fig. 8. Housing Growth</i>				
19683 - Catesby Estates Plc. [7463]	Comment	The proposed allocation includes 1,732 dwellings (28% of housing delivery) on brownfield sites. Although this aspiration is supported, there is a difference on build out rates on brownfield sites compared to greenfield. In the Lichfield's report "Start to Finish, How Quickly do Large-Scale Housing Sites Deliver?" (November 2016) it is shown that once started, large scale greenfield sites do deliver homes at a more rapid rate than their brownfield equivalents, on average 50% quicker. Again, the housing trajectory should reflect this.	Reference to report noted	The Council will consider the report and the built out rates of the different sites.
19909 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	Our guidance 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' should be used to inform the spatial distribution of growth and the requirements of FRA's for individual applications.	Noted	The guidance will be considered and reflected in policy development.
18573 - Joshua Campbell [4572]	Object	The LDP shows land miss represented as Brownfield when it is most certainly Greenbelt in the current house market.	Noted	Site assessment considers previous use and this is reflected in policy development.
19320 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Object	The net homes allocation at Priests Lane appears small taken as a total of planned building across Brentwood, the actual percentage of net build at sites 044/178 compared to Brentwood Urban Area net build is 8.25% which is a much higher percentage of net build in the Urban Area net build category. Comment on the planned 36% uplift on required housing has been made earlier, it is now clear this represents an net uplift of 2109 dwellings over the life of the plan. These 2109 dwellings would then be built in the hope of driving down house/rental prices.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19534 - Mountnessing Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [378]	Object	Omissions have been made to the number of houses being built in the area. It is assumed that the LDP draft does not use administrative/parish boundaries; but using undefined boundaries makes it hard to get a clear picture of the impacts at local levels and could even imply to some residents that there is nothing happening in their locality, if the statistics were to be quoted out of context. A sensible improvement to the document would be to include tabulations which coincide with Borough and Parish boundaries.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19796 - hgh consulting (Mr Ben Stonebridge) [7107]	Object	A Development Framework Document has been produced which demonstrates the site's ability to deliver a sustainable urban extension of at least 750 new homes alongside other community and employment uses, as well as significant enhancements to the existing open space. The site will therefore assist the Council in meeting its objectively assessed needs as detailed in Figure 8.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18741 - Mr Denis Whitton [7207]	Object	Insufficient infrastructure and services (roads, parking, schools, healthcare facilities) to accommodate the level of growth proposed. All the green space you are going to destroy and the villages that will just be part of Brentwood rather than a unique village.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18288 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Support	Hermes Investment Management support the allocation shown by "Brownfield Land within settlement boundary - other locations"	Support noted	No further action
<i>Fig. 11. Sites by Size</i>				
19809 - Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]	Comment	The first column heading should probably be "Site Size"	Disagree. Rather than list by size size, it is listed by the potential tied for the site in terms of housing unit this takes into accounts constraints on the site such as topography.	No action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17951 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]	Comment	Page 29 Paragraph 64e: we note the intention to develop a comprehensive masterplan for the new development at Dunton Hills, and we would be very keen to be involved in this planning at an early stage. There is considerable potential with this development to create multi-user links which will enhance the networks outside of the proposed development area and we would welcome the opportunity to have an input into this. It is far more beneficial and cost effective to look at these issues at the beginning rather than trying to 'retro-fit' at a later stage.	Noted. Public rights of way and non-motorised vehicle routes are being considered in order to develop the masterplan.	Consider DHGV involvement.
18294 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Comment	Hermes Investment Management supports the aim set out in paragraph 64c. However, as they have made clear all along, this should not stop the individual elements of the overall site being delivered separately.	Comment noted	Note
<i>Land Supply for Meeting Specialist Accommodation</i>				
18281 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18284 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Specialist Accommodation Needs and Supply - Registered Care Specialist Accommodation Needs and Supply - Gypsy & Traveller	Noted	On going work with Essex County Council will continue and used to inform the draft Local Plan and policies.
19637 - Ford Motor Company [3768]	Comment	Ford acknowledges that paragraph 72 makes reference to the 'Ford / Council Depot, Warley' having the potential to integrate new C2 accommodation facilities (60-bed scheme). Whilst Ford is supportive of BBC seeking to accommodate such facilities across the Borough, Ford notes that there is no further evidence provided within the BBC Preferred Site Allocations to fully justify this proposed land use at the Site. As such, Ford requests that further evidence is provided (including an assessment of capacity/need in the local area) before the next stage of the Local Plan is progressed.	Noted	Consider accordingly

Housing and Specialist Accommodation - Need and Supply, Land Supply for Meeting Specialist Accommodation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19829 - Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]	Comment	Need for Retirement Accommodation: Enabling people to downsize through the provision of appropriate accommodation would of course have a positive impact on the housing market, as larger homes become available to those who require them. Significant amount of evidence submitted by Clearbrook Group PLC, as part of a previous planning application, demonstrated a need for private sector retirement housing.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19832 - Clearbrook Group Plc [2930]	Comment	Dunton Hills Garden Village is intended to be a new settlement. As such, focussing C2 development there - and failing to provide a greater amount within existing settlements - will potentially deprive existing residents of the Borough an opportunity to continue living within their home town and community, in the event they require extra care accommodation. The Local Plan should seek to ensure a proportionate provision of C2 facilities and retirement accommodation for the Borough's various settlements	Noted	Consider accordingly
19625 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975]	Object	Objects to Paragraphs 73 and 74 and its table as it provides no plots for travelling showpeople. The Council should be allocating provision for travelling showpeople in Brentwood to accommodate the need arising in neighbouring Thurrock, which cannot be accommodated within Thurrock, given a suitable site exists (our client's site at Chequers Road). We assessed in detail why it is suitable site for a Showpeople's Yard in our March 2016 Representations.	Noted	Consider in light of county-wide evidence work

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19624 - Mr Joseph Manning [5975]	Object	Paragraphs 46-49: Objects to the references in Paragraphs 46-49 on the basis that it makes no reference to a provision of show people's plots in accordance with Government guidance (Planning Policy for Travellers). Reference is made to the Brentwood Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) (October 2017), which identified that there were no travelling showpeople living or located within Brentwood at the present time and so there was no current or future need for additional plots. However, this does not necessarily reflect the situation regarding neighbouring authorities, where a shortfall in provision exists (in this case Thurrock District)	Noted	Consider accordingly
18256 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629]	Object	The Promoters of DHGV fully support the need to provide a variety of house types including those suitable for specialist elderly persons accommodation. The precise nature of elderly persons accommodation requires further assessment before inclusion of references in policy to a prescriptive form of accommodation. See additional documents and reference under Specialist Accommodation Needs.	Noted	Consider accordingly

Fig. 12. Senior Citizen Housing in Brentwood Borough

18490 - Mrs. Carol Knill [7160]	Comment	I would like to stress one particular point, in that, there are a great many people of pensionable age who would like to move from their own homes to retirement living and there are simply not enough builds of this sort in the Brentwood area to allow it. This sort of accommodation should be high on your list of new housing.	Noted	The Council is working to identify the need for this accommodation and will reflect this in the Draft Local Plan
18297 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Comment	As the masterplan for the redevelopment of the West Horndon site has developed, the provision of specialist housing for Senior Citizens has not formed part of the discussions with residents, the Parish Council or officers, so seeing this as a commitment in the draft local plan is premature. However, Hermes would welcome discussions in future, so the implications can be understood prior to making a commitment in the local plan.	Noted	The Council welcomes further discussion on this issue

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18361 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Figure 12 - It would appear that most of the areas identified for Registered Care are reasonably well located in terms of access to bus services, which is positive. Similar attention to detail should be employed when considering the locating of affordable homes, which are another group that proportionally tend to rely more heavily on bus services.	Noted	Consider accordingly, in light of the evidence base on need
<i>Settlement Hierarchy and Accommodating Growth</i>				
18822 - Donaldson Mhairi [7217]	Object	A 28% increase in the population of Blackmore under such circumstances seems unreasonable. Villages of a similar size in the Brentwood area, including Herongate, Ingrave and Mountessing, have no planned development.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18587 - Lewis Campbell [4597]	Object	Object. Greenbelt & wildlife should be protected - Brown field used first. Greenbelt should never be built on for monetary gain for developers.	Noted. The Council are required to meet their housing need and there are insufficient previously developed sites to meet this need. Therefore sites in the green Belt are being considered	Consider accordingly
19606 - Mr Jon Nicholls [5202]	Object	Whilst we support the classification of Ingave as a "Category 3 - Large Village", we object to the inconsistent treatment of this settlement in comparison to other settlements occupying the same level in the hierarchy. This is not consistent with paragraphs 55 and 80 of the NPPF (current consultation version). Allocation of additional land for housing at Ingrave would not only meet local, settlement specific housing needs to address localised affordability issues but also retain the working age population in the village to ensure the viability and vitality of local shops and services	Noted	Consider accordingly
18445 - mr james monk [4553]	Object	Amount of housing outlined in the table starting on page 35 is too high as the existing infrastructure (ie roads) cannot cope with the proposed increase population.	Noted. Transport impacts are being assessed and mitigation options considered	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19651 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. Nick Davey) [2442]	Support	The proposed settlement hierarchy and, in particular, the classification of Doddinghurst and Kelvedon Hatch as Large Villages / Village Service Centres is supported. The position regarding Dunton Hills and West Thorndon has to be reserved although, it is accepted, that if these sites do come forward, as strategic allocations, then they should be Village Service Centres.	Support noted	Consider accordingly
18304 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Support	Hermes Investment Management support the change of West Horndon's categorisation to a Category 2 service centre	Support noted	Consider accordingly
<i>Fig. 14. Settlement Hierarchy</i>				
19458 - Mrs. Lauren Thompson [7305]	Object	Figure 14 (Settlement Hierarchy) of the current local plan understates the impact as the 95 dwellings under consideration off of Priests Lane is not included, despite being in Shenfield. Therefore, whilst other areas, excluding Dunton Hills and West Horndon, generally are expected to have increase in dwellings around 10-20%, Shenfield is outlined to have an increase in dwellings of just under 50%, from 2,053 to 3,048, once corrected for suggested allocation of 95 dwellings off Priests Lane, Shenfield (044 & 178).	Noted	Consider accordingly
18031 - Mr John Daly [7013]	Object	It is unreleastic to expect the central brentwood area which currents accomdates 28% of the towns residential units to accomadet a further 26%. The existing infrastructure is already at capacity and no consideration has been given to supporting utilities in the area	Noted. Consideration is in evidence in the infrastructure delivery work.	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18020 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Object	The %age measures used in this hierarchy are inappropriate as they do not highlight the impact on each settlement in isolation. In particular, it downplays the effect on smaller settlements by not properly highlighting the very significant changes which would result from the proposed developments, compared to their existing size. For example, the reported increase in Blackmore's %age of Total Dwellings from 1.05% to 1.13% sounds insignificant when presented in this manner and fails to highlight what actually represents a 28.6% increase in the proposed number of dwellings in that settlement.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18306 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Support	Hermes Investment Management supports Figure 14 as it relates to West Horndon. The revised capacity of the estate is shown as 580 dwellings. Whilst this is probably closer to the capacity of the combined sites than the previous figure (500), Hermes considers that the plan would be improved by making it clear that this figure represents as desired minimum number of new dwellings the Council would like to see the site yield.	Support welcomed. Site numbers are likely to be indicative and this will be made clear in the draft local plan regulation 19 version. Applications with considerably different proposed numbers will require strong justification as it will directly impact on the local plan and the assessment work already carried out.	Note
19658 - Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr. Mike Taylor) [2703]	Support	Barwood Land and Estates (BLEL) support the proposed Settlement Hierarchy set out in Figure 14. In particular, BLEL supports the proposed allocation of Land at Honeypot Lane, Brentwood as a housing site allocation. The proposed settlement hierarchy represents the current pattern of activity and forms a realistic approach to guiding future sustainable development patterns of activity and land use in the Borough. The hierarchy clearly and appropriately identifies Brentwood, Shenfield, Hutton, Warley, Brook Street and Pilgrims Hatch as 'Category 1 - Main Towns'.	Support noted	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Primary Schools</i>				
19066 - Helen Jackman [745]	Comment	Primary school predictions are already out of date as it has been acknowledged that Holly trees primary school cannot grow and that Warley primary school will need to grow to 420 pupils to account for the shortfall. I also understood that there was a need to build another primary school within the town in order to accommodate the growing and potential pupil numbers but I can find no site allocation for such a school with its requisite recreation grounds and fields.	Noted	Options for capacity building are being discussed with Essex County Council as part of the ongoing work on the IDP (Infrastructure Delivery Plan).
18287 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Comments made regarding current and future primary provision within the borough	Noted	The Council will consider the primary school provision comments from Essex County Council in line with duty to cooperate discussions
18308 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Comment	The plan's reference to Figure 15 is acknowledged and Hermes would welcome an opportunity to help develop a better understanding if the requirement for primary school places arising from the redevelopment proposals for West Horndon.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18263 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629]	Comment	INCOMPLETE - NEEDS ADDING	This representation is incomplete and has no attached documents.	No further action
18446 - mr james monk [4553] 19321 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215] 19333 - Mr & Mrs John and Marian Long [7289] 19402 - Mrs N. Jervis [1351] 19514 - Paula Masters [7315] 19677 - ESFA (Dr Douglas McNab) [6718] 21229 - Cllr Roger Keeble [1990]	Object	The formula for calculating the number of school places does not seem to reflect the current situation. Therefore concerned that there will not be sufficient school places given the proposed number of dwellings.	Calculation of capacity and future need will be made inline with Essex County Council requirements	Consider accordingly
Fig. 15. Primary School Capacity				
18314 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Comment	The RAG coding is not explained in the text of the document and we consider that it should be in order to understand the significance of the assessment.	Support welcomed	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19619 - Redrow Homes (Sarah Kirk) [6670]	Comment	The RAG coding is not explained in the text of the document and we consider that it should be in order to understand the significance of the assessment.	The colours used are to aid identification of those schools currently over capacity, near capacity and under capacity.	Clarification to be made in IDP / local plan
18309 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Comment	The plan's reference to Figure 15 is acknowledged and Hermes would welcome an opportunity to help develop a better understanding if the requirement for primary school places arising from the redevelopment proposals for West Horndon.	Noted	Considered accordingly
<i>Secondary Schools</i>				
18318 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Comment	Hermes would welcome discussions with the Council regarding paragraph 92 and the requirement for secondary places generated by the redevelopment of West Horndon Industrial Estate	Noted	Consider accordingly
18289 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Discussion and comment on school provision, current and future capacity	Noted	Discussion under the duty to cooperate is on-going
18068 - mrs zoe chambers [5634]	Object	Secondary school allocation has always been a huge concern for our area of Basildon. This Dunton development, if it proceeds, requires a secondary school to serve for the local community.	Noted	Consideration under duty to cooperate with Essex County Council
18016 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18143 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]	Object	The Dunton Hills Garden Village development proposal is unsound with regard to secondary school provision. It's clear that the development at Dunton Hills and West Horndon will not support a secondary school in the eyes of Essex Council who also refuse to take into account the lack of a secondary school in West Basildon. By contrast there is spare capacity at schools around Brentwood Town. This is another reason why the Garden Village proposal is in the wrong place.	Noted	Consider accordingly within the context of duty to cooperate discussions with Essex County Council
<i>Special Education Needs</i>				
18290 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Special educational needs, need to be considered, inline with Education Contribution Guidelines Supplement (July 2010)	Noted	Under duty to cooperate ongoing discussions and assessment will be progressed

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22173 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587]	Support	Support is given to the need to Special Education Needs and in particular the ability to ease the considerable physical capacity constraints of the Endeavour School, and the aspiration to provide a 6th form function. Support will be given by the landowner of Site Ref: 044 to the Council and the Endeavour School to masterplan the proposed housing site at Priest Lane to incorporate land set aside for use by the Endeavour School.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<hr/>				
<i>Healthcare - General Practice</i>				
18291 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Following its response to the 2016 consultation, ECC continues to seek further clarification on a number of issues in relation to the proposed spatial strategy including: identification of any cross border implications of the spatial strategy given its public health responsibilities	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.
18970 - Mr Michael Plock [7239]	Comment	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.	Noted	The Council will work with the Community Healthcare Partnership bring forward further detail within the Infrastructure Development Plan

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20091 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20092 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20093 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20094 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20095 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20096 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20097 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20098 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20099 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20100 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20103 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20104 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20105 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20106 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20107 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20108 - Community Health	Comment	<p>Health and care services and the way they are organised both from a commissioner and provider perspective will change over the lifespan of this plan. It is therefore practical at this stage to describe the additional demand that the population growth will require into the different traditional sectors that we currently have and recognise . To include such as GP services, hospitals, community healthcare providers and social care . However, a range of constraints means that this current model cannot be sustained and will transition over the lifespan of this IDP. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 has radically changed the way in which health care services are planned and organised. These are primarily provided by the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) The CCG is responsible for planning and buying ('commissioning') local health care services. Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STPs) are being prepared for wider areas that incorporate several CCG areas. Draft STP's were, published in October 2016, summarising the work to date and outlining how system-wide plans can be delivered across organisations. This is an iterative document and will be reviewed periodically. The complexity and level of demand will mean that for health and care services to meet those needs ,a much more integrated approach will need to be taken with blurring of the lines between different sectors within health and those across health and social care, and between physical and mental health. This will include those agencies who manage the wider determinants of health including housing, employment and environment. New models of care for our communities over the lifespan of the IDP, combined with technological advances will lead to more effectively integrated and technologically advanced models of care for local population.GP Needs: Generally the NHS policy locally is to attempt to accommodate growth wherever possible within the current premises envelope, and only to seek new premises where this is demonstrably necessary. It is not possible to accurately determine the build cost or size of new health facilities at this stage. This will depend on a large number of complex and inter-related factors that can only be resolved at a more advanced stage in the planning process. It will not be the case that each new</p>	Noted	The Council will continue discussions with the Community Health Partnerships regarding site specific issues.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20111 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20112 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20114 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019] 20115 - Community Health Partnerships (NHS) (Ms Clare Cable) [7019]		health facility would be a fixed size or would have a fixed range of services.		
18092 - Mr David Maplesden [6826] 18322 - Hermes Investment Management [7124] 18323 - Hermes Investment Management [7124] 18747 - Ms Lise Spicer [7210] 18936 - Natalie Miller [6963] 19322 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215] 19332 - Mr & Mrs John and Marian Long [7289] 19401 - Mrs N. Jervis [1351] 19611 - Mr Robert Morris [4552] 20216 - Maureen Clark [7755] 21230 - Cllr Roger Keeble [1990] 22115 - Corrinne Bartell [8035]	Object	Strong concern that hospitals not discussed; GP demand outstrips availability; no information on provision, more detail needed; Deal Tree Centre is over capacity; needs to be addressed before plan is adopted; the figures are too vague and don't add up; with all the NHS structure changes and closure of facilities like Orsett hospital how will this work?; some GPs have a 7 week wait for appointments	Noted	Consider more detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
<i>Fig. 17. GP Practices in Brentwood Borough</i>				
18137 - MR Graham Clegg [5485]	Comment	What strikes me as noteworthy is the number of GP practices which are already operating at ratio levels below the national average for GPs & nurses. This speaks as to the strain which the borough's existing infrastructure is already under and the low starting-point for future expansions.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18325 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Support	Paragraph 104's reference to larger premises for a surgery is supported. Hermes Investment Management intends to provide space suitable for health facilities as part of the master plan	Support noted	No further action

Fig. 17. GP Practices in Brentwood Borough

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Economic Prosperity</i>				
18923 - Mr Kevin Sherlock [7230]	Comment	Consider the closure of the High Street on Sundays and a Sunday Market. Would attract visitors and retail stores would benefit from increased footfall. Care is needed to allocate stalls. Food of all types works well as would arts and craft as well as plant and specialist in various trades. We need the injection of this type to revitalise the high street.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18801 - Gita Mackintosh [7214]	Comment	There is also reference in the documentation of the local plans for entertainment. If this is to be considered we need to strike the balance with making it for all to enjoy, without creating additional issues such as crime and rubbish.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19967 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965]	Comment	Basildon Borough Council is generally supportive of the approach Brentwood has taken, in identifying its employment land and job requirements, as informed by the Brentwood Economic Futures 2013-2033. Whilst it appears that at a highlevel, the level of employment land allocations is broadly sufficient to ensure that the Council meets its overall forecast employment land needs, which is supported, Basildon does not unconditionally support the proposed location of new employment within the DHGV. further evidence to justify the planning rationale for the proposed DHGV's employment location is urgently required to avoid it negatively affecting the soundness of the Local Plan.	Noted	Consideration of options has been on-going and is also considered within the Sustainability Appraisal and updates. Work on duty to cooperate is ongoing with South Essex Councils
19956 - Rochford District Council (Daniel Goodman) [7964]	Comment	Rochford District Council raises no objection to Brentwood's approach to economic development and growth but would highlight the need to carefully consider the impact of the planned growth on neighbouring authorities and the strategic highway network. Again, the Council would support further exploration of the mitigation and improvement measures needed to make such growth sustainable.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19323 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]	Comment	Many local businesses have struggled to survive in a high rent and rates environment. Vacant sites at the Baytree Centre bear this out, along with the proliferation of food outlets in Brentwood and Shenfield High Streets. As for travel to London, the current cost of a train season ticket from Shenfield is £3000. If the commuter wishes to go on from Liverpool Street to central London, the cost rises to £4000 plus parking. Who exactly will be able to afford to live in Brentwood, commute to London and pay a mortgage for an affordable house in the borough.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19590 - Threadneedle UK Property Authorised Investment Fund [7336]	Comment	There is a need for a dedicated retail policy setting out the amount of retail floorspace to be provided during the plan period and identification as to where this will be located. It is also important to recognise that new jobs can be created through providing additional retail floorspace, as well bringing vacant floorspace back into use. The Baytree Centre needs to be considered against an updated HELAA and accounted for within the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Draft Proposed Submission Plan (Regulation 19).	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19667 - Childerditch Properties [2642] 19803 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]	Support	Economic Aims A2 and A4 are supported. Strategic Priorities P1 and P6 are also strongly supported. The Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) approach is supported in general. The Brentwood Economic Futures (2013-2033) Final Report, that forms part of the evidence base for the draft local plan we note the report provides indicative job capacity figures. We welcome the opportunity to work with the Council as the plan emerges to further develop the masterplan for the Brentwood Enterprise Park, the mix of uses and indicative job numbers on that basis. Childerditch Industrial Park has a unique employment offer. The allocation of additional land adjacent to the existing Park provides the opportunity to build on the success of the Park, by creating additional employment opportunities with a range of businesses. The proposed allocations will also enable the upgrading of the existing units on site through increased investment. The accompanying proposed masterplan prepared by CMP Architects sets out how the redevelopment of the Park may come forward through a series of phased developments. The Brentwood Economic Futures (2013-2033) has not taken into account that the existing Park can be redeveloped.	Noted	Consider accordingly

Fig. 19. Economic Forecast Scenarios

18032 - Mr John Daly [7013]	Object	The growth predictions fail to consider the consequence of Fords closure and its impact on the lost local support businesses in the Brentwood and local area ,	Noted	Consider accordingly
-----------------------------	--------	--	-------	----------------------

Employment Land Requirements

18138 - MR Graham Clegg [5485]	Comment	Para 118 refers to the current loss of employment space. I have a concern that the current loss of urban office space is having a negative effect on the nature of the town centre, which is not easy to staunch.	Concern noted	Consider accordingly
--------------------------------	---------	---	---------------	----------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19780 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Comment	Should the proposed housing needs within the plan period increase we consider it is important that employment needs are further increased to accord with this. Importantly employment land and job requirements should be treated as net additional requirements.	Noted	Consider approach accordingly
18834 - Mr Dennis Cox [7218]	Object	The plan for business premises is of concern. The problem in this area are that the requirements for business premises are not met by the current stock of properties available. As a small office style business which needs to be near to transport links the absence of suitable accommodation has caused us to relocate to South Quays. There appears to be a view that our of area business sites are the most useful. They are not for the current type of micro and SME that is being created.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19638 - Ford Motor Company [3768]	Object	Paragraph 116, 117, 124, 125 and Figure 21: Paragraph 117 makes reference to the Site at Ford Offices, Eagle Way coming forward through the HELAA process as being suitable for residential development. Conversely, it also states that 2ha in Warley has been set aside for retained employment uses". Whilst it is not clear within the BBC PSA whether this relates to the Ford Site explicitly, no further explanation/evidence is provided and no other proposed sites in Warley include employment uses. Ford request BBC sufficiently evidence this requirement before the next stage of the new Local Plan is progressed.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18328 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Support	Support West Horndon Industrial sites proposal	Support noted	No further action
19974 - Chelmsford City Council (Claire Stuckey) [4541]	Support	CCC supports the increase in employment land allocations to meet Brentwood Borough Council's overall forecasted employments needs.	Support noted	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Fig. 21. Employment Land Need</i>				
18277 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629]	Comment	We largely support the Council's assessment of employment land need although further assessment is required through the IDP in relation to employment typologies which appear to be largely traditional in nature. The allocation of a new garden village affords an opportunity to be more innovative in the identification of employment land need and supply.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19639 - Ford Motor Company [3768]	Object	Figure 21 outlines a forecast employment land requirement of between 33.76ha to 45.96ha. Paragraph 124 continues to state that in total, a potential new employment land requirement of c.47.39ha (excluding the Ford Site) - resulting in a surplus of +1.43ha. As such, with the new employment allocations alone, BBC have a sufficient supply of employment land to meets its overall forecast needs over the plan Period. Therefore, Ford challenges the retention of any level of employment use at Sites 117A and 117B. Ford objects to the inclusion of employment uses within the draft allocation for the Site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<i>Employment Site Allocations</i>				
19711 - Simons Developments Limited [5643]	Comment	The local planning authority has missed an opportunity to incorporate greater flexibility at this early stage of the plan making process. The employment land requirement falls between 33.76-45.96 hectares and the proposed allocation is 47.39 hectares. That's a surplus of +12.63 hectares against the lower requirement - therefore there is clear scope for flexibility and a wider mix of uses on the proposed allocation . It is understood that the local planning authority is in the process of updating its evidence base regarding retail planning matters and we would welcome the opportunity to underpin further retail floorspace in Ingatestone.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18737 - Dawn Ingle [1496]	Comment	When existing and new sites are being evaluated for the creation of more jobs in the Borough, both public transport links and the need for sufficient parking need to be very carefully considered.	Agreed	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20011 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	It is unclear why the employment sites at Brentwood Enterprise Park (site ref 101A), Land South of East Horndon Farm (ref 187) and Dunton Hills Garden Village are proposed. 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 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, edge of settlement expansion and mixed use schemes.	Noted	Consideration of options has been on-going and is considered within the Sustainability Appraisal and updates. Work on duty to cooperate is ongoing with Thurrock County Council, South Essex boroughs and London boroughs.
18303 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18367 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Need to consider on going need-supply and economic impact. Please continue discussions with County Council	Noted	Discussion regarding employment within the borough will continue with the County Council
18835 - Mr Dennis Cox [7218]	Object	Concerned about the road links and car parking as a consequence of these plans. I would urge the development first of a major multi story car park at Brentwood before the other projects run. At present it is difficult to park and any change to the level of car parking to residents is likely to have a negative impact on the High Street and surrounding areas.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18270 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629]	Object	Further assessment is required to understand the opportunities which a new garden village could offer in the way of providing flexible and innovative employment space. Subject to this further assessment, the 5.5ha area suggested in the Plan and in the IDP for a mix of B1, B2 and B8 uses might not be the most appropriate provision of employment generating space.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18331 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Support	Hermes Investment Management support the new employment allocation on land at East Horndon Hall (187).	Support noted	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Fig. 22. New Employment Site Allocations</i>				
18713 - Mr Darren Williams [5311]	Comment	The largest proportion of new employment areas are extensions onto green belt land - again along the A127 corridor, further burdening the already gridlocked roadways. The A127 is already experiencing pollution levels above EU allowable levels. The erosion of Greenbelt along the A127 means that there is almost no division from the urban sprawl of London and Brentwood / Basildon meaning that there will no longer be any green belt	Noted	Consider accordingly
18033 - Mr John Daly [7013]	Object	There are no near town allocations so all will have significant transport issues with regard to access and congestion . The loss of so much in town office space to permitted development will remove the work week use of the retail offering further driving down the desire of retailers to be in the town at all.	Noted	Consider accordingl
18334 - Hermes Investment Management [7124] 18336 - Hermes Investment Management [7124]	Support	Hermes Investment Management support the new employment allocation on land at East Horndon Hall (187).	Support noted	No further action
<i>Fig. 23. Employment Land Need and Supply</i>				
19779 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Support	Economic Aims A2 and A4 are supported. Strategic Priorities P1 and P6 are also strongly supported. The use of Economic forecast is supported and forms the most robust level of growth to ensure that employment needs are met within the forthcoming plan period.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>Part Two: Preferred Site Allocations</i>				
<i>041 Land at Hunter House, Brentwood, Brentwood</i>				
19919 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	Site is close to conservation area and historic assets and setting should be considered.	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.	Consider accordingly
18338 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	be aware of historic assets within/adjoining this site.	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.	Consider accordingly
20083 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.	The Council will continue to work with Thames Water to ensure sufficient treatment capacity. The Council is updating the Water Cycle Study to	Continue working together.
18345 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	This occupy important town centre locations and will need to be considered holistically as opposed to in isolation from each other.	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.	Consider accordingly
17888 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17957 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944] 18034 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18159 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] 19509 - Mr. Richard J Baker [2862]	Object	Objection to this proposed site. Details are considered in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.	The Council will consider the site assessment in light of the comments received.	Consideration of comments
17857 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199]	Support	Ensure high level environmental homes on this site.	The Council will consider the site assessment in light of the comments received.	Consider viability of improved environmental standards when drafting policies.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>311 Eagle and Child Pub, Shenfield</i>				
21948 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001]	Comment	This pub occupies a large site but in itself is not an attractive pub. There is another historic one nearby and too numerous food and alcohol outlets in the Shenfield Broadway area.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17929 - Ms elizabeth rouse [6892] 17945 - Mrs Susan Griffin [6927] 18035 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18160 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18963 - Mr. Gary Moody [7238] 19008 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19009 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19010 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19011 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19460 - Mrs. Lauren Thompson [7305] 19878 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Object	The Eagle & Child public house is a valued local amenity which includes a successful restaurant. The impact on the environment of more housing in that busy area will be phenomenal. Schools? Doctors? Traffic? Density too high. No more houses in Shenfield. Building on this site would mean loss of business and employment in the area. The building is of has some historical influences. The local infrastructure and services (roads, parking, public transport, schools, healthcare facilities, etc) are already at capacity. The sites within Shenfield should not be built on. Some of the area can be considered wetlands. The A12 is at capacity and development should be focused around the A127, as the road is quieter and has more capacity. Removal of open green space will have a negative impact on the communities health.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19197 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 19860 - Savills UK (Danniella	Support	The emerging allocation seeks the delivery of 20 dwellings on the site within the first five years of the Plan. Welcome the additional consultation and site allocation and in particular support for the proposed allocation of the site for residential development. The draft allocation seeks the delivery of 20 dwellings on the site. Proposals for the redevelopment of the site and considers that the delivery of 20 dwellings on the site is achievable through the provision of new residential buildings rising to a maximum of four storeys. Support new homes in the north of the borough	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>040 Chatham Way / Crown Street Car Park, Brentwood</i>				
18364 - Peter Mayo [613]	Comment	Car parking must be properly considered in all residential developments and Essex County Council's Parking Standards: Design and good practice document must be seen as a minimum standard. Failure to adhere to these standards has already led to the downgrading of the quality of public space in the centre of Brentwood.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
20082 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
19920 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	This site lies within the Brentwood Town Centre Conservation Area and next to the Grade II listed Gardeners Arms Inn. We are pleased to see that the site pro-forma identifies the presence of the conservation area however the presence of the adjacent Grade II listed building is not. Development of this site will need to conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance these heritage assets and their setting. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
17858 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199] 17859 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199]	Comment	We have to preserve car parking space so we can support local businesses. We have to build more homes - but with clever thinking we can combine the two. I want more affordable homes for key workers in Brentwood. zedpods which have zero energy bills and can generate an electric charging point in usable car parking space below is the answer. see www.zedfactory.com . Planers be bold and think outside the box. Brentwood could be an exciting new residential town with modern architecture.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18339 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18342 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Historic Environment Comment -these all form car parks within the historic town centre. Consideration will need to be given to alternative car parking provision and the potential for the loss of these car parking area to create either large areas of on-street parking or to discourage people from using the town centre. The former has the potential to unduly impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, whilst the latter has the potential to harm the viability of listed buildings in commercial use, need to consider archaeology	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
21949 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001]	Comment	With an increased population envisaged and the demand for parking the redevelopment of these sites and elsewhere must be planned with these factors given priority.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
18535 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756]	Comment	It is not clear what level of town centre parking will be retained on the proposed sites. The loss of town centre car parking spaces could undermine the health of the town centre. Adequate car parking should be retained within the town centre to ensure the town centre remains attractive. The document should set out clearly how much available car parking will be provided as part of the redevelopment of these sites.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
17876 - Mr Aiden Parker [6844]	Object	As a house owner backing on to this proposed site I am extremely concerned that we will be overlooked our house is at the bottom of a steep slope our ground level is approximately 2 metres lower than that of Chatham Way/Crown Street car park. So I believe this will interfere with our quality of life. We have young children and the angle of sight people will be able to look straight down into there bedrooms. Plus the car park is always full so is obviously needed.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17889 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17919 - Mr Peter Hawkins [6909] 17930 - Ms elizabeth rouse [6892] 17958 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944] 17975 - Mrs Lindsey Wyman [6950] 17980 - Mary Morris [1585] 17989 - Daniel Lucas [6973] 18000 - Mr Phillip Burden [6957] 18005 - Mr and Mrs Colin and Linda Matthew [749] 18036 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18090 - Mr David Maplesden [6826] 18120 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18139 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] 18155 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] 18161 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18200 - Mr Richard Wright [1644] 18204 - Mr David Marchant [7090] 18205 - Mr David Marchant [7090] 18379 - Mr Andrew Cook [6840] 18384 - Miss Abbey Roundacre [6914] 18416 - Mr. & Mrs. T Llewellyn [7142] 18528 - Mrs Anna-Marie Wingrove [7093] 18537 - Anne Searle [7174] 18608 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871] 18690 - Mr Jonathan Purr [7194] 18754 - Ms Jane Goodbody [7211] 18794 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 19377 - Mr Julian How [6989] 19388 - Mrs Toni Rudgley [7088]	Object	Need parking; too many homes; need to retain the parking; will detrimentally impact on High Street; the impact on traffic, local services, disruption and reduction of car parking for the town shops would be catastrophic. It would pretty much kill off trade and visitors and be the nail in the coffin for the end of Brentwood high street. Is the proposed parking for new residents or visitors. Loss of parking income too;; will increase congestion; will change character and feel of the area detrimentally; need more parking; need to confirm the access point; Concerns surrounding traffic, parking, noise pollution and aesthetic.	Noted	Consider accordingly within policy development and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
039 Westbury Road Car Park, Westbury Road, Brentwood				
18344 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18533 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756]	Comment	It is not clear what level of town centre parking will be retained on the proposed sites. The loss of town centre car parking spaces could undermine the health of the town centre. Adequate car parking should be retained within the town centre to ensure the town centre remains attractive. The document should set out clearly how much available car parking will be provided as part of the redevelopment of these sites. Although none of these are objectionable in principle, they occupy important town centre locations and will need to be considered holistically as opposed to in isolation from each other	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
21950 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001]	Comment	With an increased population envisaged and the demand for parking the redevelopment of these sites and elsewhere must be planned with these factors given priority	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
18340 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	These all form car parks within the historic town centre. Consideration will need to be given to alternative car parking provision and the potential for the loss of these car parking area to create either large areas of on-street parking or to discourage people from using the town centre. The former has the potential to unduly impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, whilst the latter has the potential to harm the viability of listed buildings in commercial use. Although none of these are objectionable in principle, they occupy important town centre locations and will need to be considered holistically as opposed to in isolation from each other	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
20081 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.	Noted	Consider within the development of planning policy and the town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19921 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	This site lies immediately adjacent to the Town Centre Conservation Area and the Grade II listed building. We are pleased to see that both of these heritage assets have been identified. Development of this site will need to conserve and enhance these heritage assets and their setting. Careful consideration should be given to the height and scale. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
18337 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Note Archaeological potential for the historic core of Brentwood; form car parks within the historic town centre. Consideration will need to be given to alternative car parking provision and the potential for the loss of these car parking area to create either large areas of on-street parking or to discourage people from using the town centre. The former has the potential to unduly impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, whilst the latter has the potential to harm the viability of listed buildings in commercial use	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
17890 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17920 - Mr Peter Hawkins [6909] 17976 - Mrs Lindsey Wyman [6950] 17988 - MR andrew carroll [6971] 18037 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18140 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] 18156 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] 18162 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18201 - Mr Richard Wright [1644] 18380 - Mr Andrew Cook [6840] 18385 - Miss Abbey Roundacre [6914] 18609 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871] 18753 - Ms Jane Goodbody [7211] 19272 - Mr and Mrs T Smith [5958] 19389 - Mrs Toni Rudgley [7088]	Object	Need parking; too many homes; need to retain the parking; will detrimentally impact on High Street; the impact on traffic, local services, disruption and reduction of car parking for the town shops would be catastrophic. It would pretty much kill off trade and visitors and be the nail in the coffin for the end of Brentwood high street. Is the proposed parking for new residents or visitors. Where is the promised cinema? Loss of parking income too;; will increase congestion; will change character and feel of the area detrimentally; need more parking not less; need to consider impact on GPs, schools, etc; why isn't there more detail in the Local Plan about size, scale design of the development.; should quantify the impact of Crossrail first; people will use out of town instead and the high street will die.	Noted	Consider within the policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>186 Land at Crescent Drive, Shenfield</i>				
17860 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199] 17861 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199]	Comment	If this is nhs land then make housing affordable for nurses and key workers as promised by the Health Secretary. We don't need Brentwood to be a commuter dormitory highly priced and out of reach of the people who keep our essential services running (fire fighters, police etc) Work to build a community village and have preferential allocation for local people. Zedfactory built the first eco village in the UK. They offer to build ALL affordable homes, not just a select (small number) as ordinary developers and are working with local FE colleges top get young apprentices building these. We could have another eco village with people being lifted out of fuel poverty, cleaner air and highly desirable homes for local families for social rent or sale. Off site construction (based in Essex on a college site) could engage young construction workers. We could have these homes all built out in less than a year using innovative partnerships. Please ensure a heart - a community centre with advice and help,with meals for the poor and elderly and a multi faith centre for those needing emotional support. How about a visiting gp? www.zedfactory.com for world class design	Noted	Consider accordingly
17868 - Mr John Darragh [4862] 17869 - Mr John Darragh [4862] 19034 - Mr Stephen Benton [7246] 19545 - Mr Michael Wand [7041]	Comment	Major group of residents in Brentwood are couples whose children have left home but are stuck in large family homes as there are few bungalows remaining in the borough. This would be a good location for two bedroom bungalows (with constraint of their conversion to houses) due to proximity to local services.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18542 - Mr. & Mrs. R. Dawson [7175]	Comment	Flood is already a problem in this area. Essex County Council is aware of the situation. Not opposed to the allocation of this site for redevelopment in itself. Wanted to highlight the current flood issues so that they can be considered.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17943 - Mr Steven Hayter [6918]	Comment	There is a wooded area in the south west part of plot 186, which is contiguous with Glanths Woods (as known locally), which are used for recreational purposes and contains a footpath between Glanths Road and Crescent Drive. The woods are home to wildlife and is a 'green lung' for the area. Could you confirm whether the Council plans to preserve a high percentage of trees on site 186 and respect the identity and character of the adjacent woods and prevent further encroachment?	Noted	Consider accordingly
17891 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901]	Comment	Flood risk is a concern but a small amount of dwellings per development area when compared to other sites.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19880 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Object	Site 186 was not shown as a brownfield site with potential in the 2011 SHLAA. The details for site 186 note that it was formerly used by the National Blood Service.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18038 - Mr John Daly [7013]	Object	Housing density of 35 per ha why so low when Brentwood town centre is targeted for between 90 and 228?	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17959 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944] 17999 - Mrs Nicola McDermott [6984] 18028 - Mr A Benning [7012] 18341 - Mr Peter Crutchett [7132] 18964 - Mr. Gary Moody [7238] 19004 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19005 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19006 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19007 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19033 - Mr Stephen Benton [7246] 19082 - Miss Dale Rutherford [5912] 19274 - Mr and Mrs T Smith [5958] 19459 - Mrs. Lauren Thompson [7305] 19529 - Mr. & Mrs. R. Dawson [7175] 19533 - Mrs Nicola McDermott [6984] 19541 - Mr. Michael Rutherford [7323] 22125 - Mr. & Mrs. R. Dawson [7175]	Object	Too many homes proposed; flooding an issue here; improve flood controls first; congestion already a problem and traffic safety due to access to hospital; The local infrastructure and services (roads, parking, public transport, schools, healthcare facilities, etc) are already at capacity. The sites within Shenfield should not be built on. Some of the area can be considered wetlands. The A12 is at capacity and development should be focused around the A127, as the road is quieter and has more capacity. Removal of open green space will have a negative impact on the communities health; Bus and rail not enough to sustain this site; detrimental on existing community; need more detail; must consult County Council about flooding	Noted	Consider accordingly
18163 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 19196 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 19593 - Mr. Angus Martin [7342]	Support	The site is brownfield land and in a sustainable location within the urban area. HE envisage construction of the site completed within 3 years and support the allocation's reference to 1-5 year delivery timeframe. Depending on the construction approach to site reprofiling/ levelling, there could be the opportunity for more than 55 units on the site. It is suggested that, as part of the Site Allocations/ Local Plan process, the Green Belt boundary is redrawn to exclude the Green Belt from the site following the boundary shown on the allocations plan. Must consider the impact on woodlands/trees in the area.	Support noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>003 Wates Way Industrial Estate, Ongar Road, Brentwood</i>				
20222 - Mrs Patricia Veal [7995]	Comment	This was at one time considered as the site for an alternative supermarket, which I think is badly needed for healthy competition in the town.	Noted	Housing and retail development is proposed and this is reflected in the site policy.
18335 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Historic Environment Comment - Opportunity: Former Iron Works site could provide opportunity for promoting the history of this former industrial production	Noted	Consider accordingly within the limitations of the site
20075 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.	Noted	The Council will continue to work with utility providers regarding their service provision
18164 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]	Object	This would effect small businesses currently operating within this industrial estate and would force possible closure. Understand some of the units are vacant so encouragement to engage new businesses would support the council's employment objective. Industrial estates should be protected and encourage businesses to flourish rather than close them down.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17892 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17931 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [6892] 17960 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944] 18039 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18531 - Mrs Anna-Marie Wingrove [7093] 18865 - Mr & Mrs Dennis & Diane Rensch [5989]	Object	This site was supposed to be an Aldi can the area support a development of 80 units per ha? The current road infrastructure is not sufficient to be able to cope with the proposed volume of new homes. Delays and bottle necks will be inevitable, worst so than at present. Huge investment would need to be applied to our road network if any proposals were to proceed. Object to the town centre car parks being built on. Will have a negative impact on the town centre. These site suggestions are not acceptable and will simply cause chaos and add further commute	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>081 Council Depot, The Drive Warley</i>				
19866 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	There are no allocations directly within or adjacent to SSSIs but the following allocations are within Natural England Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for residential and/or rural residential development: 81, 117A, 117B, 112A, 112D, 112E, 194, 075B. This means that we would like to be consulted further to ensure that any impacts have been taken into account and mitigation provided if required. It does not mean that we have an outright objection to these allocations.	Noted	Consideration of the impact on wildlife and the woodlands will be required
20086 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18313 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways: Development on this site will need to be viewed from a holistic perspective to ensure that it contributes to a pool of funding to provide an enhanced level of bus service to serve the 473 homes planned. It will also be important to ensure that the design layout of the site facilitates sustainable access, ideally with bus gates or other interventions designed to maximise such access whilst giving these modes a journey time advantage.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18601 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871]	Object	Plan proposes in excess of 500 homes in the Warley area, (Fords, Council Depot, Pastoral Way). The roads and facilities in this area are under strain now, they would be overwhelmed and unable to cope with such an increase. 500 homes would have at least 1 car each, the expectation that people will use public transport is just rubbish. As a result the traffic, air and noise pollution in the area will rise. Its currently gridlock on The Drive, Warley Hill and Chindits Lane in the morning and evenings	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17877 - Ms Susan Henry [6847] 17932 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [6892] 18121 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18605 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871]	Object	Object due to no parking for Brentwood Imperial Youth Band; New residents will most probably complain at the noise, upsetting our 100+ Brentwood resident youths that attend. I object to moving the facilities at the depot, which include Council offices & the newly installed mixed-recyclables storage container. The cost of relocating would be borne by the Council but the developer would benefit financially. Object to the sheer number of dwellings proposed. This area already has a massive problem with commuters from the Business Park on Warley Hill parking all day in nearby roads. Commuters are currently paying to use this site (carpark behind the depot) so this would mean a loss of income and an increase in the parking problem for all local residents. Impact on roads, schools and GPs is too great.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18658 - Woodland Trust (Mr Jack Taylor) [7189]	Object	Object as likely to cause damage and or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to the boundary. Adjacent to AW on eastern boundary. Type - ARW Name - Barrack Wood aka Harts/Kents Woods. Size - 37.711702 ha. Grid ref - TQ596917	Noted	Consideration of impact on wildlife and woodland will be required
17870 - Mr John Darragh [4862] 17893 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17924 - Mr. D Haynes [2336] 18040 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18165 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 21255 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]	Support	This would be worthwhile developing if Council no longer needs a depot. Otherwise we will need to replace this site with greenfield development - so we should just look at putting housing on this new site. Must consider impact on wildlife in the area. Why only 41 units per ha?	Noted	Consider accordingly
<i>117A & 117B Ford Offices, Eagle Way, Warley, Brentwood</i>				
18320 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways & Transportation Comment: Development on these sites will need to be viewed from a holistic perspective to ensure that they contribute to a pool of funding to provide an enhanced level of bus service to serve the 473 homes planned. It will also be important to ensure that the design layout of the sites facilitates sustainable access, ideally with bus gates or other interventions designed to maximise such access whilst giving these modes a journey time advantage.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17894 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17961 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944]	Comment	Need to consider local wildlife, protected habitats, ancient woodlands; retain the existing Ford building	Noted	Consider accordingly
19640 - Ford Motor Company [3768] 19641 - Ford Motor Company [3768] 19642 - Ford Motor Company [3768] 19643 - Ford Motor Company [3768]	Comment	Support in principle but object to retention of employment uses and provision of specialist care facilities. Site is suitable for residential development. The identified Net Developable Area (4ha) is lower than that originally assessed by Icení (5.39ha) - with no further evidence provided to justify the figures proposed/diversion. Ford therefore encourages the Council to review the developable area proposed within the draft allocation. 350 homes can be accommodated but will require a higher percentage of apartments rather than family homes, and the inclusion of the existing green space fronting Eagle Way. Question the suitability of site in accommodating Specialist Care Facilities, alongside residential. Accordingly, due to the Site's location on the edge of Warley, it does not represent the most suitable and sustainable location for specialist care accommodation, as provision of additional care facilities in the Borough should be located within larger sites with good access to services and facilities and to external spaces. Ford therefore requests that the wording within the draft allocation is amended to read 'up to 350 dwellings' to allow for future master planning and flexibility. Request that the draft allocation is updated to reflect the Site's anticipated availability earlier in the Plan period - notably, 6-10 years versus the 10-15 years currently stated and considers removing the proposed employment use and care facilities as part of the allocation.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20125 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It's important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. We would expect that a holistic drainage strategy will be prepared for site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19867 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	There are no allocations directly within or adjacent to SSSIs but the following allocations are within Natural England Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for residential and/or rural residential development: 81, 117A, 117B, 112A, 112D, 112E, 194, 075B. This means that we would like to be consulted further to ensure that any impacts have been taken into account and mitigation provided if required. It does not mean that we have an outright objection to these allocations.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18330 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Economic Comment: Significant concern about the potential loss of a key local employer (Ford) if site is lost to residential. Brentwood has already lost BNY Mellon, EMOov in the last year.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19922 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	The Grade II listed Blenheim House and Grade II listed Chapel of the Royal Anglian Regiment and Essex Regiment are located to the immediate west of site 117A. We are pleased to see that both of these heritage assets have been identified within the site pro-forma. Development of this site will need to conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance these heritage assets and their setting. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21256 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]	Comment	This would be acceptable if adjacent wildlife sites were irrevocably protected.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18660 - Woodland Trust (Mr Jack Taylor) [7189]	Object	Object as likely to cause damage and or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to the boundary. AW on eastern boundary. Approx. 12m buffer of woodland (non-AW). Type - ARW. Name - Harts/Kents Woods. Size - 37.711702 ha. Grid ref - TQ596917	Noted	Consider accordingly
17871 - Mr John Darragh [4862] 17933 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [6892] 17993 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978] 18041 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18122 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18167 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18600 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871] 18603 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871] 18756 - Ms Jane Goodbody [7211] 18827 - Ms Denise Brien [1832] 18833 - Mr Dennis Cox [7218] 19156 - Mr. & Mrs. ARA & CR Jamieson [7263]	Object	Need to consider local wildlife, protected habitats, ancient woodlands; retain the existing Ford building; don't build here as need the quality jobs this would keep with Ford; has there been an economic impact assessment? Ford will move to Germany especially with Brexit; need local employment; site was a military barracks from 1742 so need to have full archaeological examination; will impact on schools and doctors in the area; density is too high; with houses will need to create an underground car park for businesses and offices in Warley Hill area; retain the employment use here; need better public transport; will impact on GPs; add to areas congestion	Noted	Consider accordingly
<i>002 Brentwood Railway Station Car Park</i>				
20074 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18534 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756]	Comment	It is not clear what level of town centre parking will be retained on the proposed sites. The loss of town centre car parking spaces could undermine the health of the town centre. Adequate car parking should be retained within the town centre to ensure the town centre remains attractive. The document should set out clearly how much available car parking will be provided as part of the redevelopment of these sites.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18307 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways & Transportation Comment - One of the constraints listed is the fact that car parking (station users) will need to be considered as part of redevelopment proposals. Reference should be made to other station users, such as pedestrians, cyclists and those who use public transport to access the site. Development for this site needs to ensure that monies are secured to improve the sustainable transport facilities at the rail station including both layover bays and departure stands.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17863 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199] 17895 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 21951 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001]	Comment	Congestion a problem already; flooding is a concern; with an increased population envisaged and the demand for parking the redevelopment of these sites and elsewhere must be planned with these factors given priority	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17921 - Mr Peter Hawkins [6909] 17926 - Mr. D Haynes [2336] 17973 - Mrs Julia Georgiou [2435] 17977 - Mrs Lindsey Wyman [6950] 17981 - Mary Morris [1585] 18002 - Mr Phillip Burden [6957] 18006 - Mr and Mrs Colin and Linda Matthew [749] 18042 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18091 - Mr David Maplesden [6826] 18141 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] 18158 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] 18166 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18199 - Mr Richard Wright [1644] 18381 - Mr Andrew Cook [6840] 18386 - Miss Abbey Roundacre [6914] 18530 - Mrs Anna-Marie Wingrove [7093] 18538 - Anne Searle [7174] 18607 - Miss Patricia Filtress [6871] 18679 - Mr Jonathan Purr [7194] 18752 - Ms Jane Goodbody [7211] 18789 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 18811 - Mr Nicholas Ashton [4845] 18978 - Mr. Geoff Coppock [7241] 19065 - Helen Jackman [745] 19248 - Steve Abrahall [666] 19271 - Mr and Mrs T Smith [5958] 19378 - Mr Julian How [6989] 19390 - Mrs Toni Rudgley [7088] 19467 - Miss Rebecca Coppock [7118] 19468 - Miss Rebecca Coppock [7118]	Object	Need parking for commuters; too many homes; need to retain the parking; will detrimentally impact on High Street; the impact on traffic, local services, disruption and reduction of car parking for the town shops would be catastrophic. It would pretty much kill off trade and visitors and be the nail in the coffin for the end of Brentwood high street. Is the proposed parking for new residents or visitors. Where is the promised cinema? Loss of parking income too;; will increase congestion; will change character and feel of the area detrimentally; need more parking not less; need to consider impact on GPs, schools, etc; why isn't there more detail in the Local Plan about size, scale design of the development.; should quantify the impact of Crossrail first; people will use out of town instead and the high street will die.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18597 - Transport for London (Mr. Jonathan Woolmer) [3740] 18598 - Transport for London (Mr. Jonathan Woolmer) [3740] 18599 - Transport for London (Mr. Jonathan Woolmer) [3740]	Support	Brentwood railway station car park TfL Commercial Development strongly supports the draft allocation of the site for housing development. The site is a well contained underutilised site with excellent transport accessibility and should therefore be a focus for growth. TfL supports the suggested approach of producing a site specific development brief for the site and would wish to be involved in its preparation. We note that the draft site allocation boundary does not include a section of car park towards the east. The attached plan represents the parcel of land within TfL's ownership for which we are exploring development feasibility, and which measures 1.39ha. Draft allocation indicates capacity of 100 dwellings (104 dwellings per hectare). High level feasibility studies indicate a decked design could allow for a greater density whilst still providing a compatible and neighbourly form of development. Reflecting the town centre location and prevailing form of development, consider that the site could support a higher density than suggested. Density assumptions for William Hunter Way should be applied to this site due to need for commuter and residential parking on site. Higher density would also make development more viable generating funding for additional infrastructure associated with parking uses. 200-250 dwellings would be appropriate.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>102 William Hunter Way car park, Brentwood</i>				
17992 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978] 18142 - MR Graham Clegg [5485] 18818 - Natasha Hart [7216] 20137 - Ms Elaine Jeater [1845] 20174 - Mr Ionut Ionescu [7977]	Comment	Where are people from the outlying villages meant to park when going to work or shopping?; Public transport is not regular enough to be reliable; Should the council not wait until Brexit before deciding what housing needs will be in 2033; too much development is in the town centre; Town centre redevelopments are complex and influenced by many factors. Whilst developments on Baytree Centre and William Hunter Way will probably happen, their timing must remain uncertain. Regarding Brentwood Town Centre and William Hunter Way: there is no green space for access (excluding around the church). When Sainsbury's was built green space was lost and it would be a real asset to have a piazza type space (ideally with children play area) at the centre of the town for use by shoppers workers as lunch breaks etc. A tiny green lung.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
20130 - Mrs Susan Butler [7970]	Comment	To construct 6-10 storey buildings will overshadow the North Road and North Road Avenue residents. There has been a lot of flats already constructed in the towns. If the car park needs to be developed there should be less flats and more retail on a lower level than suggested. A 28 seat cinema will not cater for an ever expanding population (The old Post Office would hold more people if turned into a cinema). The extra traffic would cause more congestion and pollution. Will the lack of parking space be addressed? Are the doctors coping with the existing residents?	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
18346 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Although none of these are objectionable in principle, they occupy important town centre locations and will need to be considered holistically as opposed to in isolation from each other	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
20131 - Mrs Susan Butler [7970]	Comment	It's important to understand the character of low level housing with a wider demographic than your 24-35 demographic statement in the Draft Local Plan of each area in order to proposed the appropriate typology, scale and activity.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19923 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	Whilst the pro-forma does identify the presence of the conservation area it does not reference the listed building. Given the high grade of designation Historic England would be a statutory consultee when considering the development of the site. We request that any forthcoming site specific policy identifies these designated heritage assets. Development of this site will need to conserve and enhance these heritage assets and their setting. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
18343 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18350 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Historic Environment Comment - These all form car parks within the historic town centre. Consideration will need to be given to alternative car parking provision and the potential for the loss of these car parking area to create either large areas of on-street parking or to discourage people from using the town centre. The former has the potential to unduly impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, whilst the latter has the potential to harm the viability of listed buildings in commercial use. Note the archaeological and historical core of Brentwood	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
20089 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19881 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Comment	Town centre redevelopments are complex and influenced by many factors. Whilst developments on Baytree Centre and William Hunter Way will probably happen, their timing must remain uncertain.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18532 - Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3756]	Comment	It is not clear what level of town centre parking will be retained on the proposed sites. The loss of town centre car parking spaces could undermine the health of the town centre. Adequate car parking should be retained within the town centre to ensure the town centre remains attractive. The document should set out clearly how much available car parking will be provided as part of the redevelopment of these sites.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17896 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17922 - Mr Peter Hawkins [6909] 17942 - Mrs Sarah Humphreys [6917] 17967 - Miss Laura Marriott [6945] 17978 - Mrs Lindsey Wyman [6950] 17982 - Mary Morris [1585] 18003 - Mr Phillip Burden [6957] 18007 - Mr and Mrs Colin and Linda Matthew [749] 18043 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18128 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] 18157 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] 18168 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18202 - Mr Richard Wright [1644] 18203 - Mr Shobhit Gupta [7073] 18382 - Mr Andrew Cook [6840] 18387 - Miss Abbey Roundacre [6914] 18417 - Mr. & Mrs. T Llewellyn [7142] 18529 - Mrs Anna-Marie Wingrove [7093] 18536 - Anne Searle [7174] 18610 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871] 18727 - Mr Jonathan Purr [7194] 18751 - Ms Jane Goodbody [7211] 18793 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 18805 - Carolyn Harris [7215] 18842 - Sue Marigold [2267] 18938 - Mrs Penny Cook [6948] 18955 - Mr Samuel Greaves [7235] 18956 - Mr Samuel Greaves [7235] 18957 - Mr Samuel Greaves [7235] 18962 - Mr Michael Plock [7239] 18990 - Gillian Marder [6035] 19242 - Ms Julie Landragin [3958] 19247 - Steve Abrahall [666]	Object	<p>Too many homes; need to retain the parking; will detrimentally impact on High Street; the impact on traffic, local services, disruption and reduction of car parking for the town shops would be catastrophic. It would pretty much kill off trade and visitors and be the nail in the coffin for the end of Brentwood high street. Is the proposed parking for new residents or visitors. Where is the promised cinema? Loss of parking income too; contrary to other policies for the High Street; will increase congestion; will change character and feel of the area detrimentally; need more parking not less; need to consider impact on GPs, schools, etc; why isn't there more detail in the Local Plan about size, scale design of the development. Not enough detail; should quantify the impact of Crossrail first; people will use out of town instead and the high street will die.</p>	Noted	Consider accordingly within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19273 - Mr and Mrs T Smith [5958] 19376 - Mr Julian How [6989] 19391 - Mrs Toni Rudgley [7088] 20129 - Mrs Diane Boardman [4094] 20142 - Ms Norma Jennings [5444] 20151 - Mr & Mrs Colin Thornton [4225] 20160 - J.C. Ward [987] 20221 - Mrs Patricia Veal [7995] 21952 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001] 22093 - RS Nickerson [8031] 22107 - C. Penn [858]				
18764 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539] 21252 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]	Support	This site should be allocated for residential uses only (to the exclusion of alternative/commercial usage) in order to maximise the number of dwellings. I support an approach that prioritises the residential facet, maximising the number of dwellings, subject to respecting the "right to light" of adjacent properties.	Noted	Consider within policy and town centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
<i>020, 021 & 152 West Horndon West Horndon Industrial Estate, Childerditch Lane and Station Road, West Horndon</i>				
19927 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	There are no designated heritage assets within the site. There are a number of designations to the north of the site. The pro-forma does not refer to the presence of these designated heritage assets. As the site is currently an active industrial estate any enhancements that can be made are encouraged. careful consideration should be given to the scale and height of development. These requirements should be included in policy and supported text.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18310 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways & Transportation comment - Need for clear, tested mitigation for impact on highway network, especially the A127 and A128. Development on these sites will need to be viewed from a holistic perspective to ensure that they contribute to a pool of funding to provide an enhanced level of bus service to serve the 580 homes planned. It will also be important to ensure that the design layout of the sites facilitates sustainable access, ideally with bus gates or other interventions designed to maximise such access whilst giving these modes a journey time advantage.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18073 - Pawle and Co Ltd (Mr Ray Ashby) [7029] 18169 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18981 - Mr Geoff Fynn [7242] 19524 - Bolsons Limited (Mr John Cowdry) [7126]	Object	This site is currently a thriving and long established industrial park catering for many small business which make a valuable contribution to the local economy. If this proposal goes ahead in its current form then many of these businesses could be lost and many local people would lose their jobs having a negative impact on both Brentwood and the wider community. Employment here means less road travel as it is next to the station;	Noted	Consider accordingly
19525 - Bolsons Limited (Mr John Cowdry) [7126]	Object	We would therefore welcome an opportunity to speak to an officer in the Forward Planning/Strategic Planning team and ask them to provide information as to how the Council sees the future of the industrial uses on site. It may be that the ambition can be supported/ or at least something Bolson's could be neutral about, but we don't know enough now to be able to take a view (other than one of concern) at this stage.	Noted.	Officers are happy to meet to discuss the issues further. Consider accordingly
18982 - Mr Geoff Fynn [7242]	Object	Have you been lobbied by the investment company/bank that own the site? The rich get richer at the expense of the workers.	Noted	The site has been submitted through the call for sites process and assessed by the Council accordingly. Any planning application for the site would be required to go through the usual process of assessment and democratic consideration by Members. Not further action.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19521 - Bolsons Limited (Mr John Cowdry) [7126] 19522 - Bolsons Limited (Mr John Cowdry) [7126] 19523 - Bolsons Limited (Mr John Cowdry) [7126] 19526 - Bolsons Limited (Mr John Cowdry) [7126]	Object	Concerns over the continued uncertainty over the West Horndon industrial estate continue. Whilst Compulsory Purchase is not proposed by the Council we are aware that this might change. More certainty is needed. Two possible approaches (i) that Bolsons should oppose in principle on the basis that the site should remain solely in employment use, or (ii) that Bolsons should once the consultation process evolves make representations welcoming (or being neutral about) mixed use, provided we have comfort that the modern premises on the estate with long leases etc are part of the Council's vision and objectives for such future mixed residential and employment uses on the site. National policy is very supportive of mixed use development, and of sustainable development - in particular the opportunity to reduce car travel, so locating suitable employment close to residential we understand is a good thing. That said, the crucial matter that would need to be considered when masterplanning such a site would be what would constitute "suitable" employment in the circumstances. The current operation of Bolsons is considered a good neighbour and could contribute to residential amenity. HELAA needs to be published. The Council needs to explain how it proposes to deliver housing on the Estate, when there are X businesses or Y% of the Estate on long leases (and in modern buildings etc). Explain how the Council propose the allocation of the land for housing can be delivered. If the Council are already thinking that the newer buildings on long leases could be designed into a masterplan of the site, then that would be some comfort if we were supplied with details as early as possible.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18209 - Louise Cooper [3213] 18351 - Hermes Investment Management [7124] 18430 - Mrs Jill Saddington [2549] 18467 - Mr Barry Lindsey [7154] 18733 - mr david rontree [5338] 18743 - Ms Teresa Bloxham [3315] 18757 - A Bloxham [3314] 18758 - Mr. Nathan Garrad [3100] 18759 - Natasha Garrard [3101] 18767 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540] 18980 - Mr Geoff Fynn [7242] 19052 - Sue Lister [2269] 19069 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19070 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19071 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19072 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19134 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19135 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19136 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19137 - Mr Ian Atkinson [2993] 19583 - Lisa Atkinson [2991]	Object	West Horndon Village cannot sustain the number of houses proposed by this development. The road network is not designed for such a large scale, the trains are already packed and bus links extremely limited. Showcase for the development showed no consideration to entrance of the development, a road to the A127 should be a mandatory requirement to prevent crowding and traffic through the village. Creating a roundabout at the entrance to the site would be an accident waiting to happen due to the speed at which cars cross the railway bridge. Site is greenbelt and adheres to the greenbelt functions. The road infrastructure would not be able to cope with additional vehicles. Plan is based on incorrect growth due to the outcome of Brexit. Development should be focused within the central area of Brentwood where the infrastructure currently exists. object to these proposals as the reason I live in West Horndon is because it is a village, if I wanted to live in a town I would have moved to a town. We do not have the capacity and infrastructure to accommodate hundreds of new houses and residents and we certainly do not want travellers living in this village. The crime rate will inevitably increase resulting in higher insurance premiums. Any development in the West Horndon area must not be on the flood plain area's ie East Horndon Hall designated employment area. Will significantly increase pressure on traffic, the railway station c2c journeys and the doctors.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17897 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17925 - Mr. D Haynes [2336] 18659 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 19698 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381] 21253 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]	Support	Need to consider risk of flooding; sensible to use brownfield; are appropriate for redevelopment and redevelopment to residential (or part residential) use is appropriate for this brown field land. In board support however, access to the site, the character of the area and appropriate parking facilities need to be planned with great care; Parish Council supports this with considerations over the access and road safety.	Support Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19582 - Lisa Atkinson [2991]	Support	I have got reasonably comfortable with the residential development planned for the industrial estate. Although this would considerably increase the size of the village, it would also bring benefits, not least of which would be an end to the vast number of lorries thundering through the village, albeit many of these would be replaced by cars.	Support noted	No further action
<i>044 & 178 Land at Priests Lane, Shenfield</i>				
20084 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. It is recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18119 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]	Comment	Objection is made to the allocation of this site as it would result in the loss of a site last used a school and community playing field. Its loss without mitigation would be contrary to Government policy in the NPPF and Sport England's playing fields policy that is used as a statutory consultee. The objection could be addressed if the site allocation is removed or if mitigation is made in the form of replacement provision or financial contributions in lieu of direct replacement provision.	Noted	Consider in light of evidence
19672 - ESFA (Dr Douglas McNab) [6718]	Comment	The next version of the Local Plan should seek to be more definitive in identifying which sites will need to deliver new schools to support growth, based on the latest evidence of identified need and demand. The site allocations or associated safeguarding policies should clarify requirements for the delivery of new schools, including when they should be delivered to support housing growth, the minimum site area required, any preferred site characteristics, and any requirements for safeguarding additional land for future expansion of schools where need and demand indicates.	Noted	Further work on infrastructure provision is being carried out and will be published in the IDP (Infrastructure Delivery Plan).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18049 - Gerald Downey [4671]	Comment	Previous Objection gave incorrect representation ID for Thames Water. It should be representation ID 15472 - Thames Water (Mr Mark Matthews) [6089].	Noted and agreed.	Amend on-line accordingly.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18780 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 21259 - Mrs Margaret Lamming [5512] 21260 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584] 21261 - Mrs Judith Jeffery [5756] 21262 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584] 21263 - Mr William Meredith [5496] 21264 - Mr John Griffiths [5921] 21265 - Mr S Ward [7338] 21266 - Ms Annedi Stiller [7346] 21267 - Ms Chloë Sanders [5937] 21268 - M Lincoln [7349] 21269 - Russell Cord [7351] 21270 - Ms Melissa Corby [7353] 21271 - E Jeulony [7356] 21272 - Ms Carmen Escalante [7360] 21273 - Ms Georgina Lewis [7361] 21274 - Mr Sean Worricker [7363] 21275 - Mrs Stephanie Hackett [5535] 21276 - Mr Darren Hackett [5850] 21277 - S Keeble [7366] 21278 - S Tupper [7369] 21279 - Mr Simon Oborn [6037] 21280 - K Varma [7382] 21281 - MH Oborn [7383] 21282 - C Seabrook [7384] 21283 - Miss Holly Roeder [5572] 21284 - Mr Joseph Roeder [5817] 21285 - L Milne [7393] 21286 - Mr K Milne [7394] 21287 - Tody Milne [7395] 21288 - Mr Gary Bowles [7397] 21289 - Mr Andre Van der Merwe [7401] 21290 - Ms Eloise Van de Merwe [7402] 21291 - Mr David Filer [5407] 21292 - Ms Helen Turner [7403] 21293 - TJ Turner [7404]	Object	Re-submission of 2017 petition: We the undersigned strongly believe that the building of an additional 130 houses off Priests Lane will create not only a strain on an infrastructure which is at capacity but also wholly unacceptable levels of traffic in the area, resulting in even more accidents, congestion and pollution to an already overloaded and unsafe road network. (Submitted acknowledging the reduction in housing numbers and confirming the objection remains).	Details of the petition objection have been considered in full. The Council is working to make assessment of transportation impacts of the proposed new development sites throughout the borough. Further work on the Infrastructure Development Plan is ongoing and will be updated for the Regulation 19 consultation and for the submission to the Secretary of State. All technical information submitted in relation to sites is being considered in full by the Council.	Full details of site comments are being considered by the Council.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21294 - D Hall [7405]				
21295 - J Verkullen [7406]				
21296 - J White [7408]				
21297 - M Calder [7410]				
21298 - M Gray [7411]				
21299 - Mr Benjamin Hayes [5674]				
21300 - C Gazzard [7412]				
21301 - M Roberts [7413]				
21302 - Miss Angela Kenyon [7414]				
21303 - Mrs Jane Ballard [5532]				
21304 - Mr John Wooley [7415]				
21305 - Mr Martin Ballard [8227]				
21306 - Mr Roger Haynes [5381]				
21307 - Mrs Teresa Coull [5557]				
21308 - Mr D Coull [5299]				
21309 - JM Haynes [7418]				
21310 - Mrs Ann Slawson [5501]				
21311 - Mr Richard Slawson [5502]				
21312 - Ms Patricia Sudbury [7213]				
21313 - JW Sudbury [7419]				
21314 - J Blowby [7420]				
21315 - C Moore [7421]				
21316 - S Arnold [7424]				
21317 - H Allen [7425]				
21318 - J Carron [7426]				
21319 - Emma Stack [7427]				
21320 - L Akula [7428]				
21321 - Dr Harischandra Boralessa [5834]				
21322 - G & E Preston [7429]				
21323 - AG Pashley [7431]				
21324 - Mrs Sandra Green [5333]				
21325 - M Brown [7434]				
21326 - Sally & Jim Bealey [7436]				
21327 - Eddie Stewart [7438]				
21328 - B Stewart [7439]				
21329 - Mrs Hrris [7440]				
21330 - Ms Michelle Short [7442]				
21331 - Ms Deborah Knightsbridge [7444]				
21332 - Mrs Julia Coles [5537]				
21333 - Ms Beryl Joyce Clark				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[1635]				
21334 - Ms Peggy Conley [7448]				
21335 - Ms Brenda Major [7449]				
21336 - Mr Bob Stallard [7453]				
21337 - Ms Sue Conley [7455]				
21338 - M Lipscomb [7457]				
21339 - J Peak [7459]				
21340 - CW Peak [7460]				
21341 - Ms Megan Bolger [7461]				
21342 - Mr Louis Keyworth [7467]				
21343 - Mr Harrison Keyworth [7470]				
21344 - Ms Louise Biggs [7473]				
21345 - Ms Pauline Lotherington [7474]				
21346 - Mr Peter Tompkins [7479]				
21347 - Ms Nina St Pier [7480]				
21348 - Mrs Clare Walters [5577]				
21349 - Ms Charlotte Walters [7482]				
21350 - Ms Helen Dobie [6318]				
21351 - Ms Dulcie Corbett [7484]				
21352 - J Lister [7486]				
21353 - M Nowell [7497]				
21354 - Mr R.V. Pearson [5758]				
21355 - Mrs Helen Pearson [5910]				
21356 - Mr Russell Pearson [7499]				
21357 - Mrs J Tuckwood [5723]				
21358 - Mr Louis Tuckwood [7500]				
21359 - Mrs Margaret Wynn [5504]				
21360 - Mrs Monica Donegan [5539]				
21361 - A Shamil [7507]				
21362 - Mr Eamon Shamil [7508]				
21363 - Ms Helen Sawyerr [7509]				
21364 - Ms Anita Pratten [7510]				
21365 - Ms Kerri Reynolds [7514]				
21366 - Mr Stan Howe [7517]				
21367 - Mr Lawrence Howe [7519]				
21368 - Sam Fuller [7522]				
21369 - Ms Fiona Morrison [7525]				
21370 - Cath Patient [1112]				
21371 - Ms Katie Boon [7526]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21372 - Mr Derek Browne [7529]				
21373 - Sue & Chris Kilian [7530]				
21374 - Ms Charlotte Holmes [7534]				
21375 - Ms Lisa Bishop [7538]				
21376 - Sue Enden [7536]				
21377 - Miss Danielle Kenyon [6001]				
21378 - Ugena Hall [7540]				
21379 - Chris Abbott [7543]				
21380 - Ashley Culvertnell [7546]				
21381 - Mr Joseph Prutten [7547]				
21382 - Ms Joanne Elley [7548]				
21383 - Mr Steve Josling [7549]				
21384 - Miss Charlotte Kenyon [6000]				
21385 - Mr Mike Kenyon [6023]				
21386 - Ms Sue Boon [7553]				
21387 - PA Tyzack [7554]				
21388 - Vipoda Modtoosay [7556]				
21389 - Ms Vicky Morrison [7560]				
21390 - Ms Fatima Whitbread [7567]				
21391 - R Shepherd [7570]				
21392 - J Gray [7578]				
21393 - G Partingle [7579]				
21394 - W Keress [7584]				
21395 - L Stope [7585]				
21396 - K Jones [7586]				
21397 - J Oton [7590]				
21398 - Matt Saunders [7592]				
21399 - M Pam Perraud [7601]				
21400 - A Moody [7602]				
21401 - K Webb [7605]				
21402 - P Sharp [7606]				
21403 - Mr Brian Taunton [5382]				
21404 - Ms J Taunton [7611]				
21405 - Jemma Gray [7612]				
21406 - SC Nott [7625]				
21407 - Miss Anne Todd [5432]				
21408 - Ms L McNally [7626]				
21409 - Mrs Jill Charters [5929]				
21410 - Mr M Charters [7675]				
21411 - Mrs Sarah Sewell [7678]				
21412 - Mrs. Denise Riffenburgh [2787]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21413 - Ms Nicola Banbury [7685]				
21414 - Mr Francis Lai [5946]				
21415 - Mrs Hedy Lai [5774]				
21416 - Mr Brian Jones [5799]				
21417 - P Jones [7688]				
21418 - M Jones [7689]				
21419 - N Anderson [7695]				
21420 - A Bedford [7696]				
21421 - A Knight [7698]				
21422 - K Lowen [7701]				
21423 - Mr Edward Dobie [6335]				
21424 - Corrinne Mathews [4365]				
21425 - John Utting [1888]				
21426 - Mr Steven Harris [6839]				
21427 - Mrs Julia Sexton [5514]				
21428 - HJ Utting [7334]				
21429 - Ms Lyn Murphy [7352]				
21430 - Sincerely-yours (Ms Kaye Thurgood) [3690]				
21431 - Mr Neil Hepburn [7355]				
21432 - Ms Alison Marshall [7357]				
21433 - Ms Kerry McGuire [7358]				
21434 - Ms Katie McGuire [7359]				
21435 - Harmesh Chaghan [7362]				
21436 - K Hackett [7364]				
21437 - K Hackett [7364]				
21438 - D Cooper [7368]				
21439 - B Robinson [7370]				
21440 - J Edward [7373]				
21441 - S Douns [7375]				
21442 - K Thompson [7378]				
21443 - Ms Lucy Oborn [7380]				
21444 - J Oborn [7381]				
21445 - Mr Glenn Roeder [5571]				
21446 - Mrs Faith Roeder [5569]				
21447 - Mr William Roeder [5779]				
21448 - S Norris [7386]				
21449 - L Spindler [7391]				
21450 - N Spindler [7392]				
21451 - Ms Pauline Bowles [7396]				
21452 - Mr Nick Bowles [7399]				
21453 - M2 Petro Van De Merwe [7400]				
21454 - M Milliship [7407]				
21455 - Gerald Downey [4671]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21456 - Mr Stewart Ballard [7416]				
21457 - Peter Sudbury [7226]				
21458 - P Hobson [7422]				
21459 - Dr Harischandra Boralessa [5834]				
21460 - Mr John Twyford [5429]				
21461 - S Pashley [7430]				
21462 - Ryan Green [7432]				
21463 - Mr Simon Wyatt [5359]				
21464 - Ms Nicky Cuthbert [7441]				
21465 - Ms Lisa Griffin [7443]				
21466 - Ms Mel Wilson [7445]				
21467 - Mr Andrew Clark [7447]				
21468 - Ms Audrey white [7450]				
21469 - Ms Nita Mansfield [7451]				
21470 - Ms Philippa West [7452]				
21471 - Ms Sue Stevens [7456]				
21472 - M Turrell [7458]				
21473 - Mrs Valerie Wells [4877]				
21474 - Ms Camille Keyworth [7468]				
21475 - Mr Martin Keyworth [7469]				
21476 - Mr Janick Keyworth [7471]				
21477 - Ms Joan Biggs [7472]				
21478 - Mr Richard Lotherington [7475]				
21479 - Ms Janice Kent [7477]				
21480 - Ray & Michelle Perry [7478]				
21481 - Mr William Dobie [7483]				
21482 - Ms Ella Lindsay [7485]				
21483 - P Carpenter [7487]				
21484 - A Hayward [7489]				
21485 - L Damon [7490]				
21486 - GC Beaumont [7491]				
21487 - C nooney [7492]				
21488 - S logan [7493]				
21489 - N Lupson [7494]				
21490 - D Westfall [5310]				
21491 - Ms Julie Buckley [6307]				
21492 - Ms Penny Ravis [7502]				
21493 - Mr Gerry Ravis [7504]				
21494 - Sahar Shamil [7505]				
21495 - S Shamil [7506]				
21496 - M Pratten [7511]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21497 - Kini Pathmanathan [7512]				
21498 - Mr Piers Leslie [7513]				
21499 - Lain Reynolds [7515]				
21500 - Mr Gary Howe [7516]				
21501 - Ms Hellen Lambeth [7520]				
21502 - Mr Gary Lambeth [7521]				
21503 - Mrs Amanda Murray [5608]				
21504 - Luressa [7527]				
21505 - Pennington [7528]				
21506 - Mr Andy Scott [7531]				
21507 - Ms Nicole Bragg [7532]				
21508 - Ms Karen Tottenham [7533]				
21509 - Ms Vicky Penfold [7535]				
21510 - Ms jackie Brindley [7537]				
21511 - mr Ian Osborne [7541]				
21512 - Ms Nikki Osborne [7542]				
21513 - Ms Natalie furnwood [7544]				
21514 - Ms Elizabeth Sanderson [7545]				
21515 - S Capocci [7551]				
21516 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]				
21517 - Mr Tom Davies [7557]				
21518 - C Casali [7561]				
21519 - Satinder Ruprai [7562]				
21520 - D Valzasing [7563]				
21521 - Ms Annie Chai [7564]				
21522 - Ms Karen Ford [7565]				
21523 - Ms Christine Gillespie [7566]				
21524 - A Partis [7568]				
21525 - J Fisher [7573]				
21526 - K Verity [7574]				
21527 - Ibrahim [7575]				
21528 - K Bradbury [7576]				
21529 - H Braithwaite [7577]				
21530 - C Thomson [7580]				
21531 - J Jarret [7581]				
21532 - K Kalair [7583]				
21533 - Alan Dawson [7588]				
21534 - Kate Hearn [7589]				
21535 - Sue Wrightson [7591]				
21536 - Mr Scott Hale [7593]				
21537 - C Taylor [7603]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21538 - L Yip [7604]				
21539 - mr adam willingale [4353]				
21540 - G Puttick [7607]				
21541 - Mrs Alexandra Garcia [5788]				
21542 - S Keene [7608]				
21543 - T Collins [7609]				
21544 - K Christie [7610]				
21545 - Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054]				
21546 - Chandrakart [7613]				
21547 - C Lewis [7614]				
21548 - V Marsh [7615]				
21549 - M Ballentine [7616]				
21550 - V Shoter [7617]				
21551 - J Pike [7619]				
21552 - J Regan [7620]				
21553 - N Parry [7621]				
21554 - A Howard [7622]				
21555 - Mrs Tina Walker [5425]				
21556 - J Beckwith [7624]				
21557 - Mr Lee Aspinall [5980]				
21558 - L Mizen [7637]				
21559 - A Jolly [7638]				
21560 - M Marler [7639]				
21561 - A Robert Pullen [7642]				
21562 - Ms Juliette Whittaker [7644]				
21563 - Ms Clare Gibson [7646]				
21564 - Ms Catherine Rayner [7647]				
21565 - Mrs Sheila Alton [5476]				
21566 - K Newman [7435]				
21567 - Ms Julia Robins [7654]				
21568 - Ms Wendy Morrison [7656]				
21569 - Mrs Valerie Parker [5714]				
21570 - Mr Jamie Hughes [7657]				
21571 - Ms June Hughes [7658]				
21572 - Ms Tracey Kerry [7659]				
21573 - Zahada Montgomrry [7660]				
21574 - Ms Carol Wiles [7649]				
21575 - Mrs Lisa Fenn [7677]				
21576 - Ms Marie Oldridge [7679]				
21577 - Ms Katie McNeil [7680]				
21578 - Mr Christian O'Brian				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[7682]				
21579 - Ms Gayle Penn [7683]				
21580 - Stefali Kulkerton [7684]				
21581 - Ms Fay Falco [7686]				
21582 - M Hollingsworth [7690]				
21583 - R Hadley [7691]				
21584 - Thadji Costas [7692]				
21585 - Pmadji Costas [7693]				
21586 - T Thomas [7699]				
21587 - E Jones [7703]				
21588 - O Jones [7704]				
21589 - Mr Stephen Lucas [5858]				
21590 - SP Lucas [7705]				
21591 - Mrs Iris Mais [5376]				
21592 - Mr Paul Mais [5440]				
21593 - Miss Rebecca Mais [5441]				
21594 - Mr Matthew Miller [5922]				
21595 - E Miller [7707]				
21596 - Mr Adrian Clark [5863]				
21597 - Mr Stuart Clark [4266]				
21598 - P Sheppard [7709]				
21599 - Ms Sue Lowe [7711]				
21600 - Mr. D Haynes [2336]				
21601 - Mr Ron Gulley [7462]				
21602 - Mr Paul O'Hare [7712]				
21603 - Mr Ron Lowe [7713]				
21604 - Ms Sue Haynes [7714]				
21605 - B Jones [7715]				
21606 - S Jones [7716]				
21607 - S Miller [7717]				
21608 - J Miller [7718]				
21609 - C Jackson [7720]				
21610 - Ms Margaret Mitchell [7722]				
21611 - Mr Alan Hatwell [7726]				
21612 - Mr Len Webb [7727]				
21613 - Mrs Gwendoline Webb [7733]				
21614 - Ms Kathleen Earle [7734]				
21615 - Miss Abbie Ward [7735]				
21616 - Miss Alice Ward [7736]				
21617 - Ms Margaret McCoy [7737]				
21618 - Mr Hugh McCoy [7738]				
21619 - Mrs Annette Moorhouse				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[5332] 21620 - Miss Holly Moorhouse [5665] 21621 - I Hollocks [7739] 21622 - O Moorhouse [7740] 21623 - JL Hollocks [7741] 21624 - Mrs Helen Scott [5775] 21625 - Dr Gareth Scott [5772] 21626 - Ms Lesley Cable [7742] 21627 - Mr Michael Cable [7743] 21628 - Ms Felicity Roeder [7744] 21629 - Mr William Roeder [7745] 21630 - Ms Deirdre Smith [7746] 21631 - Ms Alice Oldnall [7747] 21632 - Ms Teresa Giles [7749] 21633 - A McQuade [7750] 21634 - E Roeder [7751] 21635 - Mrs. Scott [1065] 21636 - Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909] 21637 - H Robins [7752] 21638 - Mr Andrew Wilkinson [6012] 21639 - J Carvl [7753] 21640 - C Faulkner [7754] 21641 - Maureen Clark [7755] 21642 - M Lloyd [7756] 21643 - J Jones [7757] 21644 - K Hoare [7758] 21645 - Mr David Gooderson [5871] 21646 - AF Staines [7759] 21647 - CJ Brown [7760] 21648 - AJ Brown [7761] 21649 - IJ Staines [7762] 21650 - DL Warby [7763] 21651 - DP Warby [7764] 21652 - M Wentworth [3285] 21653 - SA Lewis [7765] 21654 - C Berry [7766] 21655 - Sigrid Miles [7767] 21656 - Mr Paul Miles [7768] 21657 - Ms Katherine Miles [7769] 21658 - Ms Jackie Farrow [7770] 21659 - Mr Colin Farrow [7771] 21660 - Ms Rosie Farrow [7772]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21661 - Mr Stephen Day [5833]				
21662 - L Prescott [7773]				
21663 - M Brook [7774]				
21664 - S Brook [7775]				
21665 - Mrs Patricia Ould [5683]				
21666 - David Garrett [1476]				
21667 - K Garrett [7776]				
21668 - O O'Meara [7777]				
21669 - L O'Meara [7778]				
21670 - G Nicklen [7779]				
21671 - L Leno [7780]				
21672 - S Everson [7781]				
21673 - M Maylee [7782]				
21674 - M McCarthy [7783]				
21675 - D Furlong [7784]				
21676 - B Rohrbasser [7785]				
21677 - S Peacock [7786]				
21678 - A Bourne [7787]				
21679 - Christina Graham [7788]				
21680 - Mr Owen Edwards [7789]				
21681 - Mr Phil Bruce [7790]				
21682 - Jo Webb [7791]				
21683 - Mr Tony Fenwick [7792]				
21684 - Mr David Rayner [7793]				
21685 - Jim Hun [7794]				
21686 - Alan Church [7795]				
21687 - June Church [7796]				
21688 - Mr Brian Kinnear [5719]				
21689 - Mrs Jacqueline Kinnear [5759]				
21690 - Ms Gemma Bunn [7797]				
21691 - Mr Ian Wood [7798]				
21692 - D Steal [7799]				
21693 - B Ringer [7800]				
21694 - T Edwards [7801]				
21695 - J. Bass [2823]				
21696 - M Daws [7802]				
21697 - W Douglas [7803]				
21698 - S Lyons [7804]				
21699 - Kinnear [7805]				
21700 - Jenkins [7806]				
21701 - Chrstian Canhall [7807]				
21702 - Ms Dawn Middleton [7808]				
21703 - Lee Heffron [7809]				
21704 - Joseph Jenkins [7810]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21705 - Tristan Luke [7811]				
21706 - Ian Howie [7812]				
21707 - Mr Michael Large [5637]				
21708 - Mrs L Burns [7813]				
21709 - Mrs Julie Barnwell [5509]				
21710 - H Bradshaw [7814]				
21711 - Mrs Mary Reeves [5439]				
21712 - Mr Paul Reeves [6939]				
21713 - Michael Lee [7815]				
21714 - Mr Barry Sawtell [5904]				
21715 - Mrs Iris Sawtell [5900]				
21716 - Mrs Eileen Withrington [5967]				
21717 - Mrs M Bing [5744]				
21718 - Sylvia Haward [7816]				
21719 - Ms Natalie Coleman-Dale [5956]				
21720 - L Coleman-Dale [7817]				
21721 - Mark Fenton [7818]				
21722 - James Fenton [7819]				
21723 - Luke Fenton [7820]				
21724 - Michael Grieve [7821]				
21725 - Mr Matthew Jenkins [5624]				
21726 - Mrs Helen Jenkins [5408]				
21727 - Mr Anton Jenkins [5623]				
21728 - mr Lawrence Jenkins [5582]				
21729 - Callum Cooper [7822]				
21730 - Gayner Robjohns [7823]				
21731 - Monique Tuckwood [7824]				
21732 - Amanda Weller [7825]				
21733 - Mrs Alison Morton [5398]				
21734 - Tracey Mayo [7826]				
21735 - Mr Steven Hayter [6918]				
21736 - Tim Coles [7827]				
21737 - A Coles [7828]				
21738 - Graham Robjohns [7829]				
21739 - A Higher [7830]				
21740 - Mr David Alton [5406]				
21741 - Ms Devjani Das [5344]				
21742 - Mrs Namita Das [6018]				
21743 - Manisha Sircar [7831]				
21744 - Kalyan Sircar [7832]				
21745 - Mrs Karen Massie [6925]				
21746 - Ms Chris Massie [5955]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21747 - Rosalie Hillman [7833]				
21748 - Pauline Money [7834]				
21749 - Caroline Campbell [7835]				
21750 - Ann Battle [7836]				
21751 - 1961 Susan Palmer [6962]				
21753 - Paul Downes [557]				
21754 - Mrs Sylvia Allum [5419]				
21755 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420]				
21756 - Mr Richard Allum [6060]				
21757 - Ms Victoria Simmons [7838]				
21758 - J Darling [7839]				
21759 - S Southgate [7840]				
21760 - L Tuckey [7841]				
21761 - S Ham [7842]				
21762 - P Ham [7843]				
21763 - C Stones [7844]				
21764 - Mrs Sharon Mathieson [5155]				
21765 - Bill Jaycock [7845]				
21766 - Kate Marsh [7846]				
21767 - Ms Beverley Davies [7847]				
21768 - S Bailey [7848]				
21769 - S Paintrer [7849]				
21770 - N Wren [7850]				
21771 - J Holland [7851]				
21772 - P Holland [7852]				
21773 - P Newman [7853]				
21774 - C Farrand [7854]				
21775 - David O'Brien [7855]				
21776 - Terry Barnes [7856]				
21777 - B Barnes [7857]				
21778 - Mrs Lynn Farrand [5395]				
21779 - - Paul Gibbs [2301]				
21780 - S Gibbs Gibbs [7858]				
21781 - Mr Derek Hayden [7859]				
21782 - R Yaxley [7860]				
21783 - Mr David Saxton [4286]				
21784 - Mrs Margaret Saxton [4882]				
21785 - Mr Barry Crozier [7861]				
21786 - Darn P Sprace [7862]				
21787 - Mr Alan Morris [7863]				
21788 - P Morris [7864]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21789 - Mr Mike Keogh [7865]				
21790 - K Keogh [7866]				
21791 - P Crozier [7869]				
21792 - dr david Taylor [5394]				
21793 - Larry Morgan [7867]				
21794 - Mr Mike Churn [7868]				
21795 - Mrs Judy Taylor [5397]				
21796 - Pat Taylor [7870]				
21797 - Mr Alan Smith [5499]				
21798 - Mr Martin Budgen [2387]				
21799 - Susan Budgen [7871]				
21800 - A Mead [7872]				
21801 - Mr Keith Kan [5943]				
21802 - Mrs Eileen Kan [7874]				
21803 - Mr Stanley Gilbert [5827]				
21804 - Dr. May Gilbert [7248]				
21805 - RT Rogers [7875]				
21806 - C Rogers [7876]				
21807 - Mr Clive Gallehawk [5196]				
21808 - Mrs Saravanan [7877]				
21809 - C Brown [7878]				
21810 - H Brown [7879]				
21811 - K Cooke [7880]				
21812 - Mr Robert Payne [5511]				
21813 - Mrs Diane Payne [5508]				
21814 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713]				
21815 - A Rushworth [7881]				
21816 - PE Fiddes [7882]				
21817 - SD Wood [7883]				
21818 - Myra Breurez [7884]				
21819 - Ms Lynne Atalar [7885]				
21820 - Mrs Mary Jones [5516]				
21821 - Ms Enid Morris [7886]				
21822 - Pat Ashworth [7889]				
21823 - June Whitford [7890]				
21824 - Ms Connie Thomas [7887]				
21825 - Agnes Chu [7888]				
21826 - Ms June Lamotte [7891]				
21827 - Barbara Fathgene [7892]				
21828 - S O'Shea [7893]				
21829 - J Stollery [7894]				
21830 - A Patel [7895]				
21831 - S Smith [7896]				
21832 - RC Rahbit [7897]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21833 - C Noble [7899]				
21834 - R Holland [7898]				
21835 - K Searle [7900]				
21836 - H Panesar [7901]				
21837 - J Drouman [7902]				
21838 - M Toms [7903]				
21839 - H Patel [7905]				
21840 - S Patel [7906]				
21841 - E Lambert [7907]				
21842 - N Tarbard [7908]				
21843 - D Bishop [7909]				
21844 - S Marks [7910]				
21845 - M Porter [7911]				
21846 - I McMillan [7912]				
21847 - Dr Kamel [7913]				
21848 - M Hassani [7914]				
21849 - N Kamlow [7915]				
21850 - Ms Marium Said [7916]				
21851 - Dina Haloob [7917]				
21852 - faye Jubber [7918]				
21853 - Hala Alokati [7919]				
21854 - Fabio Lead [7920]				
21855 - M Aldewan [7921]				
21856 - A Alsewan [7922]				
21857 - A Jarwad [7923]				
21858 - J Pitman [7924]				
21859 - AM Chulloch [7925]				
21860 - Mrs Angela Burgess [5614]				
21861 - Fiona Cleame [7926]				
21862 - L Bright [7927]				
21863 - G Woodrow [7928]				
21864 - J Clark [7929]				
21865 - Ben Hassani [7932]				
21866 - Aimen Hassani [7933]				
21867 - A Khalil [7934]				
21868 - A Fadhil [7935]				
21869 - S Eleband [7936]				
21870 - S Alsaffar [7937]				
21871 - Inwar Alsaffar [7938]				
21872 - Nada Aivla [7939]				
21873 - Kassim Alkaisy [7940]				
21874 - Areej Saleh [7941]				
21875 - Kassim Saffar [7942]				
21876 - Nidd Khalil [7943]				
21877 - Rami Khalil [7944]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21878 - Nado Okali [7945]				
21879 - Dhefir Okali [7946]				
21880 - D Fayz [7947]				
21881 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]				
21882 - Mr and Mrs David and Eileen Fife [1343]				
21883 - Robin Lynn [7627]				
21884 - Ms Lisa Weaver [7501]				
21885 - AM Pepper [7335]				
21886 - Mrs Valerie Cripps [5430]				
21887 - Mrs Doreen Brock [5972]				
21888 - Mr Terence Brock [5973]				
21889 - Ms S Ward [7337]				
21890 - M Bazzoni [7339]				
21891 - Mrs Florence Bodley [5716]				
21892 - Mrs Jackie Andrews [7274]				
21893 - Mr R Templeton [7345]				
21894 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]				
21895 - Ms Jan Sanders [6007]				
21896 - Ms Lauren Sanders [7347]				
21897 - E Cooper [7367]				
21898 - J Nichols [7374]				
21899 - J Douns [7376]				
21900 - Mr Mark Nichols [7377]				
21901 - N Birchley [7379]				
21902 - Ms Ruth Abbott [7385]				
21903 - Mr Oliver Bowles [7398]				
21904 - Mrs Julie Downey [7094]				
21905 - J Gurney [7423]				
21906 - Emma Green [7433]				
21907 - Ms francesca Armstrong [7446]				
21908 - Mr Steve Kruppa [7476]				
21909 - Mr Vincent Walters [7481]				
21910 - M Hayward [7488]				
21911 - Marion Tracey [6470]				
21912 - M Preston-Phyprs [7495]				
21913 - LA Crosby [7498]				
21914 - Mr harry Parker [7552]				
21915 - Y Atherton [7558]				
21916 - C Monroe [7559]				
21917 - P Thompson [7569]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21918 - C Summers [7571]				
21919 - O Alfenagbe [7572]				
21920 - N Stak [7587]				
21921 - C Nieoria [7618]				
21922 - D Fisher [7623]				
21923 - A Sanderson [7628]				
21924 - J Blunden [7633]				
21925 - S Williams [7634]				
21926 - Z Eatwell [7635]				
21927 - J Fancy [7636]				
21928 - S Worrow [7641]				
21929 - Ms Vanessa Gordon [7643]				
21930 - Bibi Thostrup [7648]				
21931 - Mr M Wiles [7651]				
21932 - Mr Nigel Robins [7655]				
21933 - Ms Kelly Millard [7661]				
21934 - L PARRY [7662]				
21935 - Ms Julie Mott [7663]				
21936 - Carol Reeve [7664]				
21937 - Mrs Carol Ann Hennessy [5981]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17856 - Mr Michael Ekers [5403] 17875 - Mr John Darragh [4862] 17886 - Julia Ebsworth [5462] 17927 - Mr. D Haynes [2336] 17934 - Ms elizabeth rouse [6892] 17956 - Mr Jason Oliver [6009] 17983 - Maneesh Jain [5409] 18044 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18048 - Gerald Downey [4671] 18053 - Gerald Downey [4671] 18054 - D Westfall [5310] 18086 - Mrs Helen Jenkins [5408] 18095 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995] 18117 - Mrs Anne-Marie Hopcroft [7058] 18170 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18193 - Mr Simon Peacock [5427] 18207 - Mrs Julie Downey [7094] 18226 - Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332] 18227 - Ian Hollocks [5606] 18378 - Mr Andrew Cook [6840] 18409 - Mr Alan Harley [1304] 18411 - Mr Alan Harley [1304] 18419 - Mr Kevin Meister [5988] 18425 - Ms Ann Sprules [7144] 18426 - Ms Ann Sprules [7144] 18450 - Miss Amelia Skinner [5686] 18451 - Mr. Andrew Burton [7149] 18457 - Mr. Andrew Rowland [1271] 18458 - Mrs Susan Rowland [5749] 18477 - Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635] 18478 - Mrs Margaret Meredith [5507] 18479 - Mr William Meredith [5496] 18484 - Mr Robert Plumtree [1544] 18488 - Mrs Carol Gooderson [5909] 18506 - Ms Devjani Das [5344]	Object	Exacerbate congestion in the area, infrastructure impacts on GPs, roads, schools, it's a greenfield site, pedestrian danger increase, more open space information needed, impact on nature, air quality impacts, extreme congestion, speeding, would discourage cyclists, impact on drainage and sewerage, policies should reflect Priests Lane residents Association technical documents against this site, house prices would fall, need more sport and leisure locations, should be used for space for schools, no public transport there, the proposed Delivery Forecast of 1-5 years which would put this site ahead of development of alternative brownfield sites, Heavy construction lorries will damage the already fragile network of pipes beneath the road.	Objections noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18522 - Ms Devjani Das [5344]				
18556 - Miss Danielle Kenyon [6001]				
18565 - Miss Charlotte Kenyon [6000]				
18582 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999]				
18588 - Mr Mike Kenyon [6023]				
18593 - Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054]				
18594 - Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054]				
18612 - Mrs Concetta Hudson [7049]				
18613 - Mrs Concetta Hudson [7049]				
18614 - Mrs Concetta Hudson [7049]				
18617 - Mr Toby Skinner [7179]				
18618 - Mr Toby Skinner [7179]				
18620 - Mr Steven Harris [6839]				
18625 - Claire Hamer [5461]				
18626 - Mr & Mrs A Stewart [5781]				
18627 - Mr & Mrs A Stewart [5781]				
18628 - Mr & Mrs A Stewart [5781]				
18629 - Mr & Mrs A Stewart [5781]				
18630 - Mr & Mrs A Stewart [5781]				
18631 - Mr & Mrs A Stewart [5781]				
18696 - Mr Jonathan Purr [7194]				
18729 - Mr David Gooderson [5871]				
18730 - Mr David Gooderson [5871]				
18731 - Mr David Gooderson [5871]				
18734 - Mr David Gooderson [5871]				
18735 - Mr David Gooderson [5871]				
18736 - Mr David Gooderson [5871]				
18765 - Mr Sasha Millwood [4539]				
18781 - Ms Patricia Sudbury				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[7213] 18782 - Ms Patricia Sudbury [7213] 18783 - Ms Patricia Sudbury [7213] 18784 - Ms Patricia Sudbury [7213] 18787 - East of England Business Group (Mr Michael Large) [3675] 18788 - East of England Business Group (Mr Michael Large) [3675] 18795 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 18836 - Mr Dennis Cox [7218] 18854 - Peter Sudbury [7226] 18924 - Ms Martina Fiddimore [1342] 18925 - Ms Martina Fiddimore [1342] 18926 - Ms Martina Fiddimore [1342] 18927 - Ms Martina Fiddimore [1342] 18928 - Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026] 18929 - Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026] 18930 - Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026] 18931 - Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026] 18932 - Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026] 18933 - Ms Rachel Gooderson [5720] 18941 - Mr Manikandan Lakshminarasimhan [7234] 18947 - Mr Francis Lai [5946] 18965 - Mr. Gary Moody [7238] 18972 - Mr Gavin Hennessy [5984] 18974 - Mr Gavin Hennessy [5984] 18975 - Mr Gavin Hennessy [5984] 18976 - Mr Gavin Hennessy [5984] 18977 - Mr Gavin Hennessy [5984] 18997 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18998 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995]				
18999 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995]				
19000 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995]				
19001 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995]				
19002 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995]				
19003 - Ms Hazel Grout [5995]				
19012 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057]				
19013 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057]				
19014 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057]				
19015 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057]				
19038 - Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026]				
19039 - Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026]				
19040 - Mr Carl Fiddimore [7026]				
19041 - Mrs Karen Massie [6925]				
19042 - Mrs Karen Massie [6925]				
19046 - Dr. May Gilbert [7248]				
19047 - Ms Lucy Vowles [7249]				
19048 - Ms Lucy Vowles [7249]				
19050 - Mr Ronald Hayns [5505]				
19055 - Mr Paul Reeves [6939]				
19056 - Mr Paul Reeves [6939]				
19057 - Mr Paul Reeves [6939]				
19058 - Mr Malcolm Bigg [7251]				
19061 - Mrs Hedy Lai [5774]				
19062 - Mrs Nicola Hearn [5493]				
19078 - Mrs Madhumitha Manikandan [7254]				
19084 - Miss Dale Rutherford [5912]				
19089 - Mrs Karen Raison [5819]				
19090 - Mr Paul Joyner [5486]				
19091 - Mr Paul Joyner [5486]				
19092 - Mr Paul Joyner [5486]				
19096 - Mr Ian Jamieson [5390]				
19163 - Mrs Sylvia Allum [5419]				
19165 - Mrs Sylvia Allum [5419]				
19166 - Mrs Sylvia Allum [5419]				
19167 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420]				
19168 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420]				
19169 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420]				
19170 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420]				
19171 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19214 - Mr Robin Ibrahim [5538]				
19215 - Mrs Jackie Andrews [7274]				
19226 - Mr Mohan Singh Kochhar [5825]				
19227 - Mr Roger Branscomb [7280]				
19233 - Mr Richard Allum [6060]				
19269 - Mr and Mrs T Smith [5958]				
19270 - Mr and Mrs T Smith [5958]				
19275 - Mrs Lisa Glassock [5389]				
19324 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]				
19325 - Mr Geoff Sanders [1215]				
19387 - Miss Vena Clark [5879]				
19408 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]				
19409 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]				
19410 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]				
19411 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]				
19412 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]				
19423 - Mr Steve Washington [7300]				
19424 - Mr Steve Washington [7300]				
19425 - Mr Steve Washington [7300]				
19454 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]				
19455 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]				
19456 - Mr Richard Jeffery [6584]				
19461 - Mrs. Lauren Thompson [7305]				
19496 - Mr Neil Fuller [7311]				
19497 - Mr Neil Fuller [7311]				
19503 - Mrs Judith Jeffery [5756]				
19515 - Peter Sudbury [7226]				
19516 - Peter Sudbury [7226]				
19542 - Mr. Michael Rutherford [7323]				
19588 - Mr Keith Kan [5943]				
19694 - Ashley Culvertnell [7546]				
19842 - A Kinnear [7950]				
19843 - A Kinnear [7950]				
19844 - A Kinnear [7950]				
20116 - Mr Frank Lummis [5568]				
20117 - Mr Frank Lummis [5568]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20118 - Mr Frank Lummis [5568]				
20119 - Mr Frank Lummis [5568]				
20120 - Mr Frank Lummis [5568]				
20121 - Mr Frank Lummis [5568]				
20153 - Mrs Helen Pearson [5910]				
20154 - Mrs Helen Pearson [5910]				
20155 - Mrs Helen Pearson [5910]				
20156 - Mrs Helen Pearson [5910]				
20157 - Mrs Helen Pearson [5910]				
20158 - Mrs Helen Pearson [5910]				
20161 - J.C. Ward [987]				
20173 - Mr Ionut Ionescu [7977]				
20182 - Mrs Teresa Coull [5557]				
20183 - Mrs Teresa Coull [5557]				
20184 - Mrs Teresa Coull [5557]				
20196 - Mr Roger Coupe [7986]				
20201 - Ms Jacqueline Grace [7990]				
20213 - Mrs Jacqueline Kinnear [5759]				
20233 - Mr Brian Grout [7998]				
20234 - Mr Steven Hearn [5492]				
20246 - Mr Tony Izatt [8000]				
21246 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]				
21947 - Mrs Julie Moreton [5563]				
21955 - Mr. Giles Murray [2785]				
21959 - Mr Nigel Panzetta [5721]				
21960 - Mr Russell Pearson [7499]				
21961 - L Prescott [7773]				
21962 - Miss Katherine Webster [6005]				
21998 - Mrs Jane Ballard [5532]				
21999 - Mrs Jane Ballard [5532]				
22000 - Mrs Jane Ballard [5532]				
22001 - Mr Martin Ballard [8227]				
22002 - Mr Martin Ballard [8227]				
22010 - Mr John Twyford [5429]				
22016 - Mrs Clare Walters [5577]				
22025 - Miss Sophie Skinner [5685]				
22027 - Arthur Welham [8570]				
22028 - Arthur Welham [8570]				
22059 - Mr. Ronald Washington [8025]				
22062 - Mrs Doreen Brock [5972]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22063 - Mr Terence Brock [5973]				
18418 - Mr Alistair Barnwell [5368]	Object	Priests Lane is already congested carrying far too many 'Through' cars. Parts already need double yellow lining i.e. the last 200 yards approaching Friars Avenue from Brentwood. If the development was to proceed possible solution(s) would be to: a) make Priests Lane one way, running from Brentwood to Shenfield; b) Put an emergency vehicle only gate across Priests Lane somewhere between Shenfield Crescent and Bishops Walk. Either of these options would drastically reduce the current through traffic and make the proposed development more acceptable and safe.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19198 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin	Support	New Homes to be built in the North of the District e.g. North of A12 Greenfield Sites, Pilgrims Hatch & Shenfield.	Noted	To be considered in the site assessment work and Spatial Strategy, and in consideration of evidence.
17898 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901]	Support	Surely the amount of dwellings could be increased when compared to the development area and other sites.	Noted	Consider accordingly
21953 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001]	Support	Development of this land is unavoidable if housing targets are to be met. 178 must take into account all the possible needs of Endeavour and Hogarth Schools. 044 Planned exit and a one through Bishop Walk are essential to spread the traffic load. Communication with St. Andrews Place must be avoided due to its bad sightline at its junction with Priests Lane	Noted	Consider accordingly
18360 - Glenda Fleming [3779]	Support	Site 178, off Bishop Walk, should be treated separately from the the larger site 044 (Priests Lane Ursuline School playing fields). With the existing access and genuine developer interest site 178 would be a locality-sensitive and speedy development, with minimal traffic impact. It is privately owned, is not publicly accessible, is not overlooked and is built on already. It provides no public amenity. The suggestion that this land could be used for Endeavour School expansion is not supported. I strongly support site 178 for housing use and this should be evaluated separately of any proposed links with site 044.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22169 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587] 22170 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587] 22171 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587] 22172 - JTS Partnership LLP (Mr. James Govier) [2587]	Support	The combined sites are shown capable of providing up to 95 dwellings. The sites will be accessible by two separate access points (Priests Land and Bishop's Walk) although further Master Planning is necessary to establish whether these two separate parcels will be linked. 044 will be the significantly larger part of the allocation and ongoing survey, assessment and master planning has established the ability of this site to be served adequately by the existing access to Priests Lane, appropriate drainage solutions and no significant ecological or environmental constraints that will prevent the projected dwelling yield being achieved. Sites are well located to Brentwood and Shenfield town centres and other facilities and services. This redundant land, which the Brentwood Borough Council Sport, Leisure and Open Space Assessment, Aug 2016, ranked as 1 out of 5 for Public Accessibility and for Recreational Value, and 2 for Amenity Value will be ranked highly in any sequential approach to site allocation and thus its release for the provision of housing, in an established residential location, is not only justified but essential in achieving housing supply numbers in accordance with the stated Spatial Strategy. The site, being located adjacent to the Endeavour School, also provides the opportunity to support their objectives through the provision of some land to accommodate future expansion aspirations.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19418 - Mr Simon Fleming [7119]	Support	Support site ref 178 for housing with delivery year 1. Site ref 044 (Ursuline School playing fields) not linked. Both sites recommended for housing, but with qualified "potential option to utilise some of the land for expansion of Endeavour School". Ursuline's land is surplus school playing fields, so set-aside should come from 044 alone. Site 178 never public or educational land. Designating "with a potential option" for possible future school expansion is a major departure. Protracted negotiations would leave whole site blighted indefinitely. Ursuline charity offer educational land in their masterplan. Urge qualification only applies to site 044	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>010 Sow and Grow, Ongar Road, Pilgrims Hatch</i>				
19928 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	The pro-forma identifies the Grade II Registered Park and Garden (RPAG) which is located to the south west of the site. The Grade II listed buildings of Langtons and Langtons Forge, which are located along the boundary of the RPAG, however have not been referenced. Development of this site will need to conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance these heritage assets and their setting. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan	Noted and agreed	Consideration of the impact on historic assets and their settings will be required.
20076 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. It is recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17899 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901]	Comment	Impact on Ongar Road is of concern	Noted	Consider accordingly
18045 - Mr John Daly [7013]	Comment	31 units per ha why so little when more is been proposed for central brentwood and this road has bus routes	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18549 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 18550 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 18551 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 18552 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 18553 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 18554 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 18555 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 18557 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 18558 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 18559 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 18560 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 18561 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 18562 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 18563 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 18564 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 18566 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 18567 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 18568 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 18569 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 18570 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 18571 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 19195 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004] 20192 - Mr David Charlie [7983] 20231 - Teresa Anderson [1586] 20232 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 20235 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656] 20236 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 22061 - Mr Stephen J Bancroft	Object	Agents to the site state: Have previously carried out pre-application discussions setting out a draft scheme. The scheme was amended to show phases 1 and 2 and submitted to the Strategic Growth Options consultation 2015. Submission of an application has been pending the adoption of the Local Plan. The site is considered deliverable as it is still in the same ownership who are willing to bring the site forwards as soon as possible. The telecoms mast on site has now been acquired to allow for reinstatement of the full freehold ownership of the site. The existing businesses on site are willing to relocate and have now agree short notice terms. Development on site could commence and be completed within 5 years. The family have formed a development company. Some discussions with developers and builders have also been taking place with a view to a family led development of the site once there is sufficient certainty to proceed. Site is available, suitable, brownfield and should be on part 2 of the brownfield register to give it permission in principle.	Noted	Consider accordingly. Noted that the Brownfield register does not have Part 2 at this time and site assessment considers the boundary to include areas that are not brownfield/ previously developed land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18508 - Miss Chika Muorah [7002] 18527 - Mrs Anna-Marie Wingrove [7093] 18775 - Mr. Keith Hodges [2610] 19225 - Mr Martin Tunak [7279] 19380 - Mrs Karen Porter [2835] 19392 - Mrs Toni Rudgley [7088] 19531 - Mr. Vernon Thomas [7319] 20128 - Mrs Diane Boardman [4094] 21995 - Mrs Elaine Ball [8012] 22007 - Mr Adam Staples [8016] 22040 - Mrs. Amanda Staples [8023]	Object	Congested with homes, roads congested, poor transport infrastructure, car parking, very little green space; air pollution is bad and this will make it worse; delays and bottlenecks in the area make this site unsuitable; access is not clear and proposal will ruin the nearby cul do sac if used; no development on Green Belt land; detrimental impact on schools which are already full; site floods; will destroy important wildlife; development must not shade the existing allotments; allotments must be protected from construction and occupation; allotment must be kept free from vehicles, equipment; materials, waste or parking form the development; would only increase traffic. Our High Street is precious to us, if it is to survive, it needs car parks and more thought regarding the Baytree Centre and the empty shops; will disrupt local businesses.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18171 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 20193 - Miss Alison Goulding [7984] 20197 - Mr Steven Deville [7987] 20198 - Mr Mehmet Doru [5680] 20199 - Ms Alisa Ellis [7988] 20203 - Mr Ian Sweetlove [5692] 20211 - Mrs Magaret Gurton [7993] 20212 - Mr Paul Gurton [7994] 20226 - Mrs Pauline Hewitt [7996] 21940 - Miss Danielle McCallam [8005] 21978 - Mrs Barbara Wooders [8009] 22011 - Mr Alan Sullivan [8017] 22024 - Mr. David Sisley [8018]	Support	Support site 010 and building on Brownfield land on Green Belt. Will help support young families.	Support noted	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>027 Land adjacent to Carmel, Mascalls Lane, Warley</i>				
20079 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	We do not envisage network infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site on a basis that it won't be any surface water connection into a public foul sewer system. Connection of surface water into a public foul sewer system reduces sewer capacity and has the potential to cause flooding to existing customers. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18432 - Mr Mark Simpson [7137] 19563 - Stonebond Properties Ltd [5948]	Comment	Support a partial development, with flourishing green corridors, of this site. I don't support development of the entire plot, but only selected parts of the plot, with well planned buffer zone. - A partial development with green buffer will improved the condition of site.- It is important to move beyond nimbyism and obsession with preserving inflated property prices - The perceived disadvantages are minor and can be mitigated - There is a real need for affordable housing in this area. If the land is used to help tackle this directly, then I would support a partial development of it.	Noted	consider accordingly
17878 - Mr Howard Knibbs [6853] 17882 - Mrs Alexis Knibbs [6874] 18116 - Mr Grealde Pearce [7032] 18123 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18148 - Mrs Patricia Creavin [7066] 18150 - Mr Martin Oxley [7067] 18195 - Great Warley Conservation Society (Mr Leonard Fryatt) [4593] 18485 - Mr. & Mrs. Brian & Sharon Hasting [7157] 18507 - Ms. Cheryl Lee [7171] 18828 - Ms Denise Brien [1832] 19223 - Mrs. Marian Spade [7277] 19280 - Mr John Plumtree [7284] 19532 - Ms. Cheryl Lee [7171] 20136 - Mrs Gabrielle Simpson [7971]	Object	Will blight the Dell to the rear; visual impact on the Dell users and residents; schools are at capacity; GPs are full; access is poor and dangerous; topology would result in overbearing and overlooking development; has been refused by a Planning Inspector before on appeal. Too many homes are being proposed; protect the Green Belt; too many new homes in this area anyway; traffic safety issues,; more congestion; impact on wildlife	Noted	Consider accordingly

027 Land adjacent to Carmel, Mascalls Lane, Warley

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19897 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Object	Site 027 was originally included in the 2011 SHLAA with an estimated capacity of 30 dwellings. It is back in the preferred site list with a capacity of 9. We think this should be included in the overall windfall allowance, and the Green Belt boundary altered accordingly.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18172 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]	Support	Ideal site with minimal local disruption with good access.	Support noted	No further action
17900 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17994 - MR NICHOLAS CHAPLIN [6981] 17995 - Mrs Ruth Chaplin [6904]	Support	his is an ideal small site for quick development of 10 - 12 dwellings. It is surrounded on 3 sides by residential and fronts Mascalls Lane. It is a small piece of infill that no longer warrants Green Belt status following the Mascalls Park development.	Support noted	No further action
<i>083 Land west of Warley Hill, Pastoral Way, Warley</i>				
17862 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199] 21257 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]	Comment	Why are we considering green belt and recreational areas when we have not yet built out on brown field sites? We see muntjac deer and even escaped peacocks in this vicinity. Wildlife abounds. Please do not destroy this pretty part of the borough especially with buildings of historical value in the site and need to ensure that adjacent wildlife sites be totally and perpetually inviolated.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20087 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19916 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963] 19929 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	There is concern that the development of this site would sever the relationship of the Tower House and Lodge from the main building. The group value of these buildings is an important aspect of their significance. Development of this site could result in harm to the significance of this group of the listed buildings. We request any site specific policy for this site includes a series of criterion, including any mitigation measures that may be appropriate. A master planning process is advised. The height of new development within the site should also be carefully considered.	Comments noted	To be considered in full regarding impact on historic assets and their settings

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18047 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18124 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18602 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871] 18606 - Miss Patricia Filtness [6871] 18674 - Mr Crispin Hanson [7191]	Object	This NHS land can be described as a hidden, idyllic setting. It's vital that the main house (visible from Warley Hill) be retained but redeveloped. The other buildings currently there could also be redeveloped or rebuilt on the same footprints they now occupy - possibly for affordable homes for young people including a shelter for vulnerable adults. I object strongly to the proposal to re-landscape, remove established, mature trees and build 43-58 homes in a close-packed urban design that takes no account of the current leafy quietness and pleasantness of the area, nor the traffic generated on Warley Hill. It was part of the planning constraints for the Warley hospital development the new building could only be on the area of previous built on land, this land was part of the Warley Hospital site accomdating staff houses, what has changed? The roads and facilities in this area are under strain now, they would be overwhelmed and unable to cope with such an increase. 500 homes would have at least 1 car each, the expectation that people will use public transport is just rubbish. As a result the traffic, air and noise pollution in the area will rise. Its currently gridlock on The Drive, Warley Hill and Chindits Lane in the morning and evenings. There would be GP impact. The site is not appropriate for development on the grounds of heritage and agriculture. Development would have an impact on the Grade II listed buildings. There are also a number of grade A and B trees in the area, and the removal of these trees would change the character of the area. Restoration of 'Greenwoods' and replacement of the other existing dwellings designed to be in keeping with the listed buildings would be a far more appropriate development opportunity and more in keeping with the local community.	Noted.	Consideration of thee issues will be made regarding this location.
18661 - Woodland Trust (Mr Jack Taylor) [7189]	Object	Object as likely to cause damage and or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to the boundary. AW 37m to West of site. Type - ASNW . Name - Clements Wood. Size - 1.490825 ha. Grid ref - TQ588921	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19595 - Bidwells (Mr. Steven Butler) [2089]	Support	These representations have been prepared on behalf of Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust (EPUT) in support of this allocation. In relation to the site we are in support of the Council's strategic strategy, the Council's recognition of the need to update the housing need figure, the Council's approach of allocating additional residential development sites, and the Council's updated methodological approach to the selection of Green Belt housing allocations based on their physical boundaries, which is now significantly more flexible than the 2016 Draft Local Plan's approach. We consider that the delivery of the site could come forward 1-5 years.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17901 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901]	Support	Green belt and woodlands need careful consideration and protection. number of dwellings lower than other sites of similar size.	Support noted	Consider accordingly

032 *Land east of Nags Head Lane, Brentwood*

20080 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure	Noted	Ongoing work with utility providers will consider this issue
19931 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	The Grade II listed Nags Head public house sits to the immediate northwest corner of the site. We are pleased to see that the presence of the designated heritage asset has been identified within the pro-forma. Development of this site will need to conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance this heritage asset and its setting. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19578 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]	Comment	Support the allocation of this site however object to the quantum of development suggested - 125 dwellings. This represents a reduction of 25 dwellings from the previous iteration of the Plan. BBC has not prepared any evidence regarding the relationship of the site with any listed buildings to justify this arbitrary 25 unit reduction. See attached Built Heritage Assessment as our evidence to support our position. CNE requests that the original allocation of 150 dwelling be reassigned to this site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18312 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways & Transportation: Development on this site will need to contribute to a pool of funding to provide an enhanced level of bus service to serve the 125 homes planned. It will also be important to ensure that the design layout of the site facilitates sustainable access, ideally with bus gates or other interventions designed to maximise such access whilst giving these modes a journey time advantage.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18971 - Mr. Gary Pratt [7240]	Object	Development I infrastructure, country lanes and services would never cope with the demand. My living standards in a peaceful green field area would be in crouched upon with the building work and housing. I object most strongly we need to preserve green field sites not build on them. This would have an impact on wildlife and nature.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17966 - Miss Laura Marriott [6945] 18115 - Mrs Carole Terry [7056] 18427 - Mr Anthony Taylor [7005] 18755 - Ms Jane Goodbody [7211] 19076 - Mr Philip Hirst [7253] 20145 - Mr Brian Ross [7974] 22122 - J Robinson [8038]	Object	This area is prone to flooding. The roads cannot cope with current traffic volumes, including J28 brook Street Roundabout. The site is currently Green belt. This development would add to the urban sprawl and soon there will be no clear demarcation between London conurbation and Essex. Need additional primary school places, better bus service; pavement access to High Street and station needs improvement; would ruin peaceful green field area impacting on existing residents; will worsen highway safety.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17902 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18173 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]	Support	Increasing the amount of dwellings should be considered for a plot this size. impact of traffic also to be considered.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>022 Land at Honeypot Lane, Brentwood</i>				
18311 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18370 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Development on this site will need to be contribute to a pool of funding to provide an enhanced level of bus service which will be especially important to ensure that it adequately serves the 200 senior citizen's homes planned. It will also be important to ensure that the design layout of the site facilitates sustainable access, ideally with bus gates or other interventions designed to maximise such access whilst giving these modes a journey time advantage. The accessibility of all housing sites to schools via safe direct walking and cycling routes must be considered.	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20252 - Ms Caroline Nuttall [5800] 20258 - Tony Lilley [7595] 20264 - Mr Ron Schild [7596] 20270 - Mr. & Mrs. Andrew & Janette Davison [7257] 20276 - Mr & Miss D J Carter-Barnard & D Skurr [7597] 20282 - Ms Denise Buckley [6356] 20288 - - C B Watson [7599] 20294 - Ms Donna Murphy [6324] 20300 - C Redmond [7600] 20306 - Mr Chris Emmings [7670] 20312 - William Madden [1102] 20318 - M Nickless [7671] 20324 - Mr and Mrs Kirton [6169] 20330 - Mr & Mrs Peter & Penny Wines [6036] 20336 - Jill Hoggs [7673] 20342 - Ms Helen Dobie [6318] 20348 - Ms Rose F. [7681] 20354 - F. Bennie [788] 20360 - Mrs Mansell [6160] 20366 - Mr T Greene [7697] 20372 - Ms L F [7700] 20378 - Mr & Mrs Evans [7702] 20384 - Mr Mandip Sidhu [7594] 20390 - Ms Linda - [7598] 20396 - Ms Joanne Urch [7630] 20402 - Ritam Joy [7631] 20408 - Mr Mike - [7645] 20414 - Mr and Mrs M and M Bmallman [7650] 20420 - Kerry D Redman [7672] 20426 - M Clements [7653] 20432 - Mr Michael Noake [6013] 20438 - Ms Carol Wiles [7649] 20444 - Ms D Greenland [6161] 20450 - Mr Ian Hodgson [7674] 20456 - Mr David Amos [7676] 20462 - Mr Andrew Davison [7006] 20468 - Roger Bonnett [718] 20474 - P M Britten [7687] 20480 - C J Penett [7694] 20486 - Mr Peter Quelch [7706] 20492 - Mr. M. Jarvis [1584]	Object	6. This is not a good choice for such a development. A deeply flawed plan. Please take my views into consideration.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20498 - Mr Neil Duhig [6995]				
20504 - J S [7710]				
20510 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
20516 - M. Frewer [736]				
20522 - Mr Ron Gulley [7462]				
20528 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20534 - Mr Mark Bayer [7719]				
20540 - V W [7721]				
20546 - - A [7723]				
20552 - J Payne [7725]				
20558 - D Robinson [7728]				
20564 - Mrs Brenda Woodford [5709]				
20570 - Mrs J Redman [6129]				
20576 - Ms Barbara Patton [7729]				
20582 - J D Miselbach [7730]				
20588 - R A Vickerage [7731]				
20594 - Carol Burpitt [5908]				
20600 - Ms Gillian Kilden [7732]				
20606 - Ms Sherry Robinson [7008]				
20612 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713]				
20618 - Paul Downes [557]				
20624 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043]				
20630 - Name Not Supplied [7668]				
20636 - J Vickery [7629]				
20642 - Mr Barrie K Joy [7632]				
20648 - Ms Amanda Arnold [7640]				
20654 - M.Y. Anjoyeb [1484]				
20660 - Ms Elizabeth Sargent [6490]				
20666 - Mr Raymond Sargent [6493]				
20672 - Name Not Supplied Clements [7652]				
20678 - Mr Jason Selwyn [6485]				
20684 - Maria Selwyn [1216]				
20690 - Mr D. Cull [7665]				
20696 - Chris Howe [1252]				
20702 - Mr & Mrs Lee and Rachel O'Meara [5839]				
20708 - Mr James Straker [7666]				
20714 - Mr Philip Beare [7667]				
20720 - Lloyd Hayden [6477]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

20726 - Ms Linda Hayden [7669]

20732 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17881 - Mrs Donna Emmings [6866] 17968 - Miss Laura Marriott [6945] 18001 - Mr Phillip Burden [6957] 18011 - Mr Kristian Darwin [6997] 18012 - Mrs Helen Andrews [6999] 18013 - Mrs Gillian Hobbs [5598] 18022 - Mr Ross Assenheim [7009] 18023 - Mr David Hunwick [6929] 18125 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18126 - Mr Gordon Bird [4560] 18217 - Chris Howe [1252] 18237 - Honeypot Action Group [7117] 18241 - Mr Neil Hornsby [7110] 18388 - Mrs Alison White [6371] 18389 - Mrs Alison White [6371] 18391 - Mrs Alison White [6371] 18392 - Mrs Alison White [6371] 18393 - Mrs Alison White [6371] 18394 - Mrs Alison White [6371] 18414 - Mr. & Mrs. T Llewellyn [7142] 18433 - Miss Jemma Hamersley [6870] 18480 - mr robert brookes [6996] 18495 - Mrs Caroline Conry [7092] 18501 - Mr Brian Evans [5434] 18509 - Mrs Namita Das [6018] 18525 - Mr and Mrs Williams [6158] 18539 - Mr and Mrs Williams [6158] 18540 - Mr and Mrs Williams [6158] 18611 - Mr Tony Walker [5959] 18619 - Mr Chris Puddefoot [6016] 18644 - Robin Penny [2139] 18645 - Robin Penny [2139] 18684 - Mr Jonathan Purr [7194] 18739 - Mr and Mrs Sturgess [6145] 18750 - Ms Jane Goodbody [7211]	Object	The Lane is dangerous at peak times. There would be increased traffic congestion, pollution. The site is inaccessible from Weald Road. Increased pressure on local infrastructure. Local schools are massively oversubscribed. GPs full. Existing drainage problems. Destruction of wildlife habitat. Erosion of the Green Belt. Dunton Garden Village would have its own infrastructure. SA report is incomplete and unreliable.	Objections noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18790 - Gita Mackintosh [7214]				
18791 - Gita Mackintosh [7214]				
18806 - Mr & Mrs M & P Tyler [5787]				
18807 - Mr & Mrs M & P Tyler [5787]				
18868 - Mr Neil Duhig [6358]				
18869 - Mr Neil Duhig [6358]				
18870 - Mr Neil Duhig [6358]				
18871 - Mr Neil Duhig [6358]				
18872 - Mr Neil Duhig [6358]				
18948 - Mr Françoise Milli [5998]				
18984 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
18985 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
18986 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
18987 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
18988 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
18989 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
19059 - Mr Graham Miles [6028]				
19068 - Mr Philip Hirst [7253]				
19105 - J. S. and R. Mack [6055]				
19106 - J. S. and R. Mack [6055]				
19108 - Mr. & Mrs. Andrew & Janette Davison [7257]				
19125 - Mr and Mrs N and J Kelly [6024]				
19164 - Mrs. Janice Yellop [7265]				
19217 - Mrs Gillian Hobbs [5598]				
19228 - Mr Jonathan Levy [5913]				
19230 - Mr Mark Phillips [5753]				
19231 - Mr Mark Phillips [5753]				
19238 - Ms Kathy Canham [5728]				
19249 - Steve Abrahall [666]				
19252 - Kerry Ackroyd [6359]				
19253 - Kerry Ackroyd [6359]				
19348 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450]				
19349 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450]				
19350 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450]				
19351 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450]				
19352 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450]				
19353 - Mrs Barbara Beckett				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[5450] 19354 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 19355 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 19356 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 19357 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 19358 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 19359 - Mrs Barbara Beckett [5450] 19373 - Dr Denny [6157] 19386 - Mrs. & Mr. Vilence & Barry Hyam [7294] 19393 - Mrs Tina Davis [6029] 19419 - Mrs Sharon Catlin [5345] 19508 - Mr Roy Felstead [7314] 19530 - Mr. Vernon Thomas [7319] 19543 - South Hill Residents Association Ltd (Mr Joseph Carr) [7327] 19561 - Ms Linda Jarvis [1850] 19580 - Lesley Ottewell [6392] 19581 - Lesley Ottewell [6392] 19655 - Chilmark Consulting Limited (Mr. Mike Taylor) [2703] 19703 - Jon Pimblett [601] 19704 - Jon Pimblett [601] 19705 - Jon Pimblett [601] 19706 - Jon Pimblett [601] 19714 - Mr Mandip Sidhu [7594] 19715 - Ms Caroline Nuttall [5800] 19716 - Tony Lilley [7595] 19717 - Mr Ron Schild [7596] 19718 - Mr. & Mrs. Andrew & Janette Davison [7257] 19719 - Mr & Miss D J Carter-Barnard & D Skurr [7597] 19720 - Ms Linda - [7598] 19722 - Ms Denise Buckley [6356] 19723 - - C B Watson [7599] 19724 - Ms Donna Murphy [6324] 19725 - C Redmond [7600]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20053 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20054 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20055 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20059 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20077 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]				
20090 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20204 - Jeanette Davidson [7992]				
20205 - Mrs Madden [6174]				
20206 - Mrs Madden [6174]				
20207 - Mrs Madden [6174]				
20208 - Mrs Madden [6174]				
20209 - Mrs Madden [6174]				
20210 - Mrs Madden [6174]				
21245 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]				
21954 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001]				
21965 - Mrs Gill White [6064]				
22004 - Mr Francis Saunders [8014]				
22015 - Mr John White [6581]				
22038 - Mrs. Amanda Staples [8023]				
22065 - mr robert brookes [6996]				
22066 - mr robert brookes [6996]				
22067 - mr robert brookes [6996]				
22068 - mr robert brookes [6996]				
22069 - mr robert brookes [6996]				
22092 - F Alexander [8030]				
22108 - Ms Norma McIntyre [6178]				
22123 - Ms Kathy Canham [5728]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20250 - Ms Caroline Nuttall [5800] 20256 - Tony Lilley [7595] 20262 - Mr Ron Schild [7596] 20268 - Mr. & Mrs. Andrew & Janette Davison [7257] 20274 - Mr & Miss D J Carter-Barnard & D Skurr [7597] 20280 - Ms Denise Buckley [6356] 20286 - - C B Watson [7599] 20292 - Ms Donna Murphy [6324] 20298 - C Redmond [7600] 20304 - Mr Chris Emmings [7670] 20310 - William Madden [1102] 20316 - M Nickless [7671] 20322 - Mr and Mrs Kirton [6169] 20328 - Mr & Mrs Peter & Penny Wines [6036] 20334 - Jill Hoggs [7673] 20340 - Ms Helen Dobie [6318] 20346 - Ms Rose F. [7681] 20352 - F. Bennie [788] 20358 - Mrs Mansell [6160] 20364 - Mr T Greene [7697] 20370 - Ms L F [7700] 20376 - Mr & Mrs Evans [7702] 20382 - Mr Mandip Sidhu [7594] 20388 - Ms Linda - [7598] 20394 - Ms Joanne Urch [7630] 20400 - Ritam Joy [7631] 20406 - Mr Mike - [7645] 20412 - Mr and Mrs M and M Bmallman [7650] 20418 - Kerry D Redman [7672] 20424 - M Clements [7653] 20430 - Mr Michael Noake [6013] 20436 - Ms Carol Wiles [7649] 20442 - Ms D Greenland [6161] 20448 - Mr Ian Hodgson [7674] 20454 - Mr David Amos [7676] 20460 - Mr Andrew Davison [7006] 20466 - Roger Bonnett [718] 20472 - P M Britten [7687] 20478 - C J Penett [7694] 20484 - Mr Peter Quelch [7706] 20490 - Mr. M. Jarvis [1584]	Object	2. This is important Metropolitan Green Belt land and I feel strongly that such land should be protected.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20496 - Mr Neil Duhig [6995]				
20502 - J S [7710]				
20508 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
20514 - M. Frewer [736]				
20520 - Mr Ron Gulley [7462]				
20526 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20532 - Mr Mark Baver [7719]				
20538 - V W [7721]				
20544 - - A [7723]				
20550 - J Payne [7725]				
20556 - D Robinson [7728]				
20562 - Mrs Brenda Woodford [5709]				
20568 - Mrs J Redman [6129]				
20574 - Ms Barbara Patton [7729]				
20580 - J D Miselbach [7730]				
20586 - R A Vickerage [7731]				
20592 - Carol Burpitt [5908]				
20598 - Ms Gillian Kilden [7732]				
20604 - Ms Sherry Robinson [7008]				
20610 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713]				
20616 - Paul Downes [557]				
20622 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043]				
20628 - Name Not Supplied [7668]				
20634 - J Vickery [7629]				
20640 - Mr Barrie K Joy [7632]				
20646 - Ms Amanda Arnold [7640]				
20652 - M.Y. Anjoyeb [1484]				
20658 - Ms Elizabeth Sargent [6490]				
20664 - Mr Raymond Sargent [6493]				
20670 - Name Not Supplied Clements [7652]				
20676 - Mr Jason Selwyn [6485]				
20682 - Maria Selwyn [1216]				
20688 - Mr D. Cull [7665]				
20694 - Chris Howe [1252]				
20700 - Mr & Mrs Lee and Rachel O'Meara [5839]				
20706 - Mr James Straker [7666]				
20712 - Mr Philip Beare [7667]				
20718 - Lloyd Hayden [6477]				

Representations***Nature******Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan******Council's Assessment******Action***

20724 - Ms Linda Hayden [7669]

20730 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20247 - Ms Caroline Nuttall [5800] 20253 - Tony Lilley [7595] 20259 - Mr Ron Schild [7596] 20265 - Mr. & Mrs. Andrew & Janette Davison [7257] 20271 - Mr & Miss D J Carter-Barnard & D Skurr [7597] 20277 - Ms Denise Buckley [6356] 20283 - - C B Watson [7599] 20289 - Ms Donna Murphy [6324] 20295 - C Redmond [7600] 20301 - Mr Chris Emmings [7670] 20307 - William Madden [1102] 20313 - M Nickless [7671] 20319 - Mr and Mrs Kirton [6169] 20325 - Mr & Mrs Peter & Penny Wines [6036] 20331 - Jill Hoggs [7673] 20337 - Ms Helen Dobie [6318] 20343 - Ms Rose F. [7681] 20349 - F. Bennie [788] 20355 - Mrs Mansell [6160] 20361 - Mr T Greene [7697] 20367 - Ms L F [7700] 20373 - Mr & Mrs Evans [7702] 20379 - Mr Mandip Sidhu [7594] 20385 - Ms Linda - [7598] 20391 - Ms Joanne Urch [7630] 20397 - Ritam Joy [7631] 20403 - Mr Mike - [7645] 20409 - Mr and Mrs M and M Bmallman [7650] 20415 - Kerry D Redman [7672] 20421 - M Clements [7653] 20427 - Mr Michael Noake [6013] 20433 - Ms Carol Wiles [7649] 20439 - Ms D Greenland [6161] 20445 - Mr Ian Hodgson [7674] 20451 - Mr David Amos [7676] 20457 - Mr Andrew Davison [7006] 20463 - Roger Bonnett [718] 20469 - P M Britten [7687] 20475 - C J Penett [7694] 20481 - Mr Peter Quelch [7706] 20487 - Mr. M. Jarvis [1584]	Object	3. Local schools and doctors surgeries have no capacity to support the additional residents.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20493 - Mr Neil Duhig [6995]				
20499 - J S [7710]				
20505 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
20511 - M. Frewer [736]				
20517 - Mr Ron Gulley [7462]				
20523 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20529 - Mr Mark Baver [7719]				
20535 - V W [7721]				
20541 - - A [7723]				
20547 - J Payne [7725]				
20553 - D Robinson [7728]				
20559 - Mrs Brenda Woodford [5709]				
20565 - Mrs J Redman [6129]				
20571 - Ms Barbara Patton [7729]				
20577 - J D Miselbach [7730]				
20583 - R A Vickerage [7731]				
20589 - Carol Burpitt [5908]				
20595 - Ms Gillian Kilden [7732]				
20601 - Ms Sherry Robinson [7008]				
20607 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713]				
20613 - Paul Downes [557]				
20619 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043]				
20625 - Name Not Supplied [7668]				
20631 - J Vickery [7629]				
20637 - Mr Barrie K Joy [7632]				
20643 - Ms Amanda Arnold [7640]				
20649 - M.Y. Anjoyeb [1484]				
20655 - Ms Elizabeth Sargent [6490]				
20661 - Mr Raymond Sargent [6493]				
20667 - Name Not Supplied Clements [7652]				
20673 - Mr Jason Selwyn [6485]				
20679 - Maria Selwyn [1216]				
20685 - Mr D. Cull [7665]				
20691 - Chris Howe [1252]				
20697 - Mr & Mrs Lee and Rachel O'Meara [5839]				
20703 - Mr James Straker [7666]				
20709 - Mr Philip Beare [7667]				
20715 - Lloyd Hayden [6477]				

Representations***Nature******Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan******Council's Assessment******Action***

20721 - Ms Linda Hayden [7669]

20727 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20248 - Ms Caroline Nuttall [5800] 20254 - Tony Lilley [7595] 20260 - Mr Ron Schild [7596] 20266 - Mr. & Mrs. Andrew & Janette Davison [7257] 20272 - Mr & Miss D J Carter-Barnard & D Skurr [7597] 20278 - Ms Denise Buckley [6356] 20284 - - C B Watson [7599] 20290 - Ms Donna Murphy [6324] 20296 - C Redmond [7600] 20302 - Mr Chris Emmings [7670] 20308 - William Madden [1102] 20314 - M Nickless [7671] 20320 - Mr and Mrs Kirton [6169] 20326 - Mr & Mrs Peter & Penny Wines [6036] 20332 - Jill Hogg [7673] 20338 - Ms Helen Dobie [6318] 20344 - Ms Rose F. [7681] 20350 - F. Bennie [788] 20356 - Mrs Mansell [6160] 20362 - Mr T Greene [7697] 20368 - Ms L F [7700] 20374 - Mr & Mrs Evans [7702] 20380 - Mr Mandip Sidhu [7594] 20386 - Ms Linda - [7598] 20392 - Ms Joanne Urch [7630] 20398 - Ritam Joy [7631] 20404 - Mr Mike - [7645] 20410 - Mr and Mrs M and M Bmallman [7650] 20416 - Kerry D Redman [7672] 20422 - M Clements [7653] 20428 - Mr Michael Noake [6013] 20434 - Ms Carol Wiles [7649] 20440 - Ms D Greenland [6161] 20446 - Mr Ian Hodgson [7674] 20452 - Mr David Amos [7676] 20458 - Mr Andrew Davison [7006] 20464 - Roger Bonnett [718] 20470 - P M Britten [7687] 20476 - C J Penett [7694] 20482 - Mr Peter Quelch [7706] 20488 - Mr. M. Jarvis [1584]	Object	5. The development would cause flooding and drainage problems in the area. The gardens in some houses backing onto the site already experience problems.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20494 - Mr Neil Duhig [6995]				
20500 - J S [7710]				
20506 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
20512 - M. Frewer [736]				
20518 - Mr Ron Gulley [7462]				
20524 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20530 - Mr Mark Bayer [7719]				
20536 - V W [7721]				
20542 - - A [7723]				
20548 - J Payne [7725]				
20554 - D Robinson [7728]				
20560 - Mrs Brenda Woodford [5709]				
20566 - Mrs J Redman [6129]				
20572 - Ms Barbara Patton [7729]				
20578 - J D Miselbach [7730]				
20584 - R A Vickerage [7731]				
20590 - Carol Burpitt [5908]				
20596 - Ms Gillian Kilden [7732]				
20602 - Ms Sherry Robinson [7008]				
20608 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713]				
20614 - Paul Downes [557]				
20620 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043]				
20626 - Name Not Supplied [7668]				
20632 - J Vickery [7629]				
20638 - Mr Barrie K Joy [7632]				
20644 - Ms Amanda Arnold [7640]				
20650 - M.Y. Anjoyeb [1484]				
20656 - Ms Elizabeth Sargent [6490]				
20662 - Mr Raymond Sargent [6493]				
20668 - Name Not Supplied Clements [7652]				
20674 - Mr Jason Selwyn [6485]				
20680 - Maria Selwyn [1216]				
20686 - Mr D. Cull [7665]				
20692 - Chris Howe [1252]				
20698 - Mr & Mrs Lee and Rachel O'Meara [5839]				
20704 - Mr James Straker [7666]				
20710 - Mr Philip Beare [7667]				
20716 - Lloyd Hayden [6477]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
-------------------------------	----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----------------------

20722 - Ms Linda Hayden [7669]

20728 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20251 - Ms Caroline Nuttall [5800] 20257 - Tony Lilley [7595] 20263 - Mr Ron Schild [7596] 20269 - Mr. & Mrs. Andrew & Janette Davison [7257] 20275 - Mr & Miss D J Carter-Barnard & D Skurr [7597] 20281 - Ms Denise Buckley [6356] 20287 - C B Watson [7599] 20293 - Ms Donna Murphy [6324] 20299 - C Redmond [7600] 20305 - Mr Chris Emmings [7670] 20311 - William Madden [1102] 20317 - M Nickless [7671] 20323 - Mr and Mrs Kirton [6169] 20329 - Mr & Mrs Peter & Penny Wines [6036] 20335 - Jill Hogg [7673] 20341 - Ms Helen Dobie [6318] 20347 - Ms Rose F. [7681] 20353 - F. Bennie [788] 20359 - Mrs Mansell [6160] 20365 - Mr T Greene [7697] 20371 - Ms L F [7700] 20377 - Mr & Mrs Evans [7702] 20383 - Mr Mandip Sidhu [7594] 20389 - Ms Linda - [7598] 20395 - Ms Joanne Urch [7630] 20401 - Ritam Joy [7631] 20407 - Mr Mike - [7645] 20413 - Mr and Mrs M and M Bmallman [7650] 20419 - Kerry D Redman [7672] 20425 - M Clements [7653] 20431 - Mr Michael Noake [6013] 20437 - Ms Carol Wiles [7649] 20443 - Ms D Greenland [6161] 20449 - Mr Ian Hodgson [7674] 20455 - Mr David Amos [7676] 20461 - Mr Andrew Davison [7006] 20467 - Roger Bonnett [718] 20473 - P M Britten [7687] 20479 - C J Penett [7694] 20485 - Mr Peter Quelch [7706] 20491 - Mr. M. Jarvis [1584]	Object	4. Site was previously rejected as it did not meet the Council's Spatial Strategy - nothing has changed.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20497 - Mr Neil Duhig [6995]				
20503 - J S [7710]				
20509 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
20515 - M. Frewer [736]				
20521 - Mr Ron Gulley [7462]				
20527 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20533 - Mr Mark Bayer [7719]				
20539 - V W [7721]				
20545 - - A [7723]				
20551 - J Payne [7725]				
20557 - D Robinson [7728]				
20563 - Mrs Brenda Woodford [5709]				
20569 - Mrs J Redman [6129]				
20575 - Ms Barbara Patton [7729]				
20581 - J D Miselbach [7730]				
20587 - R A Vickerage [7731]				
20593 - Carol Burpitt [5908]				
20599 - Ms Gillian Kilden [7732]				
20605 - Ms Sherry Robinson [7008]				
20611 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713]				
20617 - Paul Downes [557]				
20623 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043]				
20629 - Name Not Supplied [7668]				
20635 - J Vickery [7629]				
20641 - Mr Barrie K Joy [7632]				
20647 - Ms Amanda Arnold [7640]				
20653 - M.Y. Anjoyeb [1484]				
20659 - Ms Elizabeth Sargent [6490]				
20665 - Mr Raymond Sargent [6493]				
20671 - Name Not Supplied Clements [7652]				
20677 - Mr Jason Selwyn [6485]				
20683 - Maria Selwyn [1216]				
20689 - Mr D. Cull [7665]				
20695 - Chris Howe [1252]				
20701 - Mr & Mrs Lee and Rachel O'Meara [5839]				
20707 - Mr James Straker [7666]				
20713 - Mr Philip Beare [7667]				
20719 - Lloyd Hayden [6477]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

20725 - Ms Linda Hayden [7669]

20731 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472]

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20249 - Ms Caroline Nuttall [5800] 20255 - Tony Lilley [7595] 20261 - Mr Ron Schild [7596] 20267 - Mr. & Mrs. Andrew & Janette Davison [7257] 20273 - Mr & Miss D J Carter-Barnard & D Skurr [7597] 20279 - Ms Denise Buckley [6356] 20285 - - C B Watson [7599] 20291 - Ms Donna Murphy [6324] 20297 - C Redmond [7600] 20303 - Mr Chris Emmings [7670] 20309 - William Madden [1102] 20315 - M Nickless [7671] 20321 - Mr and Mrs Kirton [6169] 20327 - Mr & Mrs Peter & Penny Wines [6036] 20333 - Jill Hoggs [7673] 20339 - Ms Helen Dobie [6318] 20345 - Ms Rose F. [7681] 20351 - F. Bennie [788] 20357 - Mrs Mansell [6160] 20363 - Mr T Greene [7697] 20369 - Ms L F [7700] 20375 - Mr & Mrs Evans [7702] 20381 - Mr Mandip Sidhu [7594] 20387 - Ms Linda - [7598] 20393 - Ms Joanne Urch [7630] 20399 - Ritam Joy [7631] 20405 - Mr Mike - [7645] 20411 - Mr and Mrs M and M Bmallman [7650] 20417 - Kerry D Redman [7672] 20423 - M Clements [7653] 20429 - Mr Michael Noake [6013] 20435 - Ms Carol Wiles [7649] 20441 - Ms D Greenland [6161] 20447 - Mr Ian Hodgson [7674] 20453 - Mr David Amos [7676] 20459 - Mr Andrew Davison [7006] 20465 - Roger Bonnett [718] 20471 - P M Britten [7687] 20477 - C J Penett [7694] 20483 - Mr Peter Quelch [7706] 20489 - Mr. M. Jarvis [1584]	Object	1. The traffic caused by 200 extra houses plus a care home would cause a dramatic increase in traffic in all the local roads. Traffic at peak times is already very heavy and causes long tail backs at all junctions leading onto London Road. Honeypot Lane is already a cut-through from London Road to Weald Road and traffic still speeds through the road ignoring the 20 mph speed limit. There would be major problems with traffic wherever the entrance to the site was located. All adjacent roads and Homesteads Estate would become a traffic 'rat run'. There are many safety risks and extra pollution.		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20495 - Mr Neil Duhig [6995]				
20501 - J S [7710]				
20507 - Gillian Marder [6035]				
20513 - M. Frewer [736]				
20519 - Mr Ron Gulley [7462]				
20525 - Dawn Duhig [6360]				
20531 - Mr Mark Bayer [7719]				
20537 - V W [7721]				
20543 - - A [7723]				
20549 - J Payne [7725]				
20555 - D Robinson [7728]				
20561 - Mrs Brenda Woodford [5709]				
20567 - Mrs J Redman [6129]				
20573 - Ms Barbara Patton [7729]				
20579 - J D Miselbach [7730]				
20585 - R A Vickerage [7731]				
20591 - Carol Burpitt [5908]				
20597 - Ms Gillian Kilden [7732]				
20603 - Ms Sherry Robinson [7008]				
20609 - Mrs Hazel Emery [5713]				
20615 - Paul Downes [557]				
20621 - Mrs Rosalind Downes [6043]				
20627 - Name Not Supplied [7668]				
20633 - J Vickery [7629]				
20639 - Mr Barrie K Joy [7632]				
20645 - Ms Amanda Arnold [7640]				
20651 - M.Y. Anjoyeb [1484]				
20657 - Ms Elizabeth Sargent [6490]				
20663 - Mr Raymond Sargent [6493]				
20669 - Name Not Supplied Clements [7652]				
20675 - Mr Jason Selwyn [6485]				
20681 - Maria Selwyn [1216]				
20687 - Mr D. Cull [7665]				
20693 - Chris Howe [1252]				
20699 - Mr & Mrs Lee and Rachel O'Meara [5839]				
20705 - Mr James Straker [7666]				
20711 - Mr Philip Beare [7667]				
20717 - Lloyd Hayden [6477]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20723 - Ms Linda Hayden [7669] 20729 - Mrs Lisa Christie [1472]				
17903 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18077 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18174 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]	Support	Support allocation	Support noted	No further action
<i>023A & 023B Land off Doddinghurst Road, either side of A12, Brentwood</i>				
20244 - Mrs Wendy Garnett [7999]	Comment	Will there be roundabout access to both Doddinghurst Road and Ongar Road, as turning out onto both these roads will become dangerous due to driver inconsideration. Will the additional residents be able to register at a doctor's surgery? Will the pedestrian access at the end of King Georges Road remain? Also did Brentwood Council receive any payment for the piece of land at the end of where 8 Bishop Hall Road is? This path used to go straight to the end of the field, now blocked off. If so, how much? If not, why not?	Noted	Consider accordingly
18127 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18634 - Mr and Mrs Clive and Lesley Tanner [1071] 20243 - Mrs Wendy Garnett [7999]	Comment	Concerned about car parking being developed as it will have a negative impact on the high street and cause greater issues finding parking. Building on Green belt land leaves no room for natural corridor or aesthetic spaces in the town. Building on this site will lead to great traffic congestion and pollution. Services, such as schools, are already oversubscribed. Other services, Doctors, Dentists, Water, Sewerage is already at maximum capacity and no extra provision is made to increase this. Greater need for a housing mix - currently looking to downsize and cannot find an appropriate place in the borough.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20078 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. It is therefore recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17904 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17969 - Mrs Barbara Marler [6947] 17970 - Mrs Julia Georgiou [2435] 18154 - Mrs Jennifer Crocker [4550] 18390 - Mr Nazamudin Rajubally [7139] 18526 - Mrs Anna-Marie Wingrove [7093] 18687 - Mr Jonathan Purr [7194] 18792 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 18979 - Mr. Geoff Coppock [7241] 19088 - Mr Ian Sutton [5944] 19311 - Mr Michael Fitzgerald [6050] 19381 - Mrs Karen Porter [2835] 19469 - Miss Rebecca Coppock [7118] 19470 - Miss Rebecca Coppock [7118] 19889 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] 20152 - Mr & Mrs Colin Thornton [4225] 20202 - Mr Peter Wild [7991] 22008 - Mr Adam Staples [8016] 22039 - Mrs. Amanda Staples [8023]	Object	Flooding an issue; traffic and congestion a problem, Ongar Road access dangerous; A12 air pollution and noise are already bad so not good for new homes; schools are overcrowded; GPS full; will impact badly on Pilgrims Hatch; car parking a problem; will make grid lock worse; site acts as a green lung and open space don't build on it; get ECC to show how schools will cope; drainage here is already bad; don't build on Green Belt; build on other sites nearer High Street to reduce vehicle use; need to improve the bus service as it is being reduced	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19787 - Countryside Properties [250] 19791 - Countryside Properties [250] 19792 - Countryside Properties [250] 19793 - Countryside Properties [250]	Support	The site at Doddinghurst Road, Brentwood provides a sustainable and deliverable option for residential development. Brentwood Borough Council have stated that the site can provide up to 200 dwellings on site, however further work undertaken by external consultants suggests that the site could provide up to 250 dwellings on site. The site could come forward in the short term - 5-10 years. A density study undertaken by JTP confirms that parcels 023A and 023B can accommodate up to 250 dwellings. A plan indicating the potential extent of developable area and the proposed density can be found in the accompanying study. Given that the most recently standardised methodology for calculating local housing need has stated that the Borough need to provide 72 more homes per annum, the Council should take the opportunity to maximise density of housing on sites which are sustainable and deliverable. A number of technical reports and associated documents have been completed including: Density Study, Landscape and Green Belt Appraisal, Air Quality Assessment, Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, Drainage Strategy, Desktop Noise Report, Social Infrastructure Review, Transport Technical Note; all demonstrate that the site represents a deliverable, sustainable and achievable site for residential development.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18175 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 20200 - Ms Maureen Thornton [7989]	Support	The above plan is for very much needed housing, especially families in this borough who have waited patiently for accommodation for extended families. Hopefully they will be added to be first here first served. Good idea if that happens.	Support welcomed	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>263 Land east of Chelmsford Road, Shenfield</i>				
19904 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962] 19910 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	Suggested text to be included for sites referenced 263 and 276 have small areas in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and part of the site referenced 200 is located in Flood Zone 3. Applicants should be aware of the modelled watercourses in the area as proposed developments may be required to model nearby watercourses to determine local flood risk. All development proposals within the flood zone (which includes Flood Zones 2 and 3), or elsewhere on sites of 1 hectare or more must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).	Comment noted and agreed	Include within site assessment and policies
19673 - ESFA (Dr Douglas McNab) [6718]	Comment	The next version of the Local Plan should seek to be more definitive in identifying which sites will need to deliver new schools to support growth, based on the latest evidence of identified need and demand. The site allocations or associated safeguarding policies should clarify requirements for the delivery of new schools, including when they should be delivered to support housing growth, the minimum site area required, any preferred site characteristics, and any requirements for safeguarding additional land for future expansion of schools where need and demand indicates.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17944 - Mrs Hannah Kirby [6926] 17946 - Mr John Cattini [3035]	Comment	I feel it is vital that this site is used to house Hutton Football club, as this is a great focal point for the local community. As many funds as possible should be directed towards this goal.	Disagree. This location has been identified for new homes and associated open space in line with evidence base.	No further action
18327 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways & Transportation: Development on this site will need to be viewed from a holistic perspective to ensure that it contributes to a pool of funding to provide an enhanced level of bus service to serve the 825 homes planned. It will also be important to ensure that the design layout of the site facilitates sustainable access, ideally with bus gates or other interventions designed to maximise such access whilst giving these modes a journey time advantage.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19851 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]	Comment	Concern regarding the evidence base and specific wording of the allocations. A care home and 10 gypsy and traveller (G&T) pitches are sought on the Officer's Meadow Site, with the allocations for Sites 158 and 263 for housing and employment only. Although BBC is seeking the provision of a care home and G&T pitches in Shenfield, the sites have not been fully assessed at this stage to determine the most suitable location for these uses. They should not be restricted to the Officer's Meadow Site, the Plan should include provision of these uses across the sites in Shenfield area.	Noted	Evidence base will be published
17928 - Mr. D Haynes [2336] 17935 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [6892] 18064 - Jamie Bottono [3034] 18375 - Mr Christopher Powell [7086] 18665 - Woodland Trust (Mr Jack Taylor) [7189] 18966 - Mr. Gary Moody [7238] 19024 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19025 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19026 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19027 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19433 - Mr John Owen [7302] 19464 - Mrs. Lauren Thompson [7305] 19500 - Mr Neil Fuller [7311]	Object	Excessive dense development to the boundary with the A12 should be avoided. The watercourse could be an attractive advantage to an attractive design. Priests Lane is a link into Shenfield from the A127, and with a further 1000 houses on the Officer's Meadow site current congestion will be much worse. Concern over traffic volumes, congestion, school capacity; infrastructure including GPs, hospital, schools; protect Green Belt as important to gap between Shenfield and Mountnessing; too many new homes will impact badly on existing residents; need accommodation for seniors as so many bungalows lost or expanded; will result in a town devoid of character; scale back development as roads can't cope; public transport already too busy; need to keep the farmland to grow food; increase flooding problems already in evidence; scrub and tree seedlings would be destroyed should allow woodland to grow and protect the existing areas too; do not develop as need to protect the wildlife; object to loss of green open space; will need more retailers; scale back this site to only 276 and 34; need more police; issues with road safety due to bend and narrowness of the road; acts as a green lung; all infrastructure should be in place before any houses are built; need improvements to Shenfield Station	Noted	Consider accordingly
18176 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 19200 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin	Support	Support homes here	Support noted	No further action

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19807 - Redrow Homes (Jenny Massingham) [7948]	Support	The Draft Plan shows this site as coming forward in years 5-10 of the Plan period. Redrow Homes believe that in the absence of any site specific constraints which might affect delivery timescales and the sustainability credentials, there is the opportunity to bring the site forward to support the five-year housing land supply. Redrow would seek to ensure that the masterplanning exercise was high level to ensure that all sites could still be delivered separately. the combined development provides for new primary school provision; further details required.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17905 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18232 - Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]	Support	Any development must therefore be carefully designed to avoid harm and provide a) generous green buffers around the woodland, and b) alternative areas of open space to reduce recreational impacts on the woodland.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>034, 087, 235 & 276</i>	<i>Officer's Meadow, land off Alexander Lane, Shenfield</i>			
19852 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 19853 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656] 19854 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]	Comment	Local Plan should seek to be more definitive in identifying which sites will need to deliver new schools to support growth, based on the latest evidence of identified need and demand. The site allocations or associated safeguarding policies should clarify requirements for the delivery of new schools, including when they should be delivered to support housing growth, the minimum site area required, any preferred site characteristics, and any requirements for safeguarding additional land for future expansion of schools where need and demand indicates. Given their location, the phasing of the sites in the Shenfield area must be managed and guided by the Local Plan to avoid development separated from the built-up area. Officer's Meadow is the logical first phase, adjoining the existing built-up area of Shenfield and being a logical urban extension. The masterplan required within the current Reg 18 consultation would be required prior to the submission of planning applications for the sites, delaying the submission of these and ultimately the delivery of housing on the sites. As such, whilst the relevant Local Plan Policy may include an indicative plan to demonstrate how development may be located on the sites, the requirement for a masterplan across all 3 sites of the allocations (Officer's Meadow, site 158, site 263) should not be included to ensure the Officer's Meadow Site can be delivered in a timely manner.	Comments noted	Consider accordingly
19674 - ESFA (Dr Douglas McNab) [6718]	Comment	The next version of the Local Plan should seek to be more definitive in identifying which sites will need to deliver new schools to support growth, based on the latest evidence of identified need and demand. The site allocations or associated safeguarding policies should clarify requirements for the delivery of new schools, including when they should be delivered to support housing growth, the minimum site area required, any preferred site characteristics, and any requirements for safeguarding additional land for future expansion of schools where need and demand indicates.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19905 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962] 19911 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	The preferred site allocations referenced 263, 276 & 200 may require a permit for work within 8 metres of a defence structure/culvert. We would however, prefer that any works around a main river must allow space for maintenance of our assets. This would also provide multiple benefits including an ecological buffer strip and corridors. Suggested text to be included for sites referenced 263 and 276 have small areas in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and part of the site referenced 200 is located in Flood Zone 3. Applicants should be aware of the modelled watercourses in the area as proposed developments may be required to model nearby watercourses to determine local flood risk. All development proposals within the flood zone (which includes Flood Zones 2 and 3), or elsewhere on sites of 1 hectare or more must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).	Comment noted and agreed	Include within site information accordingly
18315 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways & Transportation Comment - Development on these sites will need to be viewed from a holistic perspective to ensure that they contribute to a pool of funding to provide an enhanced level of bus service to serve the 825 homes planned. It will also be important to ensure that the design layout of the sites facilitates sustainable access, ideally with bus gates or other interventions designed to maximise such access whilst giving these modes a journey time advantage.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17873 - Mr John Darragh [4862] 18838 - Mr Derek Barker [7219] 22095 - RS Nickerson [8031] 22096 - RS Nickerson [8031]	Comment	Need to consider Shenfield Station needs to improve: car parking by excavation from Hutton Mount at ground level, and maintaining that level as the underground level at the present car park site, providing parking at no environmental cost of inconvenience to adjacent residents. The Chelmsford Roads sewerage arrangements for the existing properties from Alexander Lane to the A12 Roundabout, are fed via a small pumping station across the Shenfield School Playing fields through my garden and discharging into the main sewer in Oliver Road. Refer to attached letters from 1974. Major group of residents are households whose children have left home. This would be a good site for two bedroom bungalows for local people to move into (and release their larger houses) as it is close to local services. We should use this land for local people first.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17923 - Mrs Janet Turnbull [6915] 17936 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [6892] 18055 - D Westfall [5310] 18065 - Jamie Bottono [3034] 18377 - Mr Christopher Powell [7086] 18640 - Robin Penny [2139] 18641 - Robin Penny [2139] 18642 - Robin Penny [2139] 18643 - Robin Penny [2139] 18668 - Woodland Trust (Mr Jack Taylor) [7189] 18773 - M Hill [2290] 18839 - Mr Derek Barker [7219] 19017 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19018 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19019 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19182 - Mr Gary Williams [7267] 19186 - Mr Gary Williams [7267] 19187 - Mr Gary Williams [7267]	Object	Excessive dense development to the boundary with the A12 should be avoided. The watercourse could be an attractive advantage to an attractive design. Priests Lane is a link into Shenfield from the A127, and with a further 1000 houses on the Officer's Meadow site current congestion will be much worse. Concern over traffic volumes, congestion, school capacity; infrastructure including GPs, hospital, schools; protect Green Belt as import to gap between Shenfield and Mountnessing; too many new homes will impact badly on existing residents; need accommodation for seniors as so many bungalows lost or expanded; will result in a town devoid of character; scale back development as roads can't cope; public transport already too busy; need to keep the farmland to grow food; increase flooding problems already in evidence; scrub and tree seedlings would be destroyed should allow woodland to grow and protect the existing areas too; do not develop as need to protect the wildlife; object to loss of green open space; will need more retailers; scale back this site to only 276 and 34; need more police; issues with road safety due to bend and narrowness of the road; all infrastructure should be in place before any houses are built.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18967 - Mr. Gary Moody [7238] 19016 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19279 - Mr Mark Feeley [7017] 19434 - Mr John Owen [7302] 19462 - Mrs. Lauren Thompson [7305] 19498 - Mr Neil Fuller [7311] 19924 - Julia and Ray Blencowe [5495] 19925 - Julia and Ray Blencowe [5495] 19926 - Julia and Ray Blencowe [5495] 21244 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612] 21956 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001] 22097 - RS Nickerson [8031]	Object	Excessive dense development to the boundary with the A12 should be avoided. the watercourse could be an attractive advantage to an attractive design. Priests Lane is a link into Shenfield from the A127, and with a further 1000 houses on the Officer's Meadow site current congestion will be much worse. Concern over traffic volumes, congestion, school capacity; infrastructure including GPs, hospital, schools; protect Green Belt as import to gap between Shenfield and Mountnessing; too many new homes will impact badly on existing residents; need accommodation for seniors as so many bungalows lost or expanded; will result in a town devoid of character; scale back development as roads cant cope; public transport already too busy; need to keep the farmland to grow food; increase flooding problems already in evidence; scrub and tree seedlings would be destroyed should allow woodland to grow and protect the existing areas too; do not develop as need to protect the wildlife; object to loss of green open space; will need more retailers; scale back this site to only 276 and 34; need more police; issues with road safety due to bend and narrowness of the road; acts as a green lung; all infrastructure should be in place before any houses are built; need improvements to Shenfield Station	Noted	Consider accordingly
18225 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]	Object	Sport England objects to part of the potential allocation of Land at Officer's Meadow, Shenfield (site 087) for residential development in the local plan as currently proposed. Objection is made to the allocation of this site as it would result in the loss of an operation community playing field site without clear proposals for mitigation. The objection could be addressed if the site allocation is removed or if the policy is changed to provide clarity about mitigation in terms of replacement provision or financial contributions in lieu of direct replacement provision.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18079 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18177 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 19201 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin	Support	Site welcomed and note that wildlife protection and issues of flooding are important here; note the proximity to rail and road links more sites like this would be ideal - it is a shame it is Green Belt	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17906 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18233 - Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]	Support	Development at this site has the potential to result in harmful impacts on sensitive ancient woodland habitat. Any development must therefore be carefully designed to provide generous green buffers around the and a generous allocation of alternative green open space to reduce recreational impacts on the ancient woodland habitat.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<hr/>				
<i>158 Land north of A1023 Chelmsford Road, Shenfield</i>				
18321 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways & Transportation Comment: Development on this site will need to be viewed from a holistic perspective to ensure that it contributes to a pool of funding to provide an enhanced level of bus service to serve the 825 homes planned. It will also be important to ensure that the design layout of the site facilitates sustainable access, ideally with bus gates or other interventions designed to maximise such access whilst giving these modes a journey time advantage.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<hr/>				
19850 - Croudace Strategic Ltd [2656]	Comment	Concern regarding the evidence base and specific wording of the allocations. A care home and 10 gypsy and traveller (G&T) pitches are sought on the Officer's Meadow Site, with the allocations for Sites 158 and 263 for housing and employment only. Although BBC is seeking the provision of a care home and G&T pitches in Shenfield, the sites have not been fully assessed at this stage to determine the most suitable location for these uses. They should not be restricted to the Officer's Meadow Site, the Plan should include provision of these uses across the sites in Shenfield area.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<hr/>				
19892 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Comment	Given its location next to the A12 and a major road junction between the A12 and the A1023, this site would do nothing to help the aim of promoting healthy communities.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17872 - Mr John Darragh [4862] 17937 - Ms Elizabeth Rouse [6892] 18046 - Mr John Daly [7013] 18376 - Mr Christopher Powell [7086] 19020 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19021 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19022 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19023 - Mrs Patricia Hedges [7057] 19183 - Mr Gary Williams [7267] 19188 - Mr Gary Williams [7267] 19189 - Mr Gary Williams [7267] 19435 - Mr John Owen [7302] 19463 - Mrs. Lauren Thompson [7305] 19499 - Mr Neil Fuller [7311] 21957 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001]	Object	Excessive dense development to the boundary with the A12 should be avoided. The watercourse could be an attractive advantage to an attractive design. Priests Lane is a link into Shenfield from the A127, and with a further 1000 houses on the Officer's Meadow site current congestion will be much worse. Concern over traffic volumes, congestion, school capacity; infrastructure including GPs, hospital, schools; protect Green Belt as import to gap between Shenfield and Mountnessing; too many new homes will impact badly on existing residents; need accommodation for seniors as so many bungalows lost or expanded; will result in a town devoid of character; scale back development as roads can't cope; public transport already too busy; need to keep the farmland to grow food; increase flooding problems already in evidence.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17907 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18080 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18178 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 19204 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin	Support	Good option and must consider flooding, congestion and utilities	Noted	Consider accordingly
<i>128 Ingatestone Garden Centre, Roman Road, Ingatestone</i>				
18196 - Mr Richard Wright [1644] 19102 - Mr & Mrs Jon and Pamela Gooding [7258] 19292 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19295 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19298 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19382 - Mr. Alderman Kieth Brown [7293]	Comment	Infrastructure needs to be sorted out medical services, parking, highways, station, impact on Green Belt; congestion; sewerage; flooding issues and exacerbation of existing problems; unsuitable location as close to A12 - health impacts from pollution and noise and road safety issues; too many people will impact on current residents; need affordable homes and smaller homes as shouldn't all be large houses. Need to attract young people as village is aging.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19621 - Redrow Homes (Sarah Kirk) [6670]	Comment	We note that this site is described as being a self-contained urban extension with the neighbouring site. It is requested that this be deleted from the allocation summary. This site is evaluated in the SA. Under Special Landscape Area this site received an amber rating. It is unclear as to how this determination was made. This rating will need to be updated when further information is available and we would ask that it includes an assessment that takes into account the existing nature of the site, potential landscape enhancement and the removal of the SLA designation. Removal of walking distance.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19535 - Mountnessing Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [378]	Object	The loss of Green Belt is irretrievable. The advantage of rail travel to London is highlighted but not how the new houses could be served with local bus routes when station car parks are already at full capacity. The current retail centre in Ingatestone consists of cramped roads and lack of parking. Building on car parks will create more traffic/parking pressure within Brentwood borough. Infrastructure (health, education, services etc) are already at capacity.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17883 - mr ian taylor [6884] 17938 - Ms elizabeth rouse [6892] 17971 - Mrs Julia Georgiou [2435] 18461 - Mr. & Mrs. Michael & Ann Malyon [7152] 19421 - Steve Undrill [2496] 20148 - P.T. Smart [1596] 20178 - Mrs Patricia Jones [7978] 20179 - Mrs Patricia Jones [7978] 22120 - M Willcock [8037]	Object	Object as already a disastrous new development at the Mountnessing roundabout; infrastructure needs to be sorted out medical services, parking, highways, station, impact on Green Belt; congestion; sewerage,; flooding issues and exacerbation of existing problems; unsuitable location as so close to A12 - health impacts from pollution and noise and road safety issues; too many people will impact on current residents; will add a corridor of housing where there should be green belt.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17908 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18081 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18179 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18443 - Mrs. Jane Winter [7146]	Support	Density could be increased, good brownfield site for development, self contained with access to main roads; need for affordable housing and social rent, need small homes not more large ones; ideal brownfield site; need to consider flooding	Comments noted	Consider accordingly

079A Land adjacent to Ingatestone by-pass (part bounded by Roman Road, south of flyover)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>079A Land adjacent to Ingatestone by-pass (part bounded by Roman Road, south of flyover)</i>				
19933 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	There are no designated heritage assets within or near to the site. However, the site lies immediately adjacent to a Roman Road which increases the likely hood of potential archaeological remains. We are pleased to see that the pro-forma has identified this and the need for archaeological investigations to be carried out prior to development. We request that this is included as a criterion within any site specific policy.	Noted and agreed	Criterion to be considered
18197 - Mr Richard Wright [1644] 19103 - Mr & Mrs Jon and Pamela Gooding [7258] 19293 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19296 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19299 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19383 - Mr. Alderman Kieth Brown [7293]	Comment	Increase in new residential properties in Ingatestone Village must result in significant additions to the supporting 'infrastructure', including (but not limited to) car parking, sewage & grey water waste, NHS surgery, nursery & schools (all ages up to 18 years) and police presence. The Council needs to make public the comprehensive plan to enhance Ingatestone's supporting infrastructure.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17884 - mr ian taylor [6884] 17972 - Mrs Julia Georgiou [2435] 18463 - Mr. & Mrs. Michael & Ann Malyon [7152] 18646 - Mr Paul Harper [6837] 19420 - Steve Undrill [2496] 19502 - Mrs Rosemary Spouge [5941] 19891 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] 20139 - Mr Scott Lavin [7973] 20147 - P.T. Smart [1596] 20180 - Mrs Patricia Jones [7978]	Object	Object as already a disastrous new development at the Mountnessing roundabout; infrastructure needs to be sorted out medical services, parking, highways, station, impact on Green Belt; congestion; sewerage,; flooding issues and exacerbation of existing problems; unsuitable location as so close to A12 - health impacts from pollution and noise and road safety issues; too many people will impact on current residents; will add a corridor of housing where there should be green belt. Will destroy village character. Will the Mountnessing school be extended?	Noted	Consider accordingly
17909 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18082 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18180 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18441 - Mrs. Jane Winter [7146] 19627 - CALA Homes [5237]	Support	Density could be increased, good brownfield site for development, self contained with access to main roads; need for affordable housing and social rent, need small homes not more large ones; need care homes; ideal brownfield site; need to consider flooding	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>106 Site adjacent to Ingatestone Garden Centre (former A12 works site)</i>				
18372 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Education Comment - ECC advises that the accessibility of all housing sites to schools via safe direct walking and cycling routes must be considered. Particular attention should be paid to allocations 022 and 106.	Comment noted	Consider accordingly
18198 - Mr Richard Wright [1644] 19104 - Mr & Mrs Jon and Pamela Gooding [7258] 19294 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19297 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19300 - Mr Trevor Morley [7287] 19384 - Mr. Alderman Kieth Brown [7293]	Comment	Such a dramatic increase in new residential properties in Ingatestone Village must result in significant additions to the supporting 'infrastructure', including (but not limited to) car parking, sewage & grey water waste, NHS surgery, nursery & schools (all ages up to 18 years) and police presence. Council needs to make public the comprehensive plan to enhance Ingatestone's supporting infrastructure. Our concerns are: how the doctor's surgery will cope with the extra people. Too many properties proposed for each development. The access on to the already very busy and often dangerous Roman Road; lack of parking in the village; since the development on the (old Heybridge Moathouse) land has been built, the road is dangerous due to the parked cars on both sides of the road, which will get a lot worse with all this proposed development; sewerage is a problems already; noise pollution is already a problem; housing needs to be affordable as the aging village needs to attract young people. Development should have 2 parking spaces per home as a minimum.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18352 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Need to consider impact on historic assets within the village	Noted	Consider accordingly
17885 - mr ian taylor [6884] 17974 - Mrs Julia Georgiou [2435] 18462 - Mr. & Mrs. Michael & Ann Malyon [7152] 18647 - Mr Paul Harper [6837] 19422 - Steve Undrill [2496] 19890 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788] 20146 - P.T. Smart [1596] 22099 - RS Nickerson [8031]	Object	Object as already a disastrous new development at the Mountnessing roundabout; infrastructure needs to be sorted out medical services, parking, highways, station, impact on Green Belt; congestion; sewerage,; flooding issues and exacerbation of existing problems; unsuitable location as so close to A12 - health impacts from pollution and noise and road safety issues; too many people will impact on current residents.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17910 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901]	Support	Flooding and A12 access is a concern for this site.	Support and concerns noted	Consider accordingly
19618 - Go Planning Ltd (Mr Nigel Tedder) [4749]	Support	The site is within flood zone 1. The development is not constrained by ecological issues. Reference to noise data submitted for the adjacent Ingatestone Garden Centre site shows the location will have noise levels which will require a range of mitigation measures to control and provide an acceptable environment for residential dwellings and gardens. Site area of 3.49 hectares and a yield of 41 dwellings, appears low when compared with the density levels shown for the other edge of Ingatestone allocations. An access report shows the suitability of the existing access subject to improvements.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18083 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18442 - Mrs. Jane Winter [7146]	Support	Need for affordable housing / social rent and care homes within the borough. The housing proposed allows for small affordable homes to be built. Large homes are not needed.	Support noted	Consider accordingly
<i>076 Land south of Redrose Lane, north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore</i>				
18104 - Mr John Riley [4905]	Comment	Halve proposed dwellings. Upgrade infrastructure, school, health provision, roads, electricity, mobile signal and broadband. Provide mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom bungalows with access/exit as a cul de sac onto Red Rose Lane only.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18348 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 19914 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963] 19938 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	Any development of the site will need to be sensitive presence of heritage assets, to this edge of settlement location and relate to the open landscape around it as well as to the historic settlement it adjoins. The surrounding land is of historic interest and also makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Development of this site will need to conserve and enhance these heritage assets and there setting. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should include policy and supporting text.	Comment noted	To be considered in detail as site specific policies are developed.

076 Land south of Redrose Lane, north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19366 - Mr Martin West [5005]	Comment	Site 076 in this version of the Plan does not include the plot of land which was referenced in the 2016 version of the plan as plot 250 with an estimated dwelling capacity of 20 units. Site 250, is adjacent to plot 076 and therefore should be included in proposed dwellings because it is located in "the development area of the village". Inclusion of this land forms a complete self-contained extension to the village. The settlement Hierarchy, Figure 14 states that Blackmore should have "estimated new dwelling numbers of 336". Therefore I would request that plot 250 be included.	Noted	Consider accordingly in site assessment work. Particularly in light of evidence regarding site constraints and opportunities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17879 - Mr & Mrs Samuel Cousins [4855] 17986 - Mr Kevin Wood [6965] 17996 - Mr Richard Reed [4708] 18021 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376] 18025 - Mr Craig Stevens [4958] 18027 - Mr Martin Clark [2456] 18050 - Mrs Danielle Cross [7016] 18057 - Dr Murray Wood [7003] 18071 - Ms Wendy Cohen [6923] 18085 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18111 - Mr Paul Anthony [6823] 18113 - Miss Nicola Smyth [7037] 18114 - Mr Gary Dimond [7055] 18145 - Mr David Smith [4872] 18147 - Mrs sheila cohen [7027] 18213 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097] 18219 - Mr Kevin Burrell [7102] 18254 - Mr Jon Watson [7112] 18396 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141] 18399 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141] 18400 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141] 18412 - Cllr Aimi Middlehurst [6573] 18434 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547] 18437 - Mr Kevin Hall [6734] 18444 - Ms Charlotte Hall [7147] 18452 - Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869] 18470 - Bruno Giordan [636] 18496 - Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497] 18511 - Mr Geoffrey Town [3982] 18519 - Mr Roland Lazarus [4908] 18523 - Mrs Christina Atkins [8118] 18546 - Ms Charlotte Hall [7147] 18596 - Mr David Barfoot [7177] 18604 - Mrs Jo Smith [7178] 18615 - Charles Smith [4130] 18649 - Mr. Clive Austin [7186] 18680 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193]	Object	No internet or phone connections available; drainage system at capacity; devastation to local wildlife; No parking available whatsoever; exacerbate traffic safety problems; Existing village infrastructure schools, GPs, congested roads and are at breaking point; Extreme loss of privacy & light for existing residents; flooding an issue; disproportionately large for the site and the village; don't build on Green Belt land; destroys agricultural land; visual impact, particularly for existing residents; makes village less attractive; needs better bus service first; no suitable access road; impacts worse with development in Epping Forest DC; site will run along a lane used to by-pass plague victims; no library and mobile library has almost stopped; will be swallowed up by London with this urban sprawl, ruin character of the village, out of proportion to existing village.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18682 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18685 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]				
18688 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18689 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18692 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18694 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18697 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18700 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18720 - Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200]				
18722 - David & Gill Hall [7201]				
18823 - Donaldson Mhairi [7217]				
18825 - Donaldson Mhairi [7217]				
18879 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
18881 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
18883 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
18885 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
18887 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18889 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18891 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18892 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18894 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18896 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18898 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18899 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18901 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18903 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18905 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18907 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18908 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18910 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18912 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18914 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18916 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18943 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]				
18949 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]				
19080 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]				
19093 - Mr Ian Tuffey [4621]				
19097 - Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709]				
19100 - Ms Sue Dunne [6552]				
19119 - Mrs Pauline Farthing [7120]				
19121 - Mrs Pauline Farthing [7120]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19123 - Mrs Pauline Farthing [7120]				
19141 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
19143 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
19145 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
19148 - Mr John Lester [4396]				
19173 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
19175 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
19177 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
19178 - Mrs Jasdeep Dhesi [7266]				
19180 - Mr. Gurpreet Dhesi [7268]				
19184 - Mrs. Bhupinder Dhesi [7269]				
19190 - Mr. Gurpal Singh Dhesi [7270]				
19194 - Mr Colin Miers [3959]				
19207 - Miss Nicky Carvell [6961]				
19209 - Mr Richard Hooks [7273]				
19212 - Mrs. Jill Austin [7272]				
19221 - Mr Miles Forrest [7276]				
19229 - Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]				
19235 - Mrs M.H. Giordan [1540]				
19282 - Mr David Clark [5022]				
19327 - Mr Peter Snelling [6960]				
19335 - Valerie Godbee [4943]				
19336 - Valerie Godbee [4943]				
19340 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]				
19341 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]				
19449 - Malcolm Hurford [7304]				
19472 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19473 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19474 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19475 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19476 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19477 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19478 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19479 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19480 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19481 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19482 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19504 - Mrs. Samantha Dalton [7313]				
19510 - Mr Richard Romang [4374]				
19546 - Mr Mark Dalton [7328]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19550 - Mr Melvyn Gorsuch-Browne [7329]				
19555 - Ms Linda Cearn [5013]				
19564 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19566 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19568 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19571 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19573 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19575 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19577 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19599 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899]				
19601 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899]				
19628 - Mr Paul David Jackson [7387]				
20016 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20018 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20020 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20023 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20026 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20029 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20030 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20032 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20034 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
20162 - J.C. Ward [987]				
20217 - Mr Michael Juniper [5025]				
20228 - Mr Patrick Hinchin [6750]				
21228 - Cllr Roger Keeble [1990]				
21234 - Mr Alfred Larney [4990]				
21236 - Mrs Alison Ratcliffe [5040]				
21238 - Mr. Keith Creffield [8001]				
21248 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828]				
21939 - Mr Shaun Folan [8003]				
21942 - Mrs Patricia Minns [4969]				
21944 - Mrs. Jane Lodge [8006]				
21963 - Mrs Valerie Wells [4877]				
21966 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045]				
21968 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045]				
21970 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045]				
21973 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
21975 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045]				
21979 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
21981 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]				
21984 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]				
21985 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]				
21987 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]				
21989 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]				
21991 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]				
21993 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010]				
21996 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011]				
22005 - Mrs Valerie Sherwood [8015]				
22012 - Mrs Hazel Town [4993]				
22019 - Mr David Saxton [4286]				
22030 - Mrs Kim Smith [8021]				
22034 - Mr.s & Mrs Terry & Eileen Smith [8020]				
22036 - Mrs. Nicola Stananought [8022]				
22041 - Ms. Donna Toomey [8024]				
22043 - Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029]				
22045 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970]				
22046 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970]				
22048 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970]				
22050 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970]				
22052 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970]				
22054 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970]				
22070 - Mr J Cakebread [8027]				
22071 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]				
22074 - Mr J Cakebread [8027]				
22076 - Mr J Cakebread [8027]				
22078 - Mr J Cakebread [8027]				
22080 - Mr J Cakebread [8027]				
22082 - Mr J Cakebread [8027]				
22084 - Mr J Cakebread [8027]				
22086 - Mr J Cakebread [8027]				

076 Land south of Redrose Lane, north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22101 - Mrs Margaret Laing [7046] 22109 - Ms Margaret Boreham [8033] 22163 - Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council				
17911 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17990 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978] 18181 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]	Support	Flooding only concern, consider surface water	Noted	Consider accordingly
19824 - Crest Nicholson Eastern (Mr Mark Bedding) [2510]	Support	Crest Nicholson Eastern (CNE) support the Plan in principle and in particular the allocation of site 076; Land South of Redrose Lane, north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore (hereafter referred to as "the site"). The table relating to allocation: Delete "Access considerations on Redrose Lane" and "Surface water flooding considerations." under heading "Site Constraints". There are no technical constraints relating to highways or drainage preventing early delivery.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<i>077 Land south of Redrose Lane, north of Woollard Way, Blackmore</i>				
17991 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978] 18105 - Mr John Riley [4905] 19161 - Mrs Jane Marr [6006]	Comment	If this is to go ahead must consider the regular flooding which takes place in this part of the village. It is likely to reduce drainage of surface water and be at risk of flooding. Halve proposed dwellings. Upgrade infrastructure, school, health provision, roads, electricity, mobile signal and broadband. Provide mix of 4&5 bedrooms houses, starter homes and 2&3 bedroom bungalows with access/exit as a cul-de-sac onto Red Rose Lane only. It does seem essential that: Houses meet the needs of first time buyers and end of lifers, sewage infrastructure etc are adequate. Barely currently the case that school places and medical facilities are adequate. The number and style of houses need to be in sympathy with the surrounding roads. Use Essex Design Guide, use to maintain the essential nature of an Essex village, albeit an enlarged one.	Comments noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18349 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 19915 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963] 19939 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	A constraint to development is the potential archaeology associated with this historic settlement. This has the potential to harm the significance of these designated heritage assets by eroding their setting. NE recommend that any subsequent site specific policy includes criterion to help secure a high quality development which respects the setting of the nearby listed buildings and conservation area. The policy should refer to the sites' sensitive edge of settlement location, the need for high quality design which will relate to both the rural surroundings to the north and to the historic settlement adjoining the site to the south. Careful master planning will be required. The pro-forma has not identified the presence of the heritage assets. Any development of the site will need to be sensitive to this edge of settlement location and relate to the open landscape around it as well as to the historic settlement it adjoins. Development of this site will need to conserve and enhance these heritage assets and there setting. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan.	Noted and agreed	To be reflected in the local plan

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17912 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 17987 - Mr Kevin Wood [6965] 17997 - Mr Richard Reed [4708] 18024 - Mr Martin Clark [2456] 18026 - Mr Craig Stevens [4958] 18051 - Mrs Danielle Cross [7016] 18058 - Dr Murray Wood [7003] 18059 - Mrs Elisabeth Taylor [2918] 18072 - Ms Wendy Cohen [6923] 18084 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18093 - Mrs Rosemarie Nelson [4529] 18097 - Mrs Lesley Moss [7053] 18146 - Mr David Smith [4872] 18206 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376] 18214 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097] 18218 - Mr Graham Stanley [4827] 18220 - Mr Kevin Burrell [7102] 18234 - Mrs Joanne Gill [4758] 18397 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141] 18398 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141] 18401 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141] 18413 - Cllr Aimi Middlehurst [6573] 18435 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547] 18453 - Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869] 18471 - Bruno Giordan [636] 18497 - Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497] 18512 - Mr Geoffrey Town [3982] 18520 - Mr Roland Lazarus [4908] 18524 - Mrs Christina Atkins [8118] 18547 - Ms Charlotte Hall [7147] 18595 - Mr David Barfoot [7177] 18650 - Mr. Clive Austin [7186] 18681 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193] 18683 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759] 18686 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright	Object	No internet or phone connections available; drainage system at capacity; devastation to local wildlife; No parking available whatsoever; exacerbate traffic safety problems; Existing village infrastructure schools, GPs, congested roads and are at breaking point; Extreme loss of privacy & light for existing residents; flooding an issue; disproportionately large for the site and the village; don't build on Green Belt land; destroys agricultural land; visual impact, particularly for existing residents; makes village less attractive; needs better bus service first; no suitable access road; impacts worse with development in Epping Forest DC; site will run along a lane used to by-pass plague victims; no library and mobile library has almost stopped; will be swallowed up by London with this urban sprawl, ruin character of the village, out of proportion to existing village.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[7195]				
18691 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18693 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18695 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18698 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18702 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
18721 - Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200]				
18723 - David & Gill Hall [7201]				
18824 - Donaldson Mhairi [7217]				
18826 - Donaldson Mhairi [7217]				
18880 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
18882 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
18884 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
18886 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
18888 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18890 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18893 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18895 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18897 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18900 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
18904 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18906 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18909 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18911 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18913 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18915 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
18944 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]				
18950 - Mr Graham Lawrenson				
[6958]				
19079 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]				
19094 - Mr Ian Tuffey [4621]				
19098 - Mr Anthony Nicholson				
[4709]				
19120 - Mrs Pauline Farthing				
[7120]				
19122 - Mrs Pauline Farthing				
[7120]				
19124 - Mrs Pauline Farthing				
[7120]				
19142 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
19144 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
19146 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
19149 - Mr John Lester [4396]				
19174 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
19176 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
19179 - Mrs Jasdeep Dhesi [7266]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19181 - Mr. Gurpreet Dhesi [7268]				
19185 - Mrs. Bhupinder Dhesi [7269]				
19191 - Mr. Gurpal Singh Dhesi [7270]				
19203 - Mr Colin Miers [3959]				
19208 - Miss Nicky Carvell [6961]				
19210 - Mr Richard Hooks [7273]				
19213 - Mrs. Jill Austin [7272]				
19222 - Mr Miles Forrest [7276]				
19236 - Mrs M.H. Giordan [1540]				
19283 - Mr David Clark [5022]				
19328 - Mr Peter Snelling [6960]				
19337 - Valerie Godbee [4943]				
19342 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]				
19343 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]				
19344 - Valerie Godbee [4943]				
19450 - Malcolm Hurford [7304]				
19483 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19484 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19485 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19486 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19487 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19488 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19489 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19490 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19491 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19492 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19493 - Mr Timothy Hogan [7309]				
19505 - Mrs. Samantha Dalton [7313]				
19547 - Mr Mark Dalton [7328]				
19551 - Mr Melvyn Gorsuch-Browne [7329]				
19556 - Ms Linda Cearn [5013]				
19565 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19567 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19569 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19572 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19574 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
19576 - Mr John Richardson				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[4858] 19600 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899] 19602 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899] 19629 - Mr Paul David Jackson [7387] 20017 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20019 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20021 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20024 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20027 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20028 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20031 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20033 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20035 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953] 20163 - J.C. Ward [987] 20218 - Mr Michael Juniper [5025] 20227 - Mr Patrick Hinchin [6750] 21231 - Cllr Roger Keeble [1990] 21235 - Mr Alfred Larney [4990] 21237 - Mrs Alison Ratcliffe [5040] 21239 - Mr. Keith Creffield [8001] 21249 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828] 21938 - Mr Barry Monery [8004] 21941 - Mr Shaun Folan [8003] 21943 - Mrs Patricia Minns [4969] 21945 - Mrs. Jane Lodge [8006] 21946 - Miss Jean Monery [8007] 21964 - Mrs Valerie Wells [4877] 21967 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045] 21969 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045] 21971 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045] 21974 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045] 21976 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045] 21980 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] 21982 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 21983 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 21986 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 21988 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 21990 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 21992 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 21994 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 21997 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011] 22006 - Mrs Valerie Sherwood [8015]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22014 - Mrs Hazel Town [4993] 22020 - Mr David Saxton [4286] 22035 - Mr.s & Mrs Terry & Eileen Smith [8020] 22037 - Mrs. Nicola Stananought [8022] 22042 - Ms. Donna Toomey [8024] 22044 - Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029] 22047 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970] 22049 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970] 22051 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970] 22053 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970] 22055 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970] 22072 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024] 22073 - Mr J Cakebread [8027] 22075 - Mr J Cakebread [8027] 22077 - Mr J Cakebread [8027] 22079 - Mr J Cakebread [8027] 22081 - Mr J Cakebread [8027] 22083 - Mr J Cakebread [8027] 22085 - Mr J Cakebread [8027] 22087 - Mr J Cakebread [8027] 22102 - Mrs Margaret Laing [7046] 22110 - Ms Margaret Boreham [8033] 22164 - Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council				
18182 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18183 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 19579 - Constable Homes Limited [7333] 20124 - Charles Smith [4130] 22022 - Mrs Valerie Sherwood [8015]	Support	Good brownfield site for development, self contained with good access to main roads; it adheres to the NPPF, greenbelt assessment, the site is identified as coming forward within 5-10 years however we would ask the Council to change this to within the first 5 years as Constable Homes Limited have a reputation of being able to bring high quality designed sites forward quickly. Suitable for development. There's never been any surface water flooding nor accumulating/ponding of surface water.	comments noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>075B Land off Stocks Lane, Kelvedon Hatch</i>				
19940 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	Any development of the site will need to be sensitive to this edge of settlement location and relate to the open landscape around it as well as to the settlement it adjoins.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19870 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	There are no allocations directly within or adjacent to SSSIs but the following allocations are within Natural England Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for residential and/or rural residential development: 81, 117A, 117B, 112A, 112D, 112E, 194, 075B. This means that we would like to be consulted further to ensure that any impacts have been taken into account and mitigation provided if required. It does not mean that we have an outright objection to these allocations.	Noted	Consider impact on historic assets accordingly
20085 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. It is recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18008 - Mr and Mrs Colin and Linda Matthew [749]	Comment	The Village suffers from poor sewage systems, low water pressure, a fallible electric supply system etc. We also have a poor local GP services that presently can take 3-4 weeks to get a GP appointment without any population increase	Noted	Consider accordingly
18847 - Mr Ian White [7060] 18951 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958] 18969 - Mr Michael Plock [7239] 19074 - Ms Helen Box [7252] 19099 - Ms Sue Dunne [6552] 19150 - Mr John Lester [4396]	Object	The objections range from the infrastructure, to primary school, doctors surgery, extra traffic, congestion, parking, road safety, local facilities, air and noise pollution, vandalism and the loss of community spirit where residents look out for each other to the loss of green belt land. The impact of this number houses on this community will be detrimental to the current residents. The only winners in this plan are the developers and residents will have to pickup the cost of sustaining the other houses after they have taken their profits and run.	noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17913 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18184 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]	Support	Density could be increased, good brownfield site for development, self contained with access to main roads	Support noted.	Green belt impact is being assessed, consider accordingly
<hr/>				
<i>194 Brizes Corner Field, Blackmore Road, Kelvedon Hatch</i>				
18009 - Mr and Mrs Colin and Linda Matthew [749]	Comment	The Village suffers from poor sewage systems, low water pressure, a fallible electric supply system etc. We also have a poor local GP services that presently can take 3-4 weeks to get a GP appointment without any population increase	Noted	Consider accordingly
<hr/>				
20126 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. Drainage hierarchy to be followed in addressing surface water. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. It is recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<hr/>				
19869 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	There are no allocations directly within or adjacent to SSSIs but the following allocations are within Natural England Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for residential and/or rural residential development: 81, 117A, 117B, 112A, 112D, 112E, 194, 075B. This means that we would like to be consulted further to ensure that any impacts have been taken into account and mitigation provided if required. It does not mean that we have an outright objection to these allocations.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<hr/>				
19941 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	Any development of the site will need to be sensitive to this edge of settlement location and relate to the open landscape around it as well as to the settlement it adjoins.	Noted and agreed	Historic asset impacts will be considered
<hr/>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17914 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18952 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958] 18968 - Mr Michael Plock [7239] 19075 - Ms Helen Box [7252] 21220 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997] 21222 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997] 21223 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997] 21226 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997]	Object	Density is too high, will impact on wildlife, village has poor sewage systems, low water pressure, poor electricity supply, GP is full and appointments take 3-4 weeks, it is green field and green belt so should be protected, roads are congested, parking not suitable, school are at capacity, should remove from plan.	Comments noted	Consider accordingly
18185 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610]	Support	Good brownfield site for development, self contained with good access to main roads.	Support noted	No further action
<i>294 Chestnut Field, Backmore Road, Hook End</i>				
18107 - Mr John Riley [4905] 20127 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	This is the only public land associated with the Tipps Cross Community Hall and should be preserved as such. Also, the impact on the local infrastructure taking all the local proposals into account needs to be minimised and in the scheme of things this proposal is a bit sad. On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. The outfall sewer that the Thames Water network connects to is within the Anglian Water supply area and flows to Anglian Water's High Roding Sewage Treatment Works. It is therefore recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal.	Comment noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19679 - Icen Projects Limited (Mr Luke Challenger) [7052]	Comment	The site boundary appears incorrectly and includes two paddocks on its eastern end which are part of the residential gardens of Tipps Cross Lane. The boundary shown is inconsistent with the site boundary plan submitted with the HELAA Site form on behalf of our client on 8th May 2017. The submission put forward an estimated dwelling yield of up to 6 units based on this site area. Our client's site can achieve independent access to Blackmore Road without the need utilise any land within site 085B.	Boundary query noted.	Consider and clarify proposed boundary of site accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18078 - Valerie Godbee [4943] 18186 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18212 - Mrs Lauren Clarke [7096] 18215 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097] 18363 - Mr Francis Caves [7134] 18408 - Cllr Aimi Middlehurst [6573] 18448 - Mr. Alfie Gardner [7148] 18473 - Mr. Ben Gardner [7155] 18474 - Mr Peter Burgess [4863] 18481 - Mr Robert Davis [4789] 18671 - Mr Regan Saveall [7190] 18776 - Ms Samantha Saveall [7212] 18777 - Ms Samantha Saveall [7212] 18778 - Ms Samantha Saveall [7212] 18953 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958] 18991 - Mr Graham Mann [7244] 18993 - Mr Graham Mann [7244] 18995 - Mr Graham Mann [7244] 19101 - Ms Sue Dunne [6552] 19202 - Mr Colin Miers [3959] 19220 - Mr Miles Forrest [7276] 19255 - Julie Gardner [4581] 19257 - Julie Gardner [4581] 19265 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 19267 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 19285 - Stondon Massey Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [380] 19338 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942] 19506 - Mrs. Samantha Dalton [7313] 19536 - Mr. & Mrs. Rosindell [7320] 19540 - Julie Gardner [4581] 19548 - Mr Mark Dalton [7328] 19558 - Ms Linda Cearns [5013] 19976 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954] 19978 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]	Object	<p>The field is the only recreation/sports field in Tipps Cross and is an important facility for local people for sport, for recreation, for children and for the elderly and visitors hiring the hall. Once built on, the land - and its health/social/sports benefits - are lost forever. Density is too high for the area. Hall hirers appreciate and use the field to extend their activities and its loss will have a serious detrimental impact on bookings and viability of the hall. Will ruin the view, make the roads less safe. The local infra-structure (doctor/school etc) are already stretched; extra housing will just exacerbate the situation. Concern over increased traffic to the small village. Site is Green Belt so shouldn't be built on. Bus service is minimal.</p>	Comments noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19980 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954] 19982 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954] 19984 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954] 19986 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954] 19988 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954] 20219 - Mr Michael Juniper [5025] 20229 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997] 21233 - Cllr Roger Keeble [1990] 22018 - Mr. & Mrs. Rosindell [7320] 22033 - Mr.s & Mrs Terry & Eileen Smith [8020] 22057 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970] 22089 - E.W. Hall [8028] 22091 - E Harris [8029] 22166 - Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921] 22168 - E Harris [8029]				
17915 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901]	Support	Small amount of dwellings being considered for size of site when compared to other sites.	Support welcomed	No action

085B Land adjacent to Tipps Cross Community Hall, Blackmore Road, Tipps Cross

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>085B Land adjacent to Tipps Cross Community Hall, Blackmore Road, Tipps Cross</i>				
18108 - Mr John Riley [4905] 20088 - Thames Water (On behalf of Thames Water) [1927]	Comment	This is the only public land associated with the Tipps Cross Community Hall and should be preserved as such. Also, the impact on the local infrastructure taking all the local proposals into account needs to be minimised and in the scheme of things this proposal is a bit sad. On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site. Please note that the above comments relate to the sewerage network within the Thames Water supply area only. The outfall sewer that the Thames Water network connects to is within the Anglian Water supply area and flows to Anglian Water's High Roding Sewage Treatment Works. It is therefore recommended that Anglian Water are also consulted for their comments in relation to this development proposal.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18094 - Mrs Rosemarie Nelson [4529] 18210 - Mrs Lauren Clarke [7096] 18211 - Mr Joe Clarke [7095] 18216 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097] 18410 - Cllr Aimi Middlehurst [6573] 18447 - Mr. Alfie Gardner [7148] 18472 - Mr. Ben Gardner [7155] 18475 - Mr Peter Burgess [4863] 18482 - Mr Robert Davis [4789] 18638 - Mr Brian Odden [7184] 18639 - Mr Brian Odden [7184] 18672 - Mr Regan Saveall [7190] 18850 - Mrs Irene Stran [7224] 18851 - Mrs Irene Stran [7224] 18852 - Mrs Irene Stran [7224] 18942 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848] 18954 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958] 18992 - Mr Graham Mann [7244] 18994 - Mr Graham Mann [7244] 18996 - Mr Graham Mann [7244] 19199 - Mr Colin Miers [3959] 19205 - Mr Colin Miers [3959] 19219 - Mr Miles Forrest [7276] 19254 - Julie Gardner [4581] 19256 - Julie Gardner [4581] 19258 - Julie Gardner [4581] 19259 - Julie Gardner [4581] 19260 - Julie Gardner [4581] 19261 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 19262 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 19264 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 19266 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 19268 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 19284 - Stondon Massey Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [380] 19339 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942] 19345 - Valerie Godbee [4943] 19507 - Mrs. Samantha Dalton [7313] 19537 - Mr. & Mrs. Rosindell [7320] 19539 - Julie Gardner [4581]	Object	The field is the only recreation/sports field in Tipps Cross and is an important facility for local people for sport, for recreation, for children and for the elderly and visitors hiring the hall. Once built on, the land - and its health/social/sports benefits - are lost forever. Hall hirers appreciate and use the field to extend their activities and its loss will have a serious detrimental impact on bookings and viability of the hall. Will ruin the view, make the roads less safe. The local infrastructure (doctor/school etc) are already stretched; extra housing will just exacerbate the situation. Concern over increased traffic to the small village. Site is Green Belt so shouldn't be built on. Bus service is minimal.	Objections noted	Consider objections to the sites accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19549 - Mr Mark Dalton [7328]				
19557 - Ms Linda Cearn [5013]				
19977 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]				
19979 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]				
19981 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]				
19983 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]				
19985 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]				
19987 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]				
19989 - Mrs T Malecki-Scott [7954]				
20195 - Ms Helen Carolan [7985]				
20220 - Mr Michael Juniper [5025]				
21219 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997]				
21221 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997]				
21224 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997]				
21225 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997]				
21227 - Mrs Frances Alvarez [7997]				
21232 - Cllr Roger Keeble [1990]				
22003 - Mr Terrence Edward Roberts [8013]				
22017 - Mr. & Mrs. Rosindell [7320]				
22032 - Mr.s & Mrs Terry & Eileen Smith [8020]				
22056 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970]				
22058 - Mr. Kenneth Bennett [4970]				
22064 - Mrs Valerie Glossop [4854]				
22088 - E.W. Hall [8028]				
22090 - E Harris [8029]				
22103 - Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]				
22111 - Ms Margaret Boreham				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>[8033] 22124 - Mr. Raymond Potter [8039] 22165 - Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921] 22167 - E Harris [8029]</p>				
17916 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901]	Support	Small amount of dwellings being considered for size of site when compared to other sites.	Support noted	No further action
<i>200 Dunton Hills Garden Village</i>				
19615 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	ECC advise that if the DHGV allocation is being proposed as a 'Garden Village' it is recommended that the Garden City principles as outlined in the NPPF (paragraph 52) and the 2013 TCPA's publication "Creating garden cities and suburbs today" are incorporated into the Draft Plan policy to ensure delivery. ECC recommends that the Essex Design Guide 2018 is referenced within the Draft Plan and the Sustainable Modes of Travel Strategy (SMOTS) be included within the evidence base.	Noted	The work on masterplanning for the Dunton Hills Garden Village incorporates the Garden City ethos.
19907 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	The watercourse through the middle of the site proposed for the Dunton Hills Garden Village has not been modelled, and therefore the risk of flooding to the site is currently unknown. Modelling would be required to accurately establish the risk to any proposed development and ensure that the site is designed to reflect the current and future flood risk. Built development should be located away from areas of future flood risk. Further information in respect of modelling is provided below under the heading 'JFLOW'	Noted and agreed.	The masterplanning work is considering the issue of flooding and will be reflecting this in the masterplanning work for the village.
19991 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	Thurrock Council remains concerned about the identification and impact on the Green Belt of the proposed Dunton Hills Garden Village. In addition limited new or updated evidence has been made available to demonstrate the deliverability or viability of such a scheme.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19912 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	The preferred site allocations referenced 263, 276 & 200 may require a permit for work within 8 metres of a defence structure/culvert. We would however, prefer that any works around a main river must allow space for maintenance of our assets. This would also provide multiple benefits including an ecological buffer strip and corridors	Noted	Noted and agreed
19864 - Epping Forest District Council (Tai Tsui) [7960]	Comment	It currently appears that there is a risk of some unmet housing need over the plan period should the acceleration of the garden village proposal not be achieved. It is advisable that the Council continues to maintain a watching brief regarding its role on the West Essex and East Hertfordshire Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board with regard to potential cross boundary matters.	Noted	Brentwood Borough Council intends to address the housing need within the borough and will therefore continue to maintain a watching brief regarding its role on the West Essex and East Hertfordshire Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board with regard to potential cross boundary matters.
18305 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18326 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18333 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18354 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18368 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Comments pertaining to highways and transportation, masterplanning process and content, masterplanning in conjunction with neighbouring LPAs, recommends a Development Planning Document to support the local plan policy position for DHGV and will ensure the infrastructure and phasing is appropriate. The historic environment must be considered. The site will completely surround Dunton Hills, with the potential to cause substantial harm to the heritage asset. It may also intrude on the setting of Dunton Hall and the Church of St. Mary, which read as an historic church hall complex, the isolated setting of which makes an important contribution to their significance. The Historic Church Hall complex on boundary will impact on setting. Likely to contain further extensive archaeological deposits. ECC recommends that BBC should seek to produce a Development Plan Document (DPD) to support the planning policy position for DHGV. To ensure it can be delivered with the appropriate infrastructure and phasing.	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17865 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199] 18648 - Mr Paul Harper [6837] 18666 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 19632 - Persimmon Homes Essex (Mr David Moseley) [6707] 19675 - ESFA (Dr Douglas McNab) [6718] 19848 - Icen Projects Limited (Ms Charlotte Hutchinson) [5043]	Comment	The community should have a say in who develops this, needs self builders and serviced plots. Needs to consider the clean air act, electric vehicles and zero energy build homes. Is an opportunity to build an eco-village. Please consider working with Basildon to get more affordable homes, housing associations and SME involvement. Look at what Oxford is offering their residents in a one stop shop. Good idea to take pressure off the villages, provided proper infrastructure is included in the plans. While instinctively I dislike the idea of the continual in-filling of green spaces, recognise that the population of the world, the UK, and our area has grown tremendously in the past few years and so something has to be done to alleviate the pressure on housing. Serious effort should be made to minimise the impact on wildlife. All development benefits from green space with good planting and many trees, particularly along the A12. Large development like Dunton Hills Garden Village is a good opportunity to plan this way. Dunton Hills site is almost the last green belt gap between Upminster (London) and Southend thus the development of this site would basically create continuous development between London and Southend. The western side of the site needs to be restricted and turned into a buffer zone by creating a woodland. This would have the effect of visual separation between the two villages and would also mitigate some of the potential flood risk that the development would create. The surrounding infrastructure will need to be improved to allow for the development. There is presently a distinct lack of published supporting technical studies in relation to the Dunton Hills Garden Village as proposed in the Local Plan. There is insufficient evidence of co-operation with and a joint vision Basildon & Thurrock Council's with regards the Garden Village, how it will be delivered having regards to the neighbouring authorities aspirations for growth in this area. The Council are exploring whether Dunton Hills Garden Village could increase delivery from 2500 to c4,000. It is considered that this work should have been undertaken in advance of the consultation and the findings inform the Preferred Options. The next version of the Local Plan should seek to be more definitive in identifying which sites will need to deliver	Comments noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		new schools to support growth, based on the latest evidence of identified need and demand. The site allocations or associated safeguarding policies should clarify requirements for the delivery of new schools, including when they should be delivered to support housing growth, the minimum site area required, any preferred site characteristics, and any requirements for safeguarding additional land for future expansion of schools where need and demand indicates. The Council suggests accelerated delivery of Dunton Hills could contribute towards meeting a higher housing target. No evidence has been provided to prove that 2,500 dwellings on the site could be delivered in the plan period, let alone a higher figure. It is considered prudent therefore, that the Council should consider allocating other sites to meet this higher target.		
18010 - Mr and Mrs Colin and Linda Matthew [749]	Comment	Good idea to take pressure off the villages, provided proper infrastructure is included in the plans	Comment welcomed	Consider accordingly
19994 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	At all DTC meetings Thurrock Officers have reiterated the objection to Dunton Garden village and suggested that alternative options are investigated including potential development at West Horndon and A12 Corridor. Thurrock is concerned about Dunton Hills Garden Village and due to its location close to and adjoining the boundaries between the two authorities Thurrock Council requests further engagement on this development and considerations of alternative options along the A127 Corridor and elsewhere. Brentwood Council should progress key strategic matters through the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan process as well as with individual local authorities on cross-boundary matters.	Noted.	Brentwood are continuing Duty to Cooperate work with Thurrock Council on the Draft Local Plan. Work on the Joint Strategic Plan is noted.
17952 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]	Comment	This site has the opportunity to enhance the public rights of way network by creating links for all users - including equestrians - through the site and beyond.	Comment noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19873 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	In terms of nationally designated sites, the development will also need to consider increased recreational pressure to the nearby Thorndon Park SSSI and Basildon Meadows SSSI (and any potential changes to the boundary of the SSSI; in Basildon District) and any mitigation measures that might be required.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20061 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Comment	Transport for London should be afforded the opportunity to comment on the implications of the Dunton Hills Garden Village proposal on the A127 because it is a Transport for London route once it is within the London area. Brentwood will be aware of the joint working taking place between authorities along the A127 corridor to consider the transport aspects of development proposals (such as Dunton Hills Garden Village) and plan-preparation and this should be recognised and explained in the document.	Noted. Consultation with TfL is ongoing regarding the Local Plan and the proposed Garden Village and Enterprise Park.	Consider accordingly
19995 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	The South Essex authorities are considering spatial options to assess the capacity of South Essex to deliver growth and are commissioning a spatial options study to inform the Joint Strategic Plan preparation. In consideration of locations and strategic sites for growth a range of options including alternatives to Dunton Hill Garden village should form part of the options testing as part of this study. Therefore it is considered premature for the Brentwood Plan to progress until the outcome of this options testing is known and the locations and nature of growth has been advanced with a degree of certainty.	Noted	Consider accordingly in line within the ongoing the Duty to Cooperate requirements of the NPPF and Local Plan evidence base. Further consideration is discussed within the Preferred Site Allocations 2018 consultation statement.
19906 - Environment Agency (Charlie Christensen) [7962]	Comment	Suggested text to be included for sites referenced 263 and 276 have small areas in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and part of the site referenced 200 is located in Flood Zone 3. Applicants should be aware of the modelled watercourses in the area as proposed developments may be required to model nearby watercourses to determine local flood risk. All development proposals within the flood zone (which includes Flood Zones 2 and 3), or elsewhere on sites of 1 hectare or more must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).	Noted and agreed.	The Council have commissioned an update to the SFRA and the WCS and will continue to work with the Environment Agency on these issues.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19917 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	This site contains a number of listed buildings and is located near to a Registered Park and Garden, two scheduled monuments and a range of other Grade II* and Grade II listed buildings. There is concern that there is inadequate evidence to support the allocation of this site at this stage. We request that a Heritage Impact Assessment is undertaken to provide a better understanding of the site and of the potential impacts upon heritage assets within the site and around its boundary. Historic Landscape Characterisation and archaeological assessments should also be carried out.	Noted	Consider accordingly within the masterplanning work for the village.
18235 - Essex Wildlife Trust (Dr Annie Gordon) [2414]	Comment	A GI masterplan will be essential to protect and enhance existing biodiversity, providing generous green buffers to existing sensitive habitats, functionally linked semi-natural habitats and protecting important hedgerows and existing priority deciduous woodland and Eastlands Spring LoWS. The aim should be to improve ample green open space to reduce recreational impacts on sensitive habitats and habitat linkages between Thorndon Country Park and Woodland to the north and Langdon Hills Country Park to the south-east. The overarching aim should be to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.	Noted	Green and Blue infrastructure is being considered within the masterplanning work for the village, in line with the Garden Village ethos.
20062 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Comment	It is noted that Strategic Objective SO4 mentions the importance of place-making. It will be important to ensure that the Dunton Hills Garden Village scheme is designed to avoid creating the impression of the A127 being a corridor of built development. Master-planning of the site should ensure that development is set back from the A127 and separated from it by high quality landscaping and open, undeveloped areas.	Noted. Design considerations are an important facet of the Garden City ethos that runs through the masterplanning work.	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19872 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	We advise that mitigation measures will be required to avoid significant adverse impacts to designated sites. Our SSSI risk zones have identified that water supply mechanisms and the method of foul drainage will need confirming before impacts can be ruled out. Potential impacts from surface water runoff on water quality-sensitive designated sites will need consideration; good quality SuDS within the development would help to address this and could also provide biodiversity net gain along with other enhancement mechanisms, such as the provision of ecological linkages to existing habitats of importance and habitat management for S41 biodiversity priority habitats and species	Noted and agreed	The Council will continue to work with Natural England to consider and develop these requirements within the masterplanning work for Dunton.
19945 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	It is acknowledged that some of these surrounding heritage assets are severed from the site by the A127 however development of the site still has the potential to impact upon the setting of the RPAG. It is also not clear how the listed properties within the site are to be treated. Given the sensitive nature of the site and given the lack of supporting evidence on the historic environment, we request that a Heritage Impact Assessment is undertaken in accordance with our advice note 'Site allocations in Local Plans'. We recommend that further archaeological investigation is undertaken and landscape characterisation.	Noted	Consideration of the impacts on archaeology of the village will be in evidence within the masterplanning work
20057 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Comment	It is noted that paragraph 105 of the Brentwood Local Plan document notes that eventually, the Garden Village may have some 9,000 residents. It notes that health facilities are available in nearby Thurrock and Basildon. It is, of course, the case that facilities in Havering would also be close by. The recognition in paragraph 105 about developing new integrated health facilities in the Garden Village to serve the needs of that community is strongly supported. Residents of the Garden Village seeking to use Havering facilities would be to the detriment of provision for Havering residents.	Comment noted. The proposed Garden Village is for 2,500 in the life of the plan and to reach a size of 4,000 new homes in total. The council are continue to work with health service providers regarding this	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18228 - Sport England (Mr. Roy Warren) [4294]	Object	The allocation policy will need to make provision for retaining or replacing the Dunton Hills Golf Centre unless it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that it is surplus to requirements through a golf course needs assessment. The Council's evidence base for sport should be used to inform the scale and nature of community sports facility provision that will need to be provided on-site or off-site to meet the additional needs generated by a development of this scale. Sport England Active Design guidance should be used for guiding the masterplanning in order to create environments which promote active lifestyles.	Noted	Assessment of gold provision in the area will be carried out by Brentwood Borough Council in order to inform site proposal.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17979 - Mrs Debbie Weekes [4542] 18015 - Mr Glen Carlile [7001] 18056 - D Westfall [5310] 18070 - Mrs Zoe Chambers [5634] 18208 - Louise Cooper [3213] 18221 - Mrs Rachel Gibbs [5584] 18371 - Mrs Helen Gabell [4332] 18374 - Mr Paul Gabell [5675] 18405 - Mr. & Mrs. Adrian & Julie Dunn [7140] 18420 - Miss Ann Allen [7143] 18421 - Miss Ann Allen [7143] 18422 - Miss Ann Allen [7143] 18423 - Miss Ann Allen [7143] 18424 - Miss Ann Allen [7143] 18428 - Mrs Jill Saddington [2549] 18436 - Ms Jenni Parlour [6062] 18449 - Amanda Burton [1628] 18468 - Mr Barry Lindsey [7154] 18486 - Mr. Callum Walker [7158] 18504 - Mr Alan Camp [7168] 18505 - Miss Caroline May [7169] 18518 - Mr Roland Lazarus [4908] 18548 - Carla Wright [7176] 18616 - Charles Smith [4130] 18624 - Claire Silversword [7181] 18669 - Woodland Trust (Mr Jack Taylor) [7189] 18699 - Mr Jonathan Purr [7194] 18703 - Mr Danny Lovey [6010] 18714 - Mr Darren Williams [5311] 18715 - Mr Dave Walker [7197] 18716 - Mr Dave Walker [7197] 18717 - Mr Dave Walker [7197] 18718 - Mr Dave Walker [7197] 18719 - Mr Dave Walker [7197] 18724 - David Halliday [6204] 18726 - Mr David A.W. Llewellyn [5738] 18728 - Mr Jonathan Purr [7194] 18732 - Mr David Rontree [5338] 18738 - Debbie Fellowes [7204] 18771 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540] 18796 - Gita Mackintosh [7214] 18855 - Mr Derrick Fellowes	Object	Infrastructure at capacity; roads are already congested and dangerous; need to protect the environment and safety of local residents; look for other sites; too open ended; no detail on infrastructure need or provision; need facts; all infrastructure should be in place before homes are built; will obliterate Green Belt, should go to A12 especially with Crossrail; hospitals, GPS, schools, rail, bus all inadequate here; puts pressure on Basildon not Brentwood; unfair on Basildon; rail already overcrowded and infrequent service here; negative impact on local environment; CIL funds won't be able to provide everything needed; object to loss of Golf course; A127 and A128 already congested; impact on Green Belt; too many travellers sites, max 15 pitches; too far from Brentwood; too big a development; will damage wildlife and habitats; need to assess Brexit impact on population;	Objections have been noted.	Consideration of all comments, support and objections are being made during the process of developing the Dunton Hills Garden Village Policy and masterplanning for the site.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[4361]				
18856 - Mr Derrick Fellowes				
[4361]				
18857 - Mr Derrick Fellowes				
[4361]				
18858 - Mr Derrick Fellowes				
[4361]				
18859 - Mr Derrick Fellowes				
[4361]				
18860 - Mr Derrick Fellowes				
[4361]				
18861 - Mr Derrick Fellowes				
[4361]				
18862 - Mr Derrick Fellowes				
[4361]				
18863 - Mr Derrick Fellowes				
[4361]				
18873 - Mrs D Antrobus [4557]				
18874 - Mrs D Antrobus [4557]				
18875 - Mrs D Antrobus [4557]				
18876 - Mrs D Antrobus [4557]				
18877 - Mrs D Antrobus [4557]				
18878 - Mrs D Antrobus [4557]				
19087 - Landmark Town Planning Services (Mr Ian Beatwell) [4642]				
19110 - Mr Steve Little [7259]				
19111 - Mr Steve Little [7259]				
19112 - Mr Russ Mizen [7260]				
19113 - Mr Russ Mizen [7260]				
19116 - Mr Russ Mizen [7260]				
19129 - Mr Letrois Bernard [7262]				
19130 - Mr Letrois Bernard [7262]				
19131 - Mr Letrois Bernard [7262]				
19132 - Mr Letrois Bernard [7262]				
19133 - Mr Letrois Bernard [7262]				
19139 - Mr Russell Shaw [6977]				
19140 - Mr Russell Shaw [6977]				
19162 - Ms Katherine Livermore [7264]				
19206 - Mr Jeffrey Goodwin [5004]				
19276 - - Lesley & David Hawkes [7283]				
19278 - Dunton Community Association (Mr Edward Cowen) [6185]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
19288 - Mrs Julie Williams [6192]				
19289 - Mrs Julie Williams [6192]				
19304 - Ms Liz Donald [7288]				
19361 - Mr John Berry [2490]				
19362 - Mr John Berry [2490]				
19394 - Dr. Timothy Nicklin [7295]				
19397 - Simon Rayner [7297]				
19407 - Mrs Leigh Hughes [7065]				
19417 - Sandra Halliday [6196]				
19427 - Miss Sarah McInerney [7071]				
19438 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19439 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19440 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19442 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19443 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19444 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19445 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19446 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19447 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19448 - Mr Ian Hawthorn [7303]				
19451 - Mr Leonard-Wright Lewis [7306]				
19452 - Mr Leonard-Wright Lewis [7306]				
19453 - Mr Leonard-Wright Lewis [7306]				
19527 - Patricia Harper [7316]				
19592 - Turn2us [6753]				
19608 - Mr Jon Nicholls [5202]				
19700 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]				
19726 - Countryside Properties [250]				
19728 - Countryside Properties [250]				
19731 - Countryside Properties [250]				
19736 - Countryside Properties [250]				
19737 - Countryside Properties [250]				
19738 - Countryside Properties [250]				
19744 - Countryside Properties				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[250]				
19745 - Countryside Properties				
[250]				
19753 - Countryside Properties				
[250]				
19887 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd				
[2788]				
20007 - Thurrock Borough				
Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]				
20012 - Thurrock Borough				
Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]				
20060 - London Borough of				
Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas)				
[7966]				
20135 - Mr Peter Greenfield				
[6792]				
20164 - M&G Cotton [7975]				
20165 - M&G Cotton [7975]				
20166 - M&G Cotton [7975]				
20167 - M&G Cotton [7975]				
20168 - M&G Cotton [7975]				
20169 - M&G Cotton [7975]				
20185 - Mr Steve Ault [7980]				
20186 - Mr Steve Ault [7980]				
20187 - Mr Steve Ault [7980]				
20188 - Mr Steve Ault [7980]				
21243 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]				
22127 - Mr. Stuart Giles [2625]				
22128 - Mr. Stuart Giles [2625]				
22129 - Mr. Stuart Giles [2625]				
22130 - Mr. Stuart Giles [2625]				
22131 - Mr. Stuart Giles [2625]				
22132 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349]				
22133 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349]				
22134 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349]				
22135 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349]				
22136 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349]				
22137 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349]				
22138 - Mrs Nicola Giles [4349]				
22139 - Mr M. Saddington [1273]				
22140 - Mr M. Saddington [1273]				
22141 - Mr M. Saddington [1273]				
22142 - Mr M. Saddington [1273]				
22143 - Mr M. Saddington [1273]				
22144 - Mr M. Saddington [1273]				
22145 - Mr M. Saddington [1273]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
22155 - Mr. Callum Walker [7158] 22156 - Mr. Callum Walker [7158] 22157 - Mr. Callum Walker [7158] 22158 - Mr. Callum Walker [7158] 22159 - Mr Andrew Fletcher [2760] 22160 - Mr Andrew Fletcher [2760]				
19968 - Basildon Borough Council (Adeola Awolola) [7965]	Object	Basildon Council objected to the proposal to create a standalone new village to the west of the joint administrative boundary in February 2016. Basildon Council maintains the view that there currently remains a lack of credible and robust technical evidence to justify that a new village in this Green Belt location is the best option for meeting Brentwood's housing needs. Basildon Council considers that without any further evidence to support this proposal, Brentwood Borough's Local Plan is unlikely to be found sound on the basis of justification and effectiveness, and makes objections on these grounds. We do not support DHGV.	Noted	Consider accordingly in line within the ongoing the Duty to Cooperate requirements of the NPPF and Local Plan evidence base. Further consideration is discussed within the Preferred Site Allocations 2018 consultation statement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17917 - Ms Connie Roffe [6901] 18129 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18187 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 19218 - Mrs Gillian Hobbs [5598] 19414 - Stephen Hill [612] 19831 - AECOM (David Carlisle) [6031] 20141 - Mrs. M. A. Montgomery [1772] 21958 - Mr Henry Pulley [4001]	Support	Support any future housing development throughout the whole of Brentwood and outlying villages particularly the Dunton Garden village. There is an urgent need for housing of all types in our communities now not in 20 years time. Appears to be ideal but flooding, wildlife and traffic impact should be examined & mitigated. Strongly advocate looking at continental ideas for eco-friendly, low-cost, smart, colourful & energy efficient homes with cutting-edge design. The mooted new rail link/station should be provided as an essential to reduce car movements to 7 from London on A127. Landscaping, planting and design of the overall village should reflect that of a village with community facilities in rural surroundings. It would make much more sense to create a purpose built housing development at the proposed site 200 of the LDP at Dunton Garden Village where facilities such as Schools, Doctor's surgeries, pharmacies and community meeting places could all be included in the new build. The integrated infrastructure will offer tremendous advantages over developing the town and its nearby environments. Strongly believe that a number of satellite developments, such as Dunton Garden Village, will offer the best solution to the need for new homes in our area despite these settlements having to be developed on green belt land. Crest Nicholson and Bellway Homes are pleased to submit joint representations in respect of their land interests to the West of Basildon. Our clients strongly support proposal for the allocation of DHGV and its proposed removal from the Green Belt. Dunton is essential to take main volume of the housing required. It must be well planned, with its own infrastructure and to help other area's local facilities being overwhelmed.	Support noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18295 - CODE Development Planners Ltd (Mr Mike Carpenter) [4629] 19865 - CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050] 19871 - CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050] 19874 - CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]	Support	<p>CODE: The preferred allocation at DHGV is supported by the proportionate evidence prepared by the Council and by the promoters. While additional more detailed work is being undertaken in consideration of the infrastructure requirements and delivery mechanisms and in the master planning of the Garden Village it is clear that DHGV is deliverable in the form, scale and timeframe envisaged by the Local Plan. The additional documents contain summaries of relevant evidence prepared on behalf of the Promoters and suggest a form of policy and explanatory text to be incorporated into the Regulation 19 Plan. Noting Part 2 Green Belt Study, it is necessary to re-asses the Dunton Hills site in more detail to allow for the consideration of how the DHGV scheme can provide development that responds to the landscape and Green Belt context. Supporting document identifies that Parcel 17 may be assessed as making a lower contribution to the Green Belt purposes than the Part 2 Study has suggested, making a Moderate contribution to most Green Belt purposes. Dunton Hills Site is considered to make an even lower contribution to the Green Belt than Parcel 17.</p> <p>Due to: - Smaller scale compared to Parcel 17; The detracting influence of on-site development-buildings, wind turbine, pylons, roads and railway- upon the landscape character and contribution to the countryside; Separation of site from the built edge and containment by the A127, A128 and railway line; Opportunities to provide a soft transition with the adjacent landscape, as well as forming a robust and defensible new Green Belt boundary; Opportunities for a landscape led scheme that provides green infrastructure and landscape enhancement. DHGV can be delivered to respect the landscape and distinctive features, incorporating measures that would help to mitigate the negative impacts of existing transport infrastructure, whilst strengthening the degraded landscape structure through enhancement of boundaries. As recognised by the Council within the Sustainability Appraisal, development at DHGV has the potential to be delivered as a landscape-led scheme that responds to the topography of the site, provides substantial areas of green infrastructure incorporating accessible multifunctional green space and landscape planting that respects the local</p>	Support noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		character.		
<i>101A Brentwood Enterprise Park (former M25 Junction 29 works)</i>				
18768 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540]	Comment	New industrial estate near M25 junction has only road links no public transport to site. This junction is notorious for being jammed leaving the site stranded, emergency services being unable to get to the site.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18316 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Highways and transportation on the site	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.
20013 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Comment	Development would harm the openness of this part of the Green Belt and result in urban sprawl along the A127 by spreading the extent of built development further into the Green Belt. The form and scale of the site would also cause significant harm to the other purposes of the Green Belt and would result in major encroachment into the countryside whilst also causing harm to the purpose of preventing the merging of neighbouring towns. The location scores overall a Moderate in terms of meeting the purposes of the Green Belt in the Brentwood draft Green Belt Review.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18329 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Economic implications of the site	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18130 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252]	Comment	As Councillor for Warley I've repeatedly asked that, if this area is to redeveloped for business purposes, it must not contain retail units but be solely for business/light industry. The buildings should be low-rise, modern, elegant, glass which reflects the trees on the perimeter of the site. New landscaping/planting to the south would go some way towards the original agreement with the Highways Authority that this should be re-instated as farmland after the M25 widening works were completed. This development at the southern gateway to Brentwood should not detract from south Warley and be sympathetic to Great Warley Conservation Area.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17953 - Essex Bridleways Association (Mrs Sue Dobson) [3855]	Comment	These three sites provide an opportunity to retain and enhance the bridleway network on a site which currently suffers from enforcement issues, along with improvements dependent upon the land use for the proposed Lower Thames Crossing.	Noted	Consider accordingly
20040 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106] 20041 - Highways England (Mr Mark Norman) [6106]	Comment	This site could have a significant effect on the operation of the junction, due to its size and its proximity to the junction. The LP indicates that public transport will be encouraged at the site to encourage 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 SRN. 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.	Noted	The Council will continue discussions with Highways England regarding site specific issues.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
20065 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966] 20066 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966] 20068 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Comment	Allocation narrative should explain how the transport implications of the proposals will be addressed and reflect that the existing junction is likely to be remodelled if the Lower Thames Crossing proposal proceeds. This will be particularly important for Brentwood Enterprise Park given the scale of the development proposed and the likely impact on the adjoining highway network particularly the A127 trunk road because this enters Havering and intersects with the A12 trunk road at the Gallows Corner intersection. Transport for London should be consulted and the joint working taking place between authorities along the A127 corridor to consider the transport aspects of development proposals (such as Brentwood Enterprise Park) and plan-preparation and this should be recognised and explained in the document. Previous stakeholder objections should be considered.	Comments noted	Consider accordingly
17962 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944] 18019 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309] 18939 - Mr Gary Scott [7233] 19428 - Miss Sarah McInerney [7071]	Object	Needs public transport, car orientated. Not feasible due to the lower Thames crossing. A127 is already congested here.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18670 - Woodland Trust (Mr Jack Taylor) [7189]	Object	Object as likely to cause damage and or loss to areas of ancient woodland within or adjacent to the boundary. Adjacent to AW on Type - ASNW. Name - Hobbs Hole	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments in further detail in relation to drafting the site specific policies.
20067 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Object	It is noted that earlier consultation on the Brentwood Local Plan indicated that some stakeholders objected in principle to the extent of development along the A127 corridor (paragraph 9) and the Brentwood Enterprise Park allocation should be considered against that. Gallows Corner is already highly congested, an accident 'hot spot' and gives rise to environmental problems. The scale of development proposed at Brentwood Enterprise Park will exacerbate this considerably.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18190 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18662 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 19702 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381] 19805 - St Modwen Properties PLC [5124]	Support	Support for the site with clarification of access	Support noted	Consider accordingly
<i>101C and 101D Codham Hall</i>				
18347 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Constraint: Known historic settlement complex, will require significant archaeological investigation. Constraint: Potential historic settlement complex, likely to require significant archaeological investigation	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.
18317 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Impact on the A127 needs to be fully assessed and suitable mitigation identified. Provision of sustainable modes of transport facilities are also required	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.
17963 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944] 18131 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252] 18769 - Mr Derek Agombar [2540]	Object	Object as it is in Green Belt and it has been operating illegally for more than 12 years.	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment in light of the comments received.
18189 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18663 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 19774 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 19785 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098] 19786 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Support	Support for the allocation of this site	Support welcomed	None required

112D and 112E Childerditch Industrial Estate extensions (inc existing 112A)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>112D and 112E Childerditch Industrial Estate extensions (inc existing 112A)</i>				
19868 - Natural England (Alison Collins) [7961]	Comment	There are no allocations directly within or adjacent to SSSIs but the following allocations are within Natural England Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for residential and/or rural residential development: 112D, 112E. This means that we would like to be consulted further to ensure that any impacts have been taken into account and mitigation provided if required. It does not mean that we have an outright objection to these allocations.	Comment noted	Reflect in site policy.
18319 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Impact of development on the A127 needs to be fully assessed with significant improvement to the junction with the A127 / Childerditch Lane. Within the expansion and improvements, connectivity should be developed for accessing the sites via sustainable transport measures. The A127 does act as a deterrent for people using sustainable modes of transport.	Noted.	The Council will continue to work with Essex County Council on highways issues. Details are considered in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.
17964 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944] 18132 - Mrs Jill Hubbard [2252]	Object	Object due to transport access, impacts of large vehicles and visual impacts to the area.	Noted	Consider accordingly
17864 - MRS RANI MOORCROFT [1199] 18188 - Mr and Mrs Paul McEwen [4610] 18664 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 19669 - Childerditch Properties [2642] 19701 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]	Support	Support for this site allocation	Support noted	None required

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
<i>187 Land South of East Horndon Hall</i>				
19947 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	We are pleased to see that the presence of the designated heritage asset has been identified within the proforma. Development of this site will need to conserve and enhance this heritage asset and its setting. There is concern that the extent of the site and the position of development will harm the setting of this designated heritage asset. Further information is required in order to justify this allocation. Further investigative work will be required to determine what sorts of mitigation measures will be appropriate and where the boundary of the site should be located.	Noted	Consider comments accordingly
18324 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18332 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776] 18353 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Comment	Consider including site as part of the DHGV (ref 200), to support the creation of a comprehensive masterplan. The impact of development on the A127 / A128 interchange is required. The proposals to improve the A127/A128 junction include widening / realignment of slip lanes for which safeguarding may be required. Consideration must be given to how residents will access nearby railway stations using sustainable transport. Good connectivity to the larger towns and employment opportunities via network of cycle paths should also be provided and needs to consider the setting of the Church of All Saints located to the north of the A127.	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Essex County Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.
20014 - Thurrock Borough Council (Mr Richard Hatter) [2461]	Object	This site abuts the boundary of a Grade II listed building and seems to incorporate some of its curtilage buildings. There is concern regarding the proximity to this heritage asset and the subsequent impact upon its significance. Information regarding setting, character and significance will need to be provided to determine if the boundary should be pulled back. This assessment should be proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset and the nature of employment development. This should inform a site specific policy. We are unable to support this allocation.	Noted	The Council will consider the site assessment comments from Thurrock Council in further detail in the Preferred Sites Allocations 2018 Consultation Statement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
17965 - MR JOSEPH ELLIS [6944] 18656 - Mr Colin Foan [2992] 19708 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]	Object	Needs public transport, inappropriate development in Green Belt, flooding issues there, needs a site specific flood risk assessment, will increase development creep into Green Belt, , more strain on the A127.	Noted	Consider accordingly
19918 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Object	This site abuts the boundary of a Grade II listed building and seems to incorporate some of its curtilage buildings. There is concern regarding the proximity to this heritage asset and the subsequent impact upon its significance. Information regarding setting, character and significance will need to be provided to determine if the boundary should be pulled back. This assessment should be proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset and the nature of employment development. This should inform a site specific policy. We are unable to support this allocation.	Noted	Consider accordingly
18355 - Hermes Investment Management [7124] 19680 - Catherine Williams [7454]	Support	Support inclusion of this site	Noted	Support welcomed
<i>079C Land adjacent to Ingatestone by-pass (part bounded by Roman Road)</i>				
19948 - Historic England (Katie Parsona) [7963]	Comment	It is recommended that archaeological investigations are carried out prior to development. We request that this is included as a criterion within any site specific policy.	Noted and agreed.	Noted and agreed
19712 - Simons Developments Limited [5643]	Comment	A mixed use scheme on this site can help address the existing deficiency in local retail provision and deliver more jobs than a scheme of Class B uses only. Welcome a further dialogue with the local planning authority prior to "Regulation 19" consultation in order to ensure that the emerging Preferred Site Allocations DPD contains a policy framework which is sufficiently flexible to deliver a mixed use scheme.	Noted	Consider accordingly

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
18464 - Mr. & Mrs. Michael & Ann Malyon [7152] 19613 - Mr Lyndon Day [7344]	Object	Would be totally out of context with our village. We currently have a mix of small offices and businesses, which operate well within the village community. Currently, our local industrial area is just outside Shenfield, which it would seem more logical to extend. This development would not be in keeping with the current character of the area. Land is greenbelt and building here would join up the villages.	Noted	Consider accordingly
<i>Fig. 24. Map of All Preferred Sites</i>				
17874 - Mr John Darragh [4862]	Comment	Development seems to be in the centre and bottom of the borough. More of the development needs to be put in the North of the borough, for example, why is there so little in Doddinghurst?	The site assessment work and spatial strategy considers many opportunities and constraints to development in the borough which has led to this preferred distribution of new development as described in the Preferred Sites document	Consider accordingly
19684 - The Holiday Inn [7464]	Object	There is a need to remove the Holiday Inn site from the Green belt.	Noted	Consider accordingly