

# *Addendum of Focussed Changes to the Pre-Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19)*

## *Public Participation Report*

Addendum of Focussed Changes to the Pre-Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19)

Sustainability Appraisal

### *Representations*

### *Nature*

### *Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan*

### *Council's Assessment*

### *Action*

## *Addendum of Focussed Changes to the Pre-Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19)*

### *Sustainability Appraisal*

26796 - M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]	Object	<p>Plan remains unsound as a result of the Focussed Changes. The higher LHN has not been incorporated, nor the requirement to identify a suitable buffer. The Plan is therefore failing to meet the requirements of the NPPF and the identified need for the Borough. The Focussed Changes do not demonstrate that the Plan will be effective in meeting housing needs, given it seeks to re-direct housing delivery from the short-term to the later years of the Plan, further decreasing its ability to meet its needs early in the Plan period.</p> <p><i>The Council should have considered the merits of identifying additional, suitable sites to deliver in the short-medium term, including those which provide specialist accommodation to meet an identified local need, such as the land west of Crossby Close (site 073). As discussed above and shown in Appendix B, this represents a suitable site with local support for specialist accommodation that has been overlooked.</i></p>	<p>The overall housing provision identified in the Pre-Submission Local Plan is still in line with the housing need following the standard method. Acknowledge that the Local Housing Need section of the Plan (paragraphs 4.11 to 4.21) needs to be updated to reflect the standard method.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.11 to 4.21 of Pre-Submission Local Plan to be updated in line with Standard Method.</p>
26888 - St Modwen Properties PLC and S&J Padfield and Partners [8835]	Object	<p>The SA: The commentary on Economy and Employment also refers to the 'Enterprise Corridor' and the role of the Enterprise Park along the corridor. We note that paragraph 9.6.8 suggests that access will be directly to Junction 29 and the M25, while the draft plan indicates that access may be achieved via the B186.</p> <p><i>Clarification of Enterprise Park - to provide consistency between the SA and Local Plan</i></p>	<p>The Pre-Submission Local Plan sets out under paragraph 9.208 that there are a number of potential access points including via M25 Junction 29 and Warley Street (B186). Both of these options will impact on similar areas from a transport perspective. Therefore consider that the SA appropriately assesses the potential impact of the Enterprise Park.</p>	<p>No further action</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26884 - St Modwen Properties PLC and S&J Padfield and Partners [8835]	Object	<p>IDP Transport &amp; Movement chapter should also make reference to the potential role that Demand Responsive public transport can play. This element of the Transport work is being progressed by a number of parties who are engaging proactively in seeking to rationalise and progress solutions for delivering the identified sites along the Southern Growth Corridor (SGC), and this should be referenced in the IDP. Currently, the sections of the Transport and Movement document referring to buses are focused on provision of traditional fixed route bus services, which may only one be solution adopted at Brentwood Enterprise Park.</p> <p><i>Consideration of demand responsive public transport role.</i></p>	The Council will need to consider a number of options for public transport in addition to emerging alternatives such as demand responsive public transport. The use of this type of approach would not be precluded.	No further action
26903 - Ford Motor Company [3768]	Object	<p>Ford owned site (RO4 and RO5) is currently anticipated by BBC to come forward within years 9-17 of the proposed plan period as shown in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix 1. In fact, it is realistic that the site could be delivered within 6 -10 years (2021-2025).</p> <p><i>Request that BBC review and update the Site's inclusion in the housing trajectory, including considering the Ford owned and Council Depot sites separately (see further comments below) - bringing forward the Ford owned land in years 6-10 (which Ford have demonstrated is available and deliverable). In our opinion this is necessary in order to ensure the Plan is positively prepared, having regard to the requirements of Paragraph 35 of the NPPF 2019.</i></p>	In assessing the delivery timeframes of sites the Council has taken a cautious approach and considers the estimate for site allocation R04 and R05 to be reasonable at the point of formulating the plan considering which was based on the likely lead in time needed for the site to be vacated, application timeframes including masterplanning, any demolition works to be completed and remediation.	No further action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26824 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856]	Object	<p>Risk in not meeting the LHN. Flaw in calculation allocation total in appendix 1: The NPPF states Plan should look ahead of 15 years from adoption, therefore completions for year 2016/17, 17/18 (363 net homes) should be discounted. Removed 926 extant permissions from the 'allocation total' unless the Council can provide evidence that they would still be extant at the point the Plan is adopted. Similarly, unless there is compelling evidence to suggest they are a reliable source of supply, the 410 windfall allowance should be removed from the allocation total.</p> <p><i>Revise Allocation Total for Plan period as suggested with regard to life of plan.</i></p>	See Councils monitoring information for up to date position on extant permissions. Disagree that windfall allowance should be removed from the allocation total, this figure is based on historic delivery and in any case has not been included as part of the 5 year delivery supply in the calculations.	No further action
26794 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Object	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal October 2019 does not appear to have been updated to reflect our previous comments. Codham Hall Farm continues to be scored negatively against Local Wildlife Site, Ancient Wood and AQMA, GP, and school provision. These criteria should be considered differently when applied to an allocation for employment land rather than residential proposals. Through appropriate design and landscaping, adverse impacts can be avoided. A 'neutral or depending on implementation' scoring for a number of these criteria would be much more appropriate. The allocation at Brentwood Enterprise Park (E11) is also scored negatively against Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p><i>Local Wildlife Site, Ancient Wood and AQMA, GP, and school provision criteria should be considered differently when applied to an allocation for employment land rather than residential proposals. Through appropriate design and landscaping, adverse impacts can be avoided. A 'neutral or depending on implementation' scoring for a number of these criteria would be much more appropriate.</i></p>	Noted. The Sustainability Appraisal has applied a standard GIS based analysis to all sites and the results provide an overview of likely impacts. The results of this have been considered on a broad basis rather than highlighting the inappropriateness of sites based on a single issue.	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>
26795 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Object	<p>The IDP: Transport &amp; Movement chapter should make reference to the potential role that Demand Responsive public transport can play. This is being progressed by parties seeking to rationalise and progress solutions for delivering the identified sites along the Southern Growth Corridor (SGC). The reference to buses are focused on provision of traditional fixed route bus services. Additional work is required with regards to the proposed cycle network for the SGC if this is to be delivered without the need for third party land, and the progression of development on key sites should therefore not be reliant on this.</p> <p><i>Transport &amp; Movement chapter of the IDP should make reference to the Demand Responsive public transport. Additional work is required with regards to the proposed cycle network for the SGC.</i></p>	The Council will need to consider a number of options for public transport in addition to emerging alternatives such as demand responsive public transport. The use of this type of approach would not be precluded.	No further action
26679 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	<p>Each item is different and must not be considered as a single representation. You must see each item and they have implications for multiple sites.</p> <p><i>Remove sites R25 and R26.</i></p>	The comments have been split up into the multiple sites and responses made in relation to the sites.	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>
26690 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	<p>SA Report Addendum 2.5.6 -refers to delivery of new homes alongside infrastructure, but NOTHING has been considered or planned for Blackmore. R25 &amp; R26 should be removed entirely from the LDP and their allocation transferred to R01 unless an appropriate infrastructure improvement plan can be incorporated into the Plan to facilitate the development. SA Report Addendum 2.11.3 - recognises that the existing planned reduction of 20 homes at R25/R26 is insufficient to affect the retention of agricultural land. To facilitate this objective R25 &amp; R26 should be completely removed from the plan and the allocation transferred to R01. SA Non-Tech Summary - R25 &amp; R26 fail at least 8 of the stated Objectives required for the LDP. These sites should be completely removed from the plan and the allocation transferred to R01. SA Non-Tech Summary - This report discusses how developing some sites would, or would not, successfully achieve the objective of reducing Car Dependency. However this test has not been applied to R25 &amp; R26 which require absolute total Car Dependency for any new homes. R25 &amp; R26 should be removed entirely from the plan to meet the LDP goal of reducing car dependency. SA Non-Tech Summary - raises "omission sites" incl Honeypot Lane R022 and considers the benefits/disadvantages of their reintroduction. Honeypot Lane was eminently more suitable than any of the 4 sites now seeking reduction in the Focussed Changes, yet was removed without the opportunity for proper review in November 2018. The only reasons I have heard for the removal are a) the site was in the area of a Council member who would need to consider the views of voters b) There is a short pinch point in the access road to the site which would make development access difficult. However the pinch point is still wider than the entire length of Redrose Lane which is being suggested for development of both R25 &amp; R26. The Honeypot Lane site, inexplicably, is still not considered as an alternative to the Northern Villages Allocation. R022 should be re-included in the Plan as this would allow all R18, R19, R25, &amp; R26 to be completely removed and also not require an increased burden being added to R01.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from the plan</i></p>	<p>Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs. The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability.</p>	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>
26902 - Ford Motor Company [3768]	Object	<p>BBC's proposed phased approach to the annual housing requirement, may not deliver sufficient quantum of housing within the early years of the Plan following adoption. As such we consider that this approach would be unsound, as the Plan would not be positively prepared in this regard, unless clear evidence can be provided to demonstrate that all potential options to boost housing supply in the early years of the Plan have been explored in detail.</p> <p><i>The Ford site is identified by BBC as a proposed allocation and will make a vital contribution towards the anticipated trajectory in this context, particularly as a less constrained medium scale site. However, we consider that the further efforts should be made to ensure the capacity for the site to deliver housing on brownfield land early in the plan period are maximised, in order to ensure that the annual requirement is sound.</i></p>	<p>The Local Plan is proposing a stepped trajectory which is considered appropriate in recognising the difficulties in significantly increasing housing delivery in a short period of time. The use of a stepped trajectory when meeting full housing need is acceptable based on the NPPF and PPG. In assessing the delivery timeframes of sites the Council has taken a cautious approach and considers the estimate for site allocation R04 and R05 to be reasonable at the point of formulating the plan considering which was based on the likely lead in time needed for the site to be vacated, application timeframes including masterplanning, any demolition works to be completed and remediation.</p>	No further action
26901 - Ford Motor Company [3768]	Object	<p>We question the below aspects of the draft allocation (in the absence of robust evidence):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Retention of 2.0 hectares of employment land - Land south of Eagle Way (i.e. main Ford Headquarters);</li> <li>* Delivery of residential care home providing 60 x bed spaces; and</li> <li>* 5% self-build and custom build across the entire allocation.</li> </ul> <p>This is contrary to the fundamental sustainability objectives of the NPPF and all previous representations submitted by Ford.</p> <p><i>Further evidence regarding Ford site allocation</i></p>	<p>The sites location represents an opportunity for small scale employment uses which reflects the historic use of the area for employment and also is appropriate in complementing a strategic scale development. The spatial strategy identifies two growth corridors and recognising there is a need to allocate land for employment purposes in both areas. It is considered that the delivery of employment land wouldn't significantly impact on the delivery of homes in this location. The requirement for a care home and 5% Custom and Self Build properties has been applied to all Strategic site allocations over 500 dwellings as these are felt to be large enough to accommodate these needs.</p>	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>
26791 - Hallam Land Management Ltd [2353]	Object	<p>Focussed Change 13 amends the Local Development Plan Housing Trajectory and reduces the five year supply of deliverable housing by 70 dwellings. This is on the basis of the Plan being adopted in 2020, and the five year supply being calculated for Years 5 to 9 of the trajectory. Whilst the change is a relatively small reduction in supply, it still further reduces supply and an objection is maintained on the grounds of soundness in that it is not consistent with national policy in failing to identify a five year supply of specific deliverable sites against the housing requirement.</p> <p><i>No specific change proposed</i></p>	Noted	No further action
26778 - London Borough of Havering (Mr Martyn Thomas) [7966]	Object	<p>The focussed changes do not address nor resolve issues that Havering raised in its original Regulation 19 consultation in Spring 2019. The representations submitted previously still stand and should be reported to the Inspector when the Brentwood Local Plan is formally submitted.</p> <p><i>Plan review</i></p>	Noted. The Council will continue to engage with The London Borough of Havering with the view to producing a Statement of Common Ground.	Continue to engage with The London Borough of Havering with a view to producing a Statement of Common Ground.
26761 - McColl's Retail Group PLC [3662]	Object	<p>Remove McColl's site (ref 321) from existing employment site, Policy PC03. This site has now got Prior Approval for the change-of-use from offices to create 55 dwellings (19/01043/PNCOU). The Council may have previously declined to do so on the grounds that only limited information was available as to the site's likely future. However, given our client's clear intent to use the site for residential purposes, and the extant Prior Approval allowing them to do so in principle, this needs to be revisited in order for both the employment and housing provision within the Plan to be up-to-date and sound.</p> <p><i>Remove McColl's site (ref 321) from existing employment site as set out in Policy PC03, either through an additional focussed change, or by way of modification at Examination stage. Document is not Sound</i></p>	Noted.	Review employment figures stated in Policy PC03

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26880 - Icen Projects Limited (Mr Luke Challenger) [7052]	Object	<p>The SA states that the Local Housing Need figure has increased from 350 to 454 dwellings. The Consultation does not provide any evidence to demonstrate what this figure is based on, albeit it is closely related to the capped standardised method for the Borough of 452 dwellings. The PPG requires the Planning Authority to seek to meet the uncapped figure - 469 dpa. The Council has failed to consider the increased housing figure that will occur as a result of Crossrail's opening, which it is estimated will give rise to an additional need of 1,000 dwelling over the Plan Period.</p> <p><i>In order to address the soundness issues we consider that the housing target should be reviewed with regard to the new evidence and that further sources of land supply should be identified, not only to deal with shortfalls over the plan period in total, but also specifically within its first 10 years. Land to the north of West Horndon railway station is available, suitable and deliverable and can contribute to meeting this shortfall. Importantly, it can come forward independently of the wider area of growth being promoted by EASL to the south of the settlement (in Thurrock Borough). The Brentwood Local Plan needs to seriously consider early delivery to ensure the Plan provides sufficient housing for Five Year Housing Land Supply, and for years 5 - 10. Early delivery of West Horndon would assist DHGV coming forward as it would act as a catalyst for housing delivery in this area of Brentwood and enhance the attractiveness of DHGV from a purchaser's perspective. It would also help a Local Plan inspector determine that Brentwood's Local Plan is sound; as is self-evident from the present draft of the Local Plan that Brentwood's ability to meet its housing needs is inextricably linked with the release of Green Belt land, primarily at DHGV. The failure to adopt a local plan would not only result in Brentwood being unable to address its housing needs, it would deprive DHGV of the policy context in which to come forward as a planning application proposal, thereby exacerbating the deficit. We had previously set out in the West Horndon Delivery Statement (Appendix 1 to our March 2019 representations) that the site could deliver first completions by 2024. This would mean that significant numbers of homes could be delivered within the first</i></p>	<p>The overall housing provision identified in the Pre-Submission Local Plan is still in line with the housing need following the standard method. Acknowledge that the Local Housing Need section of the Plan (paragraphs 4.11 to 4.21) needs to be updated to reflect the standard method. The figure of 454 dwellings per annum is correct in line with the standard method. The strategy which focusses on growth in the central and southern corridors is based on the presence of good road and rail access in these locations.</p>	<p>Update paragraphs 4.11 to 4.21 in line with Standard Method.</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<i>5 - 10 years of the plan period helping to address the soundness issues identified. We trust these representations clarify our position and that they are taken into consideration in the advancement of the Local Plan.</i>		
26691 - Transport for London (Ms Lucy Wakelin) [8812]	Object	<p>In written representations dated 14th March 2019 (see attachment 2), we supported the principle of the Strategic Housing Allocation R10: Brentwood Railway Station Car Park, however we did not agree with the approximate capacity of 100 homes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* This capacity was not in line with the content of the Draft Brentwood Town Centre Design Guide which identified that up to "405 units per hectare is suitable around key transport nodes, such as Brentwood Station."</li> <li>* Brentwood Railway Station Car Park is a brownfield site, located within a town centre and adjacent to a significant transport interchange. It is, therefore, a prime opportunity to optimise housing delivery in a highly accessible location in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 103 and 118 (D).</li> <li>* Feasibility studies indicated that a decked design could allow a greater density to be achieved on the site whilst still providing a compatible and neighbourly form of development.</li> <li>* The draft site allocation boundary did not include a section of car park towards the east. The whole parcel of land which TfL has an interest in and for which we are exploring development feasibility measures 1.39ha.</li> </ul> <p>we suggested that the indicative density was increased. A density of 405 units per hectare would better reflect the sites capacity; if this figure is applied to the site area of 1.39 hectares this would equate to around 560 homes. This is considered a more realistic housing figure for the site, to ensure that the site is fully optimised and the Addendum of Focussed Changes should be amended accordingly.</p> <p><i>Increase density of site Allocation R10 Brentwood Railway Station Car Park and reflect this in the Addendum and Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan.</i></p>	The number of dwellings identified for each housing allocation is considered to represent a reasonable estimate of what can be achieved according to certain characteristics such as surrounding density and character, and the amount of land considered to be developable. The number of new homes on a site is indicative, and in each case, the Council will consider the need to maximise development according to Policies within the Plan.	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>
26565 - Mr Kevin Craske [2712]	Object	All these proposals appear to token gestures pandering to the affluent areas of Brentwood. They show no joined up thinking, there are no explanations of traffic resolution unless you are in the Shenfield area of course. In my opinion they are poorly thought out and are simply not justifications but excuses for a bad plan which will be pushed through despite protests from residents and tax payers. It is in a mess still!  <i>No specific change proposed</i>	The proposals set out within the Addendum of Focussed Changes represent the Council recognising the concerns of residents in trying to limit the impact of development on the area and its character. The Council is still of the view that those sites which have a proposed reduction in housing numbers still represent suitable locations for sustainable growth which is why they have not been proposed to be removed.	No further action
26797 - M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]	Object	The trajectory as set out in the Focussed Changes remains overly optimistic, with the concerns as to the effects of a slippage in delivery at DHGV raised forming part of the reason for the SA conclusions that the Focussed Changes will have 'uncertain negative effects' on the 'Housing' objective. We strongly disagree with the SA's further conclusions that the assessment of the PSLP against the 'Housing' objective (significant positive effects) 'broadly holds true' for the Focussed Changes (uncertain negative effects).  <i>Review trajectory and SA</i>	The Addendum of Focussed Changes has resulted in a very small variation of the housing trajectory which is still considered to be deliverable. The Council has been very cautious in the stated estimated delivery timeframes for all sites in order to avoid being too optimistic. These figures therefore represent a realistic prospect.	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>
26758 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	<p>Policy R16 &amp; R17. Countryside maintain concerns over the amendment to the wording of Policy R16 &amp; R17 that was made without justification during the previous iteration of the draft Local Plan. The previous iteration of the policy required vehicular access to be provided from "Doddinghurst Road for both site and/or Karen Close and Russell Close". The current policy is worded to allow for vehicular access from Doddinghurst Road only. Whilst access from Doddinghurst Road is accepted as the preferred strategy for all parties, initial appraisal work in this respect has recognised a potential requirement for significant levelling and land movement which could have implications on the viability of housing delivery on the site. It is therefore requested that the policy retains flexibility for the use of the other accesses from Karen Close and Russell Close as a worst case scenario, in the interests of protecting the deliverability of the southern parcel of the site, particularly as these routes of access have been previously agreed with Essex County Council Highways. The use of these accesses may also better support the design of scheme that is fully integrated with existing development. Countryside continue to support Brentwood in the progression of their Local Plan, but wish to emphasise the continuing importance of minor amendments to specific policies, alongside the need for consistent housing delivery across the entire Plan period. This is important to ensure that the Plan is deliverable and found sound at Examination.</p> <p><i>Re-consider details on access flexibility to site R03.</i></p>	<p>Access to site R17 via Doddinghurst Road is considered more appropriate on the basis of the scale of development being proposed. As and when an application for the site comes forwards the consideration of an alternative access is not precluded subject to agreement from the Highway Authority.</p>	No further action

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b></i>	<i><b>Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Action</b></i>
26762 - Arebray Ltd [5339]	Object	<p>Salmonds Grove is a suitable and available site within Brentwood.</p> <p>The Addendum proposes movement of 70 homes from sites R18, R19, R25 and R26 to Dunton Hills Garden Village, with a reliance of a faster rate of delivery at DHGV within the life of the plan. This proposal exacerbated the proportion to be delivered from 34.6 to 35.6%. This delivery is unrealistic. In order to address this, the Salmonds Grove site is available for fast implementation if allocated within the plan and can be considered as part of the 5 year land supply. The justification for the Addendum changes is not backed by evidence; it is inconsistent with national policy and not positively prepared.</p> <p><i>Add Salmonds Grove to the local plan.</i></p>	<p>The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability.</p>	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>
26751 - Basildon Borough Council (Ms Christine Lyons) [8820]	Object	<p>Transport and Infrastructure impacts of DHGV</p> <p>The Addendum of Focussed Changes provided an opportunity for the Brentwood Local Plan to clarify matters relating to transport and infrastructure mitigation measures on the surrounding areas. The DHGV is within close proximity of the administrative boundaries with Basildon &amp; Thurrock Boroughs, and Basildon Council still remains concerned by the lack of mitigation measures on potential infrastructure impacts and is disappointed that Brentwood Council have not taken the opportunity to address this through the Addendum of Focussed Changes.</p> <p>Basildon Council are aware that Brentwood see themselves as a standalone housing market Area, however development in the proximity of administrative boundaries will have cross boundary infrastructure impacts that need to be addressed but both the Reg19 LP and the Addendum of Focussed changes do not appear to have addressed. It is noted that the need for new connections into Basildon Borough in terms of walking, cycling, public transport or road do not appear to be mentioned as being necessary to make it sustainable</p> <p>The transport mitigation measures included in the pre submission local plan are concentrated within Brentwood and ignore the fact that Laindon Station, has more platforms and has greater commutable capacity than West Horndon and could become an alternative choice for residents of the Dunton Hills Garden Village. Furthermore, early residents of the Dunton Hills Garden Village, will rely on some services and facilities outside the 'village' to meet their initial needs. As an example, Dunton Hills Garden Village is proposing new primary and secondary school provision. However, until such a time as the critical mass for new homes is established, it is more likely that Basildon Borough's facilities in Laindon will be picking up the demands of new users arising from the new settlement.</p> <p>While using Basildon Infrastructure like the station, schools and the hospital, there will be added pressure on the A127, Basildon road network and public transport services.</p> <p>It is questionable whether it can be adequately demonstrated by the Brentwood Local Plan that the allocations chosen, represent the most sustainable</p>	<p>The Council recognises there will be potential cross boundary impacts of proposed development. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the mitigation considered necessary to accommodate proposed growth. Work has been ongoing with the Southern Brentwood Growth Corridor Sustainable Transport vision work which Basildon Council have been involved in. This acknowledges that there will need to be sustainable transport connections between Dunton Hills Garden Village into Basildon. It is also recognised that West Horndon railway station will require improvements with this being reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to engage with Basildon Council as the Dunton Hills Garden Village proposals evolve through the masterplanning process and implementation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	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>
		<p>option without identifying and testing the viability of specific highway mitigation measures that will be necessary to make them deliverable and sustainable. Without this work, Brentwood Borough could find its ability to unlock the capacity to deliver new communities and homes, particularly at an accelerated pace becomes hindered by a lack of infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>It should not be assumed that such growth can just be absorbed by the nearby infrastructure and services and Basildon Council expects policies in the Brentwood Local Plan to make it clear that S106/CIL or other funding receipts will be spent outside Brentwood Borough to sufficiently address where negative direct or residual impacts could otherwise occur.</p> <p><i>It is questionable whether it can be adequately demonstrated by the Brentwood Local Plan that the allocations chosen, represent the most sustainable option without identifying and testing the viability of specific highway mitigation measures that will be necessary to make them deliverable and sustainable. Without this work, Brentwood Borough could find its ability to unlock the capacity to deliver new communities and homes, particularly at an accelerated pace becomes hindered by a lack of infrastructure capacity.</i></p>		
26887 - St Modwen Properties PLC and S&J Padfield and Partners [8835]	Object	<p>The SA has not been updated to reflect our previous comments. The Brentwood Enterprise Park site continues to be scored negatively against Local Wildlife Site, Ancient Wood and AQMA, GP, and school provision; these criteria should be considered differently when applied to an allocation for employment land than residential proposals. Additionally, through appropriate design and landscaping, any adverse impacts can be avoided. A neutral or 'depending on implementation' scoring for a number of these criteria would be much more appropriate. The same comment applies to Codham Hall Farm (101C), which has also scored negatively against Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p><i>Review of SA</i></p>	Noted. The Sustainability Appraisal has applied a standard GIS based analysis to all sites and the results provide an overview of likely impacts. The results of this have been considered on a broad basis rather than highlighting the inappropriateness of sites based on a single issue.	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>
26678 - Ingatestone and Fryerning Parish Council (Ms Rosemary Spouge) [8811]	Object	<p>We recognise that the amendments do not alter the Plan's spatial strategy but seek to respond to concerns in specific areas of the Borough by redistributing housing growth, and it is in that context that we write. Our last comprehensive comments were, on 3rd March 2016 (copy attached), we had not begun the evidence gathering for our Neighbourhood Plan, as our Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee was not convened until November 2017. The research on our own housing needs, relating to our existing 2,000 households and the requirements of our residents for the planning period the LDP covers, was only started in 2018.</p> <p>We had attempted to establish what the demand for housing is via Brentwood's own records but have not succeeded in obtaining a figure. Recently we have learnt that that your planning department policy team has been discussing local demand but they believe that the figure can only be based on the proposed development sites within the Regulation 19 Brentwood Local Plan Pre-Submission draft. Additionally this would include a figure for windfall sites expected in the area which would account for an additional 5%.</p> <p>In summary - the proposed housing for our Parish is not based on local demand, but rather on what a proposed development site could accommodate. Therefore the figure for our Parish would be R22 as the site and 57 dwellings for the yield, plus 5% for the Parish as a whole. Mountnessing Parish is adjacent to Ingatestone and Fryerning, and has been the subject of considerable new build housing in the last few years. In the current LDP a further development site is identified for 161 dwellings, amounting therefore to some 229 units that will be looking towards our Parish to meet much of its infrastructure needs, namely, pre-schools, schools, health services, parking, rail services etc. These figures are confirmed in Appendix 1 to your Addendum document.</p> <p>The LDP does also identify a site for Employment close to both the sites identified above (R21 and R22). The Parish would wish to work with Brentwood Borough Council and Mountnessing Parish Council to enable this site to provide some of the infrastructure needs essential to both local communities.</p>	BBC has supported a borough-wide spatial strategy which is detailed in the reg. 19 draft local plan. The opportunities and constraints of sites have been considered across the borough rather than divided into parish or similar sub-areas to produce the draft local plan. This strategy has proposed a Garden Village which enables a development of a scale that will enable new infrastructure rather than piecemeal development that impacts on infrastructure across the borough without the scale of development to enable investment.	Continue work with the Parish Councils to facilitate the development and implementation of 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>
26737 - Redrow Homes [6669]	Object	<p>I represent Redrow Homes Ltd (RHL), who has an interest in emerging site allocation R21 (Ingatestone Garden Centre). I have previously submitted comments to earlier versions of the plan on behalf of RHL and these comments remain valid.</p> <p>My comment to the addendum document relates to Appendix 1 of that document and the absence of any change to the proposed trajectory in relation to this site.</p> <p>As you know, RHL has a current application submitted for the redevelopment of Ingatestone Garden Centre (part of R21). That application is well-advanced and is currently held up by the plan-making process. RHL repeats its desire to commence development of this site at the earliest opportunity and reminds you that it is the legal owner of the land. It is an established house-builder, willing and able to deliver homes at this site as soon as the Council can grant it permission to do so.</p> <p>I therefore write to request that you update your trajectory at Appendix 1 to reflect the fact RHL could deliver homes from year 2020/21 rather than 2021/22 as currently listed. This would tie in with another garden centre that you have proposed for allocation (R07), which is also in the Green Belt but that your records indicate as not being the subject of an application (current or otherwise). R07 is identified as delivering from 2020/21 and given the advanced stage that RHL is at, R21 should also be identified as starting delivery in the same year.</p> <p>The prompt delivery of sites such as Ingatestone Garden Centre will be crucial in ensuring that your Council can make significant in-roads in the current housing land supply deficit. RHL remains at your service to assist you in demonstrating to the Inspector how it can help you in this regard.</p> <p><i>update your trajectory at Appendix 1 to reflect the fact RHL could deliver homes from year 2020/21 rather than 2021/22 as currently listed. This would tie in with another garden centre that you have proposed for allocation (R07), which is also in the Green Belt but that your records indicate as not being the subject of an application (current or otherwise). R07 is identified as delivering from 2020/21 and given the advanced stage that RHL is at, R21 should also be identified as starting delivery in the same year.</i></p>	<p>The Council has taken a cautious approach in estimating delivery timeframes for proposed housing allocations which it considers to reflect a realistic housing trajectory. For site R21 the difference being stated is only 1 year and it is still showing delivery contributing to the 5 year land supply.</p>	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>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26750 - Basildon Borough Council (Ms Christine Lyons) [8820]	Object	<p>Housing Trajectory</p> <p>Basildon Council objects to the housing trajectory, particularly on the reliance on DHGV to deliver at an accelerated rate of construction and early within the plan-period. The housing trajectory included within the Addendum of Focussed Changes with regard to Dunton Hills Garden Village assumes that delivery will commence in 2022/23 (within the next five years) starting with a rate of 100 homes per annum, climbing to 300 homes per annum by 2026/27. This seems overly optimistic given that the allocation is currently within the extent of the Green Belt, requires master planning and will need to be subject to an Examination in Public in order to determine whether it should be allocated, before going through the planning application process and elements of the condition discharge process before development on site can even commence. Development commencement on-site will meanwhile be reliant on essential utility and infrastructure provision. No evidence was provided within the Reg19LP or the Addendum of Focussed Changes as to how the housing trajectory in general has been developed. Furthermore, there is no specific evidence published setting out the evidence base or any form of a development framework/ masterplan for the Dunton Hills Garden Village which explains how the proposed accelerated rate of delivery will be possible to achieve. Early residents of the Dunton Hills Garden Village, should it be approved, will rely on some services and facilities outside the 'village' to meet their initial needs. As an example, the Dunton Hills Garden Village will require new primary and secondary school provision. However, whilst the Brentwood Infrastructure Delivery Plan shows the primary provision in particular being delivered early, it is not economically viable to operate a school with low pupil numbers, and it may be the case that the village grows for a number of years with these pupils travelling to other schools in the locality, whilst operational primary and then secondary education provision is secured.</p> <p><i>The Council therefore seeks for evidence to be provided demonstrating a realistic delivery trajectory for DHGV so that the potential short-medium term pressures on services and facilities in nearby</i></p>	<p>The Council has taken a cautious approach in estimating delivery timeframes for proposed housing allocations which it considers to reflect a realistic housing trajectory.</p> <p>The Council recognises there will be potential cross boundary impacts of proposed development. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies the mitigation considered necessary to accommodate proposed growth. Work has been ongoing with the Southern Brentwood Growth Corridor Sustainable Transport vision work which Basildon Council have been involved in. This acknowledges that there will need to be sustainable transport connections between Dunton Hills Garden Village into Basildon. It is also recognised that West Horndon railway station will require improvements with this being reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council will continue to engage with Basildon Council as the Dunton Hills Garden Village proposals evolve through the masterplanning process and implementation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	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>settlements can be assessed, understood and planned for by service providers and neighbouring authorities. This will help ensure adequate mitigation provisions can be put in place to reduce any potential negative impacts on Basildon Borough residents living nearby.</i>		
26620 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612]	Object	<p>Object to all document particularly R25 and R26. Not legally compliant as still contravenes Green Belt legislation and national policy; unsound as R25 and R26 changes grossly inadequate as fail to rectify destruction of Green Belt, loss of agricultural land, access issues on Redrose Lane, impact on school and medical facilities, minimal public transport, flood risk. Failure comply with Duty to Cooperate as local residents and elected representative concerns are disregarded. Proposed changes are superficial/more more radical reform required. Housing demand should be addressed with high density in and around Brentwood Town - blocks of flats and above shops. Executed effectively in Dagenham Heathway.</p> <p><i>Failure comply with Duty to Cooperate as local residents and elected representative concerns are disregarded.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed changes are superficial/more more radical reform required. Housing demand should be addressed with high density in and around Brentwood Town - blocks of flats and above shops. Executed effectively in Dagenham Heathway.</i></p>	The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land. All comments are considered in the process of drafting the local plan in relation to their content. Policy HP03 Residential Density encourages development coming forward in Town and District Centres to be at least 65 dwellings per hectare.	No further action
26798 - M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]	Object	<p>The decision to discount the need for consideration of reasonable alternatives is inconsistent with national policy, and unjustified. This is apparent from the SA conclusions (discussed above), and we are highly concerned that this has reduced the ability of the Plan to meet the housing needs of the Borough going forward.</p> <p><i>Review SA particularly with regard to meeting of housing alternatives</i></p>	The Addendum of Focussed Changes has resulted in a very small variation of the housing trajectory which is still considered to be deliverable. This accords with the Councils strategy which has been developed through previous versions of the Local Plan and assessed through many iterations of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. There have been an extensive number of reasonable alternatives assessed through this process. Therefore disagree that reasonable alternatives have not been considered in formulating the Sustainability Appraisal.	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>
26757 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	<p>Policy R03</p> <p>In addition to the comments made separately, we have also previously raised a recommendation for policy wording relating to an inflexible provision of employment land (2ha) to be amended or removed. This is in respect of an over-provision of employment land that has been allocated in comparison to the need identified within the Plan, and also in the interests of providing an employment use at Chelmsford Road that best meets the market demand and Borough Council objectives for this site. Discussions with Brentwood Borough Council have confirmed that the site presents an opportunity to provide a key gateway into Shenfield and onto Brentwood in this location. Considering the employment uses referred to in Policy PC02, it has been agreed during discussions that an entirely B1 office frontage for the site would not be suited to this role, given that such a use would be unlikely to generate a visually prolific building or a flagship/feature, or be desirable in this edge of settlement location. B2 industrial or B8 storage uses would not be consistent with the desire for this location to act as a gateway to the area, and would also have implications on the A12 gyratory through the associated movements of HGVs and other vehicles. We are aware of interest in the use of the site for other employment generating and commercial uses which would not fall under B-class uses and may be able to play a better role in the formation of a key gateway in this location. It is recognised however that the spatial requirements of such uses are again unlikely to meet a full 2ha of land. The proposed provision of employment uses on this site has not been justified and is not effective. The provision of 2ha on this site is not required to meet the Borough's identified employment need and conflicts with the deliverability of new homes on the site to meet the Council's housing need. Countryside Properties are confident of the ability to deliver this either through exemplary residential and landscaped design at the entrance to the site, or through a smaller provision of employment land which is respective of the current market and likely demand in this location. As such, the provision of 2ha of land for employment purposes</p>	<p>The sites location represents an opportunity for small scale employment uses particularly near the A12 junction and also its proximity to Shenfield railway station. The spatial strategy identifies two growth corridors and recognising there is a need to allocate land for employment purposes in both areas. It is considered that the delivery of employment land wouldn't significantly impact on the delivery of homes in this location.</p>	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>
		<p>should be removed from the policy.</p> <p><i>R03: the provision of 2ha of land for employment purposes should be removed from the policy.</i></p>		
26792 - Hallam Land Management Ltd [2353]	Object	<p>The minimum Local Housing Need now equates to 454 dwellings per annum, which as a consequence means the Plan no longer makes any provision for a housing supply buffer. The Addendum therefore notes that the absence of a buffer, and the greater reliance upon one site (Dunton Hills Garden Village) to meet the housing need in a location some distance from where the need is largely derived (Central Brentwood) places a greater degree of uncertainty and risk that the Housing objectives will not be met.</p> <p><i>The Council should consider through the Examination process additional allocation(s) within the Central Brentwood area in order to maintain its supply buffer and reduce the uncertainty and risks associated with the current Plan in relation to failing to meet housing need in areas where the need is derived. In this regard, HLM would also encourage the Council again to consider the evidence submitted as to the benefits of allocating or safeguarding Land west of Ongar Road for residential development.</i></p>	The overall housing provision identified in the Pre-Submission Local Plan is still in line with the housing need following the standard method. Acknowledge that the Local Housing Need section of the Plan (paragraphs 4.11 to 4.21) needs to be updated to reflect the standard method.	Update paragraphs 4.11 to 4.21 in line with standard method.
26543 - Transport for London (Mr Richard Carr) [7185]	Support	<p>No comment to make</p> <p><i>None</i></p>	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>
26759 - Highways England (Heather Archer) [8309]	Support	Highways England will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), in this case the A12 and M25 Junctions 28 and 29. We have examined the consultation documents and given the scope of the Focussed Changes we have no comments at the present time. In terms of the sustainability appraisal, it is worth stating that a growing concern to us is air quality and the impact of development traffic contributing to emissions from traffic on the SRN. We note that Paragraph 9.2.7 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report lists a number of wide ranging policies in pursuit of air quality objectives. We shall be paying particular attention to air quality matters in future and stress the need for appropriate monitoring. We will continue to cooperate separately with Brentwood Officers in relation to the transport assessment of your Local Plan concerning the M25 and A12.  <i>Changes not proposed</i>	The Council will continue to engage with Highways England in ensuring that mitigation as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is appropriate and results in nil detriment to the Strategic Road Network in respect of Brentwood Local Plan growth. Policy NE05 Air Quality requires that development does not cause negative effect and appropriate mitigation is proposed where necessary. Again the Council will actively work with Statutory Bodies such as Highways England through the application process on this matter.	No further action
26544 - Marine Management Organisation (Mr Andy Davis) [8788]	Support	No comment to make  <i>None</i>	Noted	No further action
26760 - McColl's Retail Group PLC [3662]	Support	The focussed changes are not exhaustive and concern only five policies regarding particular allocations or sites that were already included in the pre-submission draft of the Local Plan. We have no comments on the necessity of the adjustments in housing figures that are proposed, although note that these are very minor in scale. For example, the changes to the Dunton Hills Garden Village allocation is equivalent to just a 2.5% increase in housing whilst other adjustments concern only 10 homes being deducted from allocations.  <i>No change proposed</i>	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>
26885 - St Modwen Properties PLC and S&J Padfield and Partners [8835]	Support	<p>IDP: Additional work is required by all parties with regard to the proposed segregated cycle network for the southern growth corridor if this is to be delivered without the need for third party land and the progression of development on key sites should therefore not be reliant on this from day one.</p> <p><i>Update IDP and local plan with regard to segregated cycle network</i></p>	<p>The IDP identifies a number of items of infrastructure mitigation that are considered appropriate for the development being proposed in the Borough. In the Southern Brentwood Corridor which comprises a number of strategic developments the provision of infrastructure to enable sustainable transport methods is considered important. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a live document and will provide further clarification on the potential distribution of costs for identified infrastructure required to mitigate planned growth.</p>	No further action
26769 - Childerditch Properties [2642]	Support	<p>Strongly support the proposed allocation at Childerditch Industrial Estate but seek clarification regarding transport item in the IDP (T17). We question the extent to which these new cycle ways could be delivered along the A127 corridor. Who would be responsible for delivery - the IDP confirms that this will be Essex County Council but we have not been party to discussions with BBC or ECC on how this new cycle way may be delivered in either physical and monetary terms. Further clarification is required on this prior to the submission.</p> <p><i>Further clarification is required on delivery of the cycle ways structure along the A127 in either physical and monetary terms. Further clarification is required on how funding will be apportioned to developers for these works as this may impact upon the viability and delivery of the employment allocation at Childerditch Industrial Estate. Welcome a discussion with Officers prior to the submission of the Plan and in this respect, we would be happy to enter into a Statement of Common Ground with BDC in the lead up to the Examination of the Plan, to confirm the deliverability of the proposed allocation.</i></p>	<p>The IDP identifies a number of items of infrastructure mitigation that are considered appropriate for the development being proposed in the Borough. In the Southern Brentwood Corridor which comprises a number of strategic developments the provision of infrastructure to enable sustainable transport methods is considered important. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a live document and will provide further clarification on the potential distribution of costs for identified infrastructure required to mitigate planned growth.</p>	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>
26646 - Environment Agency (Mr Pat Abbott) [8308]	Support	<p>Thank you for the consultation on the Brentwood pre-submission local plan. Having reviewed the document, we find the plan sound. We have provided comments in regards to Responding to Climate Change, Water Efficiency, Water Quality, Ecology, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Contaminated Land where we feel the plan can be enhanced. These comments are detailed in full in the full text attached.</p> <p><i>Responding to Climate Change, Water Efficiency, Water Quality, Ecology, Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage and Contaminated Land where we feel the plan can be enhanced. These comments are detailed in full in the full text attached.</i></p>	The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and where feasible, enhance the plan.	Full consideration of plan enhancement where feasible.
26882 - St Modwen Properties PLC and S&J Padfield and Partners [8835]	Support	<p>The Development Typology chapter of the IDP more accurately reflects the anticipated job numbers set out within information that we previously submitted to the Council, specifying that the Brentwood Enterprise Park has the potential to deliver circa 2,435 jobs across a number of sectors.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	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>
26723 - Stonebond Properties Ltd [5948]	Support	<p>This letter has set out our views on the focussed changes to the Draft Local Plan, with particular emphasis on the role that the identified sites at Land of Stocks Lane and Land of Blackmore Road (R24 &amp; R25 respectively) can assist the Council in meeting its requirements ahead of the Local Plan Examination.</p> <p>As set out in this letter, we are responding to the contents of the AFC and specifically the housing trajectory and redistribution of housing as identified. To support our comments, we are resubmitting the representations previously made with regard to the two sites under Stonebond's control in Kelvedon Hatch. We reiterate points made at Pre-submission stage that both of these sites can accommodate additional homes above the number they are identified to assist the Council in meeting its requirement for new housing at early stages of the Plan period, which is of critical importance given the position with the Council's 5 year housing land supply shortfall.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Pre-submission stage was prepared before publication of the revised NPPF in February 2019 which introduced important changes to the approach to identifying housing land supply and greater emphasis on the efficient use of land. Both of these matters clearly indicate that our proposals for R23 and R24 would be compatible with national planning policy objectives and provide justification for a review of capacity of these sites and confirmation for early delivery against the issues we identify with the both the timing of supply and redistribution of housing set out in the AFC.</p> <p>We would welcome further liaison with the Council regarding the opportunities expressed in this and our previous representations as the Local Plan proceeds to the examination stage. In particular, we would be more than happy to present to the Examination a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the Council to reflect our proposals. The SoCG would confirm that sites R23 and R24 are available, suitable, and sustainable to aid the Council to confirm certainty of early delivery. We believe that our proposals also provide for flexibility in sources of supply to assist in</p> <p><i>None proposed</i></p>	<p>The Council recognises the importance of meeting housing needs and demonstrating a five year land supply. The number of dwellings identified for each housing allocation is considered to represent a reasonable estimate of what can be achieved according to certain characteristics such as surrounding density and character, and the amount of land considered to be developable. The number of new homes on a site is indicative, and in each case, the Council will consider the need to maximise development according to Policies within the Plan.</p>	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>
26692 - Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd (Mr. Michael Calder) [3814]	Support	<p>Whilst we do not wish to add to the representations already submitted on behalf of Countryside Properties, Redrow Homes, Croudace Homes and Shenfield High School, we would like to identify that this part of the allocation is now within the control of Stonebond Properties who are committed to working in partnership with the Council to deliver this part of the site at first opportunity independently from the wider allocation to boost the Council's Housing Supply. Due to the physical characteristics of the site (capable of independent access, drainage, landscaping and ecology provision) in addition to the scale of development proposed, we are confident that the scheme can come forward quickly to boost supply, without compromising the wider principles of the allocation. and which will likely be brought forward in advance of the wider site allocation.</p> <p>We therefore make this representation specifically in respect of the Housing Trajectory. As is shown on the illustrative site layout attached at Appendix 1. The development of this site is not reliant upon any of the strategic site infrastructure that is required to deliver the wider allocation, with access into this parcel served by Alexander Lane. Stonebond Properties have started engagement with Essex County Council Highways in respect of access into the site.</p> <p>As such, and having a controlling interest in the site, Stonebond Properties are committed to delivering 50 dwellings on the site before 2023/24 and would like to work in partnership with the Council to submit a planning application for determination upon the adoption of the Local Plan. Furthermore, should the emerging Local Plan reach a stage where the Council are confident to attach weight to emerging policies for decision making, an application may be submitted prior to adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p><i>We therefore request that the housing trajectory for R03 is updated to reflect the fact that this site is capable of delivery in the first five years of the plan. Indeed, the approach that the Council has taken to the housing trajectory on this site, confirming an annual delivery of 155 dwellings per year, which suggests that the Council are aware that the site will be brought forward by several developers.</i></p>	<p>Site R03 Land North of Shenfield is made up of a number of different site promoters but it is expected that the requirements of the Policy equally apply to them all. It is expected that a comprehensive masterplan is developed for the site which will require all site promoters to actively work with each other. In addition infrastructure requirements will need to be contributed towards by all site promoters. The delivery timeframes for the site are still considered to be appropriate considering the lead in time for an application, S106 agreements and implementation of required infrastructure.</p>	No further action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26886 - St Modwen Properties PLC and S&J Padfield and Partners [8835]	Support	<p>IDP: With regard to specific mitigation measures, T24 covers improvements at the B186/A127 junction. We are currently in discussion with ECC as to how the proposed access to Brentwood Enterprise Park can be delivered alongside these solutions. It should be noted that the measures set out at T24 will need to cater for the wider planned growth in the Borough, and not be seen as a measure wholly to ensure the delivery of the Brentwood Enterprise Park.</p> <p><i>More detail in IDP and local plan with regard to Brentwood Enterprise Park access and associated junction improvement.</i></p>	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a live document and will provide further clarification on the potential distribution of costs for identified infrastructure required to mitigate planned growth.	No further action
26777 - Natural England (Ms Laura Chellis) [8823]	Support	<p>Publication of Brentwood Borough Council's Addendum of Focussed Changes to the Pre-Submission Local Plan, its accompanying updated Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment. We note the changes listed in the above documents and the rebalancing of housing numbers towards Dunton Hills Garden Village. We do not consider the modifications significantly change our position submitted to the Council as part of Reg 19 consultation, via email on 5th April 2019 (Our Ref 272769).</p> <p><i>No change proposed for this consultation.</i></p>	Noted	No further action
26883 - St Modwen Properties PLC and S&J Padfield and Partners [8835]	Support	<p>IDP Transport and Movement chapter: proposed measures to facilitate safe and efficient access (T16, T17, T18) listed as likely to be delivered in the Medium to Long term. It is anticipated that employment provision at Brentwood Enterprise Park will commence early in the Local Plan period to provide jobs to support growth in the Borough, and consider it is imperative that these measures are planned for the immediate term in order to support the much needed employment provision.</p> <p><i>Further detail on transportation with regard to T16, T17 and T18, and Enterprise Park.</i></p>	It is anticipated that there will be a phased approach to the delivery of infrastructure in line with the delivery of sites. A priority ranking has been applied to identified recognising where infrastructure will be more likely needed in order to facilitate development at the early stages. The IDP is a live document in order to allow it to be updated accordingly.	No further action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26793 - S & J Padfield and Partners [6098]	Support	<p>Whilst we have no comments on the proposed reduction to the number of homes for Blackmore or Shenfield, we do consider that minor amendments should be able to be made to other allocations within the Regulation 19 Pre-submission Local Plan where required, such as site E10. We reiterate the points made through our Regulation 19 representation, that the site as a whole should be removed from the Green Belt to allow flexibility moving forwards for not only for effective landscaping but also for the security of access arrangements.</p> <p><i>Site E10 as a whole should be removed from the Green Belt to allow flexibility moving forwards for not only for effective landscaping but also for the security of access arrangements.</i></p>	Noted. The Plan as written expects the 8ha of land for landscaping, amenity, access and ancillary uses to remain within the Green Belt. If it is removed from the Green Belt there is a risk that this land could easily be developed for other purposes further impacting on the openness of the Green Belt in this location.	No further action
26780 - Thames Chase Trust (Mr Dave Bigden) [7196]	Support	<p>The Thames Chase Trust would seek to see reference made to the Thames Chase Community Forest (TCCF); its importance to the area in and around the emerging Dunton Hills Garden Village 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, the Dunton Hills Garden Village area and its relationship, in terms of location, with the TCCF area and boundary.</p> <p><i>Produce a map with the Thames Chase Community Forest area and boundary in relation to Dunton Hills Garden Village.</i></p>	Policy NE04 Thames Chase Community Forest requires that any development proposals within the area will be expected to make a positive contribution towards its implementation. In addition developers will be expected to work collaboratively in partnership with the Land of the Fanns Partnership to develop scheme proposals through the masterplanning process. The development of the Dunton Hills Garden Village masterplan would be expected to incorporate these requirements.	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>Policy R01 (I): Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation (page 252)</i>				
27082 - Mr Richard Bastin [8844] 27182 - Mrs Paula Bills [8854] 27222 - Ms Pam Blackmore [8856] 27439 - Ms Kaye Bundy [8874] 27559 - Ms Janet Carter [8887] 27772 - Mr Anthony Colbert [8902] 27807 - Mrs Danielle Cross [7016] 27827 - Ms Gloria Tanner [8904] 27872 - Ms Shirley Taylor [8907] 27882 - Mrs Sila Sheridan [5201] 27912 - Mr Ritchie Hobbs [8909] 28073 - Mr Alan Snook [8484] 28153 - Dean Spicer [8930] 28182 - Mr Peter Jakobsson [8177] 28285 - Andrew Stevens [8942] 28307 - Lynn Stevens [8945] 28376 - Mrs Patricia Dean [8434] 28661 - Mr Matthew Woodward [8979] 28696 - Mr Stephen Pyke [8985] 28979 - Matthew Emerson [9011] 29078 - Ms Sheena Parish [9014] 29254 - Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460] 29358 - Mrs Doreen Gray [9033] 29437 - Tom McLaren [8992] 29439 - Christopher Kilian [8944]	Object	Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation The allocation should be further increased and the delivery programme accelerated in order to remove policies R25 and R26 from the LDP  I disagree - Dunton Hills should not be made to accommodate the houses planned for Blackmore. The number of houses allocated to Blackmore is small and can easily be accommodated through either windfall sites or existing brownfield sites within the borough which are not currently scheduled for development.	The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough. The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development. Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.	The Council consider the Addendum changes are appropriate.

*Remove R25 and R26*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26712 - Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]	Object	<p>We support the reduction in housing numbers at the allocation sites in Shenfield and Blackmore, as this is justified by the evidence base. However, we object to the re-distribution of 70 dwellings to the Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV) allocation, because it would mean that fewer homes would be delivered in the early years of the plan. The reliance on DHGV to deliver such a large proportion of the Borough's housing need within the early years of the plan is too great, particularly when smaller sites are available, some of which are brownfield.</p> <p>Changes to Plan: Larger sites often take longer to deliver housing, because they typically have complex ownership structures and require significant investment in infrastructure. Research published by consultancy Nathaniel Lichfield &amp; Partners (Start to Finish: How Quickly do Large-Scale Housing Sites Deliver? November 2016) found that for sites of over 2,000 dwellings, the average timeframe between the validation date of the planning application and the delivery of the first dwelling was just under seven years. This compares with just under three years for smaller sites of up to 99 dwellings and therefore, whilst it is justified to reduce the housing allocation at the sites in Shenfield and Blackmore, the 70 dwellings should be re-distributed to suitable smaller developments rather than being added to DHGV. Smaller sites are often able to come forward more quickly than larger sites because they are typically in single ownership and require less investment in infrastructure. They also attract smaller, more local housebuilding companies that would not be present on larger sites, enable more early deliveries and constitute a more sustainable approach towards meeting the housing need. Brownfield sites should also be prioritised in line with the requirements of the NPPF, which states in paragraph 137 that: 'before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for</p>	Refer to Pre-Submission Local Plan Chapter 3 for spatial development principles and sequential approach to site selection. The Council recognises the need to utilise brownfield and urban area sites before considering Green Belt release.	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>
		<p>development.</p> <p>As a result, brownfield land should be utilised, with greenfield land being released only when all sustainably located, available and deliverable sites have been identified as allocations.</p> <p>In contrast, Brentwood Borough Council propose relying entirely on the delivery of a single, large, greenfield site to be able to demonstrate and maintain a five-year supply in the early plan period - a method that has been criticised by several inspectors at Local Plan Examinations in Braintree District, Tendring District and Colchester Borough Council in relation to North Essex Garden Communities.</p> <p>Due to the location of the Dunton Hills Garden Village allocation, a significant proportion of Brentwood's housing would be located on the Borough boundary with Basildon. The settlement would adjoin Basildon's Green Belt and although it was once intended for both Councils to locate settlements in this area, Basildon no longer propose this. It could therefore also be considered that the authorities have not complied with their duty to co-operate.</p> <p>In conclusion, we object to the re-distribution of 70 dwellings into the Dunton Hills Garden Village allocation, considering instead that the dwellings should be re-allocated to more suitable smaller sites and brownfield land. Whilst we do not object to the principle of a new settlement, we do not consider that it should be relied upon to deliver such a significant proportion of the Borough's housing need within the timeframe envisaged, particularly when suitable alternative sites are available.</p> <p><i>Dwellings should be re-allocated to more suitable smaller sites and brownfield land and numbers not increased in Dunton Hills Garden Village.</i></p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26559 - Mr Kevin Craske [2712]	Object	<p>1) Policy ROI</p> <p>It appears that the Local Plan is to put all the homes it possibly can into Dunton Hills Garden Village at the expense of our local environment and habitat and flood risk rather than impose such a huge number of 70 homes in Shenfield. Obviously the environment and habitat in an urban area is far more important than green belt! Dunton Hills Garden Village is growing like Topsy and will be Dunton Hills Garden Town!</p> <p><i>Change not identified</i></p>	<p>The reduction of homes for the two sites in Shenfield is 50 with a further 20 to be reduced at two sites in Blackmore. There is no overall increase in the number of homes to be delivered at DHGV as proposed in the focussed changes, the sites overall capacity remains 4000 homes of which 2,770 are proposed to be delivered in the plan period. The Pre-Submission Local Plan sets out under chapter 8 how it is expected that the natural environment is to be protected and positively mitigated where development takes place.</p>	Accept Addendum of Focussed Changes amendments to the plan.
26783 - Wiggins Gee Homes Ltd [2788]	Object	<p>Some justifications were given for reducing R18, R19, R25 and R26's potential capacity, but no justification is given for transferring this lost capacity to the Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation (DHGV). DHGV is surrounded by too much controversy and too many outstanding issues over the timing of housing delivery and the capacity of local and regional infrastructure to fully support this strategic proposal. Brentwood's immediate neighbours continue to maintain strong opposition to the proposal. It should not be a "cure-all" repository for the Borough's planning problems.</p> <p><i>The 2.8 ha of land at Crow Green Lane, Pilgrims Hatch owned by Wiggins Gee Homes Limited is in single ownership, available now, and could be used for much needed affordable housing. It is not subject to objections from other major parties to the Local Plan preparation process. It does not have serious implications for local and regional infrastructure. It is located in the Local Plan's A12 Growth Corridor, enjoying far better environmental and social conditions than some of the other allocations being proposed in this Corridor. Its effect on the Green Belt would be negligible compared to DHGV.</i></p>	<p>The strategy as proposed includes justification for the site allocations, alternative/additional sites have been considered but have not been selected. The Council is of the view that DHGV can be delivered within the required timeframes as set out within the published trajectory. As part of the masterplan work, further information will be forthcoming on delivery of DHGV.</p>	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>
26773 - Turn2us [6753]	Object	<p>Concerned with the proposed approach whereby Dunton Hills Garden Village will deliver at a greater rate than previously suggested, at just a fast enough rate to account for the shortfall created by the reduced capacity of site R18, R19, R25, and R26. It's wholly inappropriate to assume Dunton Hills Garden Village will accommodate an even greater number of dwellings by 2033 than the PSLP did. The PSLP as amended by the AFC remains unsound.</p> <p><i>Allocate additional site to delivery at least 70 additional homes in the early years of the plan period (2022/23 - 2024/25). Site 219 (land at Rayleigh Road, Hutton) represents an ideal site to respond to the above</i></p>	<p>The strategy as proposed includes justification for the site allocations, alternative/additional sites have been considered but have not been selected. The Council is of the view that DHGV can be delivered within the required timeframes as set out within the published trajectory. As part of the masterplan work, further information will be forthcoming on delivery of DHGV.</p>	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>
26789 - Historic England (Andrew Marsh) [8824]	Object	<p>The site contains three Grade II listed buildings and is surrounded by a range of other designated heritage assets. Development on site therefore has the potential to harm the significance designated heritage assets within the setting of the site. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is required to justify its allocation, inform the potential capacity of the site, and any mitigation measures necessary to accompany the proposals. Additional characterisation and archaeological investigations will also be fundamental to understanding the capacity of development on site.</p> <p><i>Given the sensitive nature of the site and given the lack of supporting evidence on the historic environment, we reiterate our request that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is undertaken. The HIA should determine the appropriateness or otherwise of the site for development, the extent of the development and therefore potential capacity of the site, the impacts upon the historic environment (considering each asset and its setting and its significance), impacts of development upon the asset and any potential mitigation measures necessary to accompany the proposals. Should the HIA conclude that development in the area could be acceptable and the site be allocated, the findings of the HIA should inform the Local Plan policy including development criteria and a strategy diagram which expresses the development criteria in diagrammatic form. Further archaeological investigation is undertaken as well as landscape characterisation work to inform the evidence base.</i></p>	DHGV masterplan work is ongoing, heritage is an identified issue that will need to be addressed accordingly. We will continue to involve Historic England and other relevant stakeholders	No change to plan
26790 - Hallam Land Management Ltd [2353]	Object	<p>No clear or sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the housing trajectory for R01 Dunton Hills Garden Village in Appendix 1 is justified. Whilst the change is a relatively small increase, given the absence of evidence to support the rate of delivery proposed, an objection is maintained. As also noted from the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum (paragraph 2.9.3), there is a degree of increased risk associated with reliance on this site, as this is a large and complex site associated with delivery challenges, including in respect of infrastructure delivery.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	The Council considers that DHGV represents a reasonable and sustainable location for strategic growth which is consistent with the borough's character. The emerging masterplan work for DHGV is addressing questions raised regarding access and connectivity (among other things), which Basildon Council will continue to be involved in.	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>
26744 - Basildon Borough Council (Ms Christine Lyons) [8820]	Object	<p>Basildon Council objects to the Focussed Changes 1 - 5, as they do not seem to have been informed by evidence or the Sustainability Appraisal as required by National Policy. The amendments effectively redistributes 70 proposed dwellings from the 'Central Brentwood Growth Corridor', which has opportunities to embrace more sustainable modes of transport, to a Green Belt location with a less developed public transport infrastructure. The reasons for the amendments do not seem to be supported by the evidence and appear to be based solely on the considerable number of objections received in response to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation in March 2019. The Brentwood Sustainability Appraisal October 2019 concludes that; "It is difficult to draw strong conclusions, with the primary considerations being: A) decreasing the homes assigned to the Brentwood/Shenfield urban area by 50 may serve to reduce traffic through the problematic town centre AQMA, but any benefit would be marginal, and equally these are accessible locations suited to minimising car dependency; and B) increasing the number of homes assigned to DHGV by 70 is potentially associated with a degree of risk, noting the ongoing work being undertaken in respect of improving air quality along the A127 within Basildon Borough, and noting consultation responses received."</p> <p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF advises amongst other things that Plans should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Basildon Council has considered the two Growth Corridors identified in the Brentwood Borough Local Plan. It has reflected however that there are fundamental distinctions between them, which do not appear to have influenced site selection choices in a justified way. The Central Brentwood Growth Corridor is the location of nationally and regionally managed and maintained infrastructure - the A12 &amp; M25 (Highways England) and the Elizabeth Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Transport for London) and East Anglia Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Abellio East Anglia). Growth in this location would maximise this infrastructure investment. The South Brentwood Growth Corridor meanwhile, consists the</p>	<p>The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough. The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development. Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.</p>	<p>Brentwood Borough will continue to work with Basildon Borough on masterplanning of Dunton hills Garden Village.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<p>A127 (maintained by Essex County Council) and Essex Thameside Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by c2c).</p> <p>It is not considered that the two corridors offer comparable choices in terms of the strategic importance or capacity of transport connections, and using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the strategic infrastructure available. This would encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Such an alternative approach would be justified by evidence and align with national policy.</p> <p><i>Review plan</i></p>		
26558 - Mr Kevin Craske [2712]	Object	<p>The initial statement that it is proposed to build an additional 70 homes at Dunton Hills Garden Village does not match up with the itemised changes. There are 70 homes being relocated from the Shenfield area and a further 20 homes from Blackmore Village area. That is a total of 90 homes. Where are the other 20 homes going to be located?</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	<p>Please refer to paragraph 2 of the Addendum of Focussed Changes document. There are only 50 homes from the Shenfield area in the proposed change. A further 20 homes in Blackmore total the reduction of 70 homes overall.</p>	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>
26881 - Icen Projects Limited (Mr Luke Challenger) [7052]	Object	<p>The proposed modifications are further delaying the delivery of housing until later in the Plan period pushing out 70 dwellings from Years 7 - 9 to Years 15 - 17. While this is a modest number of homes it demonstrates the significant challenge the Council is facing in the delivery of housing in the early years of the Plan period; The Pre-Submission Plan is seeking to deliver just a 1% buffer on top of the minimum LHN of 454 dwellings. The Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the Consultation warns against this approach, stating that there is an over reliance on Dunton Hills Garden Village for housing delivery "which leads to an increased degree of risk in respect of delays to delivery.</p> <p><i>In order to address the soundness issues we consider that the housing target should be reviewed with regard to the new evidence and that further sources of land supply should be identified, not only to deal with shortfalls over the plan period in total, but also specifically within its first 10 years. Land to the north of West Horndon railway station is available, suitable and deliverable and can contribute to meeting this shortfall. Importantly, it can come forward independently of the wider area of growth being promoted by EASL to the south of the settlement (in Thurrock Borough). The Brentwood Local Plan needs to seriously consider early delivery to ensure the Plan provides sufficient housing for Five Year Housing Land Supply, and for years 5 - 10. Early delivery of West Horndon would assist DHGV coming forward as it would act as a catalyst for housing delivery in this area of Brentwood and enhance the attractiveness of DHGV from a purchaser's perspective. It would also help a Local Plan inspector determine that Brentwood's Local Plan is sound; as is self-evident from the present draft of the Local Plan that Brentwood's ability to meet its housing needs is inextricably linked with the release of Green Belt land, primarily at DHGV. The failure to adopt a local plan would not only result in Brentwood being unable to address its housing needs, it would deprive DHGV of the policy context in which to come forward as a planning application proposal, thereby exacerbating the deficit. We had previously set out in the West Horndon Delivery Statement (Appendix 1 to our March</i></p>	<p>The strategy as proposed includes justification for the site allocations, alternative/additional sites have been considered but have not been selected. The Council is of the view that DHGV can be delivered within the required timeframes as set out within the published trajectory. As part of the masterplan work, further information will be forthcoming on delivery of DHGV. There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs.</p>	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>
		<p>2019 representations) that the site could deliver first completions by 2024. This would mean that significant numbers of homes could be delivered within the first 5 - 10 years of the plan period helping to address the soundness issues identified. We trust these representations clarify our position and that they are taken into consideration in the advancement of the Local Plan.</p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26756 - Countryside Properties [250]	Object	<p>Allocation of Unit Numbers</p> <p>Whilst Countryside Properties can confirm their support of the draft Local Plan in principle, and in particular the allocation of land at Chelmsford Road and Doddinghurst Road for residential development, it is noted that the Focussed Changes relate exclusively to the reduction of unit numbers on 4 sites that are proposed for allocation within the Pre-Submission Local Plan, and the respective increase of the number of homes proposed for delivery as part of Dunton Hills Garden Village to accommodate the reductions. Countryside Properties remain concerned in relation to an over-reliance on large scale strategic development for the provision of housing over the Plan period (2033). Brentwood Borough Council should protect those sites that are immediately available for the short term delivery of housing within the early stages of the Local Plan period. Should there be specific reasons why the 4 sites have a lower capacity than initially understood, alternative sites proposed for allocation, such as land at Chelmsford Road and Doddinghurst Road have sufficient capacity to accommodate an increase in unit numbers to protect overall housing delivery numbers for the Borough. This would help to balance the reliance on Dunton Hills Garden Village for housing delivery whilst ensuring the efficient use of small to medium scale sites which are available to deliver housing immediately. Countryside are able to confirm an intention for the three developer parties with land interests at Shenfield to agree a Statement of Common Ground, which is expected to provide further reassurance of the short term delivery of this particular allocation in due course.</p> <p>It should also be acknowledged that no growth of the sustainable settlement of Hutton has been proposed, despite its sustainability credentials and offering of small scale development sites such as land at Bayleys Mead. Such sites currently make a negligible contribution to the Green Belt and would not contribute to coalescence of settlements given the scale and enclosed nature of the site, as has been demonstrated in information submitted alongside previous representations at earlier stages of this Local Plan.</p>	<p>The strategy as proposed includes justification for the site allocations, alternative/additional sites have been considered but have not been selected. There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs. The sites have not been removed but reduced in capacity on the basis of local concern about development impacts. As set out in paragraph 9.2 a of the Pre-Submission Local Plan (Reg 19) the number of homes shown for each site is indicative, and in each case, the Council will consider the need to maximise development according to policies within the plan.</p>	No change to plan

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
		<i>Ensure delivery of homes is not reliant on one large development site.</i>		

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26531 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477] 26532 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477] 26593 - Mr. James Harris [8678] 26606 - Susan Harris [8686] 26632 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417] 26639 - Mr Adam Harris [8679] 26701 - Mr John Lester [4396] 26713 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195] 26770 - Mr Michael Jefferyes [5175] 26784 - Mr Gary Dimond [7055] 26860 - Mrs Christina Atkins [8118] 26891 - L Apostolides [8836] 26896 - Mr Alex Atkins [8126] 26904 - Mr Christopher Atkins [8837] 26909 - Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703] 26914 - Ms Lynn Baggott [8721] 26919 - Mr David Hall [4867] 26924 - Mr Authur Austin [8838] 26929 - Mrs Gillian Hall [8684] 26932 - Mr. Clive Austin [7186] 26939 - Mr Harry Austin [8839] 26940 - Mr Kevin Hall [6734] 26945 - Mrs. Jill Austin [7272] 26954 - Mr. Chris Hamilton [3835] 26959 - Mrs Mandy Hamilton [8633] 26964 - Mr Jack Stevens [8840] 26969 - Mr Ronald Quested [8452] 26976 - Mr John Adkins [8734] 26981 - Ms Anne Adkins [8735] 26986 - Mr Matthew Aiken [8827] 26991 - Kerry Allardyce [8828] 26992 - Mr Michael Bacon [8841] 26997 - Mr David Barfoot [7177] 27006 - Mr Liam Allardyce [8829] 27011 - Bernard Allen [8830] 27016 - Mr Mark Allen [8831] 27026 - Toni Allen [8832]	Object	Agree with the increase in housing numbers for the Dunton Hills Garden Village but need to add more with a faster delivery programme as it is of a location and scale that can provide new infrastructure.	The Council is of the view that DHGV can be delivered within the required timeframes as set out within the published trajectory. As part of the masterplan work, further information will be forthcoming on delivery of DHGV.	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>
27031 - Tallulah Allen [8833]				
27036 - Mr Stephen Allington [8316]				
27041 - Mr Brian Andrews [8834]				
27046 - Ms Melanie Andrews [8826]				
27047 - Mr Thomas Barrett [8842]				
27056 - Ms Mandy Anthony [8737]				
27061 - Mr Paul Anthony [6823]				
27062 - Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651]				
27067 - Mr Peter Bartrop [8650]				
27072 - Ms Anita Bastin [8843]				
27077 - Ms Pauline Davidson [6327]				
27087 - Mr James Baur [8845]				
27092 - Karen Baur [1079]				
27097 - Mr Kurt Baur [8846]				
27102 - Mr Gordon Beaman [8848]				
27108 - Mrs Eileen Beazley [8700]				
27115 - Mr Ron Beazley [4831]				
27118 - Mr Gary Bedford [8673]				
27123 - Mavis Beeching [8849]				
27128 - Mr. Robert Beeching [3839]				
27133 - Mr Cameron Beman [8850]				
27142 - Mr. Brian Rafis [4554]				
27147 - Ms Diane Randall [8851]				
27152 - Mr John Randall [8852]				
27153 - Mr David Bennett [8649]				
27162 - Mr Andy Davies [8853]				
27167 - Ann Davis [4404]				
27172 - Mr Robert Davis [4789]				
27177 - Ms Maria J Bennett [8723]				
27187 - Mr Arthur Birch [4769]				
27192 - Mrs Janet Birch [8730]				
27197 - Mr Peter Birch [8158]				
27202 - Mr Craig Bishop [8855]				
27207 - Mr Cliff Black [8729]				
27212 - Mrs Ruth Black [8728]				
27217 - Mr Tim Black [8248]				
27227 - Ms Rosemary Blowes [8857]				
27232 - Alison Ratcliffe [8860]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27234 - Mr Andrew Borton [8648]				
27237 - Mr Alan Hardy [8858]				
27244 - Mr Alan Bradley [8861]				
27252 - Mrs Ella Bradley [4875]				
27257 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
27259 - Mr Richard Brassett [8862]				
27266 - Mrs Judith Brewster [8863]				
27272 - Mrs Kelly BRITTLETON [8097]				
27273 - D. Rawlings [1058]				
27281 - Mr Robert J Brittleton [8724]				
27285 - Mrs Lisa Rawlings [8555]				
27286 - David Hammond [577]				
27295 - Mrs June Harrington [4776]				
27300 - Mr Lawrence Harrington [4778]				
27301 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011]				
27307 - Mrs Susan Rayner [8553]				
27312 - David Read [8864]				
27319 - Vera Read [8865]				
27324 - Ms Tina Harrington [4779]				
27332 - Mrs Margaret Brooks [8683]				
27337 - Mr Adam Harris [8679]				
27339 - Mr Ray Brooks [8643]				
27347 - Mr Andrew Harris [8628]				
27352 - Mr. James Harris [8678]				
27357 - Laura Harris [8685]				
27364 - Susan Harris [8686]				
27367 - Mrs Sara Harris [8122]				
27372 - Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]				
27377 - Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]				
27382 - Miss Jade Hayes [8136]				
27387 - Mrs Helen Haynes [8416]				
27393 - Mr Michael Haynes [8138]				
27394 - Mr Michael Haynes [8138]				
27403 - Mr Simon Heed [8868]				
27404 - Mr Raymond Hatfield [8869]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27409 - Ms Joanne Browne [8870]				
27414 - Mr Colin Budd [8871]				
27419 - Mrs Kathleen Budd [8872]				
27424 - Mr Richard Reed [4708]				
27426 - Mr Carl Budge [8873]				
27434 - Theresa Reed [8876]				
27441 - Mrs Irene Richardson [4859]				
27449 - Mrs Beryl Burgess [5030]				
27450 - Ian Richardson [8878]				
27455 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
27460 - Mr Keith Richardson [8192]				
27465 - Mrs Sandra Richardson [7330]				
27471 - Mrs Beryl Burgess [5030]				
27474 - Mr Simon Richardson [8562]				
27479 - Mrs Sue Rigley [8879]				
27484 - Steve Rigley [8880]				
27490 - Mr Peter Burgess [4863]				
27495 - Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]				
27499 - Mr Shaun Burnett [8881]				
27505 - Jaqueline Robinson [8883]				
27507 - Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]				
27515 - Ms Jean Bury [8716]				
27520 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899]				
27525 - Mr Thomas Bury [8717]				
27530 - Mr David Rolfs [8566]				
27535 - Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]				
27540 - Andrew Romang [8884]				
27545 - Ms Jan Butler [8885]				
27549 - Mrs Maureen Butler [5017]				
27554 - Ms Bonnie Cain [8886]				
27564 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
27569 - Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]				
27574 - Mr Richard Romang [4374]				
27579 - Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27584 - Joanne Ryan [8889]				
27589 - Nichola Ryan [8890]				
27594 - Mr Peter Ryan [4937]				
27599 - Robert Ryan [8891]				
27604 - Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]				
27606 - Mr Christopher Sanders [8474]				
27614 - Mr Gary Sanders [4923]				
27618 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193]				
27624 - Mrs Malanie Sanders [8511]				
27625 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]				
27634 - Mr Barry Casswell [8888]				
27639 - Mrs Irene Saunders [8386]				
27643 - Mrs Beryl Caton [8657]				
27649 - Ms Marjorie Herring [8893]				
27650 - Ronald Barry Saunders [8894]				
27659 - Mr Graham Hesketh [8634]				
27661 - Mr John Caton [4881]				
27664 - Mr David Saxton [4286]				
27673 - Mr David Chalkley [8671]				
27679 - Miss Carole Scott [8541]				
27684 - Ms Kim Chalkney [8895]				
27687 - Stephen Scott [8896]				
27692 - Ms Susan Hill [8897]				
27697 - Kerry Hipgrave [8898]				
27702 - Mr Rick Hipgrave [8899]				
27707 - Kay Hobbs [8900]				
27712 - Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]				
27717 - Mrs Mandy Chambers [4846]				
27722 - Mrs Trina Chambers [8348]				
27727 - Ms Julie Chandler [8352]				
27732 - Mrs Anita Clark [8168]				
27737 - Mr Joshua Clark [8135]				
27742 - Mr Martin Clark [2456]				
27747 - Mr David Coates [8133]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27752 - Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]				
27757 - Ms Karen Cohen [8901]				
27762 - Mr Marc Cohen [4268]				
27767 - Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]				
27777 - Mr Barry Coldham [8656]				
27782 - Mrs Louise Coldham [8666]				
27787 - Mr Peter Cole [8903]				
27792 - Mr Brian Cook [8794]				
27797 - Mrs Joann Cook [8669]				
27802 - Mr Daniel Cracknell [8142]				
27812 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]				
27817 - Mrs Christine Tabor [8427]				
27822 - Mr Frank Tabor [8424]				
27832 - Miss Chloe Taylor [8429]				
27837 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978]				
27842 - Mrs Elisabeth Taylor [2918]				
27847 - Mr Gary Taylor [8905]				
27852 - Mr James Taylor [8430]				
27857 - Ms Nikki Taylor [8906]				
27862 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]				
27867 - Mr Steven Taylor [8431]				
27873 - Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]				
27887 - Collin Sherwood [8908]				
27892 - Mrs Valerie Sherwood [8015]				
27897 - Mrs Maureen Slimm [5042]				
27902 - Mr Adam Smith [8910]				
27907 - Barry Smith [8911]				
27917 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
27922 - Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]				
27927 - Ms Lauren Holbrook [8912]				
27932 - Miss Ami Holmes [8653]				
27937 - Mr Ben Holmes [8654]				
27942 - Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]				
27947 - Mr Ken Holmes [8691]				
27952 - Mr Luke Holmes [8652]				
27957 - Mr Mark Holmes [8655]				
27963 - Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27972 - Mrs Jane House [8681]				
27977 - Mr Howe [8913]				
27984 - Mrs Elizabeth Thompson [5016]				
27988 - Mrs Howe [8914]				
27996 - Ms Charlotte Howse [8915]				
27999 - Mr David Smith [4872]				
28003 - Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]				
28007 - Mr James Hughes [8677]				
28012 - Mr John Hughes [4500]				
28015 - Joyce Smith [8917]				
28019 - Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]				
28026 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735]				
28032 - Lesley Smith [8918]				
28037 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
28038 - Marisa Smith [8919]				
28048 - William Alan Smith [8920]				
28055 - Malcolm Hurford [7304]				
28058 - Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]				
28063 - Mrs Melanie Snelling [8547]				
28068 - Mr Peter Snelling [6960]				
28078 - Mr Nicholas Thororgood [8916]				
28087 - Ms Annie Jackson [8921]				
28088 - Ms Emma Thwaite [8922]				
28093 - Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]				
28098 - Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]				
28103 - Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]				
28108 - Mr Derek Tillet [8923]				
28116 - Mrs Diane Smith [8388]				
28121 - Peter Southgate [8925]				
28126 - Vyvian Southgate [8926]				
28131 - Deborah Spencer [8927]				
28136 - Kevin Spencer [8928]				
28143 - Mrs Karen Tomey [8428]				
28148 - Liam Spencer [8929]				
28159 - Paul Springate [8931]				
28167 - Mr Khodad Jahromi [8190]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28172 - Gulay Jahromi [8933]				
28177 - Ms Mitra Jahromi [8934]				
28188 - David Janes [8935]				
28191 - Mr Michael Jefferyes [5175]				
28196 - Mrs Catherine Jennings [8693]				
28201 - Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]				
28206 - Nicola Joiner [8936]				
28211 - Aidan Jones [8937]				
28218 - Chloe Jones [8938]				
28221 - Diane Jones [8939]				
28226 - Miss Heather Jones [8318]				
28231 - Iris Jones [8495]				
28238 - Mr Michael Jones [8690]				
28243 - Ms Sophie Jones [8940]				
28248 - Sylvia Stanley [8932]				
28250 - Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]				
28252 - Mr Gary Staples [8526]				
28261 - Brenda Juniper [8493]				
28266 - Mrs Jane Staples [8527]				
28271 - Mrs Ann Stenning [8546]				
28274 - Mr Michael Juniper [8129]				
28278 - Mr Terence Stenning [8544]				
28290 - Benjamin Stevens [8943]				
28298 - Mr Craig Stevens [4958]				
28312 - Mrs Cynthia Kirby [8453]				
28313 - Sandra Stock [8946]				
28321 - Lynne Stocks [8947]				
28327 - Mr David Kirby [8454]				
28331 - Richard Stocks [8948]				
28336 - Iain Stretton [8949]				
28341 - Samantha Stretton [8950]				
28346 - Jennifer Stucky [8951]				
28351 - Steve Stuckey [8952]				
28356 - Christine Swettenham [8953]				
28361 - Mr Colin Tomey [8448]				
28366 - Edward Davis [8954]				
28371 - Miss Harriet Davis [8440]				
28381 - Sharon Decastro-Bunce [8955]				
28386 - Allan Roy Dickinson [8956]				



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28391 - Mr Louis Tregent [8924]				
28397 - Mr Paul Tregent [8437]				
28401 - Mrs Paula Tregent [8433]				
28403 - Mrs Evelyn Dickinson [8777]				
28411 - Mr Dennis Trumble [8418]				
28416 - Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029]				
28423 - Cariss Tsui [8694]				
28428 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
28433 - Mr Ian Tuffey [4621]				
28438 - Mr Giovanni Vaccari [8957]				
28443 - Mr Pete Vince [8123]				
28448 - Mr Ronald Wakelin [8958]				
28453 - Ms Natalie Walters [8959]				
28458 - Mr Richard Ward [8960]				
28463 - Ms Stephanie Kmiotek-Mutton [8961]				
28468 - Harry Krajicek [8962]				
28473 - Ms Madeline Krajicek [8963]				
28478 - Stephen Krajicek [8964]				
28487 - Mr John Laing [8501]				
28488 - Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]				
28493 - Sarah Louise Lapena [8965]				
28494 - Mr John Warner [5018]				
28502 - Mrs Linda Watkinson [4984]				
28510 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]				
28513 - Ms Elizabeth Watson [8966]				
28515 - Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]				
28521 - Mr Jon Watson [7112]				
28526 - Mr Tony Watson [8967]				
28531 - Mr Thomas Lennon [747]				
28533 - Mr Eric John Webb [1830]				
28541 - Mrs Susan Webb [4919]				
28545 - Mr John Lester [4396]				
28551 - Ms Michelle Lockton [8968]				
28553 - Mrs Joan Westover				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[4635] 28561 - Keith Lodge [8969] 28566 - Ms Maureen Wheeler [8970] 28573 - Mr Andy Wilkins [8972] 28575 - Graeme Logan [8971] 28581 - Mrs Kim Lucas [4711] 28586 - Mr Stuart Lucas [4956] 28592 - Sean Lucas [8973] 28601 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097] 28606 - Mr Alan Manning [8974] 28611 - Ms Christine Wilks [8975] 28614 - Duncan Maclaurin [8976] 28621 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728] 28626 - Ms Elaine Williams [8159] 28631 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141] 28636 - Mr John Wollaston [8183] 28641 - Mrs Marion Woolaston [8397] 28646 - Mr Kevin Wood [6965] 28651 - Mrs Sandra Wood [8720] 28656 - Mr Neal Woodford [8978] 28666 - Ms Ann Wright [8980] 28671 - Mrs Karen York [8748] 28676 - Ms Barbara Young [8981] 28681 - Charlie Pyke [8982] 28686 - Ms Hannah Pyke [8983] 28691 - Mr Harry Pyke [8984] 28701 - Ms Eve Pulford [8987] 28706 - Mr Daniel Pulford [8988] 28711 - Mr Brian Marchant [8569] 28723 - Mrs Jane Marr [6006] 28726 - Surrell McGovern [8991] 28735 - Mrs. Susan Miers [8695] 28740 - Mr Colin Miers [3959] 28745 - Alex Mills [8993] 28750 - Mrs Diane Mills [8533] 28755 - Greg Mills [8994] 28760 - Ms Karen Page [9000] 28765 - Ms Marquite Peacham [8999] 28770 - Ms Janice Plummer [8997]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28775 - Ms Judith Phillips [8615]				
28780 - Mrs Jill Pritchard [4269]				
28785 - Mrs Irene Power [8610]				
28790 - Mr Stephen Poulton [8149]				
28796 - Mrs Carol Poulton [8119]				
28800 - Miss Natasha Playle [4291]				
28805 - Ms Polyblank [8996]				
28810 - Ms Gillian Pope [8995]				
28815 - Lloyd Piper [8616]				
28820 - Mr Frederick Piper [8380]				
28825 - Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]				
28826 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]				
28834 - Mr Douglas Piper [603]				
28840 - Mr Gary Dimond [7055]				
28845 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
28850 - Mr Conrad Dixon [8688]				
28855 - Mrs Jennifer Dodd [5498]				
28860 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828]				
28862 - Jack Mills [9001]				
28870 - Carla Downton [9002]				
28875 - Jane Mills [9003]				
28879 - Mr Stephen Downton [8432]				
28883 - Mr Peter Mills [6982]				
28890 - Christine Drew [9004]				
28894 - Anna Dunk [8426]				
28896 - Toby Mills [9005]				
28904 - Dennis Mitchell [9006]				
28909 - Mrs Lorna Mitchell [8391]				
28914 - Mr Sean Moore [8520]				
28919 - Mrs Shui-Lin Moore [8521]				
28924 - Anastasia Mootoosamy [9007]				
28929 - John Moppett [9008]				
28934 - Mr Bryan Moreton [8513]				
28939 - Gloria Moreton [9009]				
28944 - Samantha Dunk [8438]				
28949 - Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]				
28954 - Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]				
28959 - Mr John Eaton [8124]				
28964 - Kirsty Edwards [8450]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28969 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477]				
28974 - J Ellis [9010]				
28984 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]				
28989 - Mr Mark Morgan [4987]				
28994 - Mrs Michelle Morgan [4505]				
28999 - Mrs Lesley Moss [7053]				
29004 - Mr and Mrs Brian and Lesley Moss [2905]				
29009 - Mrs Carol Moulder [4719]				
29018 - Stuart Moulder [4713]				
29019 - Mr Gerald Mountstevens [4911]				
29024 - Mr Lewis Pincombe [8745]				
29029 - Patricia Mountstevens [9012]				
29033 - Mrs Janet Pincombe [8614]				
29037 - Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]				
29043 - Mrs Lindsey Pavitt [8746]				
29047 - Dr Murray Wood [7003]				
29052 - Mr Anthony Pavitt [8747]				
29058 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
29063 - Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]				
29068 - Mr Tony Parris [9013]				
29073 - Ms Janet Parris [8315]				
29083 - Mrs Beth Pardoe [8613]				
29088 - Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]				
29093 - Mr Andrew Pallet [1313]				
29098 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
29103 - Callie Emmett [9019]				
29108 - Mr Peter Owen [9016]				
29111 - MR David Emmett [8445]				
29117 - Ms Amanda Owen [9017]				
29122 - Mr Jack Emmett [8372]				
29127 - Ms Jennifer Emmett [4896]				
29133 - Mr Joe Emmett [8436]				
29140 - Mr Scott Osborne [8456]				
29143 - Mrs Faye Osborne [8458]				
29148 - Mr John Orbell [4805]				
29153 - Mrs Gemma Olley [8462]				
29154 - Ann Eustace [9020]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29161 - Mr David Olley [8461]				
29168 - Kathleen Evans [9021]				
29171 - Mr Neil O'Riordan [8630]				
29175 - Pat Fahy [9022]				
29183 - Pat Fearnley [9024]				
29188 - Mr Brett O'Hara [9023]				
29193 - Mr Andrew O'Hara [9025]				
29198 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29202 - Ms Suzanne O'Hara [9026]				
29208 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29215 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29217 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29223 - Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]				
29224 - Ms Tracey O'Brien [9028]				
29232 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]				
29239 - Mr Graham Gregory [9029]				
29248 - Mrs Anne Gregory [4305]				
29253 - Mr Richard Fisher [8480]				
29263 - Mr Christopher Fletcher [8470]				
29267 - Paul Fletcher [9030]				
29272 - Mr Colin Foreman [4394]				
29277 - Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]				
29282 - Sally French [9031]				
29287 - Mr Lee Fullick [8467]				
29292 - Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]				
29297 - Daniel Furnell [9032]				
29302 - Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]				
29307 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282]				
29312 - Mr Ian Garrett [4947]				
29317 - Mrs Lorraine Murrell [8519]				
29322 - Mrs Maureen Murrell [8560]				
29327 - Mr Stephen Murrell [8517]				
29332 - Mr Colin Newcombe [8598]				
29337 - Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597]				
29342 - Mr Stephen Newton [8601]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29422 - Mrs Niyazi [9039] 29432 - Mr Stephen Slaughter [9041]				
		<i>Add more to Dunton Hills and reduce or remove other smaller Green Belt sites such as R25 and R26.</i>		
26925 - Mr Authur Austin [8838] 28021 - Mr Thomas Hughes [8637] 28591 - Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406] 29238 - Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459] 29347 - Mrs Karen Geary [8483] 29348 - Mrs Tina Newton [8600] 29356 - Doddinghurst Infant School (Ms. Ingrid Nicholson) [4339] 29360 - Beverley Gibson [9034] 29369 - Mr Christopher Gill [8492] 29377 - Mrs Joanne Gill [4758] 29383 - Mr John Ginivan [8476] 29385 - Mr Brian Gordon [9035] 29392 - Mr Bruno Giordan [8104] 29396 - Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709] 29399 - Mr David Goodall [9036] 29405 - Mrs M.H. Giordan [1540] 29412 - Valerie Godbee [4943] 29417 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Object	Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation. The allocation should be further increased and the delivery programme accelerated in order to remove policies R25 and R26 from the LDP. Dunton Hills can accommodate the houses planned for Blackmore.	There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need. This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. Reliance on one large development has its risks even when, as is the case with Dunton Hills, the site is available and achievable. It will take some time to build out new homes as there needs infrastructure to be built before and during the homes are developed. It is expected that the development will be phased to optimise the speed of delivery however there will still be a need for other sites through out the Borough of Brentwood.	Continue with the proposed housing numbers and sites within the borough to deliver the Local Plan.
		<i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan</i>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26625 - Punch Partnerships (PGRP) Ltd [8801]	Object	<p>The proposed reduction in housing numbers in Shenfield and Blackmore reduces housing numbers in sustainable settlements where growth is needed, and puts them in a less sustainable location. In relocating the units to the proposed strategic allocation at Denton Hills, the provision of these units will inevitably occur later in the plan period, when the focus should be on early provision to address the current housing land supply shortfall. The site at Spital Lane is an ideal candidate, having minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt, being capable of accommodating six houses without any risk of flooding.</p> <p><i>A much better solution would be to reprovide the units lost from the Shenfield and Blackmore allocations on sustainable sites in and around Brentwood. The site at Spital Lane is an ideal candidate, being located on the edge of the town close to services and facilities, having minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and as per the Environment Agency comments on the most recent planning application, being capable of accommodating six houses without any risk of flooding. We therefore advocate that Spital Lane be allocated for housing in the emerging plan, along with other suitable smaller sites identified in the SHLAA, to make up the housing numbers lost in Shenfield and Blackmore.</i></p>	The strategy as proposed includes justification for the site allocations, alternative/additional sites have been considered but have not been selected.	No action
26542 - Dr Philip Gibbs [4309]	Object	<p>This does not meet needs of Brentwood in the right places.</p> <p><i>move housing development in the other direction</i></p>	The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough. The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development. Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.	No further action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
27017 - Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200] 29427 - Ms Viola Sherwin [9040]	Object	Q - FOCUSED CHANGE 1: POLICY R01 - Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation. The allocation should not be further increased and the delivery programme accelerated in order to remove policies R25 and R26 from the LDP.  <i>Dunton Hills should not be made to accommodate the houses planned for Blackmore</i>	There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs.	Accept Addendum of Focussed Changes amendments to the plan.
26807 - Glenda Fleming [3779]	Object	No clear or sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the housing trajectory for R01 Dunton Hills Garden Village in Appendix 1 is justified. Whilst the change is a relatively small increase, given the absence of evidence to support the rate of delivery proposed, an objection is maintained. As also noted from the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum (paragraph 2.9.3), there is a degree of increased risk associated with reliance on this site, as this is a large and complex site associated with delivery challenges, including in respect of infrastructure delivery.  <i>Reduce or remove size of Dunton Hills Garden Village.</i>	The Council is of the view that DHGV can be delivered within the required timeframes as set out within the published trajectory. As part of the masterplan work, further information will be forthcoming on delivery of DHGV.	Accept Addendum of Focussed Changes amendments to the plan.



<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26743 - Basildon Borough Council (Ms Christine Lyons) [8820]	Object	<p>It is noted that the Addendum of Focussed Changes is proposing the redistribution of 70 proposed dwellings from the "Central Brentwood Growth Corridor" to the Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV). Basildon Council objects to the proposal to create a standalone new village (DHGV) to the west of the joint administrative boundary as previously indicated in our responses to Brentwood's Local Plan consultations in February 2016, March 2018 and March 2019. 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 Borough's housing needs, and continues to have doubts whether this allocation would be found sound at Examination in Public. In giving this view, Basildon Council is apprehensive that the scale of development proposed, which amounts to over a third of the borough's entire housing provision for the plan period, could be supported by infrastructure in the absence of a clear delivery plan. It remains unclear, if the proposal were to be approved, how it will relate in terms of access and connectivity to the Basildon urban area given that the nearest Town Centre and acute healthcare facilities are all within Basildon Borough.</p> <p><i>The Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the strategic infrastructure available.</i></p>	<p>The Council considers that DHGV represents a reasonable and sustainable location for strategic growth which is consistent with the borough's character. The emerging masterplan work for DHGV is addressing questions raised regarding access and connectivity (among other things), which Basildon Council will continue to be involved.</p>	<p>Continue work with Basildon Council regarding Dunton Hills Garden Village and masterplanning.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26660 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Mr. Derek Armiger) [303] 26661 - Sow & Grow Nursery (Ms Kim Armiger) [4657] 26662 - Ms Maxine Armiger [4656]	Object	<p>2 However, they are all concerned that the Council's reliance on the large new community development at Dunton Green inherently carries more risk in providing housing over the Plan period, given the size of allocation and annual deliveries required, as it may be subject to delays arising from large scale finance and infrastructure provision as well as housing and finance market fluctuations, such that there can be substantial risks to the annual and overall housing delivery for the District during the Plan period.</p> <p>3 Accordingly, they are of the view that there should be no further preferred smaller site reallocations currently identified as preferred development sites into the Dunton Green allocation for the Plan period, without sound and convincing reasoning to support this.</p> <p>4 The many smaller sites identified as preferred sites, such as at the Sow N Grow Nursery site R07, provide for a more secure and dispersed risk in provision of housing delivery as these will tend to have far less upfront and complimentary infrastructure provision required before development can commence. In addition there will tend to be less upfront financial investments by developers, builders, and also by infrastructure providers making development potentially easier and quicker. The exposure to local market fluctuations may also be lessened with sites dispersed throughout the District and site assembly will not often be required. This allows the Plan to be more robust in housing delivery annually and for the Plan period.</p> <p>5 Further re-allocations would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular, paragraphs 67- 76, and para. 68 in particular.</p> <p>6 The Family also remains concerned that the supporting documents and assessments also published for this Consultation still do not have regard to the full potential of the Sow N Grow Nursery site which, together with the land owned by Mrs Dunbar, comprising the wider site R07, has again been assessed to 38 dwellings. There is clearly scope for many more, perhaps 50 dwellings plus in total as drawings used in pre-application discussions suggested. (These are in abeyance pending the Adoption of the Plan).</p> <p>7 However no matters raised in the documents being</p>	<p>Noted, there are no further proposals to redistribute numbers of dwellings proposed at site R07 to other areas. The Council would agree with importance placed on paragraph 68 of the NPPF in terms of ensuring quick delivery of homes. As set out in paragraph 9.2 a of the Pre-Submission Local Plan (Reg 19) the number of homes shown for each site is indicative, and in each case, the Council will consider the need to maximise development according to policies within the plan.</p>	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>
		<p>consulted upon appear to in anyway significantly or adversely impact on the site being selected as a preferred site for development and release from the Green Belt, provided the approach is not extended further to other sites. The Adopted Plan is awaited, so that pre-application discussions can recommence.</p> <p><i>Changes are noted and may not have impact on Sow and grow nursery site, discussions pre-application should continue.</i></p>		
26725 - West Horndon Parish Council (Mr Kim Harding) [381]	Object	<p>The proposed additional homes added to Dunton Hills Garden Village ignores the fact that these homes will exacerbate an already ill-conceived and poorly planned new Garden Village, the size of which has grown and grown. The Council states that it is planning for a borough of villages however West Horndon Parish is being expected to provide a disproportionate amount of the necessary housing and industrial development. The conclusion being that the Garden Village is being used as an excuse to ensure that other parts of the borough do not have to experience the upheaval that will result from extended building works over time.</p> <p>The proposed Garden Village is not consistent with national sustainable development in terms of transport links, meeting climate change and combatting flooding. Sustainable movement in West Horndon Parish is already difficult and will be problematic with the Garden Village. No evidence has been provided to show appropriate assessment of the impacts on the A127 and A128, passenger numbers at West Horndon station on are already at capacity and no understanding or allowance has been made to accommodate additional passengers. The proposal is non-sustainable.</p> <p><i>Remove Dunton Hills Garden Village from the West Horndon Parish and distribute around the borough.</i></p>	The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough. The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development. Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.	No further action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26813 - Tesco Stores Limited [3856]	Object	<p>We advise BBC to rethink its proposed strategy which has over the course of three drafts increased housing allocations at Dunton Hills Garden Village (DHGV). Any delay in implementing DHGV in line with the revised housing trajectory would result in housing shortfalls. The objections from Basildon and Thurrock Council are clear indicators that there has been insufficient engagement with adjoining Local Authorities over important cross boundary issues. 'The Consolidated Changes' should not be adopted until all concerning Local Authorities have discharged their duties to cooperate [in addressing all the issues relating to DHGV].</p> <p><i>Recommend that the Sawyers Hall Farm site (ref: 024a and 024b) is allocated as this site is available for development now.</i></p>	The Council considers that DHGV represents a reasonable and sustainable location for strategic growth which is consistent with the borough's character. Disagreement about cross boundary issues continues to be subject of discussion, however, disagreement is not an indication of insufficient engagement.	No action
26804 - M Scott Properties Ltd [8054]	Object	<p>Cross-boundary and Statutory Consultee Objections: Basildon Borough Council have objected to the DHGV allocation raising concerns regarding the cross-boundary impacts of this site. Similarly, Essex County Council also raised concerns in respect of the transport evidence base for DHGV. As part of the Focussed Changes, the Council have seemingly overlooked these comments, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, seeking instead to direct more housing numbers to this allocation within the Plan period, and failing to consider any reasonable alternatives.</p> <p><i>Plan review required</i></p>	Reasonable alternatives have been considered and set out within the Sustainability Appraisal. The emerging masterplan work for DHGV is addressing questions raised regarding access and connectivity (among other things), which Basildon Council and Essex County Council will continue to be involved in.	No change to plan

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26727 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Object	<p>NPPF para 31 requires planning policies to be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence. BBC need to be satisfied increase in dwelling numbers is supported by appropriate evidence base, including: - demonstrating site is where need is (para 59) - all other reasonable options have been fully examined, including making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and optimising density (para 137) - updated transport evidence base fully assesses transport implications. Proposed policy change does not address ECC's Pre-Submission Reg.19 consultation representations to this policy (March 2019). ECC's position has not changed on this matter.</p> <p><i>As a result of the increase in dwelling numbers for this site allocation BBC should include, within the Plan evidence and supporting text for this Policy, details to demonstrate that the reallocation of dwellings to this site is where the need is (paragraph 59 of the NPPF), and that all other reasonable options for reallocating the dwellings have been fully examined, including making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and optimising density. BBC should also update its transport evidence base for the Local Plan to fully assess the transport implications of the change in dwellings numbers on this site allocation.</i></p> <p><i>The policy needs to be further changed to address ECC's representations to this policy made to the Pre-Submission Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation in March 2019.</i></p>	Refer to Pre-Submission Local Plan Chapter 3 for spatial development principles and sequential approach to site selection. The Council recognises the need to utilise brownfield and urban area sites before considering Green Belt release. The Council will continue to work with ECC regarding the transport evidence base. Comments regarding the wording of policies in the Pre-Submission Local Plan are considered in the corresponding consultation statement.	No action
26652 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]	Support	<p>Anglian Water. As an infrastructure provider we closely monitor housing growth in our region to align our planned investment with additional demand for water recycling infrastructure. Therefore we have no comments to make relating to the focused change to Policy R01.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	Comment welcomed	No action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26588 - Rochford District Council (Daniel Goodman) [7964]	Support	Rochford District Council would like to acknowledge the importance of Brentwood Borough Council continuing to engage positively on strategic issues, including as part of the Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA) and in the preparation of the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan. Brentwood Borough Council is expected to continue to discharge its Duty to Co-operate with Rochford District Council and work positively to ensure that their mutual aspirations and vision for South Essex, set out in the Memorandum of Understanding dated July 2018, can be realised in the most effective, sustainable and equitable way.  <i>No specific change identified</i>	The Council note the acknowledgement of the Association of South Essex Local Authorities (ASELA), the preparation of the South Essex Joint Strategic Plan as set out in the MoU of July 2018.	No further action.
26514 - Cllr Chris Hossack [1974]	Support	This is a minor increase to what is already a substantial proposal. The increment in housing numbers should be easily absorbed into the overall development proposal  <i>Support proposed increase in housing numbers in Dunton Hills Garden Village</i>	Noted	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>
26659 - Wood (on behalf of National Grid) (Ms Lucy Bartley) [8094]	Support	<p>the following sites have been identified as being crossed or in close proximity to National Grid infrastructure. Further details are provided in the table overleaf.</p> <p>Electricity Transmission Site Ref Asset Details Appendix Ref E11- Brentwood Enterprise Park ZB Route - 275Kv two circuit route from Warley substation in Havering to Waltham Cross substation in Epping Forest ET329 (GT113)</p> <p>Gas Transmission Site Ref Asset Details Appendix Ref R01 Strategic Allocation Brentwood Hills Garden Village FM05 - Braintree to Horndon GT111</p> <p>R06 - Land off Nags Head Lane, Brentwood FM18 - Stapleford Tawney to Tilbury Thames North GT112</p> <p>E11- Brentwood Enterprise Park FM18 - Stapleford Tawney to Tilbury Thames North GT113 (ET329)</p> <p>Please see attached plan referenced ET329, GT111, GT112 &amp; GT113 at Appendix 2. The proposed sites are crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transmission overhead line and/or National Grid underground high-pressure gas pipeline. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in-ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site. You can find National Grid's guidelines for developing near Over Head Lines here: <a href="https://www.nationalgrid.com/sites/default/files/documents/Development%20near%20overhead%20lines_0.pdf">https://www.nationalgrid.com/sites/default/files/documents/Development%20near%20overhead%20lines_0.pdf</a></p> <p><i>Note location of transmission lines and gas pipelines</i></p>	BBC welcome this confirmation	No additional action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26587 - Rochford District Council (Daniel Goodman) [7964]	Support	Rochford District Council raises no objection to the proposed amendments to Brentwood Borough Council's Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan, namely the revised capacities of various sites proposed for development. Brentwood Borough Council should, however, satisfy themselves and the Inspector that the policies subject to amendment, in the context of its wider spatial strategy, are both sound and deliverable. In particular, Brentwood Borough Council (BBC) should satisfy itself that the rate of development suggested for 'Dunton Hills Garden Village' is deliverable and realistic in order to ensure no unmet needs will arise.  <i>No specific change identified</i>	Noted	No action
26592 - CEG Land Promotions Limited [5050]	Support	CEG note the Council's proposal to increase the number of new homes to be provided for within the DHGV strategic housing allocation in the plan period to 2033. CEG considers this to be a relatively small increase in the number of new homes when compared to what was previously proposed to be provided by the end of the plan period and the total indicative capacity of the DHGV allocation overall.  <i>No specific change identified.</i>	Brentwood Borough Council welcomes support from CEG.	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>
------------------------	---------------	---	-----------------------------	---------------

---

*Policy R18: Land off Crescent Drive, Shenfield (page 290)*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26775 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406]	Object	<p>Focussed change reducing dwellings to "around 35 homes". This will keep an area of on site public open space. I consider that this change has not been positively prepared and not consistent with policies in the NPPF requiring an integrated approach to housing and community facilities. The woodland open space should be a priority and an opportunity to enhance a community asset in an area of open space deprivation is foregone.</p> <p>(i) Paragraph 3 of the Focussed Changes Consultation states that a significant number of representations were received, and a summary of key concerns raised "include inconsistency with the character of the local area in regard to density; implications of increased traffic and associated safety; highway access; development on urban open space; environmental and habitats impacts; and flooding."</p> <p>(ii) No site appraisal justifying the proposed change appears to have been prepared. The character of the area was established by the Glanthsams Park Estate Development scheme and layout with some statutory and charitable modifications before the redevelopment of the main hospital site in 2011 with the transfer of land for a public woodland opens space, and a footpath between the hospital and the Regional Blood Transfusion site (R18). In addition to the footpath the R18 site benefits from an easement for a right of way connecting to Worrin Road.</p> <p>(iii) The proposed focussed change to R18 does not relate to the objectives of the Hospital redevelopment scheme and transfer of public woodland open space.</p> <p>(iv) These objections are supported by a serious caveat in the Addendum to the SA Report prepared by AECOM Infrastructure, and a conclusion which is couched in evasive language.</p> <p>(v) The Addendum is qualified by being in accordance with the established budget, and also states that information provided by third parties has not been checked. At paragraph 2.5.3 of the Addendum there is a caveat that costly "costly access and transport infrastructure upgrades will be required in order to ensure a good flow of traffic and support safe access by walking and cycling..... There is a need to question whether scheme viability could be adversely affected as a result in the reduction in the number of homes". In other words, the work has not been carried out to</p>	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Shenfield. There is no proposal to change rights of way or access to existing woodland as part of the allocation. Policy R18 refers to protection and enhancement of landscape boundaries.	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>
		<p>justify the soundness of the change</p> <p>(vi) The conclusion to the Addendum at paragraph 2.5.6 is equivocal. It makes the highly dubious assertion that a response to (some but not all) concerns has positive implications for community objectives while highlighting an unquantified degree of uncertainty concerning infrastructure, including community infrastructure at DHGV.</p> <p>(vii). It is open to the Council to make an order under the Highways Act creating a byway for all traffic over its easement. This would open up the public open space transferred in 2011, which has been the subject since then of encroachments and trespass. There are other options. However, the focussed change proposed seeks to take a line of minimum development with some onsite open space to avoid grasping the nettle of integrated planned development. This is unsound, unjustified and inimical to national planning policy objectives and not in the public interest. Document is not Sound</p> <p><i>Further work is needed to justify change. Reconsider proposal in light of evidence</i></p>		

<b><i>Representations</i></b>	<b><i>Nature</i></b>	<b><i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i></b>	<b><i>Council's Assessment</i></b>	<b><i>Action</i></b>
26724 - Fairview New Homes Ltd (Ms Faye Wilders) [8365] 29353 - Mrs Karen Geary [8483]	Object	<p>Object to the reduction in homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The Council's failure to demonstrate that the strategic requirement of National Planning Policy Framework have need met.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the Local Plan is not legally compliant or sound;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* That no evidence or justification has been provided by the Council to justify the reduction in the number of units allocated of the site;</li> <li>* The lack of evidence and justification behind the Council's decision to reallocate additional housing onto a large strategic Green Belt allocation where the delivery has already been highlighted as risk within the Sustainability Appraisal 2019; and</li> <li>* The continued failure of the Council to support the full capacity of a strategic site, despite discussion with Development Management and Statutory Consultees which demonstrate that the site could accommodate in excess of 55 units.</li> </ul> <p><i>Return the site numbers to the upper level</i></p>	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	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>
26745 - Basildon Borough Council (Ms Christine Lyons) [8820]	Object	<p>Basildon Council objects to the Focussed Changes 1 - 5, as they do not seem to have been informed by evidence or the Sustainability Appraisal as required by National Policy. The amendments effectively redistributes 70 proposed dwellings from the 'Central Brentwood Growth Corridor', which has opportunities to embrace more sustainable modes of transport, to a Green Belt location with a less developed public transport infrastructure. The reasons for the amendments do not seem to be supported by the evidence and appear to be based solely on the considerable number of objections received in response to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation in March 2019. The Brentwood Sustainability Appraisal October 2019 concludes that; "It is difficult to draw strong conclusions, with the primary considerations being: A) decreasing the homes assigned to the Brentwood/Shenfield urban area by 50 may serve to reduce traffic through the problematic town centre AQMA, but any benefit would be marginal, and equally these are accessible locations suited to minimising car dependency; and B) increasing the number of homes assigned to DHGV by 70 is potentially associated with a degree of risk, noting the ongoing work being undertaken in respect of improving air quality along the A127 within Basildon Borough, and noting consultation responses received."</p> <p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF advises amongst other things that Plans should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Basildon Council has considered the two Growth Corridors identified in the Brentwood Borough Local Plan. It has reflected however that there are fundamental distinctions between them, which do not appear to have influenced site selection choices in a justified way. The Central Brentwood Growth Corridor is the location of nationally and regionally managed and maintained infrastructure - the A12 &amp; M25 (Highways England) and the Elizabeth Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Transport for London) and East Anglia Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Abellio East Anglia). Growth in this location would maximise this infrastructure investment. The South Brentwood Growth Corridor meanwhile, consists the</p>	<p>The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development.</p> <p>Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.</p>	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>
		<p>A127 (maintained by Essex County Council) and Essex Thameside Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by c2c).</p> <p>It is not considered that the two corridors offer comparable choices in terms of the strategic importance or capacity of transport connections, and using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the strategic infrastructure available. This would encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Such an alternative approach would be justified by evidence and align with national policy.</p> <p><i>Immediately review plan with focus on northern growth corridor and urban centres</i></p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26533 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477] 26576 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376] 26594 - Mr. James Harris [8678] 26607 - Susan Harris [8686] 26633 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417] 26640 - Mr Adam Harris [8679] 26702 - Mr John Lester [4396] 26706 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193] 26714 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195] 28183 - Mr Peter Jakobsson [8177] 29349 - Mrs Tina Newton [8600] 29359 - Mrs Doreen Gray [9033] 29361 - Doddinghurst Infant School (Ms. Ingrid Nicholson) [4339] 29362 - Beverley Gibson [9034] 29370 - Mr Christopher Gill [8492] 29378 - Mrs Joanne Gill [4758] 29386 - Mr John Ginivan [8476] 29387 - Mr Brian Gordon [9035] 29393 - Mr Bruno Giordan [8104] 29398 - Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709] 29401 - Mr David Goodall [9036] 29408 - Mrs M.H. Giordan [1540] 29413 - Valerie Godbee [4943] 29418 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Object	Land off Crescent Drive, Shenfield. Brownfield. (Less than 1% of total responses, March 2019) Brownfield sites should be prioritised over Greenfield, and Green Belt should not be released at all unless all other alternatives have been used to fulfil the target housing allocations. The number of homes should be increased back to a minimum of 55 and R25 & R26 should be removed entirely. Crescent Drive is in the midst of an urban area so development here is more appropriate as infrastructure is already in place.	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	No action
		<i>Retain previous housing number of 55. This would allow other sites to come out of the plan such as Blackmore.</i>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26626 - Punch Partnerships (PGRP) Ltd [8801]	Object	<p>The proposed reduction in housing numbers in Shenfield and Blackmore reduces housing numbers in sustainable settlements where growth is needed, and puts them in a less sustainable location. In relocating the units to the proposed strategic allocation at Denton Hills, the provision of these units will inevitably occur later in the plan period, when the focus should be on early provision to address the current housing land supply shortfall. The site at Spital Lane is an ideal candidate, having minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt, being capable of accommodating six houses without any risk of flooding.</p> <p><i>A much better solution would be to reprovide the units lost from the Shenfield and Blackmore allocations on sustainable sites in and around Brentwood. The site at Spital Lane is an ideal candidate, being located on the edge of the town close to services and facilities, having minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and as per the Environment Agency comments on the most recent planning application, being capable of accommodating six houses without any risk of flooding. We therefore advocate that Spital Lane be allocated for housing in the emerging plan, along with other suitable smaller sites identified in the SHLAA, to make up the housing numbers lost in Shenfield and Blackmore.</i></p>	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	No action
26564 - Mr Kevin Craske [2712]	Object	<p>As a separate issue, why has the number of homes on brownfields sites reduced from 1152 to 1132?. There is no mention of where, when or why! Still, I expect they will be relocated to Dunton Hills Garden Town obviously.</p> <p><i>Return number to 55, not add to Dunton Hills.</i></p>	Appendix 1: Schedule of Focussed Changes to Brentwood Pre-Submission Local Plan lists all amendments to the plan on the basis of the focussed changes. Figure 4.2 (demonstrating housing provision) shows a reduction from 1,152 to 1,132 on brownfield land in the Brentwood urban area, which land at Crescent Drive is classified as.	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>
26861 - Mrs Christina Atkins [8118] 26892 - L Apostolides [8836] 26897 - Mr Alex Atkins [8126] 26905 - Mr Christopher Atkins [8837] 26910 - Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703] 26915 - Ms Lynn Baggott [8721] 26920 - Mr David Hall [4867] 26930 - Mrs Gillian Hall [8684] 26933 - Mr. Clive Austin [7186] 26941 - Mr Harry Austin [8839] 26946 - Mrs. Jill Austin [7272] 26950 - Mr Kevin Hall [6734] 26955 - Mr. Chris Hamilton [3835] 26960 - Mrs Mandy Hamilton [8633] 26965 - Mr Jack Stevens [8840] 26970 - Mr Ronald Qusted [8452] 26975 - Mr John Adkins [8734] 26980 - Ms Anne Adkins [8735] 26985 - Mr Matthew Aiken [8827] 26990 - Kerry Allardyce [8828] 26993 - Mr Michael Bacon [8841] 26998 - Mr David Barfoot [7177] 27005 - Mr Liam Allardyce [8829] 27010 - Bernard Allen [8830] 27015 - Mr Mark Allen [8831] 27018 - Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200] 27025 - Toni Allen [8832] 27030 - Tallulah Allen [8833] 27035 - Mr Stephen Allington [8316] 27040 - Mr Brian Andrews [8834] 27045 - Ms Melanie Andrews [8826] 27048 - Mr Thomas Barrett [8842] 27054 - Ms Mandy Anthony [8737] 27060 - Mr Paul Anthony [6823] 27063 - Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651] 27068 - Mr Peter Bartrop [8650] 27073 - Ms Anita Bastin [8843] 27078 - Ms Pauline Davidson [6327]	Object	FOCUSSED CHANGE 2: POLICY R18 - Land off Crescent Drive, Shenfield. Brownfield. (Less than 1% of total responses, March 2019) Brownfield sites should be prioritised over Greenfield, and Green Belt should not be released at all unless all other alternatives have been used to fulfil the target housing allocations. The number of homes should be increased back to a minimum of 55 and R25 & R26 should be removed entirely. R18 should never have been removed from the LDP and both R25 & R26 should never have been put back into the LDP as these two were originally excluded because they failed to meet infrastructure requirements and would further increase the already known flood risk for the areas in question. Given the historic nature of Blackmore and the inadequate infrastructure to cope with additional housing it would be preferable to use the Brownfield site at Shenfield and the site at Dunton Hills for the houses which are proposed in Blackmore.	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	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>
27083 - Mr Richard Bastin [8844]				
27088 - Mr James Baur [8845]				
27093 - Karen Baur [1079]				
27098 - Mr Kurt Baur [8846]				
27103 - Mr Gordon Beaman [8848]				
27104 - Mr Gordon Beaman [8848]				
27109 - Mrs Eileen Beazley [8700]				
27116 - Mr Ron Beazley [4831]				
27119 - Mr Gary Bedford [8673]				
27124 - Mavis Beeching [8849]				
27129 - Mr. Robert Beeching [3839]				
27134 - Mr Cameron Beman [8850]				
27143 - Mr. Brian Rafis [4554]				
27148 - Ms Diane Randall [8851]				
27154 - Mr John Randall [8852]				
27155 - Mr David Bennett [8649]				
27163 - Mr Andy Davies [8853]				
27168 - Ann Davis [4404]				
27173 - Mr Robert Davis [4789]				
27178 - Ms Maria J Bennett [8723]				
27183 - Mrs Paula Bills [8854]				
27188 - Mr Arthur Birch [4769]				
27193 - Mrs Janet Birch [8730]				
27198 - Mr Peter Birch [8158]				
27203 - Mr Craig Bishop [8855]				
27208 - Mr Cliff Black [8729]				
27213 - Mrs Ruth Black [8728]				
27218 - Mr Tim Black [8248]				
27223 - Ms Pam Blackmore [8856]				
27228 - Ms Rosemary Blowes [8857]				
27233 - Alison Ratcliffe [8860]				
27235 - Mr Andrew Borton [8648]				
27239 - Mr Alan Hardy [8858]				
27245 - Mr Alan Bradley [8861]				
27253 - Mrs Ella Bradley [4875]				
27258 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
27261 - Mr Richard Brassett				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8862] 27267 - Mrs Judith Brewster				
[8863] 27274 - D. Rawlings [1058] 27275 - Mrs Kelly BRITTLETON				
[8097] 27282 - Mr Robert J Brittleton				
[8724] 27287 - Mrs Lisa Rawlings [8555] 27289 - David Hammond [577] 27296 - Mrs June Harrington				
[4776] 27302 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011] 27305 - Mr Lawrence Harrington				
[4778] 27308 - Mrs Susan Rayner [8553] 27313 - David Read [8864] 27321 - Vera Read [8865] 27326 - Ms Tina Harrington [4779] 27333 - Mrs Margaret Brooks				
[8683] 27338 - Mr Adam Harris [8679] 27341 - Mr Ray Brooks [8643] 27348 - Mr Andrew Harris [8628] 27353 - Mr. James Harris [8678] 27358 - Laura Harris [8685] 27365 - Susan Harris [8686] 27368 - Mrs Sara Harris [8122] 27373 - Ms Leanne Hartley [8325] 27378 - Mr Kenneth Herring				
[4841] 27383 - Miss Jade Hayes [8136] 27388 - Mrs Helen Haynes [8416] 27395 - Mr Michael Haynes [8138] 27402 - Mr Simon Heed [8868] 27405 - Mr Raymond Hatfield				
[8869] 27410 - Ms Joanne Browne [8870] 27415 - Mr Colin Budd [8871] 27420 - Mrs Kathleen Budd [8872] 27425 - Mr Richard Reed [4708] 27427 - Mr Carl Budge [8873] 27435 - Theresa Reed [8876] 27440 - Ms Kaye Bundy [8874] 27443 - Mrs Irene Richardson				
[4859]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27451 - Ian Richardson [8878]				
27456 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
27461 - Mr Keith Richardson [8192]				
27468 - Mrs Sandra Richardson [7330]				
27469 - Mrs Beryl Burgess [5030]				
27475 - Mr Simon Richardson [8562]				
27480 - Mrs Sue Rigley [8879]				
27485 - Steve Rigley [8880]				
27491 - Mr Peter Burgess [4863]				
27496 - Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]				
27500 - Mr Shaun Burnett [8881]				
27506 - Jaquiline Robinson [8883]				
27509 - Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]				
27516 - Ms Jean Bury [8716]				
27521 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899]				
27526 - Mr Thomas Bury [8717]				
27531 - Mr David Rolfs [8566]				
27536 - Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]				
27541 - Andrew Romang [8884]				
27546 - Ms Jan Butler [8885]				
27550 - Mrs Maureen Butler [5017]				
27555 - Ms Bonnie Cain [8886]				
27560 - Ms Janet Carter [8887]				
27565 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
27570 - Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]				
27575 - Mr Richard Romang [4374]				
27580 - Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]				
27585 - Joanne Ryan [8889]				
27590 - Nichola Ryan [8890]				
27595 - Mr Peter Ryan [4937]				
27600 - Robert Ryan [8891]				
27605 - Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]				
27608 - Mr Christopher Sanders [8474]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27615 - Mr Gary Sanders [4923]				
27620 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193]				
27626 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]				
27628 - Mrs Malanie Sanders [8511]				
27635 - Mr Barry Casswell [8888]				
27640 - Mrs Irene Saunders [8386]				
27645 - Mrs Beryl Caton [8657]				
27651 - Ms Marjorie Herring [8893]				
27652 - Ronald Barry Saunders [8894]				
27660 - Mr Graham Hesketh [8634]				
27662 - Mr John Caton [4881]				
27666 - Mr David Saxton [4286]				
27674 - Mr David Chalkley [8671]				
27680 - Miss Carole Scott [8541]				
27685 - Ms Kim Chalkney [8895]				
27688 - Stephen Scott [8896]				
27693 - Ms Susan Hill [8897]				
27698 - Kerry Hipgrave [8898]				
27703 - Mr Rick Hipgrave [8899]				
27708 - Kay Hobbs [8900]				
27713 - Mr Andrew Chambers [8300]				
27718 - Mrs Mandy Chambers [4846]				
27723 - Mrs Trina Chambers [8348]				
27728 - Ms Julie Chandler [8352]				
27733 - Mrs Anita Clark [8168]				
27738 - Mr Joshua Clark [8135]				
27743 - Mr Martin Clark [2456]				
27748 - Mr David Coates [8133]				
27753 - Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313]				
27758 - Ms Karen Cohen [8901]				
27763 - Mr Marc Cohen [4268]				
27768 - Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]				
27773 - Mr Anthony Colbert [8902]				
27778 - Mr Barry Coldham [8656]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27783 - Mrs Louise Coldham [8666]				
27788 - Mr Peter Cole [8903]				
27793 - Mr Brian Cook [8794]				
27798 - Mrs Joann Cook [8669]				
27803 - Mr Daniel Cracknell [8142]				
27808 - Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]				
27813 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]				
27818 - Mrs Christine Tabor [8427]				
27823 - Mr Frank Tabor [8424]				
27828 - Ms Gloria Tanner [8904]				
27833 - Miss Chloe Taylor [8429]				
27838 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978]				
27843 - Mrs Elisabeth Taylor [2918]				
27848 - Mr Gary Taylor [8905]				
27853 - Mr James Taylor [8430]				
27858 - Ms Nikki Taylor [8906]				
27863 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]				
27868 - Mr Steven Taylor [8431]				
27874 - Ms Shirley Taylor [8907]				
27875 - Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]				
27883 - Mrs Sila Sheridan [5201]				
27888 - Collin Sherwood [8908]				
27893 - Mrs Valerie Sherwood [8015]				
27898 - Mrs Maureen Slimm [5042]				
27903 - Mr Adam Smith [8910]				
27908 - Barry Smith [8911]				
27913 - Mr Ritchie Hobbs [8909]				
27918 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
27923 - Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]				
27928 - Ms Lauren Holbrook [8912]				
27933 - Miss Ami Holmes [8653]				
27938 - Mr Ben Holmes [8654]				
27943 - Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]				
27948 - Mr Ken Holmes [8691]				
27953 - Mr Luke Holmes [8652]				
27958 - Mr Mark Holmes [8655]				
27964 - Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]				
27970 - Mrs Shirley Holmes				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8660]				
27973 - Mrs Jane House [8681]				
27978 - Mr Howe [8913]				
27986 - Mrs Elizabeth Thompson [5016]				
27987 - Mrs Howe [8914]				
27995 - Ms Charlotte Howse [8915]				
28000 - Mr David Smith [4872]				
28004 - Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]				
28008 - Mr James Hughes [8677]				
28013 - Mr John Hughes [4500]				
28018 - Joyce Smith [8917]				
28027 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735]				
28033 - Lesley Smith [8918]				
28039 - Marisa Smith [8919]				
28040 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
28049 - William Alan Smith [8920]				
28056 - Malcolm Hurford [7304]				
28059 - Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]				
28064 - Mrs Melanie Snelling [8547]				
28069 - Mr Peter Snelling [6960]				
28074 - Mr Alan Snook [8484]				
28079 - Mr Nicholas Thororgood [8916]				
28086 - Ms Annie Jackson [8921]				
28089 - Ms Emma Thwaite [8922]				
28094 - Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]				
28099 - Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]				
28104 - Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]				
28109 - Mr Derek Tillet [8923]				
28117 - Mrs Diane Smith [8388]				
28122 - Peter Southgate [8925]				
28127 - Vyvian Southgate [8926]				
28132 - Deborah Spencer [8927]				
28137 - Kevin Spencer [8928]				
28144 - Mrs Karen Tomey [8428]				
28149 - Liam Spencer [8929]				
28154 - Dean Spicer [8930]				
28160 - Paul Springate [8931]				
28168 - Mr Khodad Jahromi				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8190]				
28173 - Gulay Jahromi [8933]				
28178 - Ms Mitra Jahromi [8934]				
28189 - David Janes [8935]				
28192 - Mr Michael Jefferyes				
[5175]				
28197 - Mrs Catherine Jennings				
[8693]				
28202 - Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]				
28207 - Nicola Joiner [8936]				
28212 - Aidan Jones [8937]				
28219 - Chloe Jones [8938]				
28222 - Diane Jones [8939]				
28227 - Miss Heather Jones				
[8318]				
28232 - Iris Jones [8495]				
28239 - Mr Michael Jones [8690]				
28244 - Ms Sophie Jones [8940]				
28253 - Mr Gary Staples [8526]				
28257 - Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]				
28262 - Brenda Juniper [8493]				
28267 - Mrs Jane Staples [8527]				
28272 - Mrs Ann Stenning [8546]				
28275 - Mr Michael Juniper [8129]				
28280 - Mr Terence Stenning				
[8544]				
28286 - Andrew Stevens [8942]				
28292 - Benjamin Stevens [8943]				
28296 - Christopher Kilian [8944]				
28300 - Mr Craig Stevens [4958]				
28308 - Lynn Stevens [8945]				
28314 - Sandra Stock [8946]				
28318 - Mrs Cynthia Kirby [8453]				
28322 - Lynne Stocks [8947]				
28328 - Mr David Kirby [8454]				
28332 - Richard Stocks [8948]				
28337 - Iain Stretton [8949]				
28342 - Samantha Stretton [8950]				
28347 - Jennifer Stucky [8951]				
28352 - Steve Stuckey [8952]				
28357 - Christine Swettenham				
[8953]				
28362 - Mr Colin Tomey [8448]				
28367 - Edward Davis [8954]				
28372 - Miss Harriet Davis [8440]				
28377 - Mrs Patricia Dean [8434]				



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28382 - Sharon Decastro-Bunce [8955]				
28387 - Allan Roy Dickinson [8956]				
28392 - Mr Louis Tregent [8924]				
28396 - Mr Paul Tregent [8437]				
28402 - Mrs Paula Tregent [8433]				
28407 - Mrs Evelyn Dickinson [8777]				
28412 - Mr Dennis Trumble [8418]				
28417 - Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029]				
28424 - Cariss Tsui [8694]				
28429 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
28434 - Mr Ian Tuffey [4621]				
28439 - Mr Giovanni Vaccari [8957]				
28444 - Mr Pete Vince [8123]				
28449 - Mr Ronald Wakelin [8958]				
28454 - Ms Natalie Walters [8959]				
28459 - Mr Richard Ward [8960]				
28464 - Ms Stephanie Kmiotek-Mutton [8961]				
28469 - Harry Krajicek [8962]				
28474 - Ms Madeline Krajicek [8963]				
28479 - Stephen Krajicek [8964]				
28486 - Mr John Laing [8501]				
28489 - Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]				
28495 - Mr John Warner [5018]				
28499 - Sarah Louise Lapena [8965]				
28503 - Mrs Linda Watkinson [4984]				
28511 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]				
28514 - Ms Elizabeth Watson [8966]				
28522 - Mr Jon Watson [7112]				
28527 - Mr Tony Watson [8967]				
28532 - Mr Thomas Lennon [747]				
28535 - Mr Eric John Webb [1830]				
28542 - Mrs Susan Webb [4919]				
28546 - Mr John Lester [4396]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28552 - Ms Michelle Lockton [8968]				
28555 - Mrs Joan Westover [4635]				
28562 - Keith Lodge [8969]				
28567 - Ms Maureen Wheeler [8970]				
28574 - Mr Andy Wilkins [8972]				
28577 - Graeme Logan [8971]				
28582 - Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]				
28587 - Mr Stuart Lucas [4956]				
28593 - Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]				
28594 - Sean Lucas [8973]				
28602 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097]				
28607 - Mr Alan Manning [8974]				
28612 - Ms Christine Wilks [8975]				
28615 - Duncan Maclaurin [8976]				
28622 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
28627 - Ms Elaine Williams [8159]				
28632 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141]				
28637 - Mr John Wollaston [8183]				
28642 - Mrs Marion Woolaston [8397]				
28647 - Mr Kevin Wood [6965]				
28652 - Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]				
28657 - Mr Neal Woodford [8978]				
28662 - Mr Matthew Woodward [8979]				
28667 - Ms Ann Wright [8980]				
28672 - Mrs Karen York [8748]				
28677 - Ms Barbara Young [8981]				
28682 - Charlie Pyke [8982]				
28687 - Ms Hannah Pyke [8983]				
28692 - Mr Harry Pyke [8984]				
28697 - Mr Stephen Pyke [8985]				
28702 - Ms Eve Pulford [8987]				
28707 - Mr Daniel Pulford [8988]				
28712 - Mr Brian Marchant [8569]				
28724 - Mrs Jane Marr [6006]				
28727 - Surrell McGovern [8991]				
28731 - Tom McLaren [8992]				
28736 - Mrs. Susan Miers [8695]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28741 - Mr Colin Miers [3959]				
28746 - Alex Mills [8993]				
28751 - Mrs Diane Mills [8533]				
28756 - Greg Mills [8994]				
28761 - Ms Karen Page [9000]				
28766 - Ms Marquite Peacham [8999]				
28771 - Ms Janice Plummer [8997]				
28776 - Ms Judith Phillips [8615]				
28781 - Mrs Jill Pritchard [4269]				
28786 - Mrs Irene Power [8610]				
28791 - Mr Stephen Poulton [8149]				
28795 - Mrs Carol Poulton [8119]				
28801 - Miss Natasha Playle [4291]				
28806 - Ms Polyblank [8996]				
28811 - Ms Gillian Pope [8995]				
28816 - Lloyd Piper [8616]				
28821 - Mr Frederick Piper [8380]				
28827 - Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]				
28828 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]				
28836 - Mr Douglas Piper [603]				
28841 - Mr Gary Dimond [7055]				
28846 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
28851 - Mr Conrad Dixon [8688]				
28856 - Mrs Jennifer Dodd [5498]				
28861 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828]				
28864 - Jack Mills [9001]				
28871 - Carla Downton [9002]				
28876 - Jane Mills [9003]				
28881 - Mr Stephen Downton [8432]				
28886 - Mr Peter Mills [6982]				
28891 - Christine Drew [9004]				
28895 - Anna Dunk [8426]				
28898 - Toby Mills [9005]				
28905 - Dennis Mitchell [9006]				
28910 - Mrs Lorna Mitchell [8391]				
28916 - Mr Sean Moore [8520]				
28920 - Mrs Shui-Lin Moore [8521]				
28925 - Anastasia Mootoosamy [9007]				
28930 - John Moppett [9008]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28935 - Mr Bryan Moreton [8513]				
28940 - Gloria Moreton [9009]				
28945 - Samantha Dunk [8438]				
28950 - Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]				
28955 - Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]				
28960 - Mr John Eaton [8124]				
28965 - Kirsty Edwards [8450]				
28970 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477]				
28975 - J Ellis [9010]				
28980 - Matthew Emerson [9011]				
28985 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]				
28990 - Mr Mark Morgan [4987]				
28995 - Mrs Michelle Morgan [4505]				
29000 - Mrs Lesley Moss [7053]				
29005 - Mr and Mrs Brian and Lesley Moss [2905]				
29010 - Mrs Carol Moulder [4719]				
29016 - Stuart Moulder [4713]				
29020 - Mr Gerald Mountstevens [4911]				
29025 - Mr Lewis Pincombe [8745]				
29030 - Patricia Mountstevens [9012]				
29034 - Mrs Janet Pincombe [8614]				
29044 - Mrs Lindsey Pavitt [8746]				
29049 - Dr Murray Wood [7003]				
29054 - Mr Anthony Pavitt [8747]				
29059 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
29064 - Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]				
29069 - Mr Tony Parris [9013]				
29074 - Ms Janet Parris [8315]				
29079 - Ms Sheena Parish [9014]				
29084 - Mrs Beth Pardoe [8613]				
29089 - Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]				
29094 - Mr Andrew Pallet [1313]				
29099 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
29104 - Callie Emmett [9019]				
29109 - Mr Peter Owen [9016]				
29113 - MR David Emmett [8445]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29119 - Ms Amanda Owen [9017]				
29123 - Mr Jack Emmett [8372]				
29128 - Ms Jennifer Emmett [4896]				
29134 - Mr Joe Emmett [8436]				
29141 - Mr Scott Osborne [8456]				
29144 - Mrs Faye Osborne [8458]				
29149 - Mr John Orbell [4805]				
29155 - Mrs Gemma Olley [8462]				
29157 - Ann Eustace [9020]				
29163 - Mr David Olley [8461]				
29169 - Kathleen Evans [9021]				
29172 - Mr Neil O'Riordan [8630]				
29178 - Pat Fahy [9022]				
29184 - Pat Fearnley [9024]				
29189 - Mr Brett O'Hara [9023]				
29194 - Mr Andrew O'Hara [9025]				
29199 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29204 - Ms Suzanne O'Hara [9026]				
29209 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29216 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29219 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29225 - Ms Tracey O'Brien [9028]				
29226 - Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]				
29234 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]				
29240 - Mr Graham Gregory [9029]				
29249 - Mrs Anne Gregory [4305]				
29255 - Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460]				
29259 - Mr Richard Fisher [8480]				
29264 - Mr Christopher Fletcher [8470]				
29268 - Paul Fletcher [9030]				
29273 - Mr Colin Foreman [4394]				
29278 - Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]				
29283 - Sally French [9031]				
29288 - Mr Lee Fullick [8467]				
29293 - Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]				
29298 - Daniel Furnell [9032]				
29303 - Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29308 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 29313 - Mr Ian Garrett [4947] 29318 - Mrs Lorraine Murrell [8519] 29323 - Mrs Maureen Murrell [8560] 29328 - Mr Stephen Murrell [8517] 29333 - Mr Colin Newcombe [8598] 29338 - Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597] 29343 - Mr Stephen Newton [8601] 29423 - Mrs Niyazi [9039] 29428 - Ms Viola Sherwin [9040] 29433 - Mr Stephen Slaughter [9041]				
		<i>Increase number of homes back to a minimum of 55 and remove R25 and R26 from plan.</i>		

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
29241 - Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]	Object	<p>Brownfield sites should be prioritised over Greenfield, and Green Belt should not be released at all unless all other alternatives have been used to fulfil the target housing allocations. The number of homes should be increased back to a minimum of 55 and R25 &amp; R26 should be removed entirely. The brownfield sites around Blackmore have already been built on and do represent an opportunity to redevelop these lands without building on more land. There is the Redrose site, Aylings farm and the site at Dunton Village Gardens.</p> <p><i>The process that has been followed seems flawed. 1. The parish comments were not taken into consideration at the hearing when the decision was made by BBC because they ran out of time and the parish representations were not heard. 2. I do not believe that the local villagers concerns have been listened to or addressed, hence the strong feelings that have caused the formation of BVHA and so many responses for the size of our community. 3. There are other sites more suitable that have not been considered, eg. Stondon Massey Parish have welcomed opportunities for more housing to regenerate their village. 4. The broader development picture has not been looked at, the development plans of Epping Borough council and the already agreed building that is going on. 5. A proper impact study has not been completed looking at whether the village can cope with this level of development, looking at the whole picture of recent housing expansion not just the LDP.</i></p>	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	No change

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26560 - Mr Kevin Craske [2712]	Object	<p>The reduction in the number of homes from 55 to 35 (almost 40%) in the Crescent Drive area is purportedly due to i) inconsistency of character, ii) implications on traffic and safety, iii) Development on an urban open space, iv) environment, habitat and flood impact. Shenfield is an affluent area so any extra homes are unwelcome and out of character unless they are large and expensive. The need for homes must outweigh this and the council must find a way to build homes where needed, not where residents object on this basis. This is NIMBYISM of the highest order and should NOT be allowed. Come on Brentwood do the right thing by ALL borough residents not just the rich few! Crescent Drive to be a quiet almost traffic free area when I go to the Community Hospital so where is the traffic coming from? It is within 1 mile of the A12 so where is the issue with highway access? This sounds like a made up excuse to give padding to this reduction of home build in the area. It is nonsense. How can a suburban area have an environment and habitat and flood risk which is of more importance than Green Belt? Our area of green belt is under severe risk as it is with the Thames tunnel plan and Brentwood council are making matters worse by adding to this pressure. In a Green Belt borough emphasis should be on urban/suburban new build not on using green belt as an easy option. Why are Shenfield opinions more important than that of West Horndon opinions? These justifications appear fatuous to me and this proposed change should be rescinded as the council and planning department appear to be making fools of themselves. These are not serious justifications for a re-think, more like a plan to try and shift as much new build as possible as far away from Brentwood Town as possible. When all recent road improvements are on the A12 corridor and the high speed link on rail is coming to Shenfield surely it makes sense to put as many new homes as possible in that area which is also rich in the settlement hierarchy with good transport links, shops and open areas. So again there is an obvious disconnect with no joined up thinking.</p> <p><i>Return site housing number to 55</i></p>	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	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>
26776 - Philip Cunliffe-Jones [1406]	Object	<p>The addendum of focussed change to Policy R18 is not effective and not justified.</p> <p>(i) Paragraph 3 of the Focussed Changes Consultation states that a significant number of representations were received, and a summary of key concerns raised "include inconsistency with the character of the local area in regard to density; implications of increased traffic and associated safety; highway access; development on urban open space; environmental and habitats impacts; and flooding."</p> <p>(ii) No site appraisal justifying the proposed change appears to have been prepared. The character of the area was established by the Glanthsams Park Estate Development scheme and layout with some statutory and charitable modifications before the redevelopment of the main hospital site in 2011 with the transfer of land for a public woodland opens space, and a footpath between the hospital and the Regional Blood Transfusion site (R18). In addition to the footpath the R18 site benefits from an easement for a right of way connecting to Worrin Road.</p> <p>(iii) The proposed focussed change to R18 does not relate to the objectives of the Hospital redevelopment scheme and transfer of public woodland open space.</p> <p>(iv) These objections are supported by a serious caveat in the Addendum to the SA Report prepared by AECOM Infrastructure, and a conclusion which is couched in evasive language.</p> <p>(v) The Addendum is qualified by being in accordance with the established budget, and also states that information provided by third parties has not been checked. At paragraph 2.5.3 of the Addendum there is a caveat that costly "costly access and transport infrastructure upgrades will be required in order to ensure a good flow of traffic and support safe access by walking and cycling..... There is a need to question whether scheme viability could be adversely affected as a result in the reduction in the number of homes". In other words, the work has not been carried out to justify the soundness of the change</p> <p>(vi) The conclusion to the Addendum at paragraph 2.5.6 is equivocal. It makes the highly dubious assertion that a response to (some but not all) concerns has positive implications for community objectives while highlighting an unquantified degree of uncertainty concerning infrastructure, including</p>	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Shenfield. There is no proposal to change rights of way or access to existing woodland as part of the allocation. Policy R18 refers to protection and enhancement of landscape boundaries.	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>
		<p>community infrastructure at DHGV.</p> <p>(vii). It is open to the Council to make an order under the Highways Act creating a byway for all traffic over its easement. This would open up the public open space transferred in 2011, which has been the subject since then of encroachments and trespass. There are other options. However, the focussed change proposed seeks to take a line of minimum development with some onsite open space to avoid grasping the nettle of integrated planned development. This is unsound, unjustified and inimical to national planning policy objectives and not in the public interest. Document is not Sound</p> <p><i>Justification for change is needed and not provided. consider adjacent location proposals further.</i></p>		
26728 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Object	<p>NPPF para 31 requires planning policies to be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence. BBC need to be satisfied reduction in dwelling numbers is supported by appropriate evidence base, including: demonstrating site makes effective and efficient use of land (paragraphs 117, 118, 122 and 123 of the NPPF); is economically viable (paragraph 67); updated transport evidence base fully assesses transport implications. Proposed policy change does not address ECC's Pre-Submission Reg.19 consultation representations to this policy (March 2019). ECC's position has not changed on this matter.</p> <p><i>As a result of the reduction in dwelling numbers for this site allocation BBC should include, within the Plan evidence and supporting text for this Policy, details to demonstrate that the site allocation makes effective and efficient use of land, and is economically viable. BBC should also update its transport evidence base for the Local Plan to fully assess the transport implications of the change in dwellings numbers on this site allocation. The policy needs to be further changed to address ECC's representations to this policy made to the Pre-Submission Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation in March 2019. Document is not Sound.</i></p>	The Council will continue to work with ECC regarding the transport evidence base. Comments regarding the wording of policies in the Pre-Submission Local Plan are considered in the corresponding consultation statement.	The Council will continue to work with ECC regarding the transport evidence base. Comments regarding the wording of policies in the Pre-Submission Local Plan are considered in the corresponding 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>
26653 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]	Support	<p>Anglian Water note that it is proposed to decrease the amount of housing on this allocation site to address comments made as part of the previous consultation. As an infrastructure provider we closely monitor housing growth in our region to align our planned investment with additional demand for water recycling infrastructure. Therefore we have no comments to make relating to the focused change to Policy R18.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	The Council welcome and note the response.	No action
26694 - Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]	Support	<p>We support the following changes to the Pre-Submission Local Plan: * Policy R18 (Land off Crescent Drive, Shenfield): Reduction from "around 55" to "around 35 homes". We support the reduction in housing numbers at the allocation sites in Shenfield and Blackmore, as this is justified by the evidence base.</p> <p><i>Support welcomed</i></p>	Support welcomed and noted	No action
26705 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193]	Support	<p>Dunton hills garden village is being correctly planned and thought through in respect of the infrastructure to support housing developments ie schools doctors and road/rail links</p> <p><i>no change specified</i></p>	Support welcomed. The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	No action
26515 - Cllr Chris Hossack [1974]	Support	<p>The proposals for Crescent Drive would see an over concentration on housing here, the reduction is welcome and could well alleviate the concerns re flooding it also gives the policy more strength to resist over development</p> <p><i>Retain addendum change to plan</i></p>	Support for addendum amendment noted	No action

<b><i>Representations</i></b>	<b><i>Nature</i></b>	<b><i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i></b>	<b><i>Council's Assessment</i></b>	<b><i>Action</i></b>
26722 - Mr Barry Tydeman [8813]	Support	<p>I represent the Crescent Drive Residents Association. Broadly, we support we support Policy R18 for the Crescent Drive site: Reduction from 'around 55' to 'around 35 homes'. We have previously submitted that the Fairview application for this site be refused permission as contrary to Policies SP01, HP03 and HP14. Our petition had 500+ signatories against that proposal. We submit that it also fails the judge's decision criteria in Canterbury Council v Gladman Developments this year: a Planning Inspector must not decide in favour of an application meeting only one approved Development plan policy.</p> <p><i>Agree that reduction to around 35 homes is appropriate but are concerned the recent application is not suitable.</i></p>	Noted	No action
26788 - Historic England (Andrew Marsh) [8824]	Support	<p>Historic England: There are no designated heritage assets within or near to the site. Historic England has no comments to make on this focussed change.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	Comment welcomed and noted.	No action
26521 - Mr John Darragh [4862]	Support	<p>Support this provided developer makes contribution to community investment levy to give local residents some benefit.</p> <p><i>Ensure local residents gain from this development by community investments.</i></p>	Noted	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>
26739 - Mr Richard Owers [8816]	Support	<p>In principle we support the proposed changes to the policy R18 for the Crescent Drive site - Reduction from 'around 55' to 'around 35 homes' providing the planning application is for a development in keeping with the surrounding area, meets all the required planning criteria and is designed to reduce the future environmental footprint and impact by incorporating the latest sustainability construction methods, transport planning and provision for personal wellbeing. In particular we require the plan to allow for houses facing Crescent Drive (not flats and apartments) as this is in keeping with Crescent Drive and all surrounding roads, and that all new properties have sufficient off road dedicated parking to meet all the requirements of the residents of the new properties and their visitors. The height of any new development should be no higher than the current structure at any point so that the current visibility of all trees and vegetation is maintained.</p> <p><i>Support reduction. Plan needs to detail requirements for the site with a low density in line with adjacent area.</i></p>	Noted	No action
<hr/>				
<i>Policy R19: Land at Priests Lane, Shenfield (page 292)</i>				
26715 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195]	Object	<p>This site is brownfield and therefore in accordance with the government and local policy for brownfield sites to be prioritised over green belt then this number should not be amended. It also requires maximum densities to be maintained in such occasions</p> <p><i>The allocation for 75 houses should remain in order to avoid development on green belt land</i></p>	The site is previously undeveloped (greenfield) but is within the Brentwood urban area therefore not in the Green Belt. The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	No further action

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b></i>	<i><b>Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Action</b></i>
28287 - Andrew Stevens [8942] 29438 - Mr Peter Jakobsson [8177]	Object	<p>FOCUSSED CHANGE 3: POLICY R19 - Land at Priests Lane, Shenfield.(11% of total responses, March 2019)Defined as: Greenfield Land within Brentwood urban area / Settlement boundary. This is a site surrounded by existing housing, on a main road, and next to a railway line. This site is more suitable for residential development than more remote locations (EG Policies R25 and R26) and therefore should be built on before remote locations. I disagree - existing infrastructure should not be a relevant consideration. There is also strong local opposition to further building in Priest's Lane and this has to be acknowledged too.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan. Remove R19 from plan.</i></p>	<p>There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs. The sites have not been removed but reduced in capacity on the basis of local concern about development impacts.</p>	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>
26746 - Basildon Borough Council (Ms Christine Lyons) [8820]	Object	<p>Basildon Council objects to the Focussed Changes 1 - 5, as they do not seem to have been informed by evidence or the Sustainability Appraisal as required by National Policy. The amendments effectively redistributes 70 proposed dwellings from the 'Central Brentwood Growth Corridor', which has opportunities to embrace more sustainable modes of transport, to a Green Belt location with a less developed public transport infrastructure. The reasons for the amendments do not seem to be supported by the evidence and appear to be based solely on the considerable number of objections received in response to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation in March 2019. The Brentwood Sustainability Appraisal October 2019 concludes that; "It is difficult to draw strong conclusions, with the primary considerations being: A) decreasing the homes assigned to the Brentwood/Shenfield urban area by 50 may serve to reduce traffic through the problematic town centre AQMA, but any benefit would be marginal, and equally these are accessible locations suited to minimising car dependency; and B) increasing the number of homes assigned to DHGV by 70 is potentially associated with a degree of risk, noting the ongoing work being undertaken in respect of improving air quality along the A127 within Basildon Borough, and noting consultation responses received."</p> <p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF advises amongst other things that Plans should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Basildon Council has considered the two Growth Corridors identified in the Brentwood Borough Local Plan. It has reflected however that there are fundamental distinctions between them, which do not appear to have influenced site selection choices in a justified way. The Central Brentwood Growth Corridor is the location of nationally and regionally managed and maintained infrastructure - the A12 &amp; M25 (Highways England) and the Elizabeth Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Transport for London) and East Anglia Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Abellio East Anglia). Growth in this location would maximise this infrastructure investment. The South Brentwood Growth Corridor meanwhile, consists the</p>	<p>The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development.</p> <p>Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.</p>	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>
		<p>A127 (maintained by Essex County Council) and Essex Thameside Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by c2c).</p> <p>It is not considered that the two corridors offer comparable choices in terms of the strategic importance or capacity of transport connections, and using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the strategic infrastructure available. This would encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Such an alternative approach would be justified by evidence and align with national policy.</p> <p><i>Review plan</i></p>		
<p>26534 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477]  26577 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376]  26634 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]  26641 - Mr Adam Harris [8679]  29245 - Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]</p>	Object	<p>The number of proposed dwellings should not be reduced. This site, being fully enclosed on all 4 sides by building / major transport links, is much more appropriate for development compared to other greenfield and agriculturally viable sites included in the LDP. For example, the additional 30 dwellings that could be built here, would go part of the way towards enabling the removal of sites R25 and R26 from the plan.</p> <p><i>Keep the number of proposed dwellings to be developed on this site to 75.</i></p>	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	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>
26862 - Mrs Christina Atkins [8118] 26893 - L Apostolides [8836] 26898 - Mr Alex Atkins [8126] 26906 - Mr Christopher Atkins [8837] 26911 - Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703] 26916 - Ms Lynn Baggott [8721] 26921 - Mr David Hall [4867] 26926 - Mr Authur Austin [8838] 26931 - Mrs Gillian Hall [8684] 26934 - Mr. Clive Austin [7186] 26942 - Mr Harry Austin [8839] 26947 - Mrs. Jill Austin [7272] 26951 - Mr Kevin Hall [6734] 26956 - Mr. Chris Hamilton [3835] 26961 - Mrs Mandy Hamilton [8633] 26966 - Mr Jack Stevens [8840] 26971 - Mr Ronald Qusted [8452] 26974 - Mr John Adkins [8734] 26979 - Ms Anne Adkins [8735] 26984 - Mr Matthew Aiken [8827] 26989 - Kerry Allardyce [8828] 26994 - Mr Michael Bacon [8841] 26999 - Mr David Barfoot [7177] 27004 - Mr Liam Allardyce [8829] 27009 - Bernard Allen [8830] 27014 - Mr Mark Allen [8831] 27019 - Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200] 27024 - Toni Allen [8832] 27029 - Tallulah Allen [8833] 27034 - Mr Stephen Allington [8316] 27039 - Mr Brian Andrews [8834] 27044 - Ms Melanie Andrews [8826] 27050 - Mr Thomas Barrett [8842] 27052 - Ms Mandy Anthony [8737] 27059 - Mr Paul Anthony [6823] 27064 - Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651] 27069 - Mr Peter Bartrop [8650] 27074 - Ms Anita Bastin [8843] 27079 - Ms Pauline Davidson	Object	FOCUSSED CHANGE 3: POLICY R19 - Land at Priests Lane, Shenfield. (11% of total responses, March 2019). Defined as: Greenfield Land within Brentwood urban area / Settlement boundary. This is a site surrounded by existing housing, on a main road, and next to a railway line. This site is more suitable for residential development than more remote locations (EG Policies R25 and R26) and therefore should be built on before remote locations. Let Blackmore village undertake it's own survey for what the residents need - which will ONLY go on Brownfield. We should prioritise building on sites with, or close to, existing infrastructure. There is insufficient infrastructure in and around Blackmore, including health (general practice and practitioners - with the Deal Tree Health Centre under immense strain), bus service, roads and parking, schools, sewage, and the utilities including gas, electricity, telephones and internet.	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Blackmore and Shenfield.	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>
[6327]				
27084 - Mr Richard Bastin [8844]				
27089 - Mr James Baur [8845]				
27094 - Karen Baur [1079]				
27099 - Mr Kurt Baur [8846]				
27105 - Mr Gordon Beaman [8848]				
27110 - Mrs Eileen Beazley [8700]				
27117 - Mr Ron Beazley [4831]				
27120 - Mr Gary Bedford [8673]				
27125 - Mavis Beeching [8849]				
27130 - Mr. Robert Beeching [3839]				
27135 - Mr Cameron Beman [8850]				
27144 - Mr. Brian Rafis [4554]				
27149 - Ms Diane Randall [8851]				
27156 - Mr David Bennett [8649]				
27159 - Mr John Randall [8852]				
27164 - Mr Andy Davies [8853]				
27169 - Ann Davis [4404]				
27174 - Mr Robert Davis [4789]				
27179 - Ms Maria J Bennett [8723]				
27184 - Mrs Paula Bills [8854]				
27189 - Mr Arthur Birch [4769]				
27194 - Mrs Janet Birch [8730]				
27199 - Mr Peter Birch [8158]				
27204 - Mr Craig Bishop [8855]				
27209 - Mr Cliff Black [8729]				
27214 - Mrs Ruth Black [8728]				
27219 - Mr Tim Black [8248]				
27224 - Ms Pam Blackmore [8856]				
27229 - Ms Rosemary Blowes [8857]				
27236 - Mr Andrew Borton [8648]				
27238 - Alison Ratcliffe [8860]				
27246 - Mr Alan Bradley [8861]				
27249 - Mr Alan Hardy [8858]				
27254 - Mrs Ella Bradley [4875]				
27260 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
27262 - Mr Richard Brassett [8862]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27268 - Mrs Judith Brewster [8863]				
27276 - Mrs Kelly BRITTLETON [8097]				
27279 - D. Rawlings [1058]				
27284 - Mr Robert J Brittleton [8724]				
27288 - Mrs Lisa Rawlings [8555]				
27292 - David Hammond [577]				
27297 - Mrs June Harrington [4776]				
27303 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011]				
27309 - Mrs Susan Rayner [8553]				
27314 - David Read [8864]				
27317 - Mr Lawrence Harrington [4778]				
27322 - Vera Read [8865]				
27327 - Ms Tina Harrington [4779]				
27334 - Mrs Margaret Brooks [8683]				
27340 - Mr Adam Harris [8679]				
27342 - Mr Ray Brooks [8643]				
27349 - Mr Andrew Harris [8628]				
27354 - Mr. James Harris [8678]				
27359 - Laura Harris [8685]				
27366 - Susan Harris [8686]				
27369 - Mrs Sara Harris [8122]				
27374 - Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]				
27379 - Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]				
27384 - Miss Jade Hayes [8136]				
27389 - Mrs Helen Haynes [8416]				
27396 - Mr Michael Haynes [8138]				
27401 - Mr Simon Heed [8868]				
27406 - Mr Raymond Hatfield [8869]				
27411 - Ms Joanne Browne [8870]				
27416 - Mr Colin Budd [8871]				
27421 - Mrs Kathleen Budd [8872]				
27428 - Mr Richard Reed [4708]				
27429 - Mr Carl Budge [8873]				
27436 - Theresa Reed [8876]				
27442 - Ms Kaye Bundy [8874]				
27444 - Mrs Irene Richardson [4859]				
27452 - Ian Richardson [8878]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27457 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
27462 - Mr Keith Richardson [8192]				
27466 - Mrs Sandra Richardson [7330]				
27470 - Mrs Beryl Burgess [5030]				
27476 - Mr Simon Richardson [8562]				
27481 - Mrs Sue Rigley [8879]				
27486 - Steve Rigley [8880]				
27492 - Mr Peter Burgess [4863]				
27497 - Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]				
27501 - Mr Shaun Burnett [8881]				
27508 - Jaqueline Robinson [8883]				
27510 - Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]				
27517 - Ms Jean Bury [8716]				
27522 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899]				
27527 - Mr Thomas Bury [8717]				
27532 - Mr David Rolfs [8566]				
27537 - Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]				
27542 - Andrew Romang [8884]				
27551 - Mrs Maureen Butler [5017]				
27556 - Ms Bonnie Cain [8886]				
27561 - Ms Janet Carter [8887]				
27566 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
27571 - Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]				
27576 - Mr Richard Romang [4374]				
27581 - Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]				
27586 - Joanne Ryan [8889]				
27591 - Nichola Ryan [8890]				
27596 - Mr Peter Ryan [4937]				
27601 - Robert Ryan [8891]				
27607 - Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]				
27610 - Mr Christopher Sanders [8474]				
27616 - Mr Gary Sanders [4923]				
27621 - Mr. David Cartwright				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[7193] 27627 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright				
[7195] 27631 - Mrs Malanie Sanders				
[8511] 27636 - Mr Barry Casswell [8888]				
27641 - Mrs Irene Saunders				
[8386] 27646 - Mrs Beryl Caton [8657]				
27653 - Ms Marjorie Herring				
[8893] 27657 - Ronald Barry Saunders				
[8894] 27663 - Mr John Caton [4881]				
27668 - Mr David Saxton [4286]				
27671 - Mr Graham Hesketh				
[8634] 27675 - Mr David Chalkley [8671]				
27681 - Miss Carole Scott [8541]				
27686 - Ms Kim Chalkney [8895]				
27689 - Stephen Scott [8896]				
27694 - Ms Susan Hill [8897]				
27699 - Kerry Hipgrave [8898]				
27704 - Mr Rick Hipgrave [8899]				
27709 - Kay Hobbs [8900]				
27715 - Mr Andrew Chambers				
[8300] 27719 - Mrs Mandy Chambers				
[4846] 27724 - Mrs Trina Chambers				
[8348] 27729 - Ms Julie Chandler [8352]				
27734 - Mrs Anita Clark [8168]				
27739 - Mr Joshua Clark [8135]				
27744 - Mr Martin Clark [2456]				
27749 - Mr David Coates [8133]				
27754 - Mrs Danielle Cohen				
[8313] 27759 - Ms Karen Cohen [8901]				
27764 - Mr Marc Cohen [4268]				
27769 - Ms Wendy Cohen [6923]				
27774 - Mr Anthony Colbert				
[8902] 27779 - Mr Barry Coldham [8656]				
27784 - Mrs Louise Coldham				
[8666]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27789 - Mr Peter Cole [8903]				
27794 - Mr Brian Cook [8794]				
27799 - Mrs Joann Cook [8669]				
27804 - Mr Daniel Cracknell [8142]				
27809 - Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]				
27814 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]				
27819 - Mrs Christine Tabor [8427]				
27824 - Mr Frank Tabor [8424]				
27829 - Ms Gloria Tanner [8904]				
27834 - Miss Chloe Taylor [8429]				
27839 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978]				
27844 - Mrs Elisabeth Taylor [2918]				
27849 - Mr Gary Taylor [8905]				
27854 - Mr James Taylor [8430]				
27859 - Ms Nikki Taylor [8906]				
27864 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]				
27869 - Mr Steven Taylor [8431]				
27876 - Ms Shirley Taylor [8907]				
27877 - Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]				
27884 - Mrs Sila Sheridan [5201]				
27889 - Collin Sherwood [8908]				
27894 - Mrs Valerie Sherwood [8015]				
27899 - Mrs Maureen Slimm [5042]				
27904 - Mr Adam Smith [8910]				
27909 - Barry Smith [8911]				
27914 - Mr Ritchie Hobbs [8909]				
27919 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
27924 - Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]				
27929 - Ms Lauren Holbrook [8912]				
27934 - Miss Ami Holmes [8653]				
27939 - Mr Ben Holmes [8654]				
27944 - Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]				
27949 - Mr Ken Holmes [8691]				
27954 - Mr Luke Holmes [8652]				
27959 - Mr Mark Holmes [8655]				
27965 - Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]				
27974 - Mrs Jane House [8681]				
27979 - Mr Howe [8913]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27985 - Mrs Howe [8914]				
27989 - Mrs Elizabeth Thompson [5016]				
27994 - Ms Charlotte Howse [8915]				
28001 - Mr David Smith [4872]				
28005 - Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]				
28009 - Mr James Hughes [8677]				
28014 - Mr John Hughes [4500]				
28020 - Joyce Smith [8917]				
28022 - Mr Thomas Hughes [8637]				
28028 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735]				
28034 - Lesley Smith [8918]				
28041 - Marisa Smith [8919]				
28043 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
28050 - William Alan Smith [8920]				
28057 - Malcolm Hurford [7304]				
28060 - Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]				
28065 - Mrs Melanie Snelling [8547]				
28070 - Mr Peter Snelling [6960]				
28075 - Mr Alan Snook [8484]				
28080 - Mr Nicholas Thororgood [8916]				
28085 - Ms Annie Jackson [8921]				
28090 - Ms Emma Thwaite [8922]				
28095 - Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175]				
28100 - Mr Richard Thwaite [6964]				
28105 - Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475]				
28110 - Mr Derek Tillet [8923]				
28118 - Mrs Diane Smith [8388]				
28123 - Peter Southgate [8925]				
28128 - Vyvian Southgate [8926]				
28133 - Deborah Spencer [8927]				
28138 - Kevin Spencer [8928]				
28141 - Mrs Janet Jacobs [8692]				
28145 - Mrs Karen Tomey [8428]				
28150 - Liam Spencer [8929]				
28155 - Dean Spicer [8930]				
28161 - Paul Springate [8931]				
28166 - Mr Steven Jacobs [4408]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28169 - Mr Khodad Jahromi [8190]				
28174 - Gulay Jahromi [8933]				
28179 - Ms Mitra Jahromi [8934]				
28190 - David Janes [8935]				
28193 - Mr Michael Jefferyes [5175]				
28198 - Mrs Catherine Jennings [8693]				
28203 - Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]				
28208 - Nicola Joiner [8936]				
28213 - Aidan Jones [8937]				
28220 - Chloe Jones [8938]				
28223 - Diane Jones [8939]				
28228 - Miss Heather Jones [8318]				
28233 - Iris Jones [8495]				
28240 - Mr Michael Jones [8690]				
28245 - Ms Sophie Jones [8940]				
28254 - Mr Gary Staples [8526]				
28258 - Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]				
28263 - Brenda Juniper [8493]				
28268 - Mrs Jane Staples [8527]				
28273 - Mrs Ann Stenning [8546]				
28279 - Mr Michael Juniper [8129]				
28282 - Mr Terence Stenning [8544]				
28293 - Benjamin Stevens [8943]				
28297 - Christopher Kilian [8944]				
28301 - Mr Craig Stevens [4958]				
28309 - Lynn Stevens [8945]				
28315 - Sandra Stock [8946]				
28319 - Mrs Cynthia Kirby [8453]				
28323 - Lynne Stocks [8947]				
28329 - Mr David Kirby [8454]				
28333 - Richard Stocks [8948]				
28338 - Iain Stretton [8949]				
28343 - Samantha Stretton [8950]				
28348 - Jennifer Stucky [8951]				
28353 - Steve Stuckey [8952]				
28358 - Christine Swettenham [8953]				
28363 - Mr Colin Tomey [8448]				
28368 - Edward Davis [8954]				
28373 - Miss Harriet Davis [8440]				
28378 - Mrs Patricia Dean [8434]				



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28383 - Sharon Decastro-Bunce [8955]				
28388 - Allan Roy Dickinson [8956]				
28393 - Mr Louis Tregent [8924]				
28398 - Mr Paul Tregent [8437]				
28404 - Mrs Paula Tregent [8433]				
28408 - Mrs Evelyn Dickinson [8777]				
28413 - Mr Dennis Trumble [8418]				
28418 - Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029]				
28425 - Cariss Tsui [8694]				
28430 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
28435 - Mr Ian Tuffey [4621]				
28440 - Mr Giovanni Vaccari [8957]				
28445 - Mr Pete Vince [8123]				
28450 - Mr Ronald Wakelin [8958]				
28455 - Ms Natalie Walters [8959]				
28460 - Mr Richard Ward [8960]				
28465 - Ms Stephanie Kmiotek-Mutton [8961]				
28470 - Harry Krajicek [8962]				
28475 - Ms Madeline Krajicek [8963]				
28480 - Stephen Krajicek [8964]				
28485 - Mr John Laing [8501]				
28490 - Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]				
28496 - Mr John Warner [5018]				
28500 - Sarah Louise Lapena [8965]				
28504 - Mrs Linda Watkinson [4984]				
28512 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]				
28516 - Ms Elizabeth Watson [8966]				
28523 - Mr Jon Watson [7112]				
28528 - Mr Tony Watson [8967]				
28534 - Mr Thomas Lennon [747]				
28538 - Mr Eric John Webb [1830]				
28543 - Mrs Susan Webb [4919]				
28548 - Mr John Lester [4396]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28554 - Ms Michelle Lockton [8968]				
28558 - Mrs Joan Westover [4635]				
28563 - Keith Lodge [8969]				
28568 - Ms Maureen Wheeler [8970]				
28576 - Mr Andy Wilkins [8972]				
28578 - Graeme Logan [8971]				
28583 - Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]				
28588 - Mr Stuart Lucas [4956]				
28595 - Sean Lucas [8973]				
28596 - Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]				
28603 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097]				
28608 - Mr Alan Manning [8974]				
28613 - Ms Christine Wilks [8975]				
28617 - Duncan Maclaurin [8976]				
28623 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
28628 - Ms Elaine Williams [8159]				
28633 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141]				
28638 - Mr John Wollaston [8183]				
28643 - Mrs Marion Woolaston [8397]				
28648 - Mr Kevin Wood [6965]				
28653 - Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]				
28658 - Mr Neal Woodford [8978]				
28663 - Mr Matthew Woodward [8979]				
28668 - Ms Ann Wright [8980]				
28673 - Mrs Karen York [8748]				
28678 - Ms Barbara Young [8981]				
28683 - Charlie Pyke [8982]				
28688 - Ms Hannah Pyke [8983]				
28693 - Mr Harry Pyke [8984]				
28698 - Mr Stephen Pyke [8985]				
28703 - Ms Eve Pulford [8987]				
28708 - Mr Daniel Pulford [8988]				
28713 - Mr Brian Marchant [8569]				
28725 - Mrs Jane Marr [6006]				
28728 - Surrell McGovern [8991]				
28732 - Tom McLaren [8992]				
28737 - Mrs. Susan Miers [8695]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28744 - Mr Colin Miers [3959]				
28747 - Alex Mills [8993]				
28752 - Mrs Diane Mills [8533]				
28757 - Greg Mills [8994]				
28762 - Ms Karen Page [9000]				
28767 - Ms Marquite Peacham [8999]				
28772 - Ms Janice Plummer [8997]				
28777 - Ms Judith Phillips [8615]				
28782 - Mrs Jill Pritchard [4269]				
28787 - Mrs Irene Power [8610]				
28792 - Mr Stephen Poulton [8149]				
28797 - Mrs Carol Poulton [8119]				
28802 - Miss Natasha Playle [4291]				
28807 - Ms Polyblank [8996]				
28812 - Ms Gillian Pope [8995]				
28817 - Lloyd Piper [8616]				
28822 - Mr Frederick Piper [8380]				
28829 - Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]				
28831 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]				
28837 - Mr Douglas Piper [603]				
28842 - Mr Gary Dimond [7055]				
28847 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
28852 - Mr Conrad Dixon [8688]				
28857 - Mrs Jennifer Dodd [5498]				
28863 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828]				
28865 - Jack Mills [9001]				
28872 - Carla Downton [9002]				
28877 - Jane Mills [9003]				
28882 - Mr Stephen Downton [8432]				
28887 - Mr Peter Mills [6982]				
28897 - Anna Dunk [8426]				
28899 - Toby Mills [9005]				
28906 - Dennis Mitchell [9006]				
28911 - Mrs Lorna Mitchell [8391]				
28915 - Mr Sean Moore [8520]				
28921 - Mrs Shui-Lin Moore [8521]				
28926 - Anastasia Mootoosamy [9007]				
28931 - John Moppett [9008]				
28936 - Mr Bryan Moreton [8513]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28941 - Gloria Moreton [9009]				
28946 - Samantha Dunk [8438]				
28951 - Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]				
28956 - Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]				
28961 - Mr John Eaton [8124]				
28966 - Kirsty Edwards [8450]				
28971 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477]				
28976 - J Ellis [9010]				
28981 - Matthew Emerson [9011]				
28988 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]				
28991 - Mr Mark Morgan [4987]				
28996 - Mrs Michelle Morgan [4505]				
29001 - Mrs Lesley Moss [7053]				
29006 - Mr and Mrs Brian and Lesley Moss [2905]				
29011 - Mrs Carol Moulder [4719]				
29017 - Stuart Moulder [4713]				
29021 - Mr Gerald Mountstevens [4911]				
29026 - Mr Lewis Pincombe [8745]				
29031 - Patricia Mountstevens [9012]				
29036 - Mrs Janet Pincombe [8614]				
29038 - Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]				
29045 - Mrs Lindsey Pavitt [8746]				
29050 - Dr Murray Wood [7003]				
29055 - Mr Anthony Pavitt [8747]				
29060 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
29065 - Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]				
29070 - Mr Tony Parris [9013]				
29075 - Ms Janet Parris [8315]				
29080 - Ms Sheena Parish [9014]				
29085 - Mrs Beth Pardoe [8613]				
29090 - Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]				
29095 - Mr Andrew Pallet [1313]				
29100 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
29105 - Callie Emmett [9019]				
29110 - Mr Peter Owen [9016]				
29115 - MR David Emmett [8445]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29120 - Ms Amanda Owen [9017]				
29124 - Mr Jack Emmett [8372]				
29129 - Ms Jennifer Emmett [4896]				
29135 - Mr Joe Emmett [8436]				
29142 - Mr Scott Osborne [8456]				
29145 - Mrs Faye Osborne [8458]				
29150 - Mr John Orbell [4805]				
29156 - Mrs Gemma Olley [8462]				
29160 - Ann Eustace [9020]				
29165 - Mr David Olley [8461]				
29170 - Kathleen Evans [9021]				
29176 - Mr Neil O'Riordan [8630]				
29180 - Pat Fahy [9022]				
29185 - Pat Fearnley [9024]				
29190 - Mr Brett O'Hara [9023]				
29195 - Mr Andrew O'Hara [9025]				
29200 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29205 - Ms Suzanne O'Hara [9026]				
29210 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29218 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29220 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29227 - Ms Tracey O'Brien [9028]				
29230 - Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]				
29235 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]				
29242 - Mr Graham Gregory [9029]				
29250 - Mrs Anne Gregory [4305]				
29256 - Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460]				
29260 - Mr Richard Fisher [8480]				
29269 - Paul Fletcher [9030]				
29274 - Mr Colin Foreman [4394]				
29279 - Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]				
29284 - Sally French [9031]				
29289 - Mr Lee Fullick [8467]				
29294 - Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]				
29299 - Daniel Furnell [9032]				
29304 - Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]				
29309 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282]				
29314 - Mr Ian Garrett [4947]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29319 - Mrs Lorraine Murrell [8519]				
29324 - Mrs Maureen Murrell [8560]				
29329 - Mr Stephen Murrell [8517]				
29334 - Mr Colin Newcombe [8598]				
29339 - Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597]				
29344 - Mr Stephen Newton [8601]				
29350 - Mrs Tina Newton [8600]				
29354 - Mrs Karen Geary [8483]				
29363 - Beverley Gibson [9034]				
29364 - Doddinghurst Infant School (Ms. Ingrid Nicholson) [4339]				
29368 - Mrs Doreen Gray [9033]				
29372 - Mr Christopher Gill [8492]				
29379 - Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]				
29388 - Mr John Ginivan [8476]				
29389 - Mr Brian Gordon [9035]				
29394 - Mr Bruno Giordan [8104]				
29400 - Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709]				
29402 - Mr David Goodall [9036]				
29409 - Mrs M.H. Giordan [1540]				
29414 - Valerie Godbee [4943]				
29419 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]				
29424 - Mrs Niyazi [9039]				
29429 - Ms Viola Sherwin [9040]				
29434 - Mr Stephen Slaughter [9041]				

*Do not reduce housing numbers on R19. Remove R25 and R26 from plan*

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26627 - Punch Partnerships (PGRP) Ltd [8801]	Object	<p>The proposed reduction in housing numbers in Shenfield and Blackmore reduces housing numbers in sustainable settlements where growth is needed, and puts them in a less sustainable location. In relocating the units to the proposed strategic allocation at Denton Hills, the provision of these units will inevitably occur later in the plan period, when the focus should be on early provision to address the current housing land supply shortfall. The site at Spital Lane is an ideal candidate, having minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt, being capable of accommodating six houses without any risk of flooding.</p> <p><i>A much better solution would be to reprovide the units lost from the Shenfield and Blackmore allocations on sustainable sites in and around Brentwood. The site at Spital Lane is an ideal candidate, being located on the edge of the town close to services and facilities, having minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and as per the Environment Agency comments on the most recent planning application, being capable of accommodating six houses without any risk of flooding. We therefore advocate that Spital Lane be allocated for housing in the emerging plan, along with other suitable smaller sites identified in the SHLAA, to make up the housing numbers lost in Shenfield and Blackmore.</i></p>	<p>The strategy as proposed includes justification for the site allocations, alternative/additional sites have been considered but have not been selected. There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs. The sites have not been removed but reduced in capacity on the basis of local concern about development impacts.</p>	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>
26767 - Ursuline Sisters [28]	Object	<p>Strongly object to the 5 proposed changes, particularly to R19 (change 3). The basis of this objection is that the proposed delivery of the housing, as set out within Appendix 1 of the Consultation Document is not achievable or viable, and that the Plan should be considered as unsound. Furthermore the reallocation of the 30 units from Policy R19 is not justified or supported by any evidence and ignores the evidence presented by the landowner.</p> <p>In respect of the reduction in numbers at Policy R19 Land at Priests Lane, there is no justification or evidential support for such a reduction. The landowner has provided Highways evidence to support much higher degrees of provision that will see the efficient use of land as required by the NPPF. Also highlighted are the many highway and pedestrian improvements that will enhance pedestrian accessibility and the wider highway network. There is great uncertainty about the ability to deliver the full DHGV allocation within the Plan Period. With a significant reliance on that allocation to achieve the full Housing Supply, it is not sustainable to remove the provision delivery of achievable units from other sites where such can be delivered in the early part of the Plan Period. The projected delivery of the DHGV allocation in terms of its commencement and the ongoing delivery rate through the Plan Period is considered to be unrealistic and unviable. It relies on achieving the delivery of the first units within 2 to 3 years of the Adoption of the Local Plan and then delivering housing at a very high rate through the final 7 years of the Plan Period. While these targets may be achievable in the best case scenario, the NLP study supports the opinion that for large projects, delivery is likely to take a much greater amount of time. The Council provide no evidence to support such lofty targets. These best case scenario projections should not be adopted as realistic delivery targets through the Plan Period. Reallocating 70 units to the latter stages of the Housing Trajectory only increase the likelihood of a failure to meet the full housing supply through the</p> <p><i>Return the indicative dwelling yield to 75. Do not make the Addendum changes to the plan.</i></p>	<p>There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs. Land at Priests Lane has not been removed but reduced in capacity on the basis of local concern about development impacts.</p>	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>
26738 - Miss Katherine Webster [6005]	Object	<p>I have made an objection (referee 26711) re the change to the Priests Lane site. I would like to add a comment to that objection, but was unable to amend the submitted comment. I would like to add that the utilities already seem to be operating at maximum satisfactory capacity, as we have low water pressure and frequently have drops in electricity supply when usage is high. Local residents are concerned that the infrastructure is not adequate to absorb the additional housing, and this continues to be the case even with a lower number.</p> <p><i>Remove R19 from plan</i></p>	Utility companies have been consulted throughout the Local Plan process and comments reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There have not been any specific concerns raised in relation to proposed development on the Land off Priests Lane.	No further action
26729 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Object	<p>NPPF para 31 requires planning policies to be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence. BBC need to be satisfied reduction in dwelling numbers is supported by appropriate evidence base, including: demonstrating site makes effective and efficient use of land (paragraphs 117, 118, 122 and 123 of the NPPF). Is economically viable (paragraph 67), updated transport evidence base fully assesses transport implications. Proposed policy change does not address ECC's Pre-Submission Reg.19 consultation representations to this policy (March 2019). ECC's position has not changed on this matter. BBC should also update its transport evidence base for the Local Plan to fully assess the transport implications of the change in dwellings numbers on this site allocation. The policy needs to be further changed to address ECC's representations to this policy made to the Pre-Submission Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation in March 2019. Document is not Sound</p> <p>ECC wish to continue to work collaboratively with BBC through to submission and examination stages to progress the necessary clarification and changes identified above, to enable ECC to support BBC at examination, and subsequent implementation of the Local Plan.</p> <p><i>As a result of the reduction in dwelling numbers for this site allocation BBC should include, within the Plan evidence and supporting text for this Policy, details to demonstrate that the site allocation makes effective and efficient use of land, and is economically viable.</i></p>	The Council will continue to work with ECC regarding the transport evidence base. Comments regarding the wording of policies in the Pre-Submission Local Plan are considered in the corresponding consultation statement.	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>
26774 - Turn2us [6753]	Object	<p>The AFC does not address the potential implications for the provision of accommodation for older people in light of the concerns it has identified in respect of proposed allocation R19. It neither explains why the site's potential to accommodate a care home is unaffected by the concerns it identifies, nor propose anything to address potential shortfall of this form of specialist accommodation assuming its potential to be provided here is affected.</p> <p><i>Allocate additional site to delivery at least 70 additional homes in the early years of the plan period (2022/23 - 2024/25). Site 219 (land at Rayleigh Road, Hutton) represents an ideal site to respond to the above.</i></p>	Policy R19 indicates that the site has the potential for provision of a care home, around a 40 bed scheme as part of the overall allocation. This would not be in addition to the overall provision of houses on the site.	No further action
26586 - Mr Lawrence Allum [5420]	Object	<p>The change to the sites at Priests Lane is a reduction in houses from 'around' 75 to 'around' 45, however, this number still has no evidential base. No change has been made to the wording of access points which I feel is a major issue, believing that access onto Priests Lane poses a health and safety risk which has not been addressed. The original application for 8 houses in Bishop Walk over 20 years ago was turned down which led to the number of houses restricted to 5 houses to comply with the access requirements at that time. By the same token, the same reasoning should apply even more so to 45 houses considering the significant increase in traffic and pollution.</p> <p>In the interest of restoring and increasing the playing fields for the adjacent Hogarth Primary School, which recently had its playing field area halved whilst doubling its pupil population, as well as for Endeavour School which also adjoins the sites, then these sites must be removed from the LP and set aside for this purpose. This is also in line with government policy to provide for the health of our nation's children and for their future wellbeing.</p> <p>With the rapid expansion of development in the rest of the borough, it would be forward thinking to set aside land for the inevitable need for more school places in the not too distant future.</p> <p><i>Remove R19 from plan</i></p>	The Transport Assessment which accompanies the Local Plan has assessed the cumulative effect of proposed development on the road network and sets out required mitigation which in turn is reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council considers that development on land off Priests Lane can achieve appropriate access arrangements subject to a planning application, in consultation with the Highway Authority. Where the site contributes either cumulatively with other proposals or individually towards identified impacts on the road network appropriate financial contributions will be sought. The policy requires consideration of vehicular access 'points' onto Priests Lane. The need for schools to grow is recognised in Policy R19 which sets out that the allocation could provide for additional land to allow for the adjoining Endeavour School to expand.	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>
26561 - Mr Kevin Craske [2712] 26805 - mr simon Fleming [7119] 26806 - Glenda Fleming [3779]	Object	The reason for the change to Policy R19 is purely due to representations from local residents and political pressure. The relevance of these concerns when considering site R19 in isolation have already been disputed. Based on the evidence on air quality, biodiversity, climate change mitigation, Community and well-being, economy and employment, heritage, flooding, housing, landscape, waste, water the R19 change is not justified. This latest reduction from 75 to 45 could adversely affect the scheme viability.  <i>Return R19 to 75 homes.</i>	The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in Shenfield.	No further action
26524 - Mr Barry Sawtell [5904] 26545 - Mr Barry Sawtell [5904] 26546 - Mrs Anne-Marie Hopcroft [7058] 26547 - Sigrid Miles [7767] 26554 - Ms Beryl Joyce Clark [1635] 26557 - Miss Vena Clark [5879] 26589 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 26590 - Mr Gavin Hennessy [5984] 26591 - Mr Richard Allum [6060] 26597 - Mrs Cath Kenyon [5999] 26598 - Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association (Mrs Cath Kenyon) [6046] 26599 - Mrs Jane Ballard [5532] 26600 - Mr Martin Ballard [8227] 26601 - Mr Martin Ballard [8227] 26663 - Mrs Sylvia Allum [5419] 26664 - Mrs Lisa Aspinall [6054] 26711 - Miss katherine Webster [6005] 26734 - Mrs Annette Moorhouse [5332] 26740 - Mrs Helen Pearson [5910] 26766 - Mr Russell Pearson [7499]	Object	We appreciate the reduction in house numbers from 75 to 45 addresses our concerns about inappropriate house density. However, it fails to address other concerns about the safety of a new access road and the suitability of Bishop Walk of an access considering the limited road infrastructure of Priests Lane and the already high traffic levels which will increase as a result of the various new housing developments in the area. It also does not reflect the Council addition of multiple access points. We think our existing objections are still valid and want them to be submitted along with the LDP, and continue to request a hearing. Priests Lane Neighbourhood Residents Association	The Transport Assessment which accompanies the Local Plan has assessed the cumulative effect of proposed development on the road network and sets out required mitigation which in turn is reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council considers that development on land off Priests Lane can achieve appropriate access arrangements subject to a planning application, in consultation with the Highway Authority. Where the site contributes either cumulatively with other proposals or individually towards identified impacts on the road network appropriate financial contributions will be sought. The policy requires consideration of vehicular access 'points' onto Priests Lane.	No action
		<i>Remove R19 from plan</i>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26695 - Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368] 26696 - Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]	Support	We support the following changes to the Pre-Submission Local Plan: Policy R19 (Land at Priests Lane, Shenfield): Reduction from "around 75" to "around 45 homes". We support the reduction in housing numbers at the allocation sites in Shenfield and Blackmore, as this is justified by the evidence base.  <i>No change proposed</i>	Noted	No action
26703 - Mr John Lester [4396]	Support	Infrastructure already in place, however this is a green field site and it would be preferable to build on a disused brownfield site nearby. Suggest the old Peugeot garage which has remained abandoned for years.  <i>Replace this site with the Peugeot Garage</i>	Land at 43-57 Ingrave (the old Peugeot Garage) has previously obtained planning permission (12/00725/FUL) and therefore was not considered for allocation in the local plan. The site is also included on the brownfield register.	No further action
26520 - Mr John Darragh [4862]	Support	Support reduction of number on this site provided 45 homes built are two bedroomed bungalows for older residents  <i>No change identified</i>	Noted. Policy HP01 Housing Mix would require that any applications for housing development are of an appropriate mix of dwelling types, sizes ad tenures to meet the identified housing needs of the Borough.	No further action
26654 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]	Support	Anglian Water note that it is proposed to decrease the amount of housing on this allocation site to address comments made as part of the previous consultation. As an infrastructure provider we closely monitor housing growth in our region to align our planned investment with additional demand for water recycling infrastructure. Therefore we have no comments to make relating to the focused change to Policy R19.	Noted	No action
26516 - Cllr Chris Hossack [1974]	Support	I support the reduction. Following the consultation responses it was clear there are concerns about the impact of traffic from additional dwellings at Priest lane. This reduction should reduce the commensurate number of vehicle movements but I accept this is a Brown Field site so would be very difficult not to accept some principle of development	Noted	No further action
26787 - Historic England (Andrew Marsh) [8824]	Support	Historic England: There are no designated heritage assets within or near to the site. Historic England has no comments to make on this focussed change.  <i>No change proposed</i>	Noted	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>
<i>Policy R25: Land North of Woollard Way, Blackmore (page 299)</i>				
26730 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Object	<p>NPPF para 31 requires planning policies to be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence. BBC need to be satisfied reduction in dwelling numbers is supported by appropriate evidence base, including: - demonstrating site makes effective and efficient use of land (paragraphs 117, 118, 122 and 123 of the NPPF) - is economically viable (paragraph 67) - updated transport evidence base fully assesses transport implications. Proposed policy change does not address ECC's Pre-Submission Reg.19 consultation representations to this policy (March 2019). ECC's position has not changed on this matter.</p> <p><i>As a result of the reduction in dwelling numbers for this site allocation BBC should include, within the Plan evidence and supporting text for this Policy, details to demonstrate that the site allocation makes effective and efficient use of land, and is economically viable. BBC should also update its transport evidence base for the Local Plan to fully assess the transport implications of the change in dwellings numbers on this site allocation. The policy needs to be further changed to address ECC's representations to this policy made to the Pre-Submission Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation in March 2019. Document is not Sound</i></p>	Refer to Pre-Submission Local Plan Chapter 3 for spatial development principles and sequential approach to site selection. The Council recognises the importance of making effective and efficient use of land whilst reflecting local character with appropriate densities. The Council will continue to work with ECC regarding the transport evidence base. Comments regarding the wording of policies in the Pre-Submission Local Plan are considered in the corresponding consultation statement.	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>
26562 - Mr Kevin Craske [2712] 26967 - Mr Jack Stevens [8840] 29351 - Mrs Tina Newton [8600] 29355 - Mrs Karen Geary [8483] 29365 - Doddinghurst Infant School (Ms. Ingrid Nicholson) [4339] 29366 - Beverley Gibson [9034] 29371 - Mrs Doreen Gray [9033] 29374 - Mr Christopher Gill [8492] 29380 - Mrs Joanne Gill [4758] 29382 - Mr Brian Gordon [9035] 29390 - Mr John Ginivan [8476] 29395 - Mr Bruno Giordan [8104] 29403 - Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709] 29404 - Mr David Goodall [9036] 29410 - Mrs M.H. Giordan [1540] 29415 - Valerie Godbee [4943] 29420 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]	Object	All comments apply to both sites. Greenfield/Green Belt land in a remote village location with inadequate infrastructure. The number of houses has been reduced by 10. For all the reasons stated in March 2019, this site should be withdrawn completely from the LDP. A reduction of 10 houses does not change fundamental problems - in particular the infrastructure and services of the historically significant Blackmore Village will not support this scale of development. The sites proposed are developer led and still have not been properly assessed against local housing needs. These sites should be removed. At the time of the Addendum, a large number of developments (not included within the LDP) are in various stages of progress. These will further degrade the infrastructure of Blackmore. In particular, there has been inadequate consultation and strategic planning between Brentwood and Epping Forest Councils, with EFDC considering/consenting to; 30 houses are currently under construction in Fingrith Hall Lane (1km from the Village) An additional 5 houses are going through planning in Fingrith Hall Lane There are other EFDC 'infill sites' in Nine Ashes (1km away) Within metres of the village there will be at least 10 large dwellings at Ashlings Farm (the entrance development within Blackmore Parish). Also within Brentwood running through the normal planning process is: Redrose Farm (12 dwellings) on a Brownfield site (see R26 comments) 5 starter units in Spriggs Lane - Approved; PP being sought/appealed in Spriggs Lane/Chelmsford Road, (9 dwellings) and any number of other Greenfield sites/opportunistic PPs sought by farmers and land owners. R25 and R26 should be completely removed from the LDP, as the pre-existing and future normal infill (and windfall) in the Blackmore area means this Village has more than shouldered the appropriate housing burden, which will already overwhelm our very limited resources and wholly inadequate infrastructure. In the Addendum, sites R25 and R26 (c50 dwellings) equate to 49% of Green Belt release in 'larger villages'. Brentwood and Shenfield urban areas are identified as having the highest housing need, yet two sites (R18 and R19) have now had their allocations reduced. Blackmore remains classified as a 'Category 3' settlement ('larger village'). Our population numbers	In line with National Policy sites need to be deliverable and the Council needs to engage with developers in order to assess deliverability. In addition the Council has assessed all of it's own land where it is available in terms of its deliverability. The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability. The Council remains engaged with its neighbours such as Epping Forest District Council on strategic cross boundary matters. With regards to windfall provision the Council has included a proportion within its overall housing provision. The Council believes that Blackmore is correctly identified within Category 3 in the settlement hierarchy due to the level of services currently available. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.	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>
		<p>are much lower than many other villages in this category - which have sufficient infrastructure and resources that Blackmore lacks. Blackmore is Green Belt and there is no identified need for additional housing on the scale proposed. Taking all the above factors into account, I am opposed to building on the Green Belt, and that sites R25 and R26 should be withdrawn from the LDP.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from the Plan.</i></p>		
26688 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	<p>The Sustainability Objectives specifically raise the need for Gypsy and Traveller communities to have SUITABLE access to services and health care. BBC spent resident's money fighting one unauthorised occupation of land in Blackmore and won. Regrettably they have now smuggled this land-grab in to the LDP as a new official site with no debate or notice. This increases the burden on Blackmore services and infrastructure. which is unable to deal with the existing increase of housing proposed by the LDP. If this is left in the LPD there should be some recognition by completely removing the new house burden R25 &amp; R26 imposed on the village.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from the plan</i></p>	<p>The Council needs to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers as part of overall housing need. The option to allocate existing traveller pitches has been proposal in previous iterations of the Local Plan.</p>	No further action

<b><i>Representations</i></b>	<b><i>Nature</i></b>	<b><i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i></b>	<b><i>Council's Assessment</i></b>	<b><i>Action</i></b>
26753 - Constable Homes Limited [7333]	Object	<p>Bidwells, on behalf of Constable Homes, is currently taking a scheme proposal through the formal pre-application process, the latest design of which demonstrates to the Council (and future Local Plan Inspector) that there are no insurmountable or limiting planning issues, including those referenced in the consultation document above, to the delivery of a development of the site for approximately 40 new homes in a policy-compliant manner. In the interest of transparency, our client's emerging masterplan for site R25 accompanies these representations at Appendix 1, which has been shared with key local interest groups. This plan is the culmination of many months' of work and dialogue with those members of Blackmore's community willing to engage with our client, and its design team has reflected every constructive request proffered to residents, including: An access off Nine Ashes Road instead of Redrose Lane (which also has agreement from ECC); A generous lattice of green spaces, including a new village green area abutting existing dwellings at Woollard Way; No vehicular access through either limb of Woollard Way; Retention of historic hedgerows; An integrative mix of market and affordable homes; Multiple pedestrian linkages to encourage resident to walk to village core (e.g. the tea rooms and Co-op convenience store); A new pedestrian crossing to link with the Primary School and Village Hall; Speed reduction measures to create a safer and more attractive northern approach to the village; and, Traditional-style architecture. We therefore object to Focused Change 4 because it is unduly restrictive and would fail to optimise the beneficial use of the Policy R25 site, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p><i>return indicative housing yield to previous figure</i></p>	<p>The Council expects for those promoting development to engage through both the plan-making process and eventually the decision-making process, work described including alternative access via Nine Ashes Road is noted. The Council has recognised the concerns that residents have in relation to the amount of development and its impacts. In order to mitigate this, the Council has attempted to limit the impact of development on the area and its character.</p>	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>
26525 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376] 26527 - Mr Tom Bennett [4388] 26529 - Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240] 26535 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477] 26537 - Mr Peter Jakobsson [8177] 26552 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735] 26555 - Mrs Rosalind Rose [8557] 26566 - Mr Steve Mitchell [8535] 26568 - Mrs Lorraine Mitchell [8534] 26570 - Mr & Mrs Gunthardt [8790] 26575 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735] 26578 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376] 26580 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011] 26582 - Mr Kenneth Sexton [4860] 26584 - Ms Janet Parris [8315] 26596 - Mr. James Harris [8678] 26602 - Mr Alfred Larney [4990] 26608 - Susan Harris [8686] 26614 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848] 26616 - Mr Mark Morgan [4987] 26618 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612] 26621 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045] 26623 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 26628 - Punch Partnerships (PGRP) Ltd [8801] 26631 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880] 26635 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417] 26637 - Mr Graham Hesketh [8634] 26642 - Mr Adam Harris [8679] 26644 - Miss Jean Monery [8007] 26647 - Mr Richard Fisher [8480] 26649 - Mr Joe Clarke [7095] 26657 - Mr Andrew Borton [8648] 26665 - Mr Martin Clark [2456] 26673 - Ms Margaret Boreham [8033] 26675 - Mrs. Susan Kennard [8810] 26699 - Mr John Lester [4396] 26704 - Mr. David Cartwright	Object	Views have not changed and have in fact strengthened in the light of other developments that have arisen since February 2019. Potential residents of any development or developments be adequately warned of all the shortcomings and ongoing problems they might experience living in this village which have been raised by the BVHA during this consultation. The proposed reduction in the number of dwellings has been arbitrarily calculated. The proposed reduction has no scientific or evidence based reasoning and does not adequately address or mitigate the significant concerns and objections raised as part of the original LDP (Pre-submission, Regulation 19). The proposed change only reduces the proposed number of dwellings and not the size and extent of the site being developed, so the adverse impacts of the development would not materially reduce.  There are more suitable alternative sites in the borough which are able to absorb the number of dwellings proposed for this site. Does not address concerns about further strains on services and infrastructure within Blackmore, particularly school, GP and roads, the narrowness of Red Rose Lane (the only access to the site), potential for flooding and undue incursion of green belt land. New housing developments by Epping Forest DC at Ashling's Farm, Nine Ashes & former Equestrian Centre off Fingrith Hall Lane (~70 homes) haven't been considered, nor have the recent approvals at Red Rose Farm, Spriggs Lane or the pending application for the Travellers site on Chelmsford Road, Blackmore. These will add to the problems outlined	Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs.	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>
[7193] 26707 - Mr. David Cartwright				
[7193] 26710 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]				
26716 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright				
[7195] 26718 - Cllr. Andrew Watley				
[4869] 26720 - Mrs Susan Watley [8815]				
26732 - Mrs G Emms [8817]				
26735 - Mrs Joyce Prince [8806]				
26741 - Mrs Rosemarie Nelson				
[4529] 26754 - Mr John Riley [4905]				
26763 - Mr Brian harding [8821]				
26771 - Mr Michael Jefferyes				
[5175] 26863 - Mrs Christina Atkins				
[8118]				
<i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan.</i>				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26894 - L Apostolides [8836] 26899 - Mr Alex Atkins [8126] 26907 - Mr Christopher Atkins [8837] 26912 - Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703] 26917 - Ms Lynn Baggott [8721] 26922 - Mr David Hall [4867] 26927 - Mr Authur Austin [8838] 26935 - Mrs Gillian Hall [8684] 26936 - Mr. Clive Austin [7186] 26943 - Mr Harry Austin [8839] 26948 - Mrs. Jill Austin [7272] 26952 - Mr Kevin Hall [6734] 26957 - Mr. Chris Hamilton [3835] 26962 - Mrs Mandy Hamilton [8633] 26973 - Mr John Adkins [8734] 26978 - Ms Anne Adkins [8735] 26983 - Mr Matthew Aiken [8827] 26988 - Kerry Allardyce [8828] 26995 - Mr Michael Bacon [8841] 27000 - Mr David Barfoot [7177] 27003 - Mr Liam Allardyce [8829] 27008 - Bernard Allen [8830] 27013 - Mr Mark Allen [8831] 27020 - Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200] 27023 - Toni Allen [8832] 27028 - Tallulah Allen [8833] 27033 - Mr Stephen Allington [8316] 27038 - Mr Brian Andrews [8834] 27043 - Ms Melanie Andrews [8826] 27051 - Ms Mandy Anthony [8737] 27053 - Mr Thomas Barrett [8842] 27058 - Mr Paul Anthony [6823] 27065 - Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651] 27070 - Mr Peter Bartrop [8650] 27075 - Ms Anita Bastin [8843] 27080 - Ms Pauline Davidson [6327] 27085 - Mr Richard Bastin [8844] 27090 - Mr James Baur [8845] 27095 - Karen Baur [1079] 27100 - Mr Kurt Baur [8846]	Object	Land North of Woollard Way, Blackmore. Greenfield and Green Belt. (36% of total responses, March 2019). To be read in conjunction with Focussed Change 5 - All comments apply to both sites. Greenfield/Green Belt land in a remote village location with inadequate infrastructure. The number of houses has been reduced by 10. For all the reasons stated in March 2019, this site should be withdrawn completely from the LDP. A reduction of 10 houses does not change fundamental problems - in particular the infrastructure and services of the historically significant Blackmore Village will not support this scale of development. The sites proposed are developer led and still have not been properly assessed against local housing needs. These sites should be removed. At the time of the Addendum, a large number of developments (not included within the LDP) are in various stages of progress. These will further degrade the infrastructure of Blackmore. In particular, there has been inadequate consultation and strategic planning between Brentwood and Epping Forest Councils, with EFDC considering/consenting to; 30 houses are currently under construction in Fingrith Hall Lane (1km from the Village) An additional 5 houses are going through planning in Fingrith Hall Lane There are other EFDC 'infill sites' in Nine Ashes (1km away) Within metres of the village there will be at least 10 large dwellings at Ashlings Farm (the entrance development within Blackmore Parish). There has been inadequate consultation and sites R25 and R26 should be removed completely from the LDP. Also within Brentwood running through the normal planning process is: Redrose Farm (12 dwellings) on a Brownfield site (see R26 comments) 5 starter units in Spriggs Lane - Approved; PP being sought/appealed in Spriggs Lane/Chelmsford Road, (9 dwellings) and any number of other Greenfield sites/opportunistic PPs sought by farmers and land owners. R25 and R26 should be completely removed from the LDP, as the pre-existing and future normal infill (and windfall) in the Blackmore area means this Village has more than shouldered the appropriate housing burden, which will already overwhelm our very limited resources and wholly inadequate	Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs. The Council recognises the need to utilise brownfield and urban area sites before considering Green Belt release. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.	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>
27106 - Mr Gordon Beaman [8848]			infrastructure.	
27111 - Mrs Eileen Beazley [8700]			Sites R25 and R26 should be removed completely from the LDP.	
27114 - Mr Ron Beazley [4831]			In the Addendum, sites R25 and R26 (c50 dwellings) equate to 49% of Green Belt release in 'larger villages'. Brentwood and Shenfield urban areas are identified as having the highest housing need, yet two sites (R18 and R19) have now had their allocations reduced. Blackmore remains classified as a 'Category 3' settlement ('larger village'). Our population numbers are much lower than many other villages in this category - which have sufficient infrastructure and resources that Blackmore lacks. Blackmore is Green Belt and there is no identified need for additional housing on the scale proposed.	
27121 - Mr Gary Bedford [8673]			The allocation in Blackmore is disproportionate and unsound.	
27126 - Mavis Beeching [8849]			Taking all the above factors into account, I am opposed to building on the Green Belt, and that sites R25 and R26 should be withdrawn from the LDP.	
27131 - Mr. Robert Beeching [3839]				
27136 - Mr Cameron Beman [8850]				
27138 - Mr Ronald Qusted [8452]				
27145 - Mr. Brian Rafis [4554]				
27150 - Ms Diane Randall [8851]				
27157 - Mr David Bennett [8649]				
27158 - Mr David Bennett [8649]				
27160 - Mr John Randall [8852]				
27165 - Mr Andy Davies [8853]				
27170 - Ann Davis [4404]				
27175 - Mr Robert Davis [4789]				
27180 - Ms Maria J Bennett [8723]				
27185 - Mrs Paula Bills [8854]				
27190 - Mr Arthur Birch [4769]				
27195 - Mrs Janet Birch [8730]				
27200 - Mr Peter Birch [8158]				
27205 - Mr Craig Bishop [8855]				
27210 - Mr Cliff Black [8729]				
27215 - Mrs Ruth Black [8728]				
27220 - Mr Tim Black [8248]				
27225 - Ms Pam Blackmore [8856]				
27230 - Ms Rosemary Blowes [8857]				
27240 - Mr Andrew Borton [8648]				
27241 - Alison Ratcliffe [8860]				
27247 - Mr Alan Bradley [8861]				
27250 - Mr Alan Hardy [8858]				
27255 - Mrs Ella Bradley [4875]				
27263 - Mr Richard Brassett [8862]				
27265 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
27269 - Mrs Judith Brewster [8863]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27277 - Mrs Kelly BRITTLETON [8097]				
27280 - D. Rawlings [1058]				
27290 - Mrs Lisa Rawlings [8555]				
27293 - David Hammond [577]				
27298 - Mrs June Harrington [4776]				
27304 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011]				
27310 - Mrs Susan Rayner [8553]				
27315 - David Read [8864]				
27318 - Mr Lawrence Harrington [4778]				
27323 - Vera Read [8865]				
27328 - Ms Tina Harrington [4779]				
27330 - Mr Robert J Brittleton [8724]				
27335 - Mrs Margaret Brooks [8683]				
27343 - Mr Ray Brooks [8643]				
27345 - Mr Adam Harris [8679]				
27350 - Mr Andrew Harris [8628]				
27355 - Mr. James Harris [8678]				
27360 - Laura Harris [8685]				
27363 - Susan Harris [8686]				
27370 - Mrs Sara Harris [8122]				
27375 - Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]				
27380 - Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]				
27385 - Miss Jade Hayes [8136]				
27390 - Mrs Helen Haynes [8416]				
27397 - Mr Michael Haynes [8138]				
27400 - Mr Simon Heed [8868]				
27407 - Mr Raymond Hatfield [8869]				
27412 - Ms Joanne Browne [8870]				
27417 - Mr Colin Budd [8871]				
27422 - Mrs Kathleen Budd [8872]				
27430 - Mr Carl Budge [8873]				
27432 - Mr Richard Reed [4708]				
27437 - Theresa Reed [8876]				
27445 - Mrs Irene Richardson [4859]				
27447 - Ms Kaye Bundy [8874]				
27453 - Ian Richardson [8878]				
27458 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27463 - Mr Keith Richardson [8192]				
27467 - Mrs Sandra Richardson [7330]				
27477 - Mr Simon Richardson [8562]				
27482 - Mrs Sue Rigley [8879]				
27487 - Steve Rigley [8880]				
27493 - Mr Peter Burgess [4863]				
27498 - Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897]				
27503 - Mr Shaun Burnett [8881]				
27511 - Jaqueline Robinson [8883]				
27512 - Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618]				
27518 - Ms Jean Bury [8716]				
27523 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899]				
27528 - Mr Thomas Bury [8717]				
27533 - Mr David Rolfs [8566]				
27538 - Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567]				
27543 - Andrew Romang [8884]				
27547 - Ms Jan Butler [8885]				
27552 - Mrs Maureen Butler [5017]				
27557 - Ms Bonnie Cain [8886]				
27562 - Ms Janet Carter [8887]				
27567 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]				
27572 - Mrs Gillian Romang [8107]				
27577 - Mr Richard Romang [4374]				
27582 - Mr Clive Rosewell [8563]				
27587 - Joanne Ryan [8889]				
27592 - Nichola Ryan [8890]				
27597 - Mr Peter Ryan [4937]				
27602 - Robert Ryan [8891]				
27609 - Mr Callum Cartwright [8370]				
27612 - Mr Christopher Sanders [8474]				
27617 - Mr Gary Sanders [4923]				
27622 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193]				
27629 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[7195] 27632 - Mrs Malanie Sanders [8511] 27637 - Mr Barry Casswell [8888] 27642 - Mrs Irene Saunders [8386] 27647 - Mrs Beryl Caton [8657] 27654 - Ms Marjorie Herring [8893] 27656 - Ronald Barry Saunders [8894] 27665 - Mr John Caton [4881] 27669 - Mr David Saxton [4286] 27672 - Mr Graham Hesketh [8634] 27676 - Mr David Chalkley [8671] 27682 - Miss Carole Scott [8541] 27690 - Stephen Scott [8896] 27695 - Ms Susan Hill [8897] 27700 - Kerry Hipgrave [8898] 27705 - Mr Rick Hipgrave [8899] 27710 - Kay Hobbs [8900] 27714 - Mr Andrew Chambers [8300] 27720 - Mrs Mandy Chambers [4846] 27725 - Mrs Trina Chambers [8348] 27730 - Ms Julie Chandler [8352] 27735 - Mrs Anita Clark [8168] 27740 - Mr Joshua Clark [8135] 27745 - Mr Martin Clark [2456] 27750 - Mr David Coates [8133] 27755 - Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313] 27760 - Ms Karen Cohen [8901] 27765 - Mr Marc Cohen [4268] 27770 - Ms Wendy Cohen [6923] 27775 - Mr Anthony Colbert [8902] 27780 - Mr Barry Coldham [8656] 27785 - Mrs Louise Coldham [8666] 27790 - Mr Peter Cole [8903] 27795 - Mr Brian Cook [8794] 27800 - Mrs Joann Cook [8669]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27805 - Mr Daniel Cracknell [8142]				
27810 - Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]				
27815 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]				
27820 - Mrs Christine Tabor [8427]				
27825 - Mr Frank Tabor [8424]				
27830 - Ms Gloria Tanner [8904]				
27835 - Miss Chloe Taylor [8429]				
27840 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978]				
27845 - Mrs Elisabeth Taylor [2918]				
27850 - Mr Gary Taylor [8905]				
27855 - Mr James Taylor [8430]				
27860 - Ms Nikki Taylor [8906]				
27865 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]				
27870 - Mr Steven Taylor [8431]				
27878 - Ms Shirley Taylor [8907]				
27879 - Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]				
27885 - Mrs Sila Sheridan [5201]				
27890 - Collin Sherwood [8908]				
27895 - Mrs Valerie Sherwood [8015]				
27900 - Mrs Maureen Slimm [5042]				
27905 - Mr Adam Smith [8910]				
27910 - Barry Smith [8911]				
27915 - Mr Ritchie Hobbs [8909]				
27920 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
27925 - Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]				
27930 - Ms Lauren Holbrook [8912]				
27935 - Miss Ami Holmes [8653]				
27940 - Mr Ben Holmes [8654]				
27945 - Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]				
27950 - Mr Ken Holmes [8691]				
27955 - Mr Luke Holmes [8652]				
27961 - Mr Mark Holmes [8655]				
27966 - Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]				
27969 - Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]				
27975 - Mrs Jane House [8681]				
27980 - Mr Howe [8913]				
27983 - Mrs Howe [8914]				
27990 - Mrs Elizabeth Thompson				



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[5016] 27993 - Ms Charlotte Howse [8915] 27997 - Mrs Gail Hughes [8638] 28002 - Mr David Smith [4872] 28010 - Mr James Hughes [8677] 28016 - Mr John Hughes [4500] 28023 - Mr Thomas Hughes [8637] 28024 - Joyce Smith [8917] 28029 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735] 28035 - Lesley Smith [8918] 28042 - Marisa Smith [8919] 28044 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275] 28051 - William Alan Smith [8920] 28054 - Malcolm Hurford [7304] 28061 - Ms Dawn Ireland [4861] 28066 - Mrs Melanie Snelling [8547] 28071 - Mr Peter Snelling [6960] 28076 - Mr Alan Snook [8484] 28081 - Mr Nicholas Thororgood [8916] 28084 - Ms Annie Jackson [8921] 28091 - Ms Emma Thwaite [8922] 28096 - Mrs Deborah Thwaite [8175] 28101 - Mr Richard Thwaite [6964] 28106 - Mr Thomas Thwaite [4475] 28111 - Mr Derek Tillet [8923] 28114 - Isabella Jacobs [1695] 28119 - Mrs Diane Smith [8388] 28124 - Peter Southgate [8925] 28129 - Vyvian Southgate [8926] 28134 - Deborah Spencer [8927] 28139 - Kevin Spencer [8928] 28142 - Mrs Janet Jacobs [8692] 28146 - Mrs Karen Tomey [8428] 28151 - Liam Spencer [8929] 28156 - Dean Spicer [8930] 28162 - Paul Springate [8931] 28165 - Mr Steven Jacobs [4408] 28170 - Mr Khodad Jahromi				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8190]				
28175 - Gulay Jahromi [8933]				
28180 - Ms Mitra Jahromi [8934]				
28184 - Mr Peter Jakobsson				
[8177]				
28187 - David Janes [8935]				
28194 - Mr Michael Jefferyes				
[5175]				
28199 - Mrs Catherine Jennings				
[8693]				
28204 - Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]				
28209 - Nicola Joiner [8936]				
28214 - Aidan Jones [8937]				
28217 - Chloe Jones [8938]				
28225 - Diane Jones [8939]				
28229 - Miss Heather Jones				
[8318]				
28234 - Iris Jones [8495]				
28237 - Mr Michael Jones [8690]				
28241 - Ruth Jones [8485]				
28246 - Ms Sophie Jones [8940]				
28249 - Sylvia Stanley [8932]				
28255 - Mr Gary Staples [8526]				
28259 - Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]				
28264 - Brenda Juniper [8493]				
28269 - Mrs Jane Staples [8527]				
28276 - Mrs Ann Stenning [8546]				
28281 - Mr Michael Juniper [8129]				
28283 - Mr Terence Stenning				
[8544]				
28288 - Andrew Stevens [8942]				
28294 - Benjamin Stevens [8943]				
28299 - Christopher Kilian [8944]				
28302 - Mr Craig Stevens [4958]				
28310 - Lynn Stevens [8945]				
28316 - Sandra Stock [8946]				
28320 - Mrs Cynthia Kirby [8453]				
28324 - Lynne Stocks [8947]				
28330 - Mr David Kirby [8454]				
28334 - Richard Stocks [8948]				
28339 - Iain Stretton [8949]				
28344 - Samantha Stretton [8950]				
28349 - Jennifer Stucky [8951]				
28354 - Steve Stuckey [8952]				
28359 - Christine Swettenham				
[8953]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28364 - Mr Colin Tomey [8448]				
28369 - Edward Davis [8954]				
28374 - Miss Harriet Davis [8440]				
28379 - Mrs Patricia Dean [8434]				
28384 - Sharon Decastro-Bunce [8955]				
28389 - Allan Roy Dickinson [8956]				
28394 - Mr Louis Tregent [8924]				
28399 - Mr Paul Tregent [8437]				
28405 - Mrs Paula Tregent [8433]				
28409 - Mrs Evelyn Dickinson [8777]				
28414 - Mr Dennis Trumble [8418]				
28419 - Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029]				
28426 - Cariss Tsui [8694]				
28431 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
28436 - Mr Ian Tuffey [4621]				
28441 - Mr Giovanni Vaccari [8957]				
28446 - Mr Pete Vince [8123]				
28451 - Mr Ronald Wakelin [8958]				
28456 - Ms Natalie Walters [8959]				
28461 - Mr Richard Ward [8960]				
28466 - Ms Stephanie Kmiotek-Mutton [8961]				
28471 - Harry Krajicek [8962]				
28476 - Ms Madeline Krajicek [8963]				
28481 - Stephen Krajicek [8964]				
28484 - Mr John Laing [8501]				
28491 - Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]				
28497 - Mr John Warner [5018]				
28501 - Sarah Louise Lapena [8965]				
28505 - Mrs Linda Watkinson [4984]				
28509 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]				
28517 - Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]				
28518 - Ms Elizabeth Watson [8966]				
28524 - Mr Jon Watson [7112]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28529 - Mr Tony Watson [8967]				
28536 - Mr Thomas Lennon [747]				
28539 - Mr Eric John Webb [1830]				
28544 - Mrs Susan Webb [4919]				
28549 - Mr John Lester [4396]				
28556 - Ms Michelle Lockton [8968]				
28559 - Mrs Joan Westover [4635]				
28564 - Keith Lodge [8969]				
28569 - Ms Maureen Wheeler [8970]				
28572 - Graeme Logan [8971]				
28579 - Mr Andy Wilkins [8972]				
28584 - Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]				
28589 - Mr Stuart Lucas [4956]				
28597 - Sean Lucas [8973]				
28599 - Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]				
28604 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097]				
28609 - Mr Alan Manning [8974]				
28616 - Ms Christine Wilks [8975]				
28618 - Duncan Maclaurin [8976]				
28624 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
28629 - Ms Elaine Williams [8159]				
28634 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141]				
28639 - Mr John Wollaston [8183]				
28644 - Mrs Marion Woolaston [8397]				
28649 - Mr Kevin Wood [6965]				
28654 - Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]				
28659 - Mr Neal Woodford [8978]				
28664 - Mr Matthew Woodward [8979]				
28669 - Ms Ann Wright [8980]				
28674 - Mrs Karen York [8748]				
28680 - Ms Barbara Young [8981]				
28684 - Charlie Pyke [8982]				
28689 - Ms Hannah Pyke [8983]				
28694 - Mr Harry Pyke [8984]				
28699 - Mr Stephen Pyke [8985]				
28704 - Ms Eve Pulford [8987]				
28709 - Mr Daniel Pulford [8988]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28714 - Mr Brian Marchant [8569]				
28722 - Mrs Jane Marr [6006]				
28729 - Surrell McGovern [8991]				
28733 - Tom McLaren [8992]				
28738 - Mrs. Susan Miers [8695]				
28742 - Mr Colin Miers [3959]				
28748 - Alex Mills [8993]				
28753 - Mrs Diane Mills [8533]				
28758 - Greg Mills [8994]				
28763 - Ms Karen Page [9000]				
28768 - Ms Marquite Peacham [8999]				
28773 - Ms Janice Plummer [8997]				
28778 - Ms Judith Phillips [8615]				
28783 - Mrs Jill Pritchard [4269]				
28788 - Mrs Irene Power [8610]				
28793 - Mr Stephen Poulton [8149]				
28798 - Mrs Carol Poulton [8119]				
28803 - Miss Natasha Playle [4291]				
28808 - Ms Polyblank [8996]				
28813 - Ms Gillian Pope [8995]				
28818 - Lloyd Piper [8616]				
28823 - Mr Frederick Piper [8380]				
28830 - Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]				
28833 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]				
28838 - Mr Douglas Piper [603]				
28843 - Mr Gary Dimond [7055]				
28848 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
28853 - Mr Conrad Dixon [8688]				
28858 - Mrs Jennifer Dodd [5498]				
28866 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828]				
28867 - Jack Mills [9001]				
28873 - Carla Downton [9002]				
28878 - Jane Mills [9003]				
28884 - Mr Stephen Downton [8432]				
28888 - Mr Peter Mills [6982]				
28892 - Christine Drew [9004]				
28900 - Anna Dunk [8426]				
28901 - Toby Mills [9005]				
28907 - Dennis Mitchell [9006]				
28912 - Mrs Lorna Mitchell [8391]				
28917 - Mr Sean Moore [8520]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28922 - Mrs Shui-Lin Moore [8521]				
28927 - Anastasia Mootoosamy [9007]				
28932 - John Moppett [9008]				
28937 - Mr Bryan Moreton [8513]				
28942 - Gloria Moreton [9009]				
28947 - Samantha Dunk [8438]				
28952 - Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]				
28957 - Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]				
28962 - Mr John Eaton [8124]				
28967 - Kirsty Edwards [8450]				
28972 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477]				
28977 - J Ellis [9010]				
28982 - Matthew Emerson [9011]				
28986 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]				
28992 - Mr Mark Morgan [4987]				
28997 - Mrs Michelle Morgan [4505]				
29002 - Mrs Lesley Moss [7053]				
29007 - Mr and Mrs Brian and Lesley Moss [2905]				
29012 - Mrs Carol Moulder [4719]				
29014 - Stuart Moulder [4713]				
29022 - Mr Gerald Mountstevens [4911]				
29027 - Mr Lewis Pincombe [8745]				
29032 - Patricia Mountstevens [9012]				
29039 - Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]				
29041 - Mrs Janet Pincombe [8614]				
29046 - Mrs Lindsey Pavitt [8746]				
29053 - Dr Murray Wood [7003]				
29056 - Mr Anthony Pavitt [8747]				
29061 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
29066 - Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]				
29071 - Mr Tony Parris [9013]				
29076 - Ms Janet Parris [8315]				
29081 - Ms Sheena Parish [9014]				
29086 - Mrs Beth Pardoe [8613]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29091 - Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]				
29096 - Mr Andrew Pallet [1313]				
29101 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
29106 - Callie Emmett [9019]				
29112 - Mr Peter Owen [9016]				
29116 - MR David Emmett [8445]				
29121 - Ms Amanda Owen [9017]				
29125 - Mr Jack Emmett [8372]				
29130 - Ms Jennifer Emmett [4896]				
29136 - Mr Joe Emmett [8436]				
29139 - Mr Scott Osborne [8456]				
29146 - Mrs Faye Osborne [8458]				
29151 - Mr John Orbell [4805]				
29158 - Mrs Gemma Olley [8462]				
29162 - Ann Eustace [9020]				
29166 - Mr David Olley [8461]				
29173 - Kathleen Evans [9021]				
29177 - Mr Neil O'Riordan [8630]				
29181 - Pat Fahy [9022]				
29186 - Pat Fearnley [9024]				
29191 - Mr Brett O'Hara [9023]				
29196 - Mr Andrew O'Hara [9025]				
29201 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29206 - Ms Suzanne O'Hara [9026]				
29211 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29213 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29221 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29228 - Ms Tracey O'Brien [9028]				
29231 - Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]				
29236 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]				
29243 - Mr Graham Gregory [9029]				
29246 - Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]				
29251 - Mrs Anne Gregory [4305]				
29257 - Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460]				
29261 - Mr Richard Fisher [8480]				
29265 - Mr Christoper Fletcher [8470]				
29270 - Paul Fletcher [9030]				
29275 - Mr Colin Foreman [4394]				
29280 - Mrs Lucille Foreman				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8574] 29285 - Sally French [9031] 29290 - Mr Lee Fullick [8467] 29295 - Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464] 29300 - Daniel Furnell [9032] 29305 - Mrs Grace Furnell [8182] 29310 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282] 29315 - Mr Ian Garrett [4947] 29320 - Mrs Lorrain Murrell [8519] 29325 - Mrs Maureen Murrell [8560] 29330 - Mr Stephen Murrell [8517] 29335 - Mr Colin Newcombe [8598] 29340 - Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597] 29345 - Mr Stephen Newton [8601] 29425 - Mrs Niyazi [9039] 29430 - Ms Viola Sherwin [9040] 29435 - Mr Stephen Slaughter [9041]				
<i>Remove sites R25 and R26 from the plan</i>				
26680 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	It is not clear how to respond to the Soundness Test question below. By ticking the boxes am I saying it is OK ? or I don't like it because I am objecting. To avoid this confusion this is my view. I do not think the LDP has been Positively Prepared I do not think it is justified; I do not think it is sound.	Noted	No further action
<i>Remove R25 &amp; R26 from the LDP</i>				



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26748 - Basildon Borough Council (Ms Christine Lyons) [8820]	Object	<p>Basildon Council objects to the Focussed Changes 1 - 5, as they do not seem to have been informed by evidence or the Sustainability Appraisal as required by National Policy. The amendments effectively redistributes 70 proposed dwellings from the 'Central Brentwood Growth Corridor', which has opportunities to embrace more sustainable modes of transport, to a Green Belt location with a less developed public transport infrastructure. The reasons for the amendments do not seem to be supported by the evidence and appear to be based solely on the considerable number of objections received in response to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation in March 2019. The Brentwood Sustainability Appraisal October 2019 concludes that; "It is difficult to draw strong conclusions, with the primary considerations being: A) decreasing the homes assigned to the Brentwood/Shenfield urban area by 50 may serve to reduce traffic through the problematic town centre AQMA, but any benefit would be marginal, and equally these are accessible locations suited to minimising car dependency; and B) increasing the number of homes assigned to DHGV by 70 is potentially associated with a degree of risk, noting the ongoing work being undertaken in respect of improving air quality along the A127 within Basildon Borough, and noting consultation responses received."</p> <p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF advises amongst other things that Plans should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Basildon Council has considered the two Growth Corridors identified in the Brentwood Borough Local Plan. It has reflected however that there are fundamental distinctions between them, which do not appear to have influenced site selection choices in a justified way. The Central Brentwood Growth Corridor is the location of nationally and regionally managed and maintained infrastructure - the A12 &amp; M25 (Highways England) and the Elizabeth Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Transport for London) and East Anglia Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Abellio East Anglia). Growth in this location would maximise this infrastructure investment. The South Brentwood Growth Corridor meanwhile, consists the</p>	<p>The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development.</p> <p>Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.</p>	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>
		<p>A127 (maintained by Essex County Council) and Essex Thameside Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by c2c).</p> <p>It is not considered that the two corridors offer comparable choices in terms of the strategic importance or capacity of transport connections, and using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the strategic infrastructure available. This would encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Such an alternative approach would be justified by evidence and align with national policy.</p> <p>YYY</p>		
26550 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735]	Object	<p>Very concerned that Green Belt and rural green spaces are disappearing. This will impact on local health services, parking and safety due to increase in cars, the schools is full, there has already been a lot of new building. Brentwood town centre is affected by transport problems and the high street is changing for the worse.</p> <p><i>remove R25 and R26 from plan</i></p>	<p>The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land. Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	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>
26667 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] 26672 - Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]	Object	<p>Both the Parish Council and BVHA remain strongly opposed to the proposed allocation of Sites R25 (Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore) and R26 (Land north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore) for housing development. The proposed allocations, following the "focussed changes", are for "around 30 new homes" at R25 and for "around 20 new homes" at R26. The Parish Council and BVHA say that BBC can meet its Local Housing Need ('LHN') on preferable sites to R25 and R26. Further, the Parish Council and BVHA say that the LHN can be met without sites R25 and R26 at all.</p> <p>Greater use of Dunton Hills Garden Village with higher densities; greater use of sites R18 and R19 with higher densities rather than lower as proposed and are more sustainable town sites; the existing windfall development rate in Blackmore is appropriate; nearby development in Epping impacts on infrastructure without contribution;</p> <p>Therefore the Parish Council and BVHA recognise that proposed allocation on sites R25 and R26 has been reduced following "focussed changes".</p> <p>However, both the Parish Council and BVHA maintain that the LHN can be met on more suitable and/or sustainable sites elsewhere in the Borough.</p> <p>BBC have not considered increasing housing density on the Dunton Hills Garden Village site. A modest increase in density may negate the need for both the Shenfield (R18 and R19) and Blackmore (R25 and R26) sites. The Shenfield sites are clearly in more sustainable locations (as confirmed by the Sustainability Appraisal scores) but are surrounded by built form development but also transport links/infrastructure. Thus, the inclusion of sites R18 and R19 will not lead to coalescence nor erode the countryside/Green Belt. Sites R18 and R19 should be allocated in preference to the Blackmore sites (R25 and R26).</p> <p>There is no need for the Blackmore sites if the allocation on the Shenfield sites is reinstated. Namely, the 50 dwellings removed from sites R18 and R19 would, if reinstated, entirely negate the need to allocate sites R25 and R26. Moreover, there is no evidence that BBC have considered increasing housing density on sites R18 and R19; both of which could take a higher housing density but particularly</p>	<p>The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in both Blackmore and Shenfield. Refer to Pre-Submission Local Plan Chapter 3 for spatial development principles and sequential approach to site selection. The Council recognises the need to utilise brownfield and urban area sites before considering Green Belt release. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.</p>	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>
		<p>the latter.</p> <p><i>The Plan, as amended by the focussed changes, is not sound with the inclusion of sites R25 and R26. The inclusion of sites R25 and R26 cannot be justified and their inclusion of these sites is contrary to national policy, particularly with regards to sustainable development and Green Belt land policies within the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>Brentwood Borough Council should amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate these sites for housing.</i></p>		
26686 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	<p>The Addendum of Focussed Changes has recognised a problem with the LDP and looks to reduce the damaging impact on the worst affected Allocated Sites based on a Council view that removal of any specific site was not "possible". In fact, it is possible to remove a site at this stage, just as it is at the next stage (if so directed by the Inspector). This artificially designated "Major" change of removing a site was shelved. Possibly as it had the negative potential consequence of getting BBC censured, or even possibly having the control of the process taken away from them by central government. Whilst the "Major" change was not palatable for BBC, it is the right option, and better than a superficial "Minor" reduction in numbers on R25 &amp; R26.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from the plan</i></p>	<p>The Council is still of the view that those sites which have a proposed reduction in housing numbers still represent suitable locations for sustainable growth which is why they have not been proposed to be removed.</p>	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>
26683 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	<p>It should be recorded that each item I have entered is a separate representation and should be logged as such. It has been publicised that Blackmore created c500 responses to the previous consultation. However if you look at these actual responses stored on the BBC portal you will see that in fact for R25 there are 1,026 separate respondents and for R26 there are 1,035 respondents. In addition many of these respondents raise multiple objection when their individual response is reviewed. e.g. Ref 23127 has 11 different objections but is only counted as 1 representation. It would seem that there has been deliberate understatement of the magnitude of local feeling about the inequities of the foisted upon Blackmore by the LDP. To put these numbers in perspective the BBC site shows the representations on other sites as: R01 15 comments; R02 29 comments; R03 18 comments.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from the plan</i></p>	<p>All comments that object made during consultations, as well as support, have been recorded in full and are publicly available. All comments are considered in the process of drafting the local plan in relation to their content. This consideration is of the issues that are relevant to policies and the evidence base and not the use of a statistical analysis of the numbers of objections.</p>	No further action
26752 - Constable Homes Limited [7333]	Object	<p>This approach does not appear to be abased on sound or proportionate evidence, it is simply a response to the quantum of representations submitted to the previous iteration of the Local Plan. It is a long-established planning principle that the number of representations received in respect of a particular topic is not in itself a material consideration. The evidence prepared by Constable Homes and Brentwood Borough Council, through previous rounds of Local Plan consultation, demonstrates that the previous amount of development earmarked for the site [around 40 new homes] is entirely appropriate.</p> <p><i>Return indicative dwelling yield to previous figure</i></p>	<p>The Council recognises the concerns of residents in trying to limit the impact of development on the area and its character.</p>	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>
26610 - Mrs Diane Smith [8388] 26612 - Mr William A Smith [8512]	Object	<p>We have already written to ask for our February forms to be passed on to the Inspector. However, we have now received from our Parish Council a request to write once again about the reduced plan on sites R25 and R26 the reduction on these sites from 70 to 50. There isn't the infrastructure to accommodate more large developments. Epping and Ongar Council have already built on the boundary without consultation or thought for how we will deal with sewage surface water, traffic, we ow only have village post office shop. Parking by visitors now is abysmal with a further 15 in Spriggs Lane and Red Rose Lane We cannot cope now. Redrose and Woollard Way are meadows not brownfield. There was an application for a very small house on a brownfield site on Orchard Piece you pushed that man who was in fact homeless to distraction, you behaved in a manner we never wish to see again it was disgraceful. Now it is OK to build on the field adjacent T26. 20 houses when you dealt with him you knew about R26 and kept quiet. The whole situation has been dealt with so badly we so not feel safe in official hands. We thank Chris Hossack for speaking to us at last we have a leader who listens. Please pass all our comments to the inspector we are so disgusted the way this LDP plan has been handled.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan</i></p>	<p>Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68).</p>	No further action
26548 - Mrs Evelyn Dickinson [8777]	Object	<p>While we welcome the decision to reduce the number of dwellings proposed for the above two sites we feel this would still put too great a strain on the village facilities. Therefore we strongly support the latest proposal to remove a further 20 houses from the Plan for Blackmore.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	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>
26889 - Cllr Roger Keeble [1990]	Object	<p>I agree that the information given by me in the February 2019 consultation can be shared with the planning inspectorate and programme office. That the allocations on both sites R25 and R26 are contrary to both national and local policies. The required housing need can be found on sites that already exist on land that exists in urban areas. Blackmore is classified as a larger village which is unsound and this is inconsistent with the NPPF Feb 2019, is not effective or justified. The area including Redrose Lane is liable to flooding, has poor access and will result in an increase in housing stock that is not in accordance with the present number of present properties and will add approximately 25% to the village size. Epping Forest District Council is continuing to build on their extreme boundaries around Blackmore almost doubling the BBC LDP requirements on R25 and R26. These properties will directly impact on Blackmore Village facilities and services. The school, doctors surgery and sewerage system are already oversubscribed. R25 and R26 are situated on very good Green Belt land and there are no special circumstances for building on these sites. The Brnetwood Replacement Plan 2005 tightly restricts development on Green Belt land. The R25 and R26 sites are "developer led" as admitted at Blackmore Village Hall meeting by senior planning officers. There is no evidence of a housing need in Blackmore. Regularisation of the Oaktree Farm Gypsy and Traveller site is not reflected anywhere else in the borough and again puts more strain on the local infrastructure. R25 and R26 have been discounted most recently as 2016 as unsuitable. There has been no change in circumstances locally to allow development here. Draft Policy SP02 refers to direct development in highly accessible areas R25 and R26 are in a very rural situation with poor transport connections. There are far more sustainable sites in the borough that could easily accept the 50 houses proposed in R25 and R26. These are in Shenfield, Pilgrims Hatch, Ingatestone and Brentwood where infrastructure is already in place. There is documentary evidence for a housing need</p>	<p>In line with National Policy sites need to be deliverable and the Council needs to engage with developers in order to assess deliverability. In addition the Council has assessed all of its own land where it is available in terms of its deliverability. The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability. The Council remains engaged with its neighbours such as Epping Forest District Council on strategic cross boundary matters. With regards to windfall provision the Council has included a proportion within its overall housing provision. The Council believes that Blackmore is correctly identified within Category 3 in the settlement hierarchy due to the level of services currently available. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.</p>	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>
		<p>but not for the villages which include Blackmore. There are other brownfield sites in the borough before Green Belt land is even considered for development and the inclusion of R25 and R26 runs contrary to this. The Green Belt should be respected in both these sites and therefore R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP.</p>		
		<p>Changes to Plan: R25 and R26 have been discounted most recently as 2016 as unsuitable. There has been no change in circumstances locally to allow development here. Draft Policy SP02 refers to direct development in highly accessible areas R25 and R26 are in a very rural situation with poor transport connections. There are far more sustainable sites in the borough that could easily accept the 50 houses proposed in R25 and R26. These are in Shenfield, Pilgrims Hatch, Ingatestone and Brentwood where infrastructure is already in place.</p>		
		<p>There is documentary evidence for a housing need but not for the villages which include Blackmore. There are other brownfield sites in the borough before Green Belt land is even considered for development and the inclusion of R25 and R26 runs contrary to this. The Green Belt should be respected in both these sites and therefore R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP.</p>		
		<p>Document is not Legal Document is not Sound Document does not comply with duty to cooperate</p>		
		<p><i>The Green Belt should be respected in both these sites and therefore R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP.</i></p>		



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28306 - Christopher Kilian [8944]	Object	As far as I'm concerned, green belt was put in place for a reason. This stinks of corruption.	The Council recognises the need to utilise brownfield and urban area sites before considering Green Belt release. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land. The Council takes accusations of corruption very seriously and refutes that any regulations have been broken in the drafting of the local plan and addendum. The Council has a full complaint procedure which can be found at: <a href="http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=1893">http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=1893</a>	No further action
<i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan</i>				
27140 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association [8568]	Object	Statistical summery of responses collected by a survey co-ordinated by the Blackmore Village Historical Society. All comments have been recorded individually. 515 responses were made to the survey.	Noted	No further action
<i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan</i>				
26684 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	The Addendum of Focussed Changes is presented as a single plan affecting 5 sites, but the individual elements do not have equal merit. All negative aspects relate to R18 & R19, whilst none relate to R25 & R26. Consequently R25 & R26 should be removed entirely and their allocation transferred to R01, R18 or R19.	The addendum of focussed changes lists proposed amendments to the Pre-Submission Local Plan, no weighting has been applied to any of these changes.	No further action
<i>Remove R25 and R26 from the plan</i>				
26655 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]	Support	Anglian Water note that it is proposed to decrease the amount of housing on this allocation site to address comments made as part of the previous consultation. As an infrastructure provider we closely monitor housing growth in our region to align our planned investment with additional demand for water recycling infrastructure. Therefore we have no comments to make relating to the focused change to Policy R25.	Noted.	No further action
<i>No change proposed</i>				

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26697 - Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]	Support	We support the following changes to the Pre-Submission Local Plan: * Policy R25 (Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore): Reduction from "around 40" to around "30 homes". We support the reduction in housing numbers at the allocation sites in Shenfield and Blackmore, as this is justified by the evidence base.  <i>No change proposed</i>	Noted	No further action
26522 - Mr John Darragh [4862]	Support	Support provided includes affordable housing  <i>No change proposed</i>	Policy HP05 proposes affordable housing for new development.	No further action
26517 - Cllr Chris Hossack [1974]	Support	I support this 25% reduction. This will alleviate the pressures on the village and village centre. We must be mindful of the proposed developments adjoining Blackmore in the Epping Forest District that will have a consequential impact on the village centre as occupiers of those properties will undoubtedly use the village centre facilities and these is already huge congestion in the village  <i>No specific change identified from that proposed by the Addendum</i>	Noted	No further action
26786 - Historic England (Andrew Marsh) [8824]	Support	Historic England state that site is in close proximity to the Grade II listed The Woodbines and Horselocks Cottage, the Wells Farmhouse and the Blackmore Conservation Area. Development on site will need to be sensitive to this edge of settlement location and relate to the open landscape around it and to the historic settlement it adjoins. The surrounding land is of historic interest and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Cumulative impacts of the development of this site and site R26 must be taken into account to ensure the setting of these heritage assets is not compromised.  <i>Development of this site will need to conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance these heritage assets and their settings. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan.</i>	Policy HP19 'Conservation and Enhancement of Historic Environment' will be applicable to site R25 in determining any future planning applications.	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>
26540 - Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]	Support	<p>For relevance of Chelmsford, Policy R25 and R26, located in Blackmore have a reduction in the number of dwellings for these site allocations. From 40 to 30 homes for R25, and 30 to 20 homes for R26. The capacity of Policy R01 (Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation) has increased from 2,700 to 2,770 to take account of the reduction in numbers from the sites identified. CCC continues to support BBC's proposed approach to housing and employment allocations which are unlikely to have any obvious adverse cross-boundary impacts on Chelmsford.</p> <p>BBC continues to meet its own housing need within its administrative boundaries and has not approached neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-operate to request other authorities help accommodate any unmet needs. This is supported by CCC.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	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>Policy R26: Land North of Orchard Piece, Blackmore (page 300)</i>				

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26671 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874]	Object	<p>Both the Parish Council and BVHA remain strongly opposed to the proposed allocation of Sites R25 (Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore) and R26 (Land north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore) for housing development. The proposed allocations, following the "focussed changes", are for "around 30 new homes" at R25 and for "around 20 new homes" at R26. The Parish Council and BVHA say that BBC can meet its Local Housing Need ('LHN') on preferable sites to R25 and R26. Further, the Parish Council and BVHA say that the LHN can be met without sites R25 and R26 at all.</p> <p>Greater use of Dunton Hills Garden Village with higher densities; greater use of sites R18 and R19 with higher densities rather than lower as proposed and are more sustainable town sites; the existing windfall development rate in Blackmore is appropriate; nearby development in Epping impacts on infrastructure without contribution;</p> <p>Therefore the Parish Council and BVHA recognise that proposed allocation on sites R25 and R26 has been reduced following "focussed changes".</p> <p>However, both the Parish Council and BVHA maintain that the LHN can be met on more suitable and/or sustainable sites elsewhere in the Borough.</p> <p>BBC have not considered increasing housing density on the Dunton Hills Garden Village site. A modest increase in density may negate the need for both the Shenfield (R18 and R19) and Blackmore (R25 and R26) sites. The Shenfield sites are clearly in more sustainable locations (as confirmed by the Sustainability Appraisal scores) but are surrounded by built form development but also transport links/infrastructure. Thus, the inclusion of sites R18 and R19 will not lead to coalescence nor erode the countryside/Green Belt. Sites R18 and R19 should be allocated in preference to the Blackmore sites (R25 and R26).</p> <p>There is no need for the Blackmore sites if the allocation on the Shenfield sites is reinstated. Namely, the 50 dwellings removed from sites R18 and R19 would, if reinstated, entirely negate the need to allocate sites R25 and R26. Moreover, there is no evidence that BBC have considered increasing housing density on sites R18 and R19; both of which could take a higher housing density but particularly</p>	<p>The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in both Blackmore and Shenfield. Refer to Pre-Submission Local Plan Chapter 3 for spatial development principles and sequential approach to site selection. The Council recognises the need to utilise brownfield and urban area sites before considering Green Belt release. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.</p>	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>
		<p>the latter.</p> <p><i>The Plan, as amended by the focussed changes, is not sound with the inclusion of sites R25 and R26. The inclusion of sites R25 and R26 cannot be justified and their inclusion of these sites is contrary to national policy, particularly with regards to sustainable development and Green Belt land policies within the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>Brentwood Borough Council should amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate these sites for housing.</i></p>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28291 - Mr Michael Juniper [8129]	Object	<p>I list below my objections to the two sites in Blackmore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The village is in a hollow and any increase of hard surfaces will increase the possibility of flooding.</li> <li>2) The village school is over-subscribed and the site quite small and the space for additional teaching area is limited.</li> <li>3) The local GP surgery is not within the Parish and it is virtually at full capacity. I have been told that the residents of the Elms Development have been advised to use this surgery.</li> <li>4) The public transport is limited and not full time</li> <li>5) The current sewage system is at full capacity and the services also need upgrading</li> <li>6) There is inadequate parking in the village, particularly at weekends with many visitors and cyclists</li> <li>7) Both sites are Green Belt</li> <li>8) The amount of traffic using Redrose Lane during construction will cause considerable disruption</li> <li>9) There has been development close to the village in Epping Council area and further houses are being built, the occupiers will use the village facilities.</li> </ol> <p>I have concern that there are at least five unoccupied houses in the Village which could be used and I would think there must be many more within Brentwood, are there any powers that the council has to acquire or lease these properties?</p> <p>On reading through the draft LDP there is no mention of any proposals for Doddinghurts or Stondon Massey, are there no sites in these Parishes?</p> <p>I notice that in the LDP that there is provision for Travellers Sites, does this mean that the unauthorised sites would be removed?</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan</i></p>	<p>Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council remains engaged with its neighbours such as Epping Forest District Council on strategic cross boundary matters. Sites have been promoted and identified across the Borough including on land around villages nearby to Blackmore, however, following assessment these were not considered to be appropriate. The Council needs to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers as part of overall housing need. The option to allocate existing traveller pitches has been proposal in previous iterations of the Local Plan.</p>	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>
26528 - Mr Tom Bennett [4388]	Object	<p>The proposed reduction from 40 to 30 does not address concerns about further strains on services and infrastructure within Blackmore, the narrowness of Red Rose Lane (the only access to the site), potential for flooding and undue incursion of green belt land. New housing developments by Epping Forest DC at Ashling's Farm, Nine Ashes &amp; former Equestrian Centre off Fingrith Hall Lane (~70 homes) haven't been considered, nor have the recent approvals at Red Rose Farm, Spriggs Lane or the pending application for the Travellers site on Chelmsford Road, Blackmore. These will add to the problems outlined above.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26</i></p>	<p>Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	No further action
26629 - Punch Partnerships (PGRP) Ltd [8801]	Object	<p>The proposed reduction in housing numbers in Shenfield and Blackmore reduces housing numbers in sustainable settlements where growth is needed, and puts them in a less sustainable location. In relocating the units to the proposed strategic allocation at Dunton Hills, the provision of these units will inevitably occur later in the plan period, when the focus should be on early provision to address the current housing land supply shortfall. The site at Spital Lane is an ideal candidate, having minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt, being capable of accommodating six houses without any risk of flooding.</p> <p><i>A much better solution would be to reprovide the units lost from the Shenfield and Blackmore allocations on sustainable sites in and around Brentwood. The site at Spital Lane is an ideal candidate, being located on the edge of the town close to services and facilities, having minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and as per the Environment Agency comments on the most recent planning application, being capable of accommodating six houses without any risk of flooding. We therefore advocate that Spital Lane be allocated for housing in the emerging plan, along with other suitable smaller sites identified in the SHLAA, to make up the housing numbers lost in Shenfield and Blackmore.</i></p>	<p>The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development.</p> <p>Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.</p>	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>
26670 - Blackmore, Hook End and Wyatts Green Parish Council (Parish Clerk) [1921]	Object	<p>Both the Parish Council and BVHA remain strongly opposed to the proposed allocation of Sites R25 (Land north of Woollard Way, Blackmore) and R26 (Land north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore) for housing development. The proposed allocations, following the "focussed changes", are for "around 30 new homes" at R25 and for "around 20 new homes" at R26. The Parish Council and BVHA say that BBC can meet its Local Housing Need ('LHN') on preferable sites to R25 and R26. Further, the Parish Council and BVHA say that the LHN can be met without sites R25 and R26 at all.</p> <p>Greater use of Dunton Hills Garden Village with higher densities; greater use of sites R18 and R19 with higher densities rather than lower as proposed and are more sustainable town sites; the existing windfall development rate in Blackmore is appropriate; nearby development in Epping impacts on infrastructure without contribution;</p> <p>Therefore the Parish Council and BVHA recognise that proposed allocation on sites R25 and R26 has been reduced following "focussed changes".</p> <p>However, both the Parish Council and BVHA maintain that the LHN can be met on more suitable and/or sustainable sites elsewhere in the Borough.</p> <p>BBC have not considered increasing housing density on the Dunton Hills Garden Village site. A modest increase in density may negate the need for both the Shenfield (R18 and R19) and Blackmore (R25 and R26) sites. The Shenfield sites are clearly in more sustainable locations (as confirmed by the Sustainability Appraisal scores) but are surrounded by built form development but also transport links/infrastructure. Thus, the inclusion of sites R18 and R19 will not lead to coalescence nor erode the countryside/Green Belt. Sites R18 and R19 should be allocated in preference to the Blackmore sites (R25 and R26).</p> <p>There is no need for the Blackmore sites if the allocation on the Shenfield sites is reinstated. Namely, the 50 dwellings removed from sites R18 and R19 would, if reinstated, entirely negate the need to allocate sites R25 and R26. Moreover, there is no evidence that BBC have considered increasing housing density on sites R18 and R19; both of which could take a higher housing density but particularly</p>	<p>The focussed changes take account of local concerns regarding development impacts in both Blackmore and Shenfield. Refer to Pre-Submission Local Plan Chapter 3 for spatial development principles and sequential approach to site selection. The Council recognises the need to utilise brownfield and urban area sites before considering Green Belt release. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.</p>	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>
		<p>the latter.</p> <p><i>The Plan, as amended by the focussed changes, is not sound with the inclusion of sites R25 and R26. The inclusion of sites R25 and R26 cannot be justified and their inclusion of these sites is contrary to national policy, particularly with regards to sustainable development and Green Belt land policies within the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>Brentwood Borough Council should amend the plan to retain R25 and R26 as Green Belt and not allocate these sites for housing.</i></p>		
26689 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	<p>4. The Sustainability Objectives specifically raise the need for Gypsy and Traveller communities to have SUITABLE access to services and health care. BBC spent resident's money fighting one unauthorised occupation of land in Blackmore and won. Regrettably they have now smuggled this land-grab in to the LDP as a new official site with no debate or notice. This increases the burden on Blackmore services and infrastructure. which is unable to deal with the existing increase of housing proposed by the LDP. If this is left in the LPD there should be some recognition by completely removing the new house burden R25 &amp; R26 imposed on the village.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from the plan</i></p>	The Council needs to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers as part of overall housing need. The option to allocate existing traveller pitches has been proposal in previous iterations of the Local Plan.	No further action
26719 - Cllr. Andrew Watley [4869]	Object	<p>My previous 2019 submission still stands. New sites on border or within Parish add 65 dwellings not included within LDP and not taken into account. All will use Blackmore infrastructure and facilities with no improvements planned. Red Rose Farm - brownfield - 12 dwellings not identified in LDP being built opposite proposed site. Stondon Massey requesting development but not in LDP. Oaktree Farm Plot 3 being included even though previously thrown out by the High Court. Illogical and sends wrong messages. The LDP not thought through and vague on numbers - uses 'around' to detail developments - open ended.</p> <p><i>Development reduced to zero homes.</i></p>	The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability. The Council remains engaged with its neighbours such as Epping Forest District Council on strategic cross boundary matters.	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>
26530 - Mrs Shirley Slade-Bennett [8240] 26536 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477] 26538 - Mr Peter Jakobsson [8177] 26551 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735] 26553 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735] 26556 - Mrs Rosalind Rose [8557] 26563 - Mr Kevin Craske [2712] 26567 - Mr Steve Mitchell [8535] 26569 - Mrs Lorraine Mitchell [8534] 26571 - Mr & Mrs Gunthardt [8790] 26574 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735] 26579 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376] 26581 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011] 26583 - Mr Kenneth Sexton [4860] 26585 - Ms Janet Parris [8315] 26595 - Mr. James Harris [8678] 26603 - Mr Alfred Larney [4990] 26604 - Mrs Doreen Larney [8502] 26605 - Mrs Doreen Larney [8502] 26611 - Mrs Diane Smith [8388] 26613 - Mr William A Smith [8512] 26615 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848] 26617 - Mr Mark Morgan [4987] 26619 - Mr Timothy Webb [5612] 26622 - Mr Kenneth Bailey [5045] 26624 - Mrs Pamela Bailey [8010] 26636 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417] 26638 - Mr Graham Hesketh [8634] 26643 - Mr Adam Harris [8679] 26645 - Miss Jean Monery [8007] 26648 - Mr Richard Fisher [8480] 26650 - Mr Joe Clarke [7095] 26651 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880] 26658 - Mr Andrew Borton [8648] 26666 - Mr Martin Clark [2456] 26674 - Ms Margaret Boreham [8033] 26676 - Mrs. Susan Kennard [8810] 26677 - Mrs Christine Blythe	Object	<p>We have already written to ask for our February forms to be passed on to the Inspector. The R25 and R26 the reduction on these sites from 70 to 50. There isn't the infrastructure to accommodate more large developments. Epping and Ongar Council have already built on the boundary without consultation or thought for how we will deal with sewage surface water, traffic, we now only have village post office shop. Parking by visitors now is abysmal with a further 15 in Spriggs Lane and Red Rose Lane We cannot cope now. Redrose and Woollard Way are meadows not brownfield.</p> <p>An application for a small house on a brownfield site on Orchard Piece was refused. This is inconsistent and we so not feel safe in official hands.</p> <p>R25 received 36% of total Reg 19 responses, R26 received 37% with a total of 73% for both sites.</p> <p>Greenfield / Green Belt land in a remote village location with inadequate infrastructure not able to support level of development. Site should be removed completely from LDP, reduction of 10 houses does not resolve issues. Site is developer led and still not properly assessed against local housing needs. There are a number of large developments progressing nearby which will further degrade the infrastructure of Blackmore. These include 30 homes under construction on Fingrith Hall Lane plus an additional 5 on the same road, infill sites in Nine Ashes and 10 dwellings at Ashlings Farm. Inadequate consultation and strategic planning discussions with Epping Forest DC regarding these developments in the wider area. Other developments include 12 houses at Redrose Farm, 5 starter units in Spriggs Lane, a further 9 houses on Spriggs Lane/ Chelmsford Road. Redrose Farm is a brownfield redevelopment opportunity (opposite R26) for 12 homes and will deliver part of our own Village plan as opposed to digging up Green Belt. It should therefore replace R26 in its entirety. Both R25 and R26 should be removed as the permitted and planned windfall development in the area will already overwhelm the limited resources and infrastructure of the Blackmore area.</p> <p>There are better alternative sites both within the village/Parish and the wider Brentwood Borough area. Honeypot Lane (022) was previously removed from the Local Plan which is a better location due to it</p>	<p>Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability. The Council remains engaged with its neighbours such as Epping Forest District Council on strategic cross boundary matters. The Council believes that Blackmore is correctly identified within Category 3 in the settlement hierarchy due to the level of services currently available. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.</p>	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>
[4718] 26685 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759] 26700 - Mr John Lester [4396] 26708 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193] 26709 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547] 26717 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright [7195] 26721 - Mrs Susan Watley [8815] 26733 - Mrs G Emms [8817] 26736 - Mrs Joyce Prince [8806] 26742 - Mrs Rosemarie Nelson [4529] 26755 - Mr John Riley [4905] 26764 - Mr Brian harding [8821] 26772 - Mr Michael Jefferyes [5175] 26864 - Mrs Christina Atkins [8118]		being on the edge of the Brentwood urban area, surrounded by existing housing, providing c200 houses. This should be reinstated as it would allow R18, R19, R25 and R26 to be removed whilst not adding the burden on R01. R25 and R26 equate to 49% of the Green Belt release in larger villages. Brentwood and Shenfield urban area are identified as having the highest housing need, yet two sites (R18 and R19) have now had the number of dwellings reduced. Blackmore remains classified as a Category 3 settlement (larger village). Our population numbers are much lower than many other villages in this category which have sufficient infrastructure and resources that Blackmore lacks.	We do not need anymore houses in Blackmore as we are a sustainable Village as we are, anymore Housing would be horrendous for this village, in particular more Traffic, Flood Risk, impact on Doctor Services, School etc.	
		<i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan</i>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26890 - Cllr Roger Keeble [1990]	Object	<p>I agree that the information given by me in the February 2019 consultation can be shared with the planning inspectorate and programme office. That the allocations on both sites R25 and R26 are contrary to both national and local policies. The required housing need can be found on sites that already exist on land that exists in urban areas. Blackmore is classified as a larger village which is unsound and this is inconsistent with the NPPF Feb 2019, is not effective or justified. The area including Redrose Lane is liable to flooding, has poor access and will result in an increase in housing stock that is not in accordance with the present number of present properties and will add approximately 25% to the village size. Epping Forest District Council is continuing to build on their extreme boundaries around Blackmore almost doubling the BBC LDP requirements on R25 and R26. These properties will directly impact on Blackmore Village facilities and services. The school, doctors surgery and sewerage system are already oversubscribed. R25 and R26 are situated on very good Green Belt land and there are no special circumstances for building on these sites. The Brentwood Replacement Plan 2005 tightly restricts development on Green Belt land. The R25 and R26 sites are "developer led" as admitted at Blackmore Village Hall meeting by senior planning officers. There is no evidence of a housing need in Blackmore. Regularisation of the Oaktree Farm Gypsy and Traveller site is not reflected anywhere else in the borough and again puts more strain on the local infrastructure.</p> <p><i>R25 and R26 have been discounted most recently as 2016 as unsuitable. There has been no change in circumstances locally to allow development here. Draft Policy SP02 refers to direct development in highly accessible areas R25 and R26 are in a very rural situation with poor transport connections. There are far more sustainable sites in the borough that could easily accept the 50 houses proposed in R25 and R26. These are in Shenfield, Pilgrims Hatch, Ingatestone and Brentwood where infrastructure is already in place. There is documentary evidence for a housing need</i></p>	<p>In line with National Policy sites need to be deliverable and the Council needs to engage with developers in order to assess deliverability. In addition the Council has assessed all of its own land where it is available in terms of its deliverability. The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability. The Council remains engaged with its neighbours such as Epping Forest District Council on strategic cross boundary matters. With regards to windfall provision the Council has included a proportion within its overall housing provision. The Council believes that Blackmore is correctly identified within Category 3 in the settlement hierarchy due to the level of services currently available. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.</p>	No further action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
		<p><i>but not for the villages which include Blackmore. There are other brownfield sites in the borough before Green Belt land is even considered for development and the inclusion of R25 and R26 runs contrary to this. The Green Belt should be respected in both these sites and therefore R25 and R26 should be removed from the LDP.</i></p>		
28305 - Christopher Kilian [8944]	Object	Regulations seem to be broken on a whim, and I can't help thinking this is all about lining someone's pocket.	<p>The Council recognises the need to utilise brownfield and urban area sites before considering Green Belt release. The Council has assessed that the Council cannot meet its overall housing needs without releasing Green Belt land.</p> <p>The Council takes accusations of corruption very seriously and refutes that any regulations have been broken in the drafting of the local plan and addendum. The Council has a full complaint procedure which can be found at:  <a href="http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=1893">http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=1893</a></p>	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>
26895 - L Apostolides [8836] 26900 - Mr Alex Atkins [8126] 26908 - Mr Christopher Atkins [8837] 26913 - Mr Joseph W E Atkins [8703] 26918 - Ms Lynn Baggott [8721] 26923 - Mr David Hall [4867] 26928 - Mr Authur Austin [8838] 26937 - Mr. Clive Austin [7186] 26938 - Mrs Gillian Hall [8684] 26944 - Mr Harry Austin [8839] 26949 - Mrs. Jill Austin [7272] 26953 - Mr Kevin Hall [6734] 26958 - Mr. Chris Hamilton [3835] 26963 - Mrs Mandy Hamilton [8633] 26968 - Mr Jack Stevens [8840] 26972 - Mr John Adkins [8734] 26977 - Ms Anne Adkins [8735] 26982 - Mr Matthew Aiken [8827] 26987 - Kerry Allardyce [8828] 26996 - Mr Michael Bacon [8841] 27001 - Mr David Barfoot [7177] 27002 - Mr Liam Allardyce [8829] 27007 - Bernard Allen [8830] 27012 - Mr Mark Allen [8831] 27021 - Mrs Janet Barfoot [7200] 27022 - Toni Allen [8832] 27027 - Tallulah Allen [8833] 27032 - Mr Stephen Allington [8316] 27037 - Mr Brian Andrews [8834] 27042 - Ms Melanie Andrews [8826] 27049 - Ms Mandy Anthony [8737] 27055 - Mr Thomas Barrett [8842] 27057 - Mr Paul Anthony [6823] 27066 - Mrs Carol Bartrop [8651] 27071 - Mr Peter Bartrop [8650] 27076 - Ms Anita Bastin [8843] 27081 - Ms Pauline Davidson [6327] 27086 - Mr Richard Bastin [8844] 27091 - Mr James Baur [8845] 27096 - Karen Baur [1079]	Object	Land North of Woollard Way, Blackmore. Greenfield and Green Belt. (36% of total responses, March 2019). To be read in conjunction with Focussed Change 5 - All comments apply to both sites. Greenfield/Green Belt land in a remote village location with inadequate infrastructure. The number of houses has been reduced by 10. For all the reasons stated in March 2019, this site should be withdrawn completely from the LDP. A reduction of 10 houses does not change fundamental problems - in particular the infrastructure and services of the historically significant Blackmore Village will not support this scale of development. The site should be removed from the LDP. The sites proposed are developer led and still have not been properly assessed against local housing needs. These sites should be removed. At the time of the Addendum, a large number of developments (not included within the LDP) are in various stages of progress. These will further degrade the infrastructure of Blackmore. In particular, there has been inadequate consultation and strategic planning between Brentwood and Epping Forest Councils, with EFDC considering/consenting to; 30 houses are currently under construction in Fingrith Hall Lane (1km from the Village) An additional 5 houses are going through planning in Fingrith Hall Lane There are other EFDC 'infill sites' in Nine Ashes (1km away) Within metres of the village there will be at least 10 large dwellings at Ashlings Farm (the entrance development within Blackmore Parish). There has been inadequate consultation and sites R25 and R26 should be removed completely from the LDP. Also within Brentwood running through the normal planning process is: Redrose Farm (12 dwellings) on a Brownfield site (see R26 comments) 5 starter units in Spriggs Lane - Approved; PP being sought/appealed in Spriggs Lane/Chelmsford Road, (9 dwellings) and any number of other Greenfield sites/opportunistic PPs sought by farmers and land owners. R25 and R26 should be completely removed from the LDP, as the pre-existing and future normal infill (and windfall) in the Blackmore area means this Village has more than shouldered the appropriate housing burden, which will already overwhelm our	The Council is still of the view that those sites which have a proposed reduction in housing numbers still represent suitable locations for sustainable growth which is why they have not been proposed to be removed. In line with National Policy sites need to be deliverable and the Council needs to engage with developers in order to assess deliverability. In addition the Council has assessed all of it's own land where it is available in terms of its deliverability. The Council has assessed local housing needs for the Borough and has proposed a strategy to meet that which it considers to be sustainable. The Council remains engaged with its neighbours such as Epping Forest District Council on strategic cross boundary matters. We recognise that not all development equally distributed across the Borough as there many other factors that need to be considered such as land availability and suitability.	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>
27101 - Mr Kurt Baur [8846] 27107 - Mr Gordon Beaman [8848] 27112 - Mrs Eileen Beazley [8700] 27113 - Mr Ron Beazley [4831] 27122 - Mr Gary Bedford [8673] 27127 - Mavis Beeching [8849] 27132 - Mr. Robert Beeching [3839] 27137 - Mr Cameron Beman [8850] 27139 - Mr Ronald Qusted [8452] 27146 - Mr. Brian Rafis [4554] 27151 - Ms Diane Randall [8851] 27161 - Mr John Randall [8852] 27166 - Mr Andy Davies [8853] 27171 - Ann Davis [4404] 27176 - Mr Robert Davis [4789] 27181 - Ms Maria J Bennett [8723] 27186 - Mrs Paula Bills [8854] 27191 - Mr Arthur Birch [4769] 27196 - Mrs Janet Birch [8730] 27201 - Mr Peter Birch [8158] 27206 - Mr Craig Bishop [8855] 27211 - Mr Cliff Black [8729] 27216 - Mrs Ruth Black [8728] 27221 - Mr Tim Black [8248] 27226 - Ms Pam Blackmore [8856] 27231 - Ms Rosemary Blowes [8857] 27242 - Mr Andrew Borton [8648] 27243 - Alison Ratcliffe [8860] 27248 - Mr Alan Bradley [8861] 27251 - Mr Alan Hardy [8858] 27256 - Mrs Ella Bradley [4875] 27264 - Mr Richard Brassett [8862] 27270 - Mrs Judith Brewster [8863] 27271 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] 27278 - Mrs Kelly BRITTLETON			<p>very limited resources and wholly inadequate infrastructure.</p> <p>Sites R25 and R26 should be removed completely from the LDP.</p> <p>SOUNDNESS AND HOUSING NEED: In the Addendum, sites R25 and R26 (c50 dwellings) equate to 49% of Green Belt release in 'larger villages'. Brentwood and Shenfield urban areas are identified as having the highest housing need, yet two sites (R18 and R19) have now had their allocations reduced. Blackmore remains classified as a 'Category 3' settlement ('larger village'). Our population numbers are much lower than many other villages in this category - which have sufficient infrastructure and resources that Blackmore lacks. Blackmore is Green Belt and there is no identified need for additional housing on the scale proposed.</p> <p>The allocation in Blackmore is disproportionate and unsound.</p> <p>Oppose building on the Green Belt, and that sites R25 and R26 should be withdrawn from the LDP</p>	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8097]				
27283 - D. Rawlings [1058]				
27291 - Mrs Lisa Rawlings [8555]				
27294 - David Hammond [577]				
27299 - Mrs June Harrington [4776]				
27306 - Mr Hugh Rayner [8011]				
27311 - Mrs Susan Rayner [8553]				
27316 - David Read [8864]				
27320 - Mr Lawrence Harrington [4778]				
27325 - Vera Read [8865]				
27329 - Ms Tina Harrington [4779]				
27331 - Mr Robert J Brittleton [8724]				
27336 - Mrs Margaret Brooks [8683]				
27344 - Mr Ray Brooks [8643]				
27346 - Mr Adam Harris [8679]				
27351 - Mr Andrew Harris [8628]				
27356 - Mr. James Harris [8678]				
27361 - Laura Harris [8685]				
27362 - Susan Harris [8686]				
27371 - Mrs Sara Harris [8122]				
27376 - Ms Leanne Hartley [8325]				
27381 - Mr Kenneth Herring [4841]				
27386 - Miss Jade Hayes [8136]				
27391 - Mrs Helen Haynes [8416]				
27398 - Mr Michael Haynes [8138]				
27399 - Mr Simon Heed [8868]				
27408 - Mr Raymond Hatfield [8869]				
27413 - Ms Joanne Browne [8870]				
27418 - Mr Colin Budd [8871]				
27423 - Mrs Kathleen Budd [8872]				
27431 - Mr Carl Budge [8873]				
27433 - Mr Richard Reed [4708]				
27438 - Theresa Reed [8876]				
27446 - Mrs Irene Richardson [4859]				
27448 - Ms Kaye Bundy [8874]				
27454 - Ian Richardson [8878]				
27459 - Mr John Richardson [4858]				
27464 - Mr Keith Richardson				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8192] 27472 - Mrs Sandra Richardson [7330] 27473 - Mrs Beryl Burgess [5030] 27478 - Mr Simon Richardson [8562] 27483 - Mrs Sue Rigley [8879] 27489 - Steve Rigley [8880] 27494 - Mr Peter Burgess [4863] 27502 - Mrs Brigid Robinson [4897] 27504 - Mr Shaun Burnett [8881] 27513 - Mr. Christopher Burrow [4618] 27514 - Jaquiline Robinson [8883] 27519 - Ms Jean Bury [8716] 27524 - Mr Peter Robinson [4899] 27529 - Mr Thomas Bury [8717] 27534 - Mr David Rolfs [8566] 27539 - Mrs Yvonne Rolfs [8567] 27544 - Andrew Romang [8884] 27548 - Ms Jan Butler [8885] 27553 - Mrs Maureen Butler [5017] 27558 - Ms Bonnie Cain [8886] 27563 - Ms Janet Carter [8887] 27568 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association (Mr William Ratcliffe) [4874] 27573 - Mrs Gillian Romang [8107] 27578 - Mr Richard Romang [4374] 27583 - Mr Clive Rosewell [8563] 27588 - Joanne Ryan [8889] 27593 - Nichola Ryan [8890] 27598 - Mr Peter Ryan [4937] 27603 - Robert Ryan [8891] 27611 - Mr Callum Cartwright [8370] 27613 - Mr Christopher Sanders [8474] 27619 - Mr Gary Sanders [4923] 27623 - Mr. David Cartwright [7193] 27630 - Mrs. Margaret Cartwright				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[7195] 27633 - Mrs Malanie Sanders [8511] 27638 - Mr Barry Casswell [8888] 27644 - Mrs Irene Saunders [8386] 27648 - Mrs Beryl Caton [8657] 27655 - Ms Marjorie Herring [8893] 27658 - Ronald Barry Saunders [8894] 27667 - Mr John Caton [4881] 27670 - Mr David Saxton [4286] 27677 - Mr Graham Hesketh [8634] 27678 - Mr David Chalkley [8671] 27683 - Miss Carole Scott [8541] 27691 - Stephen Scott [8896] 27696 - Ms Susan Hill [8897] 27701 - Kerry Hipgrave [8898] 27706 - Mr Rick Hipgrave [8899] 27711 - Kay Hobbs [8900] 27716 - Mr Andrew Chambers [8300] 27721 - Mrs Mandy Chambers [4846] 27726 - Mrs Trina Chambers [8348] 27731 - Ms Julie Chandler [8352] 27736 - Mrs Anita Clark [8168] 27741 - Mr Joshua Clark [8135] 27746 - Mr Martin Clark [2456] 27751 - Mr David Coates [8133] 27756 - Mrs Danielle Cohen [8313] 27761 - Ms Karen Cohen [8901] 27766 - Mr Marc Cohen [4268] 27771 - Ms Wendy Cohen [6923] 27776 - Mr Anthony Colbert [8902] 27781 - Mr Barry Coldham [8656] 27786 - Mrs Louise Coldham [8666] 27791 - Mr Peter Cole [8903] 27796 - Mr Brian Cook [8794] 27801 - Mrs Joann Cook [8669]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
27806 - Mr Daniel Cracknell [8142]				
27811 - Mrs Danielle Cross [7016]				
27816 - Ms Deborah Cullen [4547]				
27821 - Mrs Christine Tabor [8427]				
27826 - Mr Frank Tabor [8424]				
27831 - Ms Gloria Tanner [8904]				
27836 - Miss Chloe Taylor [8429]				
27841 - Mr Dean Taylor [6978]				
27846 - Mrs Elisabeth Taylor [2918]				
27851 - Mr Gary Taylor [8905]				
27856 - Mr James Taylor [8430]				
27861 - Ms Nikki Taylor [8906]				
27866 - Ms Patricia Taylor [6880]				
27871 - Mr Steven Taylor [8431]				
27880 - Ms Shirley Taylor [8907]				
27881 - Mrs Sophia Severn [4876]				
27886 - Mrs Sila Sheridan [5201]				
27891 - Collin Sherwood [8908]				
27896 - Mrs Valerie Sherwood [8015]				
27901 - Mrs Maureen Slimm [5042]				
27906 - Mr Adam Smith [8910]				
27911 - Barry Smith [8911]				
27916 - Mr Ritchie Hobbs [8909]				
27921 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]				
27926 - Mrs Janice Holbrook [4700]				
27931 - Ms Lauren Holbrook [8912]				
27936 - Miss Ami Holmes [8653]				
27941 - Mr Ben Holmes [8654]				
27946 - Mrs Carol Holmes [4693]				
27951 - Mr Ken Holmes [8691]				
27956 - Mr Luke Holmes [8652]				
27962 - Mr Mark Holmes [8655]				
27967 - Mrs Nicola Holmes [8668]				
27971 - Mrs Shirley Holmes [8660]				
27976 - Mrs Jane House [8681]				
27981 - Mr Howe [8913]				
27982 - Mrs Howe [8914]				
27991 - Mrs Elizabeth Thompson				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[5016]				
27992 - Ms Charlotte Howse				
[8915]				
27998 - Mrs Gail Hughes [8638]				
28006 - Mr David Smith [4872]				
28011 - Mr James Hughes [8677]				
28017 - Mr John Hughes [4500]				
28025 - Joyce Smith [8917]				
28030 - Mrs Janis Smith [4735]				
28031 - Mr Thomas Hughes				
[8637]				
28036 - Lesley Smith [8918]				
28045 - Mrs Kate Hurford [4275]				
28047 - Marisa Smith [8919]				
28052 - William Alan Smith [8920]				
28053 - Malcolm Hurford [7304]				
28062 - Ms Dawn Ireland [4861]				
28067 - Mrs Melanie Snelling				
[8547]				
28072 - Mr Peter Snelling [6960]				
28077 - Mr Alan Snook [8484]				
28082 - Mr Nicholas Thororgood				
[8916]				
28083 - Ms Annie Jackson [8921]				
28092 - Ms Emma Thwaite				
[8922]				
28097 - Mrs Deborah Thwaite				
[8175]				
28102 - Mr Richard Thwaite				
[6964]				
28107 - Mr Thomas Thwaite				
[4475]				
28112 - Mr Derek Tillet [8923]				
28115 - Isabella Jacobs [1695]				
28120 - Mrs Diane Smith [8388]				
28125 - Peter Southgate [8925]				
28130 - Vyvian Southgate [8926]				
28135 - Deborah Spencer [8927]				
28140 - Kevin Spencer [8928]				
28147 - Mrs Karen Tomey [8428]				
28152 - Liam Spencer [8929]				
28157 - Dean Spicer [8930]				
28158 - Mrs Janet Jacobs [8692]				
28163 - Paul Springate [8931]				
28164 - Mr Steven Jacobs [4408]				
28171 - Mr Khodad Jahromi				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
[8190]				
28176 - Gulay Jahromi [8933]				
28181 - Ms Mitra Jahromi [8934]				
28185 - Mr Peter Jakobsson				
[8177]				
28186 - David Janes [8935]				
28195 - Mr Michael Jefferyes				
[5175]				
28200 - Mrs Catherine Jennings				
[8693]				
28205 - Dr. S.J. Jennings [1497]				
28210 - Nicola Joiner [8936]				
28215 - Aidan Jones [8937]				
28216 - Chloe Jones [8938]				
28224 - Diane Jones [8939]				
28230 - Miss Heather Jones				
[8318]				
28235 - Iris Jones [8495]				
28236 - Mr Michael Jones [8690]				
28242 - Ruth Jones [8485]				
28247 - Ms Sophie Jones [8940]				
28251 - Sylvia Stanley [8932]				
28256 - Mr Gary Staples [8526]				
28260 - Mr Kevin Joyner [8375]				
28265 - Brenda Juniper [8493]				
28270 - Mrs Jane Staples [8527]				
28277 - Mrs Ann Stenning [8546]				
28284 - Mr Terence Stenning				
[8544]				
28289 - Andrew Stevens [8942]				
28295 - Benjamin Stevens [8943]				
28303 - Mr Craig Stevens [4958]				
28304 - Christopher Kilian [8944]				
28311 - Lynn Stevens [8945]				
28317 - Sandra Stock [8946]				
28325 - Lynne Stocks [8947]				
28326 - Mrs Cynthia Kirby [8453]				
28335 - Richard Stocks [8948]				
28340 - Iain Stretton [8949]				
28345 - Samantha Stretton [8950]				
28350 - Jennifer Stucky [8951]				
28355 - Steve Stuckey [8952]				
28360 - Christine Swettenham				
[8953]				
28365 - Mr Colin Tomey [8448]				
28370 - Edward Davis [8954]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28375 - Miss Harriet Davis [8440]				
28380 - Mrs Patricia Dean [8434]				
28385 - Sharon Decastro-Bunce [8955]				
28390 - Allan Roy Dickinson [8956]				
28395 - Mr Louis Tregent [8924]				
28400 - Mr Paul Tregent [8437]				
28406 - Mrs Paula Tregent [8433]				
28410 - Mrs Evelyn Dickinson [8777]				
28415 - Mr Dennis Trumble [8418]				
28420 - Mrs Kathleen Trumble [5029]				
28427 - Cariss Tsui [8694]				
28432 - Mrs Rita Tuffey [4620]				
28437 - Mr Ian Tuffey [4621]				
28442 - Mr Giovanni Vaccari [8957]				
28447 - Mr Pete Vince [8123]				
28452 - Mr Ronald Wakelin [8958]				
28457 - Ms Natalie Walters [8959]				
28462 - Mr Richard Ward [8960]				
28467 - Ms Stephanie Kmiotek-Mutton [8961]				
28472 - Harry Krajicek [8962]				
28477 - Ms Madeline Krajicek [8963]				
28482 - Stephen Krajicek [8964]				
28483 - Mr John Laing [8501]				
28492 - Mrs Margaret Laing [7046]				
28498 - Mr John Warner [5018]				
28506 - Mrs Linda Watkinson [4984]				
28507 - Sarah Louise Lapena [8965]				
28508 - Mr Graham Lawrenson [6958]				
28519 - Ms Elizabeth Watson [8966]				
28520 - Mrs Paula Lennon [8506]				
28525 - Mr Jon Watson [7112]				
28530 - Mr Tony Watson [8967]				
28537 - Mr Thomas Lennon [747]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28540 - Mr Eric John Webb [1830]				
28547 - Mrs Susan Webb [4919]				
28550 - Mr John Lester [4396]				
28557 - Ms Michelle Lockton [8968]				
28560 - Mrs Joan Westover [4635]				
28565 - Keith Lodge [8969]				
28570 - Ms Maureen Wheeler [8970]				
28571 - Graeme Logan [8971]				
28580 - Mr Andy Wilkins [8972]				
28585 - Mrs Kim Lucas [4711]				
28590 - Mr Stuart Lucas [4956]				
28598 - Sean Lucas [8973]				
28600 - Mr Nicholas Wilkinson [8406]				
28605 - Mrs Hayley Maclaurin [7097]				
28610 - Mr Alan Manning [8974]				
28619 - Ms Christine Wilks [8975]				
28620 - Duncan Maclaurin [8976]				
28625 - Mrs Edna Williams [4728]				
28630 - Ms Elaine Williams [8159]				
28635 - Mrs Margaret Wiltshire [7141]				
28640 - Mr John Wollaston [8183]				
28645 - Mrs Marion Woolaston [8397]				
28650 - Mr Kevin Wood [6965]				
28655 - Mrs Sandra Wood [8720]				
28660 - Mr Neal Woodford [8978]				
28665 - Mr Matthew Woodward [8979]				
28670 - Ms Ann Wright [8980]				
28675 - Mrs Karen York [8748]				
28679 - Ms Barbara Young [8981]				
28685 - Charlie Pyke [8982]				
28690 - Ms Hannah Pyke [8983]				
28695 - Mr Harry Pyke [8984]				
28700 - Mr Stephen Pyke [8985]				
28705 - Ms Eve Pulford [8987]				
28710 - Mr Daniel Pulford [8988]				
28715 - Mr Brian Marchant [8569]				
28721 - Mrs Jane Marr [6006]				



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28730 - Surrell McGovern [8991]				
28734 - Tom McLaren [8992]				
28739 - Mrs. Susan Miers [8695]				
28743 - Mr Colin Miers [3959]				
28749 - Alex Mills [8993]				
28754 - Mrs Diane Mills [8533]				
28759 - Greg Mills [8994]				
28764 - Ms Karen Page [9000]				
28769 - Ms Marquite Peacham [8999]				
28774 - Ms Janice Plummer [8997]				
28779 - Ms Judith Phillips [8615]				
28784 - Mrs Jill Pritchard [4269]				
28789 - Mrs Irene Power [8610]				
28794 - Mr Stephen Poulton [8149]				
28799 - Mrs Carol Poulton [8119]				
28804 - Miss Natasha Playle [4291]				
28809 - Ms Polyblank [8996]				
28814 - Ms Gillian Pope [8995]				
28819 - Lloyd Piper [8616]				
28824 - Mr Frederick Piper [8380]				
28832 - Mrs Eileen Piper [8381]				
28835 - Mrs Patricia Dillon [8417]				
28839 - Mr Douglas Piper [603]				
28844 - Mr Gary Dimond [7055]				
28849 - Mrs Ruth Dimond [4851]				
28854 - Mr Conrad Dixon [8688]				
28859 - Mrs Jennifer Dodd [5498]				
28868 - Jack Mills [9001]				
28869 - Mr Alan Dodd [4828]				
28874 - Carla Downton [9002]				
28880 - Jane Mills [9003]				
28885 - Mr Stephen Downton [8432]				
28889 - Mr Peter Mills [6982]				
28893 - Christine Drew [9004]				
28902 - Toby Mills [9005]				
28903 - Anna Dunk [8426]				
28908 - Dennis Mitchell [9006]				
28913 - Mrs Lorna Mitchell [8391]				
28918 - Mr Sean Moore [8520]				
28923 - Mrs Shui-Lin Moore [8521]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
28928 - Anastasia Mootoosamy [9007]				
28933 - John Moppett [9008]				
28938 - Mr Bryan Moreton [8513]				
28943 - Gloria Moreton [9009]				
28948 - Samantha Dunk [8438]				
28953 - Ms Christine Durdant-Pead [8117]				
28958 - Mr Gary Durdant-Pead [8326]				
28963 - Mr John Eaton [8124]				
28968 - Kirsty Edwards [8450]				
28973 - Ms Rebecca Edwards [8477]				
28978 - J Ellis [9010]				
28983 - Matthew Emerson [9011]				
28987 - Mrs Fleur Morgan [4848]				
28993 - Mr Mark Morgan [4987]				
28998 - Mrs Michelle Morgan [4505]				
29003 - Mrs Lesley Moss [7053]				
29008 - Mr and Mrs Brian and Lesley Moss [2905]				
29013 - Mrs Carol Moulder [4719]				
29015 - Stuart Moulder [4713]				
29023 - Mr Gerald Mountstevens [4911]				
29028 - Mr Lewis Pincombe [8745]				
29035 - Patricia Mountstevens [9012]				
29040 - Mrs Vicky Mumby [8378]				
29042 - Mrs Janet Pincombe [8614]				
29048 - Mrs Lindsey Pavitt [8746]				
29051 - Dr Murray Wood [7003]				
29057 - Mr Anthony Pavitt [8747]				
29062 - Ms Sylvia Pascoe [7953]				
29067 - Mr John and Maureen Murrell [6846]				
29072 - Mr Tony Parris [9013]				
29077 - Ms Janet Parris [8315]				
29082 - Ms Sheena Parish [9014]				
29087 - Mrs Beth Pardoe [8613]				
29092 - Mr Albert Pardoe [8002]				
29097 - Mr Andrew Pallet [1313]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29102 - Miss Emily Dimond [7227]				
29107 - Callie Emmett [9019]				
29114 - Mr Peter Owen [9016]				
29118 - MR David Emmett [8445]				
29126 - Mr Jack Emmett [8372]				
29131 - Ms Jennifer Emmett [4896]				
29132 - Ms Amanda Owen [9017]				
29137 - Mr Scott Osborne [8456]				
29138 - Mr Joe Emmett [8436]				
29147 - Mrs Faye Osborne [8458]				
29152 - Mr John Orbell [4805]				
29159 - Mrs Gemma Olley [8462]				
29164 - Ann Eustace [9020]				
29167 - Mr David Olley [8461]				
29174 - Kathleen Evans [9021]				
29179 - Mr Neil O'Riordan [8630]				
29182 - Pat Fahy [9022]				
29187 - Pat Fearnley [9024]				
29192 - Mr Brett O'Hara [9023]				
29197 - Mr Andrew O'Hara [9025]				
29203 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29207 - Ms Suzanne O'Hara [9026]				
29212 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29214 - Ms Veronica O'Brien [9027]				
29222 - Mrs Susie Finlay [5892]				
29229 - Ms Tracey O'Brien [9028]				
29233 - Mr Andrew Finlay [8191]				
29237 - Ms Jill Griffiths [5024]				
29244 - Mr Graham Gregory [9029]				
29247 - Mrs Ceri Fisher [8459]				
29252 - Mrs Anne Gregory [4305]				
29258 - Ms Doreen Greenshields [8460]				
29262 - Mr Richard Fisher [8480]				
29266 - Mr Christopher Fletcher [8470]				
29271 - Paul Fletcher [9030]				
29276 - Mr Colin Foreman [4394]				
29281 - Mrs Lucille Foreman [8574]				
29286 - Sally French [9031]				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
29291 - Mr Lee Fullick [8467]				
29296 - Mrs Michelle Fullick [8464]				
29301 - Daniel Furnell [9032]				
29306 - Mrs Grace Furnell [8182]				
29311 - Mr Ricky Gardner [7282]				
29316 - Mr Ian Garrett [4947]				
29321 - Mrs Lorraine Murrell [8519]				
29326 - Mrs Maureen Murrell [8560]				
29331 - Mr Stephen Murrell [8517]				
29336 - Mr Colin Newcombe [8598]				
29341 - Mrs Hazel Newcombe [8597]				
29346 - Mr Stephen Newton [8601]				
29352 - Mrs Tina Newton [8600]				
29357 - Mrs Karen Geary [8483]				
29367 - Beverley Gibson [9034]				
29373 - Mrs Doreen Gray [9033]				
29375 - Mr Christopher Gill [8492]				
29376 - Doddinghurst Infant School (Ms. Ingrid Nicholson) [4339]				
29381 - Mrs Joanne Gill [4758]				
29384 - Mr Brian Gordon [9035]				
29391 - Mr John Ginivan [8476]				
29397 - Mr Bruno Giordan [8104]				
29406 - Mr David Goodall [9036]				
29407 - Mr Anthony Nicholson [4709]				
29411 - Mrs M.H. Giordan [1540]				
29416 - Valerie Godbee [4943]				
29421 - Mr Keith Godbee [4942]				
29426 - Mrs Niyazi [9039]				
29431 - Ms Viola Sherwin [9040]				
29436 - Mr Stephen Slaughter [9041]				

*Stes R25 and R26 should be withdrawn from the LDP*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Action</i>
26526 - Mr Anthony Cross [4376]	Object	<p>The proposed reduction in the number of dwellings has been arbitrarily calculated. The proposed reduction has no scientific or evidence based reasoning and does not adequately address or mitigate the significant concerns and objections raised as part of the original LDP (Pre-submission, Regulation 19). The proposed change only reduces the proposed number of dwellings and not the size and extent of the site being developed, so the adverse impacts of the development would not materially reduce. There are more suitable alternative sites in the borough that are able to absorb the number of dwellings proposed for this site. Any development of this greenfield, agriculturally viable and environmentally beneficial land would be detrimental to the village and natural environment.</p> <p><i>Remove site allocations R25 and R26 from the LDP entirely.</i></p>	<p>Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There is a requirement in the NPPF to have a flexible supply of locations for new development to meet housing need (NPPF paragraph 68). This includes sufficient homes for the initial five years supply as well as sites of various sizes so they can be brought forward for development. The Council does not want to rely too heavily on one site to meet the borough's development needs.</p>	No further action
26731 - Essex County Council (Mrs Anne Clitheroe) [6776]	Object	<p>NPPF para 31 requires planning policies to be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence. BBC need to be satisfied reduction in dwelling numbers is supported by appropriate evidence base, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- demonstrating site makes effective and efficient use of land (paragraphs 117,118,122,123)</li> <li>- is economically viable (paragraph 67)</li> <li>- updated transport evidence base fully assesses transport implications. Highway Authority's vehicular access objection (March 2019) overcome, now satisfied vehicular access can be taken from Redrose Lane. Proposed policy change does not address ECC's Pre-Submission Reg.19 consultation representations to this policy (March 2019). ECC's position has not changed on this matter.</li> </ul> <p><i>As a result of the reduction in dwelling numbers for this site allocation BBC should include, within the Plan evidence and supporting text for this Policy, details to demonstrate that the site allocation makes effective and efficient use of land, and is economically viable. The policy needs to be further changed to address ECC's representations to this policy made to the Pre-Submission Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation in March 2019. Document is not Sound</i></p>	<p>Refer to Pre-Submission Local Plan Chapter 3 for spatial development principles and sequential approach to site selection. The Council recognises the importance of making effective and efficient use of land whilst reflecting local character with appropriate densities. The Council will continue to work with ECC regarding the transport evidence base. Comments regarding the wording of policies in the Pre-Submission Local Plan are considered in the corresponding consultation statement.</p>	No further action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
27141 - Blackmore Village Heritage Association [8568]	Object	Statistical summary of responses collected by a survey co-ordinated by the Blackmore Village Historical Society. All comments have been recorded individually. 515 responses were made to the survey.  <i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan.</i>	Noted	No further action
26549 - Mrs Evelyn Dickinson [8777]	Object	While we welcome the decision to reduce the number of dwellings proposed for the above two sites we feel this would still put too great a strain on the village facilities. Therefore we strongly support the latest proposal to remove a further 20 houses from the Plan for Blackmore.  <i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan entirely.</i>	Noted. Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No further action
26765 - Crest Nicholson Eastern [2509]	Object	Strongly refute the assumptions of the Addendum. Previous objections on the grounds of flood, access safety and suitability, settlement category are addressed. To ensure the Plan is Sound, we therefore request that the wording of the site allocation be amended to reinstate the capacity of the development to approximately 40 dwellings, in accordance with the technical evidence and advice from statutory consultees. The appended Vision Statement articulates how approximately 40 homes can be delivered in the short term to meet Blackmore's needs as part of a high quality, generously landscaped scheme, reflective of the density, pattern and character of existing surroundings.  <i>Return indicative dwelling yield to former number of around 40 dwellings.</i>	The Council recognises the concerns of residents in trying to limit the impact of development on the area and its character.	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>
26682 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	<p>It should be recorded that each item I have entered is a separate representation and should be logged as such. It has been publicised that Blackmore created c500 responses to the previous consultation. However if you look at these actual responses stored on the BBC portal you will see that in fact for R25 there are 1,026 separate respondents and for R26 there are 1,035 respondents. In addition many of these respondents raise multiple objection when their individual response is reviewed. e.g. Ref 23127 has 11 different objections but is only counted as 1 representation. It would seem that there has been deliberate understatement of the magnitude of local feeling about the inequities of the foisted upon Blackmore by the LDP. To put these numbers in perspective the BBC site shows the representations on other sites as: R01 15 comments; R02 29 comments; R03 18 comments.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from the plan</i></p>	<p>All comments that object made during consultations, as well as support, have been recorded in full and are publicly available. All comments are considered in the process of drafting the local plan in relation to their content. This consideration is of the issues that are relevant to policies and the evidence base and not the use of a statistical analysis of the numbers of objections.</p>	No further action
26779 - Mr Richard Swift [1747] 26781 - Ms Virginia Stiff [1748]	Object	<p>Object to the further reduction the allocation of dwellings from 30 to 20. The site's original allocation of approximately 40 dwellings continues to be supported by technical evidence and statutory consultees. The village will lose its vitality and potentially current services if it doesn't continue to thrive. The amended policy of 20 houses is not in line with national policy for a plot of this size or Policy HP03 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan.</p> <p><i>Site R26 (1.52 hectares) would provide for at least 40 two and three bedroom homes for first time buyers, for local residents and for those wishing to downsize without leaving Blackmore.</i></p>	<p>The Council recognises the concerns of residents in trying to limit the impact of development on the area and its character.</p>	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>
26687 - Mr Colin Holbrook [4759]	Object	<p>The Addendum of Focussed Changes has recognised a problem with the LDP and looks to reduce the damaging impact on the worst affected Allocated Sites based on a Council view that removal of any specific site was not "possible". In fact, it is possible to remove a site at this stage, just as it is at the next stage (if so directed by the Inspector). This artificially designated "Major" change of removing a site was shelved. Possibly as it had the negative potential consequence of getting BBC censured, or even possibly having the control of the process taken away from them by central government. Whilst the "Major" change was not palatable for BBC, it is the right option, and better than a superficial "Minor" reduction in numbers on R25 &amp; R26.</p> <p><i>Remove R25 and R26 from the plan</i></p>	<p>The Council is still of the view that those sites which have a proposed reduction in housing numbers still represent suitable locations for sustainable growth which is why they have not been proposed to be removed.</p>	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>
26749 - Basildon Borough Council (Ms Christine Lyons) [8820]	Object	<p>Basildon Council objects to the Focussed Changes 1 - 5, as they do not seem to have been informed by evidence or the Sustainability Appraisal as required by National Policy. The amendments effectively redistributes 70 proposed dwellings from the 'Central Brentwood Growth Corridor', which has opportunities to embrace more sustainable modes of transport, to a Green Belt location with a less developed public transport infrastructure. The reasons for the amendments do not seem to be supported by the evidence and appear to be based solely on the considerable number of objections received in response to the Pre-Submission Local Plan consultation in March 2019. The Brentwood Sustainability Appraisal October 2019 concludes that; "It is difficult to draw strong conclusions, with the primary considerations being: A) decreasing the homes assigned to the Brentwood/Shenfield urban area by 50 may serve to reduce traffic through the problematic town centre AQMA, but any benefit would be marginal, and equally these are accessible locations suited to minimising car dependency; and B) increasing the number of homes assigned to DHGV by 70 is potentially associated with a degree of risk, noting the ongoing work being undertaken in respect of improving air quality along the A127 within Basildon Borough, and noting consultation responses received."</p> <p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF advises amongst other things that Plans should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Basildon Council has considered the two Growth Corridors identified in the Brentwood Borough Local Plan. It has reflected however that there are fundamental distinctions between them, which do not appear to have influenced site selection choices in a justified way. The Central Brentwood Growth Corridor is the location of nationally and regionally managed and maintained infrastructure - the A12 &amp; M25 (Highways England) and the Elizabeth Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Transport for London) and East Anglia Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by Abellio East Anglia). Growth in this location would maximise this infrastructure investment. The South Brentwood Growth Corridor meanwhile, consists the</p>	<p>The strategy focusses growth in sustainable locations principally along two growth corridors (Central Brentwood and Southern Brentwood). This also includes the identification of Dunton Hills Garden Village as a new settlement which will meet the needs of Brentwood Borough.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that meeting growth needs by delivering a garden village is consistent with local character and provides significant infrastructure investment to accommodate the scale of development.</p> <p>Refer to Local Plan Pre-Submission (Reg 19) Chapter 3 Spatial Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives.</p>	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>
		<p>A127 (maintained by Essex County Council) and Essex Thameside Line (maintained by Network Rail and operated by c2c).</p> <p>It is not considered that the two corridors offer comparable choices in terms of the strategic importance or capacity of transport connections, and using the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence, the Plan should select sites within the Central Brentwood Growth Corridor that provide opportunity for extensions to towns and villages that can encourage more sustainable travel choices and take advantage of the strategic infrastructure available. This would encourage commuting behaviour to shift away from private car use and therefore make this location a more sustainable and viable option to concentrate growth. Such an alternative approach would be justified by evidence and align with national policy.</p> <p><i>Reconsideration of local plan and spatial strategy.</i></p>		
26609 - Susan Harris [8686]	Object	Houses should be switched to Crescent Drive	The Council is still of the view that those sites which have a proposed reduction in housing numbers still represent suitable locations for sustainable growth which is why they have not been proposed to be removed.	No further action
		<i>Remove R25 and R26 from plan</i>		
26656 - Anglian Water (Mr Stewart Patience) [6824]	Support	<p>We note that it is proposed to decrease the amount of housing on this allocation site to address comments made as part of the previous consultation. As an infrastructure provider we closely monitor housing growth in our region to align our planned investment with additional demand for water recycling infrastructure. Therefore we have no comments to make relating to the focused change to Policy R26.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	Noted	No further action
26518 - Cllr Chris Hossack [1974]	Support	<p>I support the reduction. The width of the ancient lanes accessing this site make it evident that the existing infrastructure cannot support additional and excessive vehicle movement that would be generated as a consequence.</p> <p><i>No change to the proposed Addendum housing numbers.</i></p>	Noted. Through gathering evidence in support of the Local Plan we have not identified infrastructure issues that would prevent delivery of this number of homes. See Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	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>
26785 - Historic England (Andrew Marsh) [8824]	Support	<p>The development of this site has the potential to harm the significance of a number of designated heritage assets including the Grade II listed The Woodbines and Horselocks Cottage, and the Blackmore Conservation Area by eroding their setting. We recommend that Policy R26 includes a criterion to help secure a high quality development which respects the setting of the nearby listed buildings and conservation area.</p> <p><i>Policy R26 should refer to the sites' sensitive edge of settlement location, and 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 to ensure the scale and density of the development is appropriate for the location. The cumulative impacts of the development of this site and that of R25 must be taken into account in order to ensure the setting of these listed buildings and conservation area is not compromised. Development of this site will need to conserve and, where opportunities arise, enhance these heritage assets and their settings. The development should be of high quality design. These requirements should be included in any site specific policy and supporting text of the Plan.</i></p>	Policy HP19 'Conservation and Enhancement of Historic Environment' will be applicable to site R26 in determining any future planning applications.	No further action
26523 - Mr John Darragh [4862]	Support	<p>Support proposed reduction provided it includes affordable homes.</p> <p><i>Required to have affordable homes on this site.</i></p>	Policy HP05 requires development proposals of 11 or more to include 35% affordable housing. Policy R26 requires 25% of new homes to be reserved for people with a strong and demonstrable local connection or those over 50 years of age.	No further action

<b>Representations</b>	<b>Nature</b>	<b>Summary of Main Issue/Change to Plan</b>	<b>Council's Assessment</b>	<b>Action</b>
26541 - Chelmsford City Council (Ms Gemma Nicholson) [8305]	Support	<p>For relevance of Chelmsford, Policy R25 and R26, located in Blackmore have a reduction in the number of dwellings for these site allocations. From 40 to 30 homes for R25, and 30 to 20 homes for R26. The capacity of Policy R01 (Dunton Hills Garden Village Strategic Allocation) has increased from 2,700 to 2,770 to take account of the reduction in numbers from the sites identified. CCC continues to support BBC's proposed approach to housing and employment allocations which are unlikely to have any obvious adverse cross-boundary impacts on Chelmsford.</p> <p>BBC continues to meet its own housing need within its administrative boundaries and has not approached neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-operate to request other authorities help accommodate any unmet needs. This is supported by CCC.</p> <p><i>No change proposed</i></p>	Noted.	No further action
26698 - Mr Mr J Nicholls and Mr A Biglin (Land owners) [8368]	Support	<p>We support the following changes to the Pre-Submission Local Plan:</p> <p>* Policy R26 (Land north of Orchard Piece, Blackmore): Reduction from "around 30" to "around 20 homes".</p> <p>We support the reduction in housing numbers at the allocation sites in Shenfield and Blackmore, as this is justified by the evidence base.</p> <p><i>Support reduction of housing numbers as proposed within the Addendum</i></p>	Noted	No further action