

## 19 Appendix 1 – Overview of Results

<b>Statements with which the largest number, and percentage, of respondents agreed or strongly agreed</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
New development should respect the character of the local area	136	95
Preserve and enhance the natural and historic environment, biodiversity and visual character of the Borough	131	96
Reduce the negative impacts of development on people and the environment by encouraging prudent use of resources; reducing pollution and waste; and encouraging the use of renewable energy	131	94
All new developments should be designed to discourage crime and vandalism.	130	93
Existing urban open spaces should be protected from development and their quality improved where necessary	130	92

<b>Statements respondents most strongly disagreed with</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
Dispersed growth: development at all settlements across the Borough	83	57
Brentwood town centre should have a greater variety of commercial activities, such as cafes, bars and restaurants	76	56
Semi-dispersed growth: development at the main settlements and larger villages	64	46

<b>Statements with which the most respondents neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
There is a need for further high quality sport and leisure facilities in the Borough	70	51
There is a need for more local area community facilities in the Borough	61	46
There is a need for more health care facilities in the Borough	56	42
New developments should create the opportunities for promoting social inclusion and encouraging diversity	49	36
There is a need for the provision of facilities for older people in the Borough.	48	36
Further action should be taken to assist the vulnerable, those on low incomes and those with special needs	45	33
The opportunity should be taken to improve public spaces through, for example, using high quality materials, landscaping and works of art	43	31
There should be more flexibility in the provision of affordable housing in the rural parts of the Borough	42	31
There is a need for the provision of facilities for younger people in the Borough	39	28
There is a need for a more comprehensive cycle network in the Borough	40	28

<b>Statements with which the largest number, and percentage, of respondents strongly agreed</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
The Green Belt should be protected	103	71
New development should seek to minimise the risk of flooding	94	67
New development should respect the character of the local area	94	66
Preserve and enhance the natural and historic environment, biodiversity and visual character of the Borough	89	65
Wildlife and their habitats should be protected throughout the Borough	91	64
Reduce crime and fear of crime and ensure safe and secure living and working environments	84	62
Existing urban open spaces should be protected from development and their quality improved where necessary	87	61
All development should avoid harm to the environment and natural resources and enhance it wherever possible	86	61
The amount of additional housing in the Borough should continue to be constrained by its Green Belt location	80	57
Reduce the negative impacts of development on people and the environment by encouraging prudent use of resources; reducing pollution and waste; and encouraging the use of renewable energy	76	55

## 20 Appendix 2 – Detailed Comments

### Question 1: Proposed Vision

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about the proposed vision?	Category
5	Very important that rural areas are included in this strategy.	R
8	Vague - open to interpretation.	W/S
12	The vision seems to be for the well off, rich people - what about the other less well off and youngsters on the scrap heap at 21?	LN SU
14	The vision should include the achievement of the strategic objectives as a positive.	Imp
15	There is not a high quality life in West Horndon. Only 2 buses a day into Brentwood - none on Sundays. Without a car, Brentwood is a no go area.	QoL T
19	Open-ended statement to which almost any person or organisation could sign up to without feeling they have committed themselves to anything specific. It sees the future of Brentwood firmly rooted in the present - whether this is realistic or not remains to be seen. The vision should say something about action that will increase the overall sustainability of the Borough. Further details in full response.	IMP SU
20	Prefer aim in current local plan ie 6.2. Proposal is judgemental on 'best' and 'valued'.	W/S
21	Would be nice, but unlikely to come about.	IMP
27	It is a commendable vision, but we question the present value. We are aware it is an obligation, but with an election coming so soon and possible abolition of EERA and many financial restrictions, this (expensive) project seems a little nebulous. The future is uncertain.	IMP
31	This is a stupid question - obviously nobody will tick 'no'.	W/S
33	Having a vision is fine, but its implementation and maintenance requires determination and commitment, not to mention investment.	IMP
35	What about taking measures to redress what is devaluing the character and environmental qualities? (eyesores) 'The town' suggests there is only one 'town' in the Borough - needs to refer to villages as well.	LD
40	With Councils still operating the 'right to buy', they are always going to need expansions in council/affordable housing. Why not stop this practice and then, after a period, revisit housing needs.	H
42	Those involved with making propositions should be experienced in visiting other towns in the UK on which to draw comparisons.	O
43	Limit new housing to infilling and brownfield sites to preserve green areas and greenbelt areas around the town and its villages.	GB BF, H
44	It's important to maintain the boundaries of existing rural areas, to protect present characteristics, keep current communities intact.	LD, QoL GB, R
48	That statement doesn't say anything - it just 'lets keep things nice'.	W/S
51	Priority should always be given to those who live in the Borough.	LN
52	Where is the money going to come from for all these wonderful ideas? Stop wasting time and money on paperwork such as this.	IMP
53	Stick to it.	O
55	Changes must take place over an even spread of time, not rushed	IMP
56	As a housing charity, Shelter limits its comments to those issues within its expertise and experience.	O
60	No reference to Economic Development.	ED

61	It lacks variety/transport links & broader appeal of Chelmsford. The villages are more appealing than the town and some have problems with 'nuisance'.	<b>QoL T</b>
62	Statement is ambiguous - 'best and valued' by who? How do you define high quality of life?	<b>QoL W/S</b>
65	The vision is fine - but completely generic. It could apply to any town anywhere. What do we want 'Brentwood' to stand for? What should we be doing to differentiate 'Brentwood' from all other similar-sized towns and eg Chelmsford and Bishops Stortford?	<b>LD</b>
66	The north western area of the borough has most agricultural use, (cereals, wheat etc) other parts of the borough is grassland (very large fields) these if the owners sold could be used for housing and business, industrial, social building. Grassland without livestock.	<b>R DEV</b>
69	At the moment unless you have a car there is no satisfactory transport from West Horndon to Brentwood.	<b>T</b>
71	There is not "a high quality of life" in West Horndon for people without cars. There are very few buses and none on Sundays. To visit friends, family or events in Brentwood is impossible.	<b>QoL T</b>
73	The keyword in this proposal is 'sustainable'. Brentwood has an optimal limit in respect of growth. Any plan which exceeds this should be turned down.	<b>SU</b>
77	Change 'high quality of life' for 'good quality of life'.	<b>QoL</b>
92	Vision should concentrate on delivering the best core services at the minimum cost. The Council should stop acting (and thinking) that it is a blue chip company requiring all sorts of fancy visions and strategies and spending my money on fanciful projects.	<b>IMP</b>
97	I feel that Brentwood has grown out of all proportion and is not the small Country Town that I moved into 15 years ago. It has lost its history and rural background. For instance, the Sugar Hut nightclub should not have been allowed to have been developed on an historical site. We have too many pubs and nightclubs in the area which means that at weekends the high street is a 'no go' area for the locals. This is just encouraging the drinking culture in the area and turning Brentwood into a suburb of London. I think, like most of my friends who live in the area, we were once proud to live in a country Town but this is no more.  Our roads are not structured to cope with the amounts of traffic to cope with any more properties being built. We have had huge developments built at both the old Warley Hospital site and on the land by the Station car park. Enough is enough. We are destroying our local environment and very soon will lose its historical identity. I live off of Woodman Road and when I first moved into the area it was quiet and peaceful. Now the road is like a rat run and cars are constantly speeding down the road and it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident. Please preserve the history and background of Brentwood and don't let it become just another outpost of London.	<b>TC T LD BC</b>
101	So long as "sustainable" means that.	<b>SU</b>
106	However the vision needs hard targets to be measured before and after the implementation of the strategy, to ensure that the intended outcomes do get delivered. I would suggest independent verification of the measurement of these targets to ensure that they are accepted by the community without the usual doubt about the council's approach to measuring its own performance.	<b>IMP</b>
112	Cut down on cafes and takeaways in the high street and encourage more small businesses to provide a better shopping experience.	<b>TC BC</b>
113	I would not allow any new build on greenfield sites until all brownfield sites have been used up, and this applies to gypsies and travellers also.	<b>GB BF</b>
114	A "...high quality of life for those.....and relax in the Borough.." doesn't mean allowing it to become the binge centre of Essex. My daughter who lives in Harlow reports that young people see Brentwood as a good place for getting 'out of your face'. It is a shame we are attracting those intent on getting drunk from	<b>TC QoL BC</b>

	so far afield.	
120	Emphasis on protecting rural areas i.e. Green Belt land is paramount, especially when considering all the house building that occurred in the 1960s and 70s in and around our villages.	<b>GB R</b>
122	This vision must sustain the lovely Essex countryside and not encroach on the Green-belt lands.	<b>LD, GB R</b>
124	This means whatever the reader wants it to mean – it's like a blank cheque - I could only support a vision that means something	<b>W/S</b>
125	It is interesting to note that earlier visions made references to residents' needs and aspirations and making provision for development. The vision must reflect Government guidance (e.g. PPS1) which refers to meeting needs now and in the future.	<b>LN</b>
128	It would have been nice to have had something about assisting and encouraging local business developments, too. After all, unemployment must be more important to a lot of people than, for example 'character and environmental qualities of the town'. If the Council were able to create, for example, some sustainably built and highly efficient business units for rental, perhaps some small businesses could be encouraged to take advantage of lower energy costs.	<b>ED LN IMP</b>
130	The rural and Green Belt areas should be completely protected. It will be a sad day if the Green Belt is destroyed and London spreads out beyond where it is now.	<b>GB R</b>
133	There should be more emphasis on the protection of the Green Belt, and the rural nature of the area surrounding the town.	<b>GB R</b>
135	The proposed vision should include meeting the housing needs through sustainable inclusive communities in accordance with the East of England Plan.	<b>SU H</b>
136	I object to the wording of the new mission as it fails to address the issue of keeping people safe. I believe that the new vision statement fails to address a fundamental duty of a local council " to keep it citizens SAFE" The removal of this important word alters the council relationship and responsibilities toward the people. The previous mission statement recognised this fact and I would argue for the reinstatement of this obligation on the council.  SAFE: should be regarded in it fullest meaning, "safe from" and "safe to " spans Health, Security personal and medical, terrorist or accident, it relates to floods, Ice snow etc. It means creating a town where it is safe to walk the streets after dark, where refuse is collected, pavements fixed. Housing is built to meet local demand etc.	<b>QoL TC LN H</b>
140	This is a laudable vision and should apply irrespective of the current consultation process. It is certainly a good core vision against which all future development should be assessed to ensure the vision is not diluted in reality. If dilution is the likely outcome and the vision is not able to be met, then any relevant proposal should be dismissed.	<b>IMP</b>
141	The vision should balance the economic and environmental sustainability of the Borough both now and in the future and in the process enhance the quality of life for those that live work and relax in the area. At the moment the vision places too much emphasis on quality of life, which could be at the expense of the sustainability of the Borough, both economic in making it self sufficient, and in terms of living in a pleasant environment. (If the environment becomes too pleasant the town becomes a high class dormitory suburb of London - which then focuses land use on the provision of weekend leisure facilities. Such an aim could make the Borough reliant on salaries and funding from London, which may not be sustainable...)	<b>SU QoL</b>
142	Whilst the proposed vision is generally welcomed, its ordering should be revised so as to better reflect the Mission Statement, as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy, which provides that the Borough Council's foremost objective is to meet, and serve, the needs and aspirations of local people The Core Strategy is the principal spatial tool by which the Sustainable Community	<b>W/S LN</b>

	<p>Strategy, and the Mission Statement set out therein, are to be implemented. As such, it should also put the needs and aspirations of local people at the forefront. The policies and provisions of the Core Strategy will have to strike a difficult balance between many different, and often conflicting, priorities. As is identified in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (November 2009), a number of the Strategic Objectives, and particularly those relating to the Environment (on the one hand) and Society and the Economy (on the other), are not compatible. The proposed vision should reflect the priorities set out in the Mission Statement. Where there is a conflict between different Strategic Objectives, those relating to the social and economic well-being of the people of Brentwood should take priority. As such, and in order to send out the right message, and ensure that the provisions of the Core Strategy are appropriately framed, the proposed vision should be re-worded as follows:-</p> <p>To, both now, and in the future, make provision for the development and other needs of those who live, work and relax in the Borough, whilst also protecting and enhancing all that is best and valued of the existing character and environmental qualities of the town and its surrounding rural areas.</p>	
152	Should also ensure that the potential impact of development on species and habitats of principal importance is addressed. We hope to see this formally noted in the final document.	<b>SU</b>
160	Spatial specificity should be reflected in the vision and objectives. Currently presented in vague terms and lack acknowledgement of the Borough's characteristics	<b>LD W/S</b>
162	Support combined vision for CS and SCS. Reference should be made to high quality design	<b>QoL SU</b>
163	Needs to be more specific to the characteristics of the Borough - currently too general. It must include further detail on how the Borough will change up until 2031.	<b>LD</b>
174	Should refer to settlements other than just Brentwood, wording should include reference to villages as well as the town and its surrounding rural area.	<b>DEV R</b>
177	North East London NHS Foundation Trust is supportive of the Council's aspirations for sustainable future growth and development to meet the housing needs of the local community and make good use of previously developed land.	<b>BF H LN</b>
190	Very short consultation period and busy time of year. No mention of Essex CC partnership. No public meeting, Not enough facts to be able to respond sensibly to many questions.	<b>W/S</b>
192	While agreeing with the ideas behind the vision, it seems too long and a little passive in tone.	<b>W/S</b>

Vision Categories	Total
BC – bars & cafes	3
BF – brownfield	3
DEV - development	2
ED – economic development	2
GB – Green Belt	7
H – housing	5
IMP - implementation	11
LD – local character & distinctiveness	7
LN – local needs	7
O – other	3
QoL – quality of life & safety	10
R – rural	8
SU – sustainability	8
TC - town centre	5
W/S – wording and/or style	12

## Question 2: Strategic Objectives

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about the strategic objectives?	Category
1	Leisure facilities should be appropriate to the size and character of the town. Large scale facilities are available in nearby centres to which there are railway links.	LEI LD
3	Any growth needs to have more infrastructure. There should be no more bars, cafes and take aways in the town centre.	INF TC BC
5	Agree with maximising use of brownfield land, as long as this not used as an excuse to allow more gypsy sites into the Borough.	BF O
8	Objectives should apply across the Borough and not just target the main town and allow the rest of the Borough to become a wealthy semi-rural preserve with no new housing/retail/employment development.	DEV
9	The current alterations do not enhance it. Shops need to be varied. The old Post Office was designed and built as this and is not suitable for shop letting. It will decay and add to the ruination of the High Street.	TC RET
11	Shopping needs to be improved, as we already have many empty shops, some of which have never been occupied.	RET EMP
14	It is premature to specify 'mixed' use development at this stage.	DEV
15	Private gardens should not be built on in general. The only history in West Horndon is the 15th century church that has been badly neglected by the Council. West Horndon needs buses to Romford and Basildon, then we can use our bus passes. The repair of roads and pavements is essential to creating safe environments.	GAR PT PR
17	It is unlikely that the town centre can be the focus for employment or cultural activities. Surely better to have zones for employment and some cultural activities at the Brentwood Centre. A park and ride scheme is needed.	TC LEI T ED
18	On providing local housing should be an equal basis for allocation and bidding.	H
19	Many of the objectives are leading statements. They would have been better expressed as pairs of statements, asking consultees to say which of the pair was most important and by what degree. Surely very few people are going to disagree with these statements - what would be more useful would be to establish the relative importance of them. Certainly, the objectives all seem very laudable although taken together they paint a somewhat utopian view of Brentwood's future. Further information in full response.	W/S IMP
20	Ensure environment is preserved and buildings conserved. Once land/countryside used, it is gone forever.	C
22	Use the many small parcels of Green Belt land that do not contribute to the open rolling countryside, the image most of us have of the Green Belt.	GB
25	Care should be taken that neighbours are not adversely affected by shadow/noise/being overlooked and loss of privacy. The far end (near King's Road) of Brentwood High Street always has problems maintaining successful business.	TC ED QoL
26	Reduce parking costs to encourage more local shops and less fast food outlets.	PA
27	Almost all sane people would agree that in the best of all possible worlds all these points are obvious - who would tick strongly disagree?	W/S
31	These are stupid questions. Encouraging residents to lead healthy lives is not your business.	W/S CR

33	Optimum use should be made of empty, derelict residential properties and disused commercial premises without detriment to the character of the town or surrounding villages. There should be the opportunities for the offspring of local residents to rent apartments/flats within the Borough	<b>EMP</b> <b>LD</b> <b>H</b> <b>QoL</b>
34	Why would we not want all of the above? If we did not, it would be a sad day. I am surprised you need to ask these questions.	<b>W/S</b>
37	Clarification required on 'most sustainable locations,' 'appropriate local housing' and 'social inclusion.' We do not agree that gardens in residential areas are 'brownfield' sites as this will reduce green urban areas and increase water run-off and pollution. A strategic objective should be 'full protection of the Green Belt.'	<b>W/S</b> <b>GB</b> <b>GAR</b> <b>BF</b> <b>DEV</b> <b>SU</b>
40	Concern that green belt will start to become brownfield sites. Concern over improvement to public transport. Brentwood is in a corridor between two major roads and the highways commission will not support any further access roads to these, which means to improve the town centre, [there would have to be a] reduction in housing to make way for roads.	<b>GB</b> <b>H</b> <b>TC</b> <b>T</b>
41	Do not believe it should be the remit of the council to influence lives, healthy or otherwise. Do not agree that we should 'seek to provide everyone' with local housing - only where merited. No more restaurants or pubs.	<b>BC</b> <b>CR</b>
42	Sounds to good to be true.	<b>IMP</b>
43	It's important to preserve our recreational green spaces. More encouragement is needed to get Brentwood town centre into an attractive and desirable shopping centre with adequate cheap parking to attract shoppers. Delete parking charges at country parks to encourage people to visit more often and lead more healthy lives.	<b>TC</b> <b>RET</b> <b>PA</b>
44	Grand principles but probably not obtainable.	<b>IMP</b>
48	Some of the items are badly constructed eg if you want 'social inclusion' that includes traveller sites. 'Appropriate local housing' and 'balanced communities' are incompatible. Are you going to promote 'council housing' on Hutton Mount to make that area more 'balanced'? There is no point in having 'high quality facilities' if they are all one type, Shenfield has mainly eateries, banks, building societies & estate agents.	<b>W/S</b> <b>O</b>
49	Parking noise, traffic, drunken yobbish behaviour already impact negatively on Brentwood town centre - more housing, entertainment & people in town centre will make matters even worse.	<b>ASB</b> <b>PA</b> <b>TC</b> <b>LEI</b>
51	Priority to residents and it is not the councils purpose to engage in social engineering. Free parking would do more than anything to 'enhance Brentwood town centre'.	<b>CR</b> <b>PA</b>
53	Any growth to existing greenfield sites contradicts the proposed vision. It is not the job of the Local Authority to promote 'social inclusion' or tell residents how they should choose their lifestyle.	<b>GB</b> <b>CR</b>
55	I have reservations with regard to the provision of housing for ALL who may wish to come here and of all types. This could be taken to mean agreeing to large scale developments which would spoil the area and make this a huge town like so many others nearby.	<b>H</b> <b>C</b> <b>DEV</b>
59	Not all brownfield sites are suitable for housing, because of poor transport links or because their size if fully used for housing might have a disproportionate effect on existing local community eg if they were in or by a small settlement	<b>BF</b> <b>T</b> <b>QoL</b>
60	Do not agree with the vision, so would like to see the strategic objectives updated before responding.	<b>O</b>
65	What does the 'most suitable locations' mean? I support making the most of	<b>W/S</b>

	existing infrastructure and services. I may not support directing growth to the 'most suitable locations' without a better understanding of what the term means. The two parts of the statement may produce different, incompatible results.	<b>DEV</b>
66	Housing etc development could include the large areas of the borough, privately owned which is devoted to growing grass or is wild jungle. Excluding agricultural used for cereal growing wheat, barley oats etc. any woodland, forestry providing that the owners of the grass fields wish to sell their grass fields for urban development. The privately owned grassland does not have livestock, cattle, sheep or even horses grazing.	<b>GB DEV</b>
69	Not easy to access from West Horndon, except by car.	<b>PT</b>
71	1st objective: Growth - very little land available. A few places for infilling. 2nd objective: Residential properties and privets should not be included. 3rd: Not wind farms. 4th: All Saints Church is historic but neglected. 5th: People with low incomes I hope. 8th: Buses from and to West Horndon all day, evenings & Sundays. 9th: No Council employees being paid astronomical amounts or bonuses. Borough rates remaining the same because of the recession. 10th: Town centre - done. Cultural activities at Keys Hall & others. 11th: Parks are available. 12th: Need to repair pavements & roads, stop vehicles parking on pavements, Police responding quickly when required = safe secure living.	<b>DEV RE C H LEI TC PT Saf/Pol PR</b>
74	I have considerable reservations about private gardens & residential properties as this can lead to many problems. Cannot get head around new high st, especially if major accidents cause police to divert from M25-A12.	<b>TC T GAR Saf/Pol</b>
75	Need for better more frequent bus services. Need for low floor buses on 351, 551, 81&82 bus routes. They give off bad emissions so polluting the air. Until we get low floor, more frequent and reliable bus services and evening services, we'll never encourage car users to get on public services.	<b>PT</b>
78	These objectives are idealist, the reality will be different.	<b>IMP</b>
79	Disagree with use of private gardens and infilling. Not a Council responsibility regarding healthy living.	<b>GAR CR</b>
81	All objectives should be moderate to avoid the 'big brother' syndrome.	<b>O</b>
92	Many of the ideas sound OK but the trouble with Government and Local Government is in the execution. It is always bureaucratic and expensive and often results in petty meddling in peoples lives. The council should not busy itself with people's health. The council should not concern itself with law and order. The council should not burden local people with Climate change initiatives. It is not proven scientific fact and is being cynically exploited to raise taxes and control peoples lives.	<b>CR O</b>
97	Brentwood has become saturated with too much building. The infrastructure cannot cope with any more housing developments. It has lost its historical feeling and is not the safe and small Town that I moved to 15 years ago. It is not safe for people to walk down the High Street at night with too many nightclubs and too many drinking bars. We need to keep the community spirit and not become an extension to London for the youngsters to come out at weekends clubbing and drinking. How on earth did the Sugar Hut get the planning approval for a nightclub? This was an old coaching inn and part of our history which has now been destroyed. Smacks of back handers to me. I do not find Brentwood to be very safe any more. There is so much yobbish behaviour around the Town now and I am afraid that the 'right' people will move out further only to be replaced by the wrong people. I used to feel proud about living in Brentwood but I don't now.	<b>DEV INF C ASB Saf/Pol TC LD BC QoL</b>
99	I do not want Brentwood to turn into Romford mark two. What distinguishes Brentwood from Romford is the greater amount of green space in Brentwood. So, I strongly disagree with brown field developments that are really just building	<b>C GAR BF</b>

	in people's green gardens or the green spaces that surround our buildings.	
102	Attraction of Brentwood Town Centre - Biggest problem is lack of Parking for cars. This has always been a problem and previous administrations have not managed to resolve this.	<b>TC</b> <b>PA</b>
105	There should be a limit of what is classed as a "brownfield site" - that limit should exclude gardens.	<b>GAR</b> <b>BF</b>
106	<p>I agree that growth needs to be sustainable but the area is already over populated so any proposed increase in growth would not be as sustainable as the current level. New development nearly always impacts on established small businesses to the benefit of nation retailers and developers who have some influence over the council.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should not mean automatic development, residents near some existing brownfield sites would be better of if the site was returned to agricultural or rural management.</p> <p>Wasted question who's going to say no to common sense? (Padding)</p> <p>Everyone has a different view of what is a diverse environment, and even wider views on what constitutes the visual character of the area, single roads have very differing characters let alone village areas and parishes, more details on what this actually means to residents is required before any planning mandate can be implemented or progressed.</p> <p>Houses cost money good houses cost more that poor ones, why should some social engineering attempt try to alter the mix created by the current economic realities? All it does is upset those who have worked hard to achieve when they see some who they deem less deserving gets it free?</p> <p><b>WE DO NOT NEED ANYMORE SHOPS!</b></p> <p>Public transport in Brentwood? A joke surely? We have not even got a bus station anymore!</p> <p>How the planning committee can promote a prosperous and vibrant community is a leap too far, or is this a get out clause for when a national developer offers the inducement of local jobs when the local population do not want the development carried out?</p> <p>Enhance Brentwood town centre? If current and previous attempts are anything to go by the council is not qualified to make such decisions!</p> <p>Encourage residents to lead Healthy Lives? Another example of Politically Correct padding. How about bringing back the environmental health/safety inspectorate and give them some teeth to tackle the problems of community health.</p> <p>More effective policing at the community level would achieve this, more local police stations and get the PCSOs to come from the locality they serve.</p>	<b>LD</b> <b>ED</b> <b>PT</b> <b>RET</b> <b>Saf/Pol</b> <b>TC</b> <b>BF</b> <b>PR</b> <b>O</b> <b>QoL</b>
107	Promptly attend to all conditions that lower standards in graffiti, litter, damage both accidental or vandalism, keep clean and update public notice boards, and keep maintained all council buildings and signs.	<b>PR</b>
112	The police in this area do a good job, could do with a few more out on the streets instead of in cars, but other than that good job done by the gang.	<b>Saf/Pol</b>
113	<p>This form has been written in language that I feel is calculated to use as much gibberish as possible and to confuse a large section of the community. Please use plainer language and not this council speak nonsense.</p> <p>In addition why did you waste so much money on resurfacing the high street? This will not attract shoppers at all. What is killing Brentwood is partly the cost of parking and the number of eating and drinking places that are bringing in the wrong type of person. Also the disgusting amount of rubbish etc behind the shops is off putting.</p>	<b>W/S</b> <b>TC</b> <b>T</b> <b>PA</b> <b>BC</b> <b>PR</b>
114	<p>I disagree with the word EVERYONE in the line "Seek to provide everyone with access to appropriate local housing..." We cannot aim to serve everyone. I am in favour of a balanced community, however.</p> <p>"Ensure a prosperous &amp; vibrant local economy" - yes but only within reason; we haven't the space to become the region's major shopping or industrial centre.</p>	<b>DEV</b> <b>TC</b> <b>BC</b> <b>ED</b>

	<p>We want what we can provide to be prosperous &amp; vibrant, but not at the expense of the countryside through excessive expansion.</p> <p>Brentwood Town Centre and Shenfield Broadway are being taken over by bars and coffee houses and other eateries: this is at the expense of a wider range of retail outlets. We want a wide range of interesting shops to attract shoppers and to serve the community without residents having to travel to shopping centres outside Brentwood. Lack of variety will end up in lack of interest.</p>	<p><b>C</b> <b>LD</b> <b>RET</b></p>
121	<p>Enhance the Natural and Historic visual of the borough by building with character in mind and not the cheapest option of horrendous square, flat roofed, glass and total out of character buildings that we are constantly seeing being erected. The biggest eyesore being the new hospital, how could anyone erect such a horrendous looking building and destroy the previous in character building which detailed such expert craftsmanship compared to a log cabin that now stands in its place. (the inside however is plush) The Bay Tree centre has no bearing, or character of the history of Brentwood, both buildings were more than likely designed by a complete outsider. I expect the new plans for William Hunter Way will be of the same style to the Hospital and look completely out of character, the only Road that looks remotely how Brentwood should be is Crown Street and I notice you have chosen to put this on the front cover of Vision! I'm sure the Bay Tree Centre would not have the same effect.</p>	<p><b>C</b> <b>DEV</b> <b>LD</b> <b>PR</b></p>
122	<p>The villages to stay villages but with better transport to and from Town.</p>	<p><b>PT</b> <b>C</b></p>
124	<p>You are there to provide services, not social engineering.</p>	<p><b>CR</b></p>
125	<p>(1) It should be recognised that new development, particularly strategic scale, will provide new infrastructure.</p> <p>(2) Brownfield land should only be re-developed when it is in sustainable locations and its existing use does not need to be retained.</p>	<p><b>INF</b> <b>BF</b> <b>DEV</b></p>
128	<p>Regarding "Encourage all residents to lead healthy lives" it seems to me a laudable idea, but surely it is more the responsibility of the PCT's Health Promotion Department (or has that now been moved to Council ownership?)</p> <p>Regarding 'Enhance the Attraction of Brentwood Town Centre.....' I think that, having missed the opportunity (because it was too expensive, presumably) of giving us a traffic-free town centre, the Council should not invest a lot more effort (and, effectively throw good money after bad) into funding actual building works. Unless these are needed to enable privately funded attractive developments that fit in with the general strategy.</p> <p>As with the provision of 'high quality shopping' any Council involvement should be limited, as far as possible purely to the planning process, leaving private funding to get the work done.</p> <p>I suspect that with past unsympathetic High Street shop developments and the excess of restaurants, the High Street is a bit of a lost cause anyway. It might be better to off really quick, cheap public transport to Chelmsford or BlueWater than have to help fund any further local development.</p>	<p><b>CR</b> <b>TC</b> <b>RET</b> <b>PT</b> <b>BC</b></p>
130	<p>I do not agree with the part regarding building on gardens. Yes, utilise brownfield sites to the maximum but we should STOP building on gardens and destroying valuable green areas for people and wildlife.</p>	<p><b>GAR</b> <b>C</b></p>
133	<p>It is impossible to "provide everyone with access to appropriate local housing" and meet the vision of protecting and enhancing all that is best and valued about Brentwood currently.</p>	<p><b>H</b> <b>LD</b> <b>C</b> <b>QoL</b></p>
135	<p>A strategic objective should be to address housing shortages by securing a step change in the delivery of additional housing throughout the borough, particularly Brentwood Town, as the key centre.</p>	<p><b>H</b> <b>TC</b></p>
136	<p>I cannot wholeheartedly agree with the statements above as they span too many diverse concepts, Eg Enhance ... BTC as the focus for shopping employment and cultural activities..... This fails to recognise the high density of people and</p>	<p><b>TC</b></p>

	community that reside in the TC, a Town Centre is not just about business.	
137	Whilst it is essential to enhance Brentwood and provide the amenities mentioned above, it is also essential for Brentwood to retain its 'small town' character and not be over-developed. For example, with regards to the proposed development for William Hunter Way, I feel that the town would benefit from having a cinema but to also include another supermarket, shops and a housing complex would be totally unsuitable.	<b>LD LEI TC QOL</b>
139	Encourage personal responsibility of residents, not just human rights.	<b>CR</b>
142	Whilst the proposed Strategic Objectives are generally supported, there should be an explicit recognition, set out in the supporting text, that, given the nature of the Borough and the planning issues that need to be addressed, the Objectives are not, in every case, compatible. The Council will need to prioritise where conflicts could potentially occur.  An indication should be given as to where the Council's main priorities will lie, which should be with those Strategic Objectives that relate to the social and economic well-being of the Borough's residents. The first Strategic Objective could also be improved if it were re-worded as follows:-  'Direct growth to the most sustainable locations and manage it to that which can be accommodated by available infrastructure and services or where appropriate infrastructure and services can be provided in a sustainable manner.'	<b>W/S SU INF ED</b>
152	Would like to see provision for consideration of nature conservation issues and these should feature in the consideration of the development of brownfield sites. Further information in full response.	<b>C BF</b>
160	Must ensure that objectives follow from the vision and that policies are written in a way that seeks to deliver the vision.	<b>W/S</b>
163	The objective to direct growth to the most sustainable locations and manage it to that which can be supported by the available infrastructure is supported. The CS should consider the location of key infrastructure, including retail food stores, when determining growth locations.	<b>SU INF RET</b>
165	Support objective to provide high quality shopping, leisure, cultural and community facilities. Shops are a vital necessity but arts, sport and play can be vehicles for health promotion; libraries, museums, arts and sport can contribute to education; parks, sports, arts and tourism can play a role in urban regeneration. Each service has its specific strengths, but all can make some contribution to developing communities.	<b>LEI RET DEV TOU QoL</b>
174	Given that the borough contains a number of rural communities a further objective should be included to emphasise the importance of maintaining and enhancing the sustainability of these rural communities. Example wording included in response as well as potential eighth objective.	<b>DEV</b>
184	Use of private gardens should not be encouraged for development of housing	<b>GAR</b>
189	Employ litter enforcement and local by-laws officers	<b>PR</b>
190	BBC cannot provide leisure and culture facilities entirely, cannot improve public transport, cannot ensure a prosperous local economy and cannot affect crime. Is it the job of BBC to encourage residents to lead healthy lives?	<b>CR ED PT LEI</b>
192	A focus on balancing inequalities, especially in health, should be a key objective.	<b>QoL</b>
193	These appear so generic - they could be any council in the land - there seems nothing specific or groundbreaking.	<b>W/S</b>
195	Growth should be constrained by that required by our immediate community. If a contraction is required in future, this should also be considered. We feel that the Borough [Council?] should not provide shopping and leisure facilities in the main but encourage their provision by private and charitable means.	<b>DEV CR RET</b>
196	First question could've been phrased better.	<b>W/S</b>

<b>Strategic Objectives Categories</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>ASB – anti-social behaviour</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>BC – bars &amp; cafes</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>BF – brownfield</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>C – conservation of the historic and/or natural environment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>CR – role and remit of Council</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>DEV – development</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>ED – economy</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>EMP – vacant property</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>GAR – garden development</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>GB – Green Belt</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>H – housing</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IMP – implementation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INF – infrastructure</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>LD – local character &amp; distinctiveness</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>LEI – leisure &amp; culture</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>O – other</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>PA – parking</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>PR – public realm, including litter, graffiti, condition of pavements etc</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>PT – public transport</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>QoL – quality of life</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>RE – renewable Energy</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>RET – retail</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Saf/Pol – Safety and Police</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SU – sustainability, including flood risk, water quality, green space</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>T – transport</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>TC – town centre</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>TOU – tourism</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>W/S – wording and/or style</b>	<b>12</b>

## Question 3: Theme 1 – Sustainable Use of Resources

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about the sustainable use of resources?	Category
1	We live in the Green Belt which has served us well (see below). This should be sacrosanct. All development should therefore be on brownfield sites.	<b>GB DEV LOC</b>
7	Encourage individuals to introduce renewable energy to their own homes by providing information about the financial benefits. Low carbon homes to get re-banded council tax for five years to assist in reducing cost pay back time. Improve insulation in new development.	<b>RE</b>
8	Targeting development to existing towns must not result in those centres becoming overcrowded or sprawling. Smaller centres will require suitable new housing/facilities to remain vibrant and sustainable.	<b>DEV LN</b>
10	Specific weight should be given to public transport corridors as sustainable locations for development.	<b>DEV LOC</b>
11	Would be good to have more buses that go to Shenfield station.	<b>T PT</b>
14	It is practically impossible to develop without some harm to the environment.	<b>ENV</b>
15	Do not want wind turbines all over the place. The Mardyke acts as a flood relief on this historic fen land. Any houses built within the vicinity will find it difficult to get insurance against flood.	<b>ENV FLO</b>
19	Wonder who would disagree with some of these statements. Important to think about which are more/less important. Our instinct is that potential for developing renewable energy resources in the Borough is limited and efforts should be directed towards the efficient use of energy, not just in new development but also within the existing building stock. So if we were ordering the objectives, we would probably place minimising flood risk above renewable energy resources, but below energy efficiency in new development.	<b>RE</b>
21	Victorians used the horse and railways, we use cars and railways and phones and will do so for the foreseeable future. Any plans ignoring this will never work.	<b>QoL</b>
23	Please do not turn villages into bustling towns.	<b>DEV LN</b>
25	I once tried cycling in Brentwood, whichever way you go it is always a long pull uphill!	<b>T CY/FP</b>
27	Don't agree Council can control flooding. The answers are obvious.	<b>ENV FLO</b>
29	The second objective must not conflict with the fifth.	<b>DEV LOC ENV FLO</b>
33	The provision of cycle/walking/mobility paths and routes should be encouraged in many existing areas and not confined to 'new' developments.	<b>T CY/FP</b>
34	We should never build on flood plains. All council buildings new or renovated should include solar panels etc and permeable paving.	<b>ENV FLO</b>
37	We believe option 1 will give maximum protection of the Green Belt. Wind turbines should only be in acceptable location such as offshore. Impossible to achieve minimising risk of flooding, as new development always increases flood risk.	<b>GB RE ENV FLO</b>
41	Renewable energy should only be promoted where its capital cost (monetary and natural resource impact) is paid back in savings in 10-20 years max (i.e. not at any cost).	<b>RE</b>
48	To avoid using the car, one aim should be to provide good public transport, timing and connections.	<b>T PT</b>
49	Quality of people's day to day lives and activities should be taken into account. Plans that tick all the boxes could result in irritating bureaucracy ruling people's lives.	<b>QoL</b>

51	You won't get people out of their cars - plan for realities, not pipe dreams.	<b>T CA2</b>
53	If renewable energy means ugly, noisy wind farms it should not be considered.	<b>RE</b>
54	There needs to be a broad spread of types of development to all areas to ensure smaller communities remain sustainable and do not become redundant.	<b>DEV LN</b>
56	A preference for brownfield sites should not be so worded as to exclude the use of greenfield sites to provide badly needed social or intermediate housing if there is no suitable brownfield site available.	<b>DEV LOC</b>
61	Not everything can and should be within walking distance - we can't all live (with all our needs being met) in the same place - with the exception of schools (primary/jnr & secondary).	<b>DEV LOC</b>
62	If there is a risk of flooding - don't build. Areas that flood are needed to ensure others don't.	<b>ENV FLO</b>
65	It makes sense to direct development to brownfield sites and those where transport links are good. However, to reduce travel, it may make more sense to build the small villages into sustainable communities. The last four statements unachievable?	<b>DEV LOC</b>
66	The avoidance for building around the immediate area (fields) surrounding river Wid and Roding will prevent subsequent flooding of new buildings	<b>ENV FLO</b>
69	With regard to last statement, do not want to see future development on the flood plains and fenland.	<b>ENV FLO</b>
70	Keep ditches clear. Ensure rivers do not silt up. Stop building on flood plains.	<b>ENV FLO</b>
71	No developments on Green Belt. No wind farms - too expensive. No building on flood plains.	<b>GB RE ENV FLO</b>
74	Flood plains are key to reduce problems (don't build on them)	<b>ENV FLO</b>
79	Greater use of renewable energy sources within visual limits.	<b>RE</b>
80	I don't know what renewable sources are so cannot comment on this.	<b>O</b>
81	Developments should take account of the high proportion of elderly people in the borough	<b>DEV LN</b>
83	There would appear to be merit in producing a design code that sets construction and design quality standards for development. Any design code document should give emphasis on matters such as energy efficiency and water saving devices in buildings, beneficial effects of sustainable drainage systems on water quality and rainfall collections, the use of recycled material, green infrastructure and green roofs. We consider climate change adaptation to be an important consideration in the planning of new development - refer to adapting to climate change documents. Further information in full response.	<b>D ENV</b>
87	In considering renewable energy on site, other factors such as affordable housing should be factored into the overall viability of renewable energy proposals. Planning authorities risk depressing the housing market by requesting numerous contributions that in turn make developments unviable.	<b>RE DEV LN</b>
92	I cannot believe why on earth the council is targeted to provide so many thousand new homes. This is madness! If climate change is the problem you want us to believe then surely extra homes is adding to this.	<b>DEV</b>
103	It would be better if all the empty properties across Essex were utilised as a priority rather than looking at new developments.	<b>DEV LN</b>
105	Development should be kept away from the area south of the A127 as this area has been seriously flooded several times in the past. Extra development in this area in terms of extra water generated plus the removal of natural drainage by the development area would exacerbate the problem and make parts of the southern area more liable to flooding that are not at the moment.	<b>ENV FLO</b>
106	A more strategic approach to housing needs across the public and private spectrum is required. Housing should not be viewed so much as marketable items, more a community resource that is governed by the community. The current approach creates benefits for unscrupulous finance houses to delaying	<b>DEV LN</b>

	local sustainable development in favour of larger national corporations, even if this means properties are left idle or vacant for significant periods.	
114	Development should focus on transport - the likelihood of good bus and rail services that can be used individually or together (or with cycling/walking) to provide movement without the use of private cars.	<b>T</b>
122	Solar Energy and insulation of new-builds must be considered as a priority.	<b>RE</b>
124	You cannot direct development to larger centres without destroying them - I'd prefer a single well planned new village with its own additional services and centre.	<b>DEV LOC</b>
125	(1) Agree development is directed to larger settlements, but not necessarily using brownfield land if this is not in the most sustainable location. Further, brownfield land already has a use which may make re-development unviable and may need to be provided elsewhere. (4) Where viable.	<b>DEV LOC</b>
128	Would it be possible to have a very strong planning code that demanded, say, that all new roofs have to face roughly south if possible and be covered with solar panels rather than roof tiles or slates? Should all new walls have an exceptional U-value by the use of novel materials and techniques? I would agree strongly with 'All development should be directed.... 'were it not that this doesn't seem all that easy to achieve. It seems to me that, much as I hate the idea of being surrounded by major development here in Doddinghurst, it would be a lot easier to go for the idea of satellite developments with effective public transport. Should the Council seek to offset the carbon cost of people driving to Weald Park by planting more trees there and more actively managing the forest areas by coppicing? (And, joking, using kangaroos to graze down the parkland vegetation rather than methane-emitting cows?!!!)	<b>RE DEV LOC T PT</b>
130	Care must be taken in developing existing or previously developed land as I have noticed that the new developments tend to have increased density and run to the full size of a site without leaving any green land. This is something we will regret. St Charles is a prime example. How many more units will there be as opposed to that on the previous site. The same has happened at Warley Hospital.	<b>DEV</b>
135	It is not considered that all development required over the plan period could reasonably take place on previously developed land within the urban area. Sites located towards the edge of urban areas and would not be contrary to objectives of including land in the Green Belt e.g. result in urban sprawl or the coalescence of adjoining settlements, should be considered to be sustainable locations for development. In order to meet the objectives of sustainable development and reduce the reliance on private cars, it is important that where it is necessary to allocate new housing sites these are located adjacent to existing settlements (to offer a wide choice of shops and service), and public transport. However, any new housing site should be located away from areas that are subject to specific landscape/habitat/biodiversity designations or areas that are subject to unacceptable levels of flooding. PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas), one of its main objectives is to promote more sustainable patterns of development and focus most development in, or next to existing towns and villages, and where it is required to use greenfield land, ensure that it is not used wastefully. Furthermore, to promote more sustainable patterns of development the focus of most additional housing in rural areas should be on existing towns. Policy SS4 of the East of England Plan advises that outside the Regions Key Centres, it would seek to ensure that other towns have the potential to increase their economic and social sustainability by ensuring appropriate amounts of new housing and local facilities and improving the town's access to public transport. Brentwood is the only town and largest settlement in the Borough, and therefore	<b>GB DEV LOC</b>

	has the most extensive range of goods and services, as well as access to public transport. In order to offer both the most sustainable option and ensure that future residents have the greatest access to shops and services, the majority of new housing sites should be focused in and around this settlement.	
137	I feel that any development should take into consideration access to public transport to enable people to get to their workplace, or use the facilities of Brentwood, without using a car.	<b>T PT</b>
139	Large sized housing estates and large complexes of flats should be avoided. Personal responsibility of individuals encouraged.	<b>DEV LN</b>
140	It is very important to protect and retain all urban open spaces. These mean so much to those already living in residential areas and are vital for the well-being of our local population. They provide areas for children to play. Everybody can use these areas for recreation, walking, enjoying nature and getting away from the general hubbub for a while. This category should also include all habitats of protected species and other species at risk as well as retaining land used by the Hopefield Sanctuary and other local charities.	<b>ENV OS</b>
142	<p>Each of the Statements generally reflects recognised, and supported, sustainable development principles. Wherever possible, new development should take place on previously developed land and, depending upon its scale and the catchment population that it is intended to serve, it should be directed towards the larger settlements, or public transport nodes, where there is generally the greatest opportunity for the local population to access that development by modes other than the private car.</p> <p>However, it should also be recognised that, for some smaller scale developments, the most sustainable use of resources is to locate the facility where it would best serve the needs of its catchment population. It would not be a sustainable use of resources if small scale development used valuable, highly accessible, central urban sites such that the policies of the Core Strategy resulted in local people having to travel long distances to access even day-to-day facilities and services. Whilst the Statements provide that new development should aim to reduce energy consumption to minimise pollution and that the greater use for renewable energy sources should be promoted, there is not as much flexibility in the Statements relating to environmental and natural resources.</p> <p>These Statements, and the policies and provisions of the Core Strategy that flow from them, should also recognise that it is not always possible to meet the social and economic needs of the Borough in a manner that avoids any harm to the environment and natural resources.</p> <p>Whilst development should always seek to enhance such interests, it must be recognised that this is not always possible (and the Statements should be appropriately worded).</p>	<b>DEV LOC</b>
149	If over development occurs, residents will move further out to get the semi-rural character they want, with further adverse affects on environment/pollution.	<b>ENV DEV</b>
152	We would hope to see consideration given to green roofs. Further information in full response.	<b>RE</b>
157	Sites with potential for decentralised power and/or heating which minimise water consumption and promote better management of waste should be considered favourably.	<b>RE</b>
162	Emerging objectives of minerals development need to be considered under this theme (see full letter for more details).	<b>ENV MIN</b>
174	Directing development towards existing larger settlements and areas offering greatest opportunities for transport modes is far too simplistic. It fails to take into account PPS3, paragraph 38 – need to provide housing in rural areas. Notwithstanding this there is insufficient brownfield land within the district to accommodate the entirety of Brentwood's housing requirements to 2031.	<b>DEV LOC</b>
175	It's important to maintain development within and around Brentwood as the main	<b>DEV LOC</b>

	centre for the Borough; however, there are limited opportunities, particularly in relation to employment. Brentwood has the benefit of a good primary road network and links to the M25 - there are good opportunities in the Green Belt to build on existing employment sites within the transport corridors.	<b>GB</b>
190	Maximum use of existing brownfield sites is essential - too many have been permitted to change to residential i.e. Ingatestone.	<b>DEV</b>
192	There is a need to ensure development on brownfield sites do not add risk to the health of new and existing residents. New developments need to ensure the quality, size, and access to promote better health and well being of residents.	<b>DEV LN</b>

<b>Theme 1 Categories</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>D - design</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>DEV - development</b>	<b>26</b>
LOC - location	13
LN – local need	9
<b>ENV - environment</b>	<b>17</b>
FLO - flooding	12
OS - open space	1
MIN - minerals	1
<b>GB - Green Belt</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>RE - renewable energy</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>T - transport</b>	<b>7</b>
PT - public transport	4
CY/FP - cycling/walking	2
CA2 – unrealistic to reduce car usage	1
<b>QoL - quality of life</b>	<b>2</b>

## Question 4: Theme 2 – Ensuring the Protection of the Natural and Built Environment and Local Character

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about ensuring the protection of the natural and built environment and local character?	Category
1	The Green Belt is sacrosanct. The standard of design of new development in often highly visible locations continues to disappoint. BBC should be prepared to deal robustly with poorly or indifferently designed schemes which do not respect the scale of the town and are an ill-mannered response to the existing buildings and environment.	<b>GB1 D</b>
7	Shop front styles should be improved.	<b>D</b>
8	Whilst respecting the character of the local area, it will still be necessary to target some suitable sustainable development throughout the Borough. The urban areas have been targeted too intensively.	<b>D GB2</b>
10	Brownfield development and 'near' brownfield development should be a priority for release before greenfield development, even when in the defined Green Belt, where the location is well served and allows for sustainable development. Where greenfield land has to be used, the assessment should carefully evaluate the potential for use of previously developed land whether in the Green Belt or not, especially where sustainably located, and should be given priority over greenfield land so as to conserve the countryside and ensure more sustainable development. Although the Green Belt should be protected, this should not allow a failure to consider sites where the function and purpose of the Green Belt has been compromised, such that character and openness has been lost and there is no longer any contribution to preventing coalescence of settlements. This priority is missing from the strategic objectives. Further information in full response.	<b>GB1</b>
12	Open spaces are for children to play and not to be picturesque, unusable places.	<b>OS</b>
14	It is premature to include the last three statements. A more flexible approach would be more appropriate.	<b>OS2 PA</b>
15	Children need areas where they can play safely and with balls in particular. All public spaces should be improved. 15 years ago, West Horndon and Bulphan were included in the Thames Chase - an area of land to be used for forestry and leisure to stop further encroachment of outer London. Future planning should recognise that West Horndon and Bulphan are in the green belt and Thames Chase.	<b>OS GB1</b>
16	No building of dwellings on open farmland surrounding village of Stondon Massey	<b>GB1</b>
17	investigate and apply the Canadian scheme whereby a percentage of the value of development is used for works of art etc.	<b>PA</b>
19	Some statements under this heading are in potential conflict with each other. For example, protecting the Green Belt and protecting existing urban open space. We would attach much higher importance to protecting urban open space than blanket protection of the Green Belt. We would also attach higher priority to innovative design than respecting local character.	<b>OS D2</b>
20	Consideration given to enhancement of green belts, green wedges, green corridors and provision of recreational facilities.	<b>GB1 OS</b>
22	Not all Green Belt land should be allocated.	<b>GB1</b>
25	Re links between open spaces, always keep in mind safety for walkers and possible teenage use (smoking/drinking etc).	<b>N</b>
26	Wood frame buildings are a fire hazard and do not reflect local character.	<b>D</b>
27	Increasingly the future of Green Belt will be coming under pressure.	<b>O</b>

31	Waste of money to improve public spaces.	<b>OS2</b>
33	Keep fly tipping, travellers and Saturday night revellers from outside the Borough at bay.	<b>N</b>
34	All new developments should have green spaces for aesthetic reasons and to allow water drainage. All paving should be permeable. We should not shun modern architecture.	<b>OS D2</b>
35	Some of these need public money to ensure they happen - not good as an objective without funding mechanism.	<b>IMP</b>
37	Residential gardens are not brownfield in our view. Parks should be natural and not over-landscaped. In current economic climate, should not be spending money in this area.	<b>OS O</b>
41	Green belt should not be a sacred cow. For instance 'ribbon' development and roadside fields between rural housing should be considered. Usually such sites would have water, gas, sewerage, underneath the adjacent road and obviously would not require more adopted roads.	<b>GB2 INF</b>
42	Not in favour of acquiescing on town centre foxes and other vermin, including pigeons.	<b>NA</b>
44	Affordable dwellings for ordinary families. Dissuade development of 5/6 bedroom properties invariably built for quick profit.	<b>AF</b>
48	Innovation can be ghastly as well as delightful. Landscaping is usually ok, but works of art often means eyesores. Better to have trees and flowers.	<b>D PA</b>
49	Current art in Brentwood is a joke, if you have art it needs to be high quality. Flats at Brentwood near station (old gas holder site) are cheap and nasty. Future slums? Flats at corner kings road and Hart Street much more in keeping with adjacent properties.	<b>D PA</b>
51	It's a matter of degree protect but compromise for good, much needed development.	<b>O</b>
53	With reference to the last item - one could hardly disagree, but consider please the problems of vandalism to artworks before using our money to pay for them.	<b>PA</b>
54	Works of art will not improve public space. Good sustainable design is required.	<b>PA</b>
55	Under the section which refers to 'works of art' I have reservations as some so called modern works of art can be money wasted.	<b>PA</b>
61	New development innovative & also respects local character - how do you do both?	<b>O</b>
62	Once you lose green space it's gone forever.	<b>GB1 OS</b>
65	Better to maintain what we have. 'natural' is better than 'landscaped' generally. Works of art also need to be maintained and may be viewed as frivolous when basic needs go unmet. However could be part of Brentwood USP.	<b>OS PA</b>
74	Works of art' should be done by local schools artists to reflect local community.	<b>PA</b>
76	Not works of art - different values for everyone.	<b>PA</b>
79	The proposed cinema should be sited in the High Street using the old post office building and site. The William Hunter Way car park should be developed up to a 2 or 3 storey car park. More empty shops NOT	<b>TC</b>
81	The existing skyline should be protected and further high rise permitted. [Sic]	<b>D2</b>
92	Works of art are a waste of tax payers' money.	<b>PA</b>
93	1. Restrict the building of flats and concentrate on high quality houses instead. 2. Do not allow any more travellers. 3. No development of Green Belt at all. No development of the villages as infrastructure can't cope and they will lose their unique character.	<b>GB1 D INF</b>
100	Existing areas of Protected Urban Open Space as identified in the Adopted Local Plan should continue to be safeguarded. These areas provide valuable facilities for local people of all ages and are extremely important. This is of	<b>OS</b>

	particular importance in respect of the tennis courts to the rear of the Community Association building in Ingatestone. These tennis courts are afforded protection in the Adopted Local Plan as being Protected Urban Open Space and it is considered this should continue in the new LDF. Their loss to other uses such as car parking or residential development would be a great loss to the village and of detriment to those living in close proximity.	
102	We need affordable housing which stays affordable . The schemes in Chelmsford which I know about (and probably elsewhere for all I know) were heralded by councillors and politicians but sadly resale was not restricted and they are now mostly resold on the open market. Also maintenance charges were much too high. These low cost housing ideas are not well managed and a new model involving less overheads ( fingers in the pie) is required if we are to provide affordable housing.	<b>AF</b>
106	Less development at any single time is more sustainable than rapid ad hoc growth. No estates, single plots.	<b>S</b>
113	If I agreed to the last measure it would give you an excuse to waste a lot of money on what council officials feel is art and I suspect the rest of us would say is a further waste of money.	<b>PA</b>
114	Existing urban areas can be developed if done sympathetically - and some development can enhance existing built up places.	<b>D</b>
121	Respecting the Character of local areas should probably not be in the hands of Brentwood Council alone but be offered for input from the local people, as Brentwood Council seem to have a different opinion as to how the borough should look.	<b>D</b>
122	There must be oases in the midst of concrete jungles.	<b>OS</b>
124	Brentwood town centre development demonstrates that you do not have the skills to plan and deliver significant improvements - all that effort and nothing has changed!	<b>O</b>
125	(1) Green Belt is not an environmental designation and should not be considered as one. As its release is essential to meeting the regional housing allocation, it cannot be protected in its entirety.	<b>GB2</b>
127	The character of the local area should be defined by local residents. Production of a Village Design Statement (VDS) for each Parish should be encouraged to provide residents the opportunity to define their character and have some control over planning in their areas. RCCE (Rural Community Council of Essex) can support the creation of VDS and Brentwood Borough should provide encouragement and support from Planning Policy Officers.	<b>D</b>
128	I can't fully agree with 'New Development should....' because it isn't practicable in town centre high-rise developments. Also because I think there is a case for a development of a local equivalent of Poundbury - tightly packed but attractive, but with its green spaces outside, rather than within the built environment. Some of the existing architecture of the villages, in particular, is such a mess, that there seems to be no need to build fresh developments down to the level of local character. It depends on the location. Doddinghurst, for example, needs a complete new focal point and centre, and any vaguely East Anglian style would do. Blackmore, on the other hand is so lovely that ideally it should be left as it is, or have any development in a totally sensitive way.	<b>D</b>
130	Continual infilling results in increased congestion. I do not see any new roads, infrastructure etc just building more and more flats and houses.	<b>INF</b>
135	The policies in the East of England Plan advise that there is not a requirement to undertake a strategic review of the Green Belt Boundary within Brentwood at this point in time. The general approach is tempered in the London Arc through Policy LA1 which recognises that towns such as Brentwood will retain and develop their existing roles, recognising and making as much provision for new development within the built up area as is compatible, with retention, and wherever possible enhancement of their distinctive characters and identities.	<b>D</b> <b>GB2</b> <b>OS</b>

	<p>This approach acknowledges that there could be some development outside the urban area, which in the case of Brentwood would mean in the Green Belt. PPG2 (Green Belts), states that Green Belts should be designed to ensure that they will endure and should not include land which it is not necessary to keep open, and the boundaries should not be drawn excessively tight around the existing built-up areas, as it may not be possible to maintain a degree of permanence that Green Belts should have.</p> <p>It is important that new development is directed away from Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Country Parks and Gardens and County Wildlife Sites.</p>	
136	The open spaces in the control of the council should be put into TRUSTs to protect their status in perpetuity - e.g. St Faiths and Warley parks et al	<b>OS</b>
137	Brentwood and its surrounding villages are blessed with beautiful countryside and this should be retained at all costs as it is a major part of Brentwood's character. Landscaping within the town and at its 'gateways' certainly enhances its appearance and is welcoming to visitors. With regards to works of art, I feel that the millennium clock (when restored to the High Street) is a classic piece which definitely enhances the town and with the 'totem pole' by Kings Road, provides sufficient works of art for the area.	<b>GB1 OS PA</b>
139	Where, and only if absolutely necessary, green belt is to be built upon, it should be first offered to surrounding/neighbouring residents to offer them the opportunity to extend their, usually small, garden. This would encourage more green space.	<b>GB1 OS</b>
140	<p>As stated before, it is very important to protect and retain all urban open spaces. These mean so much to those already living in residential areas and are vital for the well-being of our local population. They provide areas for children to play. Everybody can use these areas for recreation, walking, enjoying nature and getting away from the general hubbub for a while. This category should also include all habitats of protected species and other species at risk as well as retaining land used by the Hopefield Sanctuary and other local charities.</p> <p>Whilst in principle, the Green Belt should be protected, if the only other option is to use existing urban open spaces, then our preference, however difficult to swallow for all involved, would be to use or encroach on a very limited amount of green belt, provided the habitat of protected species and others at risk is fully protected.</p>	<b>OS NA GB2</b>
142	<p>The first key issue at paragraph 7.11 of the Consultation Document, sums up the balancing exercise that the Core Strategy needs to strike, in that its policies and provisions will need to protect and enhance the Borough's environmental assets, including biodiversity, whilst also allowing for new development to take place. This wording reflects the fact that as is highlighted in the Sustainability Appraisal a number of the Strategic Objectives are not fully compatible with one another. The Statements set out under this theme and, in particular, the policies and provisions of the Core Strategy that follow, should be expressed as objectives or goals, rather than inflexible, inviolate, objectives.</p> <p>The eventual policies will need to be worded so that the value of the natural or built resource can be accessed and weighed against the social, economic, or other environmental benefits to be derived from a proposed development.</p>	<b>IMP</b>
152	Nature conservation issues should be considered in the development of brownfield sites.	<b>NA</b>
153	It should be recognised that development is encroaching on the countryside and wildlife. The destruction of wildlife habitats should be avoided.	<b>NA</b>
155	More care needs to be taken over green spaces. Lack of benches to sit on in green spaces. Lake on Shenfield common often full of litter. More thorough street cleaning required	<b>OS</b>
157	Development proposals should seek to protect and provide networks of accessible green infrastructure linking urban areas with the countryside. Where development is proposed for greenfield sites, proposals should maximise opportunities for environmental protection.	<b>OS NA</b>

161	Green belt land should not be built on unless it has no value to biodiversity. Brownfield sites should be used again. Nature reserves and SSSIs should be protected and more should be created for future generations	<b>GB1 NA</b>
174	Protecting the Green Belt does not reflect the housing allocation in the RSS. PPG2 requires green belt boundaries to not be drawn excessively tightly around existing built up areas. A Green Belt Review is required to ensure housing requirements can be accommodated. PPG2 encourages a long term approach.	<b>GB2</b>
175	The LPA should review the Green Belt boundaries, as part of the LDF and overview of the Council's strategy up to 2031. There are despoiled sites well related to the exiting transport corridors that could make a valuable contribution to employment and would benefit from investment in landscaping as part of any development to overall enhance the visual amenities of the Green Belt.	<b>GB2</b>
177	North East London NHS Foundation Trust agrees that the Green Belt should be on the whole protected. However this should not preclude small scale releases, particularly where land is previously developed and lies adjacent to existing settlement boundaries, especially around Brentwood. This would also support the model for centralised growth.	<b>GB1 O</b>
179	It is important to protect our environment and the history of the area.	<b>GB1 NA</b>
189	Development and improvements need to be protected from vandalism. By-laws are required and enforced. Laws not enforced are useless.	<b>N</b>
190	Not too innovative design. Contradiction perhaps with respecting the character of the local area. Art may not be a financial priority.	<b>D PA</b>
192	Access to good quality open and green spaces is a benefit to the wellbeing of everyone. It is essential that all development preserves and/or improves this access for new and current residents.	<b>OS</b>
193	Agree with high quality materials and landscaping, but not works of art. Think that these aren't a priority in difficult times.	<b>D PA</b>

Theme 2 Categories	Total
<b>AF – affordable housing</b>	2
<b>D – good quality, appropriate design</b>	14
<b>D2 – innovative design</b>	3
<b>GB1 – protect Green Belt</b>	13
<b>GB2 – Green Belt can't all be protected</b>	7
<b>IMP – implementation</b>	2
<b>INF – infrastructure requirements</b>	3
<b>N – safety and anti social behaviour</b>	3
<b>NA – nature conservation</b>	7
<b>O – other</b>	6
<b>OS – open space protection</b>	18
<b>OS2 – against open space protection</b>	2
<b>PA – public art</b>	15
<b>S - sustainability</b>	1
<b>TC – town centre</b>	1

## Question 5: Theme 3 – Local Economy and Economic Development

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about local economy and economic development?	Category
1	I do not support large scale leisure facilities in the town centre, which seems to be driven by developers getting the best financial return rather than high quality investment driven by the wishes of local residents.	DEV loc LEI
4	More use of voluntary sector services should be included.	VOL
5	Borough can't sustain shops already in Brentwood. Reduce business rates to shops to keep existing traders. Make parking free all the time in the town centre.	BUSI R T PA
7	Need cinema.	LEI CIN
9	There are too many eating establishments for the size of Brentwood centre.	BC
10	Additional opportunities for well sited employment developments should be allowed, especially for small businesses to allow provision of new efficient premises. Employment sites should be well located and have regard to the trunk road network and residential amenity. Older development in less well suited locations can then be released for other uses. Further information in full response.	S BUS DEV loc
11	I don't want to see more bars in Brentwood - we already have too many.	BC
12	How about premises for small businesses, for 10 employees and under.	S BUS
14	It does not seem realistic to try to forecast in such detail what the demands will be in 20 years time, particularly with the changing pattern in retail since online was introduced.	RSS
15	Include farmland in existing employment land. With an ever growing population, farmers should be encouraged to grow food or we will be forever condemned to buy from Europe, and existing employment land should be used to capacity.	AGRI
17	There are an unacceptable number of food outlets, hairdressers and nail decorators in the town.	BC
19	There is a surprising omission in the document's discussion on retailing, which is the growth in the internet shopping. Internet retailing is experiencing double figure growth in the UK and is likely to stay as such for some time. It is not unreasonable to think that this will have fundamental consequences for 'bricks and mortar' shopping facilities within the Borough, especially Brentwood town centre. This suggests to us that the town centre's future will depend increasingly on its non-retailing functions. In terms of retailing, it is likely that niche retailers that offer some specific experience above the simple sale of good together with cafes, bars and restaurants, will form the backbone of retailing activity. Further detail in full response.	RET INT
21	There are theatres in Chelmsford and Hornchurch. None needed in Brentwood in excess of existing facility. There is no need for a multiscreen cinema either.	LEI CIN
23	I feel Brentwood town centre has an abundance of cafes, bars and restaurants.	BC
25	Local business suffered during High Street rebuilding.	TC
26	Reduce the number of charity shops - increase invalidity parking.	RET T PA
27	We do not feel Brentwood could or should try to compete with the easily reached large shopping centres; it should try to improve its small specialist shops. As for culture, the present museum is excellent for what it tries to do and constantly makes headway. The theatre just about manages as do amateur groups - no need for more.	COB RET LEI
29	Brentwood does not need more shops or cafes. It needs different shops - such	RET

	as Debenhams in Romford and Woolworths.	
33	New employment sites should be assessed on their particular merit so unable to comment on statements 1 and 2.	<b>DEV loc</b>
35	Vacant premises should be allowed to have alternative uses at least temporarily so they that contribute to economy rather than having a possible negative impact.	<b>EMP</b>
37	New employment development will inevitably involve Green Belt. Difficult to agree on role of town centre without detail. Old House could be the new museum. We already have a theatre and Brentwood is too small to support another.	<b>GB LEI</b>
40	Every time new business comes to Brentwood it has an insignificant effect on employment for Brentwood unemployed. As they bring their employees with them, which puts further strain on council housing needs, as was the case with BT.	<b>JOBS</b>
41	I do not believe it should be the responsibility of the local council to help businesses to 'remain viable' it is the company's responsibility not the ratepayers.	<b>PRBUS</b>
42	Businesses should support themselves once they are established.	<b>PRBUS</b>
43	The unique quality of Brentwood should be preserved. Too much industrialism could destroy this quality.	<b>LD</b>
48	It is not enough to have theatres, it's what goes on in them that's important. There is a museum, but it is out of the way and opening times are limited. Evening classes are now too expensive for pensioners.	<b>LEI</b>
49	Brentwood town centre has become too tatty and down market. Older people avoid high street at night, including town centre residents. This is due to crowds of violent drunks using bars and clubs.	<b>ASB BC</b>
51	We need a cinema very much.	<b>LEI CIN</b>
53	There are enough cafes, bars and restaurants already.	<b>BC</b>
54	A better balance should be struck between local communities and town centre facilities to ensure that there is a good provision of local facilities that can be sustained.	<b>COMU</b>
55	Reservations concerning the numbers of new businesses of up to 250 employees. We should not grow too big. Also support for businesses should be judged carefully to ensure costly support is not wasted on businesses which have little chance of success.	<b>PRBUS</b>
62	Reduce the number of bars in Brentwood high street. They're the biggest cause of trouble at night and attract troublesome elements, particularly from outside the area. More assistance for small shops with reduced business rate.	<b>BC ASB BUSI R</b>
63	There are too many cafes and bars etc. we need to fill the empty shops in the high street and bay tree centre to encourage shoppers to the town.	<b>BC EMP</b>
65	Land use requirements necessarily change over time. Rigid 'zoning' is counterproductive in adapting to these changing needs. Brentwood town centre appears over-served with bars, pubs, restaurants and fast-food outlets.	<b>DEV loc BC</b>
66	Good examples of highly successful out of town industrial estates are the Halsford Bridge industrial estate and Childerditch industrial estates. It is not necessary to be close to Brentwood, Shenfield or Hutton. Present grassland could be used for industrial estates.	<b>DEV loc GB</b>
69	With regard to the first statement, this should include farmland.	<b>AGRI</b>
71	Priority should be full use of existing sites. New commercial development should be on commercial sites. Advice on improving business ways. Focus on Warley Hill, Ongar Road etc. not Brentwood town centre.	<b>DEV loc</b>
74	Ingatestone is now too big to qualify for rural business rate reduction. This is a big disadvantage, can borough help?	<b>BUSI R</b>

75	We have far too many cafes, bars & restaurants in the high street. No more	<b>BC</b>
77	Market place would be excellent.	<b>RET MA</b>
79	As stated before, the cinema should be sited at the old post office site and no more bars or a slight reduction in bars and food outlets (take-aways etc.)	<b>LEI CIN BC</b>
87	Protecting employment land must be viewed in the context of demand for certain types of space, particularly offices. We note that it is stated that there is 'significant amount of vacant office floorspace' in the Borough. The need for employment land must be balanced against the need for additional housing, especially on brownfield sites.	<b>DEV loc EMP</b>
92	Brentwood seems to be pursuing a policy completely at odds with much of the above. Stop treating motorists as cash cows. Parking charges are a disgrace and a serious threat to business in Brentwood town centre.	<b>T PA</b>
102	See comments re car parking in the High Street.	<b>T PA</b>
103	The number of charity shops and Italian restaurants should be reviewed and unusual retailers encouraged establishing a business in Brentwood with affordable rents etc and accessibility. Expensive parking and lack of short term 'pop to the shop' facilities will keep shoppers going to the larger developments such as Romford, Lakeside etc.	<b>RET T PA</b>
104	No more cafes / pubs please! The fewer real shops there are in Brentwood, the less reason there is to shop there.	<b>BC</b>
106	We have to admit that Brentwood is becoming wholly dependant upon the commuter population for the primary incomes. The majority of local employment is in service industries that directly or indirectly support that population. The density of housing and the scarcity of open spaces mean that any employment that is not in this 'service market' would not be welcome and rightly so. However, this is because the scale of such operations is normally considered at industrial levels, if this were downsized to cottage industry type manufacture and production then additional revenue would be brought into the area outside the currently volatile commuter populations spending power. Why open more bars when those that are there already are empty 4 nights a week?	<b>COMU DEV loc BC</b>
113	No more cafes, bars or restaurants please. We have more than enough now.	<b>BC</b>
114	Expanding local employment can only be limited if additional housing is to be provided, and the Green Belt and open spaces protected too. Brentwood Town Centre needs a wider variety of interesting shops. It does not need more leisure if that means eating & drinking outlets. As we don't have the space for everything, we should leave theatres & museums to other towns, or London, to which public transport is readily available.	<b>BC COB GB LEI RET</b>
117	Development of shopping centres and leisure facilities near the transport corridor would alleviate the current congestion in Brentwood town centre. Improved public transport facilities (i.e. local buses across the Borough running regularly - say every half hour - between the hours of 19:00 and midnight would be required to complement this strategy).	<b>DEV loc RET T PT</b>
118	It is alright to have all kinds of facilities but you need the reliable transport to use them.	<b>T PT</b>
121	Brentwood Theatre is yet another square building that looks like an office block, in totally the wrong spot with no parking. This suggests that Brentwood Councillors do not go to the Theatre or have never been near one to see how usually magnificent they are!	<b>D DEV loc</b>
122	Smaller shops are needed and less cafes, bars and restaurants. A street market, as in the past, would be most welcome which would bring more life and revenue to the town.	<b>BC RET MA</b>
124	Improved public transport is the key - frequent small buses - one large bus every hour or two.	<b>T PT</b>
125	(All) Although this depends on the outcome of the Employment Land Review.	<b>EVI</b>

	(10) These district centres play an important role in reducing the need to travel long distances.	<b>BASE DEV loc</b>
128	With only an hourly bus service to Brentwood, and none at all to Shenfield or in the evenings, cultural and leisure facilities in Brentwood are irrelevant to me here in Doddinghurst. What would interest me would be funding for a replacement and larger village hall here in Doddinghurst.	<b>T PT COMU</b>
130	We do not need more cafes, pubs etc in or around the town centre - there are too many already. We do not need it pedestrianised either!	<b>BC</b>
134	<p>EEDA's principal role is to improve the economy of the East of England through the promotion of sustainable economic development and regeneration; and through the delivery of the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) (Inventing the Future Collective Action for a sustainable economy, 2008). The RES advocates a region that is internationally competitive with a global reputation for innovation and business growth that harnesses and develops the talents and creativity of all and is at the forefront of a low carbon and resource efficient economy. Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development', 2005 reminds local authorities that they should plan for sustainable growth in support of the RES through local development documents. Also, Planning Policy Statement 12 'Creating Strong Safe and Prosperous Communities through Local Spatial Planning', 2008 highlights the importance of spatial planning in relation to economic growth and regeneration. The RES supports and complements the East of England Plan and EEDA supports the implementation of policies within that strategy.</p> <p>The Regional Economic Strategy sets out the objectives and long term vision for the region's economy with high and growing levels of wealth, increasing levels of economic participation and inclusion and sustainable dynamic rural economies. The RES also aligns with the East of England Plan 2008. The RES vision seeks to secure a region that is internationally competitive, harnesses and develops the creativity of all and is at the forefront of a low carbon economy. It should also be known for exceptional landscape, vibrant places and quality of life.</p> <p>Brentwood is strategically located adjacent to Greater London Metropolitan area and therefore identified as being within the London Arc Engine of Growth as identified in the Regional Economic Strategy. Engines of Growth are identified in relation to functional urban areas and are expected to disproportionately drive forward economic growth in the region. London's economic footprint extends well into the East of England region and therefore this should be recognised and reflected in policy terms in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The RES contains strategic ambitions for the London Arc sub region which include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support improvements in sustainable transport between key centres across the arc and between key centres and international airports.</li> <li>- Retain and enhance quality and frequency of train services to London to maximise the economic benefits to the region from planned investment in public transport systems.</li> <li>- Support the development of basic business infrastructure to support housing and economic growth</li> <li>- Support measures to raise employment rates and raise profile of higher value employment across the arc.</li> <li>- Support sub regional roles of key centres of development and change by recognising the reality of sub regional economies.</li> <li>- Deliver a high quality and sustainable urban environment across the arc that supports historic assets and brings forward brown field sites.</li> </ul> <p>In view of the above the Theme 3 - Economy and Economic Development, should look to be more considerate of the sub regional policy perspective. Although Brentwood has a relatively prosperous economy there needs to be greater recognition of the role of the district within the London Arc and its relationship with the capital.</p> <p>EEDA supports the Council in providing sufficient land for employment purposes and the proposal to safeguard sufficient land and premises to meet the</p>	<b>COB DEV loc T RSS</b>

	<p>economic and business needs of the area. The unique location of the district should be recognised when allocating new land and safeguarding existing employment land, and ideally the policy should be informed by an up to date employment land review. The East of England Forecast Model (EEFM) suggests that the district should provide for 3,700 jobs for the period 2011 to 2031.</p>	
135	<p>The East of England Plan sets out the requirement for an increase in employment provision in the Borough up to 2031 as part of 56,000 additional jobs across mid Essex. The East of England Plan Review Sub Area Profile for The Heart of Essex provides more local information about possible growth scenarios. Scenarios 1-3 suggests that the jobs that would need to be created between 2011 and 2031 could vary between 30,000 (scenario 1), 45,500 (scenario 2) and 35,400 (scenario 3). Government's household projections, which have been used to develop scenario 4, predict that between 2011 and 2031 there will be an additional 50,000 households in the sub-area.</p> <p>Proposals for major new residential developments are likely to include a neighbourhood centre and community facilities, which will be generators of jobs in their own right. In addition the occupiers of the new residential developments will also be future employees of the existing and proposed employment areas.</p>	<p><b>COMU JOBS RSS</b></p>
136	<p>In relation to the comment on the role of the Town Centre once again it fails to protect the communities focus of the Town Centre - after all the TC is only as good as the people who make use of it - local people.</p>	<p><b>TC</b></p>
137	<p>Before proceeding with any new commercial developments, the Council should be looking to fill all existing units/premises currently vacant. To boost the local economy it is essential that visitors are offered a wider variety of retail shops so all their needs are catered for within Brentwood High Street. The shops in Crown Street and the Ropers Yard area are a valuable asset to the town and the refurbishment of Wilsons Corner is an added attraction. A department store would certainly attract shoppers. As regards leisure facilities, the Brentwood Leisure Centre could offer much more and needs to be revitalised.</p>	<p><b>EMP RET LEI</b></p>
139	<p>Discourage lots of bars (such as Romford), though a viable and well regulated night life should be strongly encouraged. Encourage (local) art fairs and craft fairs. Encourage local independent shops, as well as chain retail stores. For any vibrant and successful town, I'm afraid easily accessible and affordable car parking is a must.</p>	<p><b>BC RET T PA</b></p>
142	<p>The fact that the Borough Council recognises (paragraph 7.12 of the consultation document) that continuous economic prosperity and thriving businesses are as important as bringing social and environmental benefits to the community, is welcomed. The Borough Council needs to take a balanced approach to local economic conditions and issues. It needs to recognise both changing work place and employment patterns (for example, a higher proportion of Brentwood residents, than the national average, work from home and do not, therefore, need, or contribute to a requirement for, employment land or premises) and that many existing employment sites provide poor quality, out-moded, accommodation, which is in the wrong location.</p> <p>The Issues and Options document recognises that there is a significant amount of vacant floorspace and extant planning permissions (paragraph 7.13 is an example). This is an acknowledgement of the fact that much existing employment land, and premises, does not meet the needs of modern businesses. The Core Strategy should also recognise that other forms of development (such as retail, leisure and tourism) often provides a greater number of job opportunities (per sqm of floorspace), than do 'traditional' employment activities. The type of jobs provided are generally better suited to the skills match of the local population, whilst, at the same time, they often afford enhanced career paths and development training.</p> <p>The provisions of the East of England Plan are phrased in terms of jobs created, regardless of the sector within which they arise. The Core Strategy should reflect both this fact and the structural changes that are taking place in the</p>	<p><b>DEV loc EVI BASE</b></p>

	<p>national economy and there should be a greater degree of flexibility (when compared to the policies of the current Local Plan) in terms of the type of employment generating activity that is considered appropriate for existing, or allocated, employment sites. Indeed, and particularly with respect to scarce town centre, or edge of centre, land, it is considered that existing employment sites should be reallocated as commercial sites; so recognising their suitability for a wide range of commercial uses, all of which will contribute to RSS employment targets.</p> <p>The focus being placed on the enhancement, and improvement, of Brentwood town centre is welcomed. It should, however, be recognised that the only way of developing the existing range, and quality, of retail, cultural, leisure and community facilities will be through the identification of suitable development opportunities. If the Core Strategy, or other Local Development Framework documents, does not do this, then Brentwood will continue to loose out to neighbouring centres such as Chelmsford, Romford and Lakeside.</p> <p>Spending on convenience and comparison goods, together with leisure related spending, will continue to leek out of the Borough and be lost to the local economy. The Core Strategy needs to be ambitious and, in accordance with PPS12 advice, it should identify strategic development opportunities (which are key to the achievement of Strategic Objectives) in, and on the edge of, the town centre.</p> <p>Finally, the Borough Council is urged to delay the Preferred Options stage of the Core Strategy until a full retail appraisal/analysis of the role, function and potential of the town centre has been carried out. The Borough Council cannot formulate policies for the future development of the town centre until it has the necessary evidence base.</p>	
149	Keep in mind why many people moved to Brentwood, for a suburban, semi-rural lifestyle - shopping provision should meet only daily/weekly needs and provision of additional major shopping centres should be avoided. When they moved here, people accepted that they would need to travel for major shopping to other centres and for employment. Don't ruin this character by over development, which will make people move even further out.	<b>LD</b>
152	Agree with principles and objectives.	<b>O</b>
153	Town centre struggling to compete with dispersed retail and entertainment centres.	<b>COB</b>
163	Support the identification of Brentwood as the sole main town in the Borough. It is important to maintain Brentwood as the focus for a range of services and facilities. This should be expanded to include retail employment. Retail development is a major contributor to job creation and reference to this should be made here.	<b>RET</b>
165	Comment on titles used throughout document, specifically page 31. Town centres should be multi-purpose and succeed through a self-sustaining combination of working, living and leisure. Existing facilities for cultural, leisure and community activities should be protected and enhanced with provision made for future venues to be part of a successful mixed-use environment. Performing arts are an important community element for town centres. Welcome the recognition that cultural and creative activities are an important contributor to Brentwood's economy.	<b>W/S LEI COMU</b>
172	A borough-wide retail assessment should be undertaken in order to inform whether there is a need for additional retail facilities as advised in PPS6. Once this assessment has been undertaken it will form a key part of the evidence base which would allow the Council to consider within the Core Strategy whether there is a requirement, and where this can be best located to subsequently advise the Site Allocations DPD.	<b>EVI BASE</b>
174	In addition to prioritising the viability of the district shopping centres in Ingatestone, Shenfield and Warley Hill the viability of local shopping facilities in the villages such as Mountnessing should also be prioritised in order to maintain	<b>LD RET LS</b>

	and enhance the sustainability of those settlements.	
175	It's important to maintain development within and around Brentwood as the main centre for the Borough; however, there are limited opportunities, particularly in relation to employment. Brentwood has the benefit of a good primary road network and links to the M25 – there are good opportunities in the Green Belt to build on existing employment sites within the transport corridors.	<b>GB DEV loc</b>
177	Response does not relate to economic development but rather to the potential for the Mascalls Park hospital site to support residential development.	<b>O</b>
179	The town centre should have better variety with regards to the shops to bring more visitors and keep the locals buying locally. I am not in favour of the five theatre cinema development and extra shops to the rear of the high street. There are too many shops empty already.	<b>RET LEI CIN EMP</b>
190	Role of Brentwood town centre should be improved within reason and not the detriment of village shops. Brentwood already has too many cafes/bars/restaurants. In principle yes to more cultural facilities, but must be justified financially by public support or evidence that they attract new businesses.	<b>LD BC LEI</b>
192	Education, skills and employment are key determinants of health. It is important that these are supported. It is also important that that the work/life balance is enhanced by good local services to support residents' mental health and overall well being.	<b>QoL</b>
195	Replace 'improving; cultural and leisure facilities with 'encouraging development of.' Replace 'maintain and enhance' district shopping centres with 'encourage.'	<b>W/S</b>
196	We already have a theatre and museum.	<b>LEI</b>
197	The redevelopment of West Horndon industrial estate for a mixed use development would assist the Council in meeting their objectives to improve the local economy and address a number of the issues that have been identified. The land would bring a number of benefits, such as: help the Council address a skills mismatch by redeveloping out-dated business with new good quality premises which will attract sought after service sectors and retain young people and encourage them to work in the local area; attract new investment, ensuring that the amount of jobs are retained whilst attracting new business to the area; attract new business to match the skills of the future local population; create a high quality environment. Further details in full response.	<b>JOBS GB DEV LOC</b>

<b>Theme 3 Economy Categories</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>AGRI – agriculture</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ASB – crime &amp; anti-social behaviour</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>BC – bars, cafes &amp; restaurants in town centre</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>BUSI R – business rates</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>COB – centres outside Borough</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>COMU – community facilities</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>D – design</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>DEV LOC – location of development</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>EMP – empty/vacant premises</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EVI BASE – evidence base</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>GB – Green Belt</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>JOBS - unemployment &amp; jobs</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LD – local distinctiveness</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>LEI – leisure &amp; culture</b>	<b>14</b>
CIN – Cinema	5
<b>O - other</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>OS - open space</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PRBUS – private business</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>QoL - quality of life</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>RET - retail</b>	<b>14</b>
INT role of internet	1
MA - need for a market	2
LS - preserve local shops	1
<b>RSS - RSS figures</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>S BUS – small business</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>TC - town centre</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>T - transport</b>	<b>11</b>
PA - parking	6
PT - public transport	4
<b>VOL - voluntary sector</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>W/S – wording and/or style</b>	<b>2</b>

## Question 6: Theme 4 – Meeting People’s Needs (Housing)

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about housing?	Category
1	Re question 4 above Green Belt land should not be released whether or not close to settlement boundaries, other than in exceptional circumstance, where a need can be demonstrated. The Green Belt must be rigorously applied and we look to planners in BBC to do this and not buckle under pressure from developers (or Government!)	GB
5	No high rise blocks of flats.	HR
8	Consideration should be given to housing needs outside the urban centres with improved bus links to connect them to railways and towns.	R PT
10	Housing provision should reflect local needs. The findings of the London commuter belt (east)/ M11 housing sub-region SHMA indicates demand for two and three bedroom houses (see fig. 150, page 143). There will be a demand for 3+ bedroom homes (p.149). Further information in full response.	LN
11	I don't want greenfield/green belt used for development. We are using too much of our green areas and once is has gone, it has gone forever.	GB
12	Affordable housing should be to the national average cost and not to Brentwood's inflated prices.	AF
14	If the purchase and sale of housing was simplified and untaxed, there would be less problem of under occupation and less demand for family housing	O
15	Green belt land should not be released at all. It is not always possible to locate new development so as to minimise travel. Would like to see the elderly be able to stay in the village. I was not aware that we could provide social rented housing.	GB OP
17	The Council does need to insist on better quality and greater quantities of affordable housing in developments.	AF
19	The release of Green Belt land to meet housing targets is inevitable. It certainly appears to make sense to direct development to places where current services and their accessibility are already good. However, this assumes that the pattern of service provision will remain much the same and we think this is a dangerous assumption, given the recent shift in retailing patterns. Whilst proximity to services is an important factor, this should be considered alongside other factors like protection of urban open space and the establishment of green infrastructure. The strategic objectives should make specific reference to the needs of older people. We think the desire to concentrate housing development within existing settlement boundaries and redevelop at higher densities will have perverse consequences for other objectives such as the protection of urban open space and a high quality of life. Further detail in full response.	GB OS OP
20	Present policies on housing provision and the green belt maintenance are in direct conflict and the former needs to be realistically revised. Priority to utilise existing empty/unoccupied properties.	EMP
22	Provision for downsizing by the elderly in the villages should be recognised and small housing units provided for second generation families.	OP
23	The trouble with 'affordable housing' is when the owners sell, they sell at market value and then the affordable housing has gone. If owners can make money, they are not going to say no. Also, if people from large towns are moved to a rural area, they are not always happy being away from the bright lights	AF
26	No flats.	HR
27	Since the publication of suggested housing figures for future housing needs in the area, there has been locally a sale of green belt land - we feel this is belated.	GB2

28	Green belt land should be protected and should not be released.	<b>GB</b>
29	The Green Belt should be protected at all costs. We don't want to be swallowed up by Romford!	<b>GB</b>
31	Green belt land should not be released.	<b>GB</b>
33	Gypsy and traveller sites should not be allowed and the laws associated with their survival should be restricted. Not sure what is meant by 'flexibility.' Additional accommodation only supported if it is for traditional local residents	<b>GT</b> <b>LN</b>
35	Most people won't know what 'shared ownership' is.	<b>O</b>
36	To make Brentwood more vibrant, any further housing should be built in the town rather than in the villages, then people will be encouraged to use cars less and lead to a more sustainable community.	<b>UR</b>
37	Greenfield sites should only be as a final last solution and with authenticated need. Flexibility for affordable housing in rural areas should only be in a very limited way.	<b>LN</b> <b>AF</b>
40	Consider previous comments before building more housing.	<b>O</b>
41	Each proposed development should be considered and not dogmatically pigeon-holed and refused out of hand.	<b>O</b>
42	People who have shared ownership are more likely to take a responsible attitude to upkeep of it and improvements over time.	<b>AF</b>
44	Should be limited on density to avoid over development such as the Heybridge estate Ingatestone which has created problems.	<b>HR</b>
48	Some of the statements are badly worded so it is unclear what they mean.	<b>O</b>
49	Transport can be provided to new areas of development. People are lazy. They will drive distances of 1/4 mile or less rather than walk. Government policy would have to change if children are expected to attend schools nearest.	<b>PT</b>
53	Any encroachment onto the Green Belt should be resisted - this will destroy the semi-rural feel of the area which is one, if not the best of its attractions.	<b>GB</b>
55	Should add under the need for affordable housing the need for more bungalows for retired people.	<b>AF</b> <b>OP</b>
56	The amount of housing should be determined by need, not constrained by other factors. Intermediate housing is unpredictable due to the economic crisis. Any policy should allow for a switch to rented if necessary. Affordable housing contributions should be required on smaller sites.	<b>LN</b> <b>AF</b>
61	Town centres are by nature densely developed - creating density usually means high rise which is to be detrimental to social cohesion and child development.	<b>HR</b>
62	Keep greenbelt green - no exceptions. People need space - their own and public. Dense housing is a recipe for social problems - and that costs the rate payer.	<b>GB</b> <b>HR</b>
63	Green belt should not be released at all. New developments should dispersed across the borough to minimise congestion and strain on local services. There are too many flats in the area, many remain empty to have been bought by speculators to rent out. There is inadequate parking for residents and visitors.	<b>GB</b> <b>HR</b>
65	No land should be released from Green Belt. We already see a gradual attrition of the green belt when is enough enough? Sometimes the growth of the objectives are unattainable and just planned wrong. The biggest contributor to global warming and pollution is population growth as much as transport/housing choices.	<b>GB</b>
66	Privately owned grassland (without livestock) where the owners agree to sell offers the best future housing sites.	<b>GB2</b>
70	Young people should have an opportunity to be housed in their own local area. Too many Local Authority and private houses are under occupied.	<b>AF</b> <b>EMP</b>

71	Key workers should not have priority over disabled or elderly people.	<b>OP</b>
73	Any future development should be aimed at those seeking a home. Every effort must be made to discourage 'buy to let' as generally these landlords are indirectly responsible for a lot of the 'woes' which afflict our town.	<b>AFLN</b>
74	Affordable housing is key, not just by private builders but I believe government will release money held back over decades.	<b>AF</b>
79	Stricter control over maintenance of tenants.	<b>O</b>
92	I completely disagree with the level of development proposed. We are already the third most densely populated country on the planet and the south east is the most densely populated place in England. Affordable housing should not affect people who have saved and worked themselves into a position to buy a nice house in a nice area	<b>AF2</b>
93	1. Restrict new housing developments. 2. Build quality houses rather than flats. 3. No development on greenfield at all. All new development should be high quality houses, not flats. No more travellers	<b>HR GB GT</b>
94	Should be absolutely no development on Green belt. Any new housing should be high quality houses, not flats.	<b>GB HR</b>
98	Greenfield sites should only be released as a last resort.	<b>GB</b>
102	Please see my previous comments concerning affordable housing	<b>AF</b>
103	I think there should be a needs analysis before embarking on whether this borough needs to have increased social housing and housing for people with special needs. I think there is adequate housing available that is currently not maintained and lived in.	<b>EMP</b>
106	National government decides on council requirements to provide social housing, this is what needs to be addressed; and then enforced. No more development of green belt or green field sites.	<b>AF GB</b>
110	More should be done to help young adults from Brentwood afford housing near to their families rather than having to move away to find affordable housing.	<b>AF</b>
120	With reference to statements 3 and 4, Green Belt and greenfield sites should never be used for building.	<b>GB</b>
122	House should not be squashed/cramped too close together so reasonable gardens for people to cultivate.	<b>HR</b>
124	Don't destroy the good locations we have, add one small new village with appropriate services and transport connections	<b>NS</b>
125	(1) Although densities need to be appropriate to the character of the area (3) Greenfield land can be more sustainably located than brownfield land and is likely to be more viable, so represents a more reliable source of delivery. (6) The right to a decent home for all should be a priority over maintaining the Green Belt. (12) This needs to be informed by a Housing Needs Assessment	<b>LC GB2</b>
128	New developments don't have to be great for walking or cycling to public facilities, provided that there is really good public transport provision. There could be a case for a separate new Poundbury-style village located on Green Belt land not too far from Brentwood town centre but with really good links to Brentwood and Shenfield rail stations and bus stops. By really good, I mean cheap - not over £1 per mile as at present, and at ten minute intervals throughout commuting and shopping times.	<b>PT</b>
133	Greenfield sites and Green Belt land should not be released for housing under any circumstances. Affordable housing should remain as such, and should, therefore, be rented. Other forms, ie intermediate housing end up as just another house and not available to those who need it.	<b>GB</b>
135	In order to ensure that sufficient housing is provided in the Borough, the East of	<b>GB2</b>

	<p>England Plan advises that 3,500 additional dwelling units are required over the period 2001-2021. Approximately 1,400 of the dwelling requirement has already been built since 2001. The remaining 2,100 dwellings to be built by 2021 equates to approximately 160 dwellings per year. These housing figures should be seen as minimum targets, rather than ceilings that should not be exceeded. Whilst it is noted that site specific details will be included in the Allocations DPD, it is important that the right approach is adopted by the Council to ensure that these dwellings are provided in the most sustainable manner.</p> <p>In accordance with Government advice contained within PPS3 and the East of England Plan, the priority is to ensure that brownfield sites in urban areas are developed in the first instance and then sites that would result in a sustainable form of development.</p> <p>The Council has made reference to the significant role of the use of previously developed land and these sites will generally be bigger sites within urban areas. Our concern is that large urban brownfield sites may be more difficult to develop and deliver within the relevant timescales; as these sites could be in multiple ownerships and have a number of constraints that need to be resolved prior to the site being developed. These issues can have an adverse affect on the deliverability of the site and in turn a detrimental impact on the supply of new housing.</p> <p>The Council has indicated that it wishes to restrict Green Belt development, however it is not realistic to expect that all 2,100 additional dwellings can be accommodated on previously developed sites in the urban areas and given the fact that the Green Belt is currently drawn tightly around the existing settlements, means it is likely that there will be a need for the localised release of sites from the Green Belt.</p> <p>PPS3 (Housing) advises that priority is given to developments on previously developed land, particularly where vacant and derelict; however, it does go on to state that at the regional level, broad strategic locations should be identified for new housing developments, these should ensure that the needs and demands for housing can be addressed in a way that reflects sustainable development principles. In selecting suitable locations for new housing it is necessary to consider the contribution to be made to cutting carbon emissions through focusing new development in locations with good public transport accessibility and/or by means other than the private car and to maintain sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities.</p> <p>Sites adjacent to the urban areas are considered to represent a sustainable location for development, particularly where they have access to local shops, services, community facilities, green and amenity space, public transport and would accord with the provisions of PPS3 and Policy SS7 of the East of England Plan.</p> <p>As stated previously, in order to provide sufficient sustainable sites to meet the needs and demands for new housing in Brentwood there will be a need for the release of selective sites from the Green Belt. Such sites are suitable for release from the Green Belt where they do not have a significant effect on the Green Belt or the reasons for including the land in the Green Belt.</p> <p>It is important that sufficient land is allocated to accommodate the housing figure cascading down from the East of England Plan. Although there is a priority to reuse existing brownfield sites in urban areas efficiently, due to the number of dwellings required over the plan period it will also be necessary to allocate suitable sites from the Green Belt on the edge of existing settlements.</p>	<p><b>SER</b></p>
<p>137</p>	<p>Green Belt land should not be built on at all.</p>	<p><b>GB</b></p>
<p>139</p>	<p>Bungalows in particular would be welcome (rather than flats) - detached and otherwise. Greenbelt should be protected. Once it is gone it is gone for good. If greenbelt is to be used, garden sizes should be adequate for the house and surrounding area with building restrictions, this provides more green land for wildlife. Neighbouring residents should be offered adjoining green land for additional gardening space - this will allow more space for wildlife, as well as getting past the barrier of building in someone's current back yard/view.</p>	<p><b>HR GB</b></p>

140	<p>Our preference, however difficult to swallow for all involved, would be to use or encroach on a very limited amount of green belt if no brown field or other suitable (non-recreational) sites can be found, provided the habitat of protected species and others at risk is fully protected. This decision should be supported by public funding for better and enlarged transport systems with suitable capacity and availability from all relevant residential areas to the location of the new jobs which are to be created and to town centre shopping facilities, doctors' surgeries, hospitals and other community facilities.</p>	<b>GB2</b> <b>NA</b> <b>PT</b> <b>SER</b>
141	<p>New developments should integrate social housing throughout the development to avoid pockets of deprivation. Curtilage for social housing should be minimised or set up as a fund from the profits of the developer. An acceptable profit for developers should be considered with remaining profits to be ploughed back into maintaining shared spaces, parks and nature. Allowing developers to abuse the planning uplift they get from planning permission is a crime to which councils should be accountable.</p>	<b>AF</b>
142	<p>The principal Objective, to which this Theme relates (i.e. meeting the housing needs of the local population), should be the highest priority of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Whilst there is general support for the Statements set out under the Theme, the Core Strategy has to plan for the housing provisions as set out in the East of England Plan. If it does not, and if the Borough Council cannot demonstrate a continuous five year land supply (throughout the lifetime of the Core Strategy), then there is every possibility that housing sites will be released via the appeal process.</p> <p>The Core Strategy, together with the other Local Development Document that flow from it, must address the housing targets, set out in the East of England Plan, and the Borough Council must be able to demonstrate a continuous five year supply of housing land. This may mean that existing urban sites have to be redeveloped for housing and/or that some Green Belt land has to be released for development (although, and if it is the case, locations adjacent to existing settlement boundaries would be preferred).</p> <p>Whilst the statements, as set out under this Theme, generally follow established planning guidance and principles (such as those set out in PPS3 Housing), it must be recognised that the overriding objective is to meet regional housing targets.</p>	<b>LN</b> <b>GB2</b>
152	<p>Agree with principles and objectives.</p>	
153	<p>Those living in newly developed dispersed housing would be reliant on cars and travel out of Borough for shopping and entertainment. Development of affordable housing close to town centre and Shenfield would provide easy access and encourage investment.</p>	<b>AF</b> <b>UR</b>
161	<p>More flats could be built with limited height to save land.</p>	<b>HR2</b>
162	<p>Need to make reference to Lifetime Homes standards. Reference should be made to ensuring the location of new housing close to existing services and of safe direct walking and cycling routes to schools. Appears to be a lack of consideration for some types of housing, such as specialist housing including extra care, supported housing for persons with learning difficulties and mental health issues and G&amp;T accommodation.</p>	<b>SER</b> <b>OP</b> <b>SP</b>
174	<p>It is important that in applying statements regarding locating development towards locations well served by public transport there is adequate recognition of the sustainability issues faced by rural areas where housing allocations can achieve significant sustainability gains for the village. Objective to constrain development because of Green Belt location is not in line with RSS housing figures.</p>	<b>GB2</b> <b>R</b>
176	<p>Housing affordability gap needs to be addressed through the Core Strategy. Green Belt limits new housing location to sites below the affordable housing threshold. Redevelopment of small sites causes problems: no significant contribution to sustainability; loss of open space; inability to provide appropriate</p>	<b>GB2</b> <b>AF</b>

	housing mix; and change in local character due to intensification. 5-year housing land supply is made up of increasingly scarce opportunities for brownfield redevelopment.	
177	North East London NHS Foundation Trust believes that provision of affordable, key worker and elderly and disability housing should be agreed on a site by site basis. It may not be possible for all sites to contribute equally due to viability and other site constraints.	<b>AF OP SP</b>
184	The green belt should be maintained. To release parts of it will just lead to more being developed. We need green spaces, trees etc and less paved and bricked gardens to prevent global warming.	<b>GB</b>
187	What is the definition of 'affordable housing?'	<b>O</b>
190	There should be no release of greenfield sites or green belt land. Not enough data on current position to respond on affordable housing. Social housing of good quality is desirable.	<b>GB AF</b>
192	New developments should incorporate sustainable materials and have high quality design and build, ensuring energy efficiency standards are met. This will help with insulation and fuel costs.	<b>SU</b>
193	There is a huge amount of 'affordable' housing in many other towns close to Brentwood - to maintain Brentwood's atmosphere then the housing should reflect the existing community and housing population.	<b>LN</b>

<b>Theme 4 – Housing Categories</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>AF – more affordable housing</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>AF2 – no affordable housing</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>EMP – empty and under occupied properties</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>GB – protect Green Belt</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>GB2 – develop Green Belt</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>GT – no gypsy and traveller sites</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>HR – no high-rise/ high density/ flats, support for lower density</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>HR2 – support for higher density</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>LC – respect local character &amp; distinctiveness</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>LN – reflect local needs</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>NA – nature conservation</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>NS – new settlement</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>O - other</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>OP – needs of older people</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>PT – improve public transport</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>R – meeting housing needs in rural areas</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SER – access to services and facilities</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SP – specialist housing needs</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SU – sustainability</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>UR – develop in urban areas</b>	<b>2</b>

## Question 6: Theme 4 – Meeting People’s Needs (Transport)

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about transport?	Category
1	1) The failure of BBC to develop a network of cycle routes remains disappointing. When are we going to see cycle routes to Thorndon Country Park, for instance, or to Shenfield or West Horndon stations? 2 out of 10 for this. How long do we need to wait? 2) Lack of reliable integrated bus links to Brentwood's 3 main stations (including W Horndon) is seriously frustrating.	CY PT
3	Cycle routes already provided are not used well enough to justify more.	CY2
4	Travel Plan: to reduce car usage, finding other ways to travel i.e.. More people travelling together, electric vehicles to provide passenger journeys (Brentwood community transport are looking into this), park and ride needed. In the Mayor's transport strategy, 1 in 5 parking spaces are going to be charging points for electric vehicles. What is the proposal for Brentwood?	CA FU P&R
6	Poor bus service in West Horndon, especially in evenings. Needs to be improved to allow people to travel who do not have a car.	PT
7	Improved parking at Shenfield for Crossrail and community - multi-storey	PA
8	Existing bus routes/stops should not be seen as a constraint on development as these are flexible. Development should be targeted to where it is suited/needed and bus services altered/upgraded as necessary	SER
9	The community hospital shuttle bus is much appreciated.	O
10	Development along transport corridors should have regard to: current public transport service provision and accessibility to it, potential public transport service provision where accessible additional housing and employment activities can create additional public transport service through additional new demand. Additional density guidance is required to not only make best use of existing public transport corridors but the best use of well located land within 800m/10 minute walk times of public transport services. Development favourable to increased public transport use will improve the potential for new or additional services. Further information in full response.	PT SER
11	Short-stay parking would be an improvement. Parking in Brentwood is very expensive.	PA
12	How about some buses?	PT
14	There is a need for more bus shelters at stops.	PT
15	Cycle paths that begin and end nowhere could be dangerous - they need to be kept separate from cars. Short stay shoppers parking should be free. Rail services are not within the Borough's remit. West Horndon trains already full and car park full too. Only three buses per day from West Horndon to Brentwood. When politicians stop using cars so will I. Large noise in West Horndon from heavy duty lorries on Station Road - plans don't seem to aim to reduce traffic here.	CY PA PT
17	More short stay shopper's car parking is most definitely required. A park and ride scheme is a high priority.	PA P&R
19	Regarding car usage, given the Borough's nature as a relatively small town, the prospect for improving public transport services will always remain limited; giving up the use of the private car is something that people will do very reluctantly. Pressures on car usage are more likely to lead to technological innovation in acres' fuel efficiency and the range of available fuels, rather than a voluntary switch to other transport modes. There should be every encouragement for cycling. Further details in full response.	CY CA2 FU

20	Consider improving traffic flows at peak times. Reduce movement by encouraging living and working locally.	LOC
21	More parking on streets should be allocated in the centre of Brentwood during evenings. This will enhance use of various facilities.	PA
23	You might as well face it - the car and its comfort is here to stay.	CA2
33	First and last statements depend on the development.	O
36	Wherever further housing is built - more parking in Brentwood is needed otherwise people will just go Lakeside, Bluewater and, in 2012, Stratford.	PA
37	Inevitably park and ride/park and walk would mean use of Green Belt area.	P&R2
39	Brentwood station and the forecourt outside Shenfield station both need substantial improvement.	PT
41	We do not need to tell others to use any type of transport. No law against using private transport, much government revenue is raised from road users to pay for all areas of infrastructure. Government must improve our 'A' roads.	CA2 RO
44	Rail travel cannot be improved due to track logistics. The borough is not large enough to consider park and ride.	P&R2 PT
48	Nothing about integrated timetables - connections if need to take two buses.	PT
49	Crossrail will not improve travel times to city. It will still take 40 mins. Only saving on time would be in avoiding the tube travel. Everyone would prefer to travel from Shenfield as 20/25 mins. Transport to Shenfield station should be improved. Car park at Brentwood station is never full due to poor journey times.	PT
51	You will never increase cycling very much in the borough because of the hills.	CY2
53	Public transport of course is necessary and should be clean, efficient and reliable, but can never be 'door-to-door' in all journeys. Restrictions on car use, besides being impracticable, are just another blow to our personal freedom.	PT CA2
55	Transport in rural areas needs to be increased if car use is to be reduced. There should also be later buses in the evenings. So many commuters have to use taxis in the evening when returning from Brentwood or Shenfield stations just to finish their journeys home. Others cannot go into town for an evening if they don't drive.	PT
61	Cycle network - saving cyclists lives - suspect new resources are not good enough. Car is only safe, cheap, viable option for most people. Park n Ride - who benefits commuters or shoppers?	CY
62	Don't know of any cycle paths around Brentwood – let's have some.	CY
63	Brentwood has become a very busy town in recent years. There are more cars on the roads and congestion is a problem. People should be encouraged to car share especially on school runs.	CS
65	last statement - flats are built with no parking spaces. We have to promote car use intelligently and provide attractive choices. Shuttle buses along the main corridors e.g. Brentwood/ Ingatestone, Brentwood/ Ongar or Hordon. Shuttles from stations to town centre could be promoted.	PT
66	Car parking that slows traffic movement should be discouraged at all costs. Public transport buses, trains should be encouraged, cycling and walking as well.	PT CY
71	Pavements and footpaths are needed with new development. Reliable traffic lights would help traffic flow, plus no road repairs. No where to put park & ride. Improvements of rail services is not within Councils remit.	RO FP PR2
74	Cycle network is difficult in town due to restraints on old road lay out. Plus car drivers not respecting cycles.	CY
75	Bus services improved, more frequent, evening and Sunday services.	PT
81	The existing cycle and pedestrian routes combined in William Hunter Way do not	CY

	work. They work in Chelmsford.	<b>FP</b>
86	For the purpose of soundness, the HA would like to see evidence that the impact of the Core Strategy on the A12 trunk road and M25 has been considered. The overall level of development for the Borough is relatively small and if carefully managed to minimise generation of external motor vehicle trips, it should in principle be no problem to the HA. The HA supports the Borough's objectives with regard to sustainable development. However, the HA would like to see a commitment to reducing the number of trips made by car, for example by promoting mixed use development and Area Wide Travel Plans. Further information in full response.	<b>O</b>
92	You will never stop people from using and preferring their car	<b>CA2</b>
93	Ingatestone station offers the worst service I have ever encountered. Two trains per hour in peak, one an hour later. Never, ever get a seat in rush hour. Cost of service is a joke!	<b>PT</b>
94	Train services at Ingatestone are pathetic - not enough trains calling there, much too expensive.	<b>PT</b>
101	I agree with most of this but why has BBC been so backward as regards cycle provision, for cycle parking etc, and failed to initially support Crossrail for instance?	<b>CY</b>
104	Realistically very few people can survive without a car these days due to inadequate public transport. New residential developments need to consider parking etc. otherwise congestion in the surrounding streets increases.	<b>CA2</b> <b>PT</b> <b>PA</b>
105	The use of cars should be discouraged up to a point - but provision for adequate car parking is a must. Some councils in the past have had a policy of not insisting on enough car parking for the particular development hoping this will put people off using a car. But it doesn't. It just causes chaos and congestion by people parking cars in inappropriate places instead.	<b>PA</b> <b>CA</b>
106	People will go via what is suitable for them, if no local affordable transport then costs to provide council services to should be met by the council. If transport available, then centralise. Devolve and evolve.	<b>PT</b>
112	Public transport in the area is not of the highest standard or even the lowest it's almost non existent and the few that are around do not seem to go even to the station Why not?	<b>PT</b>
114	Traffic Congestion - I don't think money should be spent on sorting out traffic congestion except for providing bus & cycle lanes. Private cars, lorries etc will, we hope, be discouraged by congestion.	<b>CY</b> <b>CA</b>
117	Currently local buses only run across the Borough up to early evening (19:00). In order to discourage the use of private cars, there must be an enhanced local bus service, running regularly - say every half hour - between the hours of 19:00 and midnight. This would be vital to support any development across the Borough.	<b>PT</b> <b>CA</b>
118	Elderly are not catered for on the local buses. The bus service is diabolical. This should be at least part controlled by the council as years ago.	<b>PT</b>
121	To reduce car travel, public fares should be lowered considerably in the borough.	<b>PT</b> <b>CA</b>
122	Definitely needs improvement in the rural areas.	<b>PT</b>
125	(1) Whilst discouraging car use is supported, the Borough is relatively rural and therefore car use is inevitable. It should be acknowledged that car ownership is difficult to control.	<b>CA,</b> <b>CA2</b>
128	As I said above, it is the frequency and cost of public transport that make a huge difference. If my grandson drives in to Brentwood, the marginal cost of using his car is around 80p, but the bus fare is well over £2. Plus he might have to wait in the cold for up to an hour for a return journey, or get a £12 taxi back if he misses	<b>PT</b>

	<p>the last bus around 6pm. If he wants to go to London, we have to drive him to Shenfield station, because there is no direct bus service at all, and we perceive the cycle ride down Doddinghurst Road and Hall lane as too dangerous.</p> <p>It seems to me very important not to create the same situation for many more people by building extensively in the villages without guaranteeing frequent, affordable public transport.</p>	
133	<p>There is no mention of routes for horse riders, who need safe ways just as much as pedestrians and cyclists. Rail services are fine, but Brentwood station certainly needs improvement.</p>	<p><b>CY</b> <b>PT</b> <b>O</b></p>
135	<p>In order to meet the objectives of sustainable development and reduce the reliance on private cars, it is important that where it is necessary to allocate new housing sites these are located adjacent to existing settlements (to offer a wide choice of shops and service), and public transport.</p>	<p><b>SER</b></p>
136	<p>The new Community Zones with mandatory 20 mph should have measures put in place to penalise speeding motorists - who risk the lives of pedestrians who also use these roads. A borough wide 20 mph on all urban roads should be policy goal.</p>	<p><b>RO</b></p>
138	<p>Developing cycle and foot paths would significantly enhance the quality of life in town and surrounding areas.</p>	<p><b>CY</b> <b>FP</b></p>
139	<p>Proper, joined up cycle paths to towns and to parks should be developed. Pavements along rural roads should be developed to encourage walking. It is impossible and very unsafe to walk on rural roads.</p>	<p><b>CY</b> <b>FP</b></p>
140	<p>The decision should be supported by public funding for better and enlarged transport systems with suitable capacity and availability from all relevant residential areas to the location of the new jobs which are to be created and to town centre shopping facilities, doctors' surgeries, hospitals and other community facilities.</p>	<p><b>PT</b> <b>SER</b></p>
141	<p>Park and Ride simply paves greenfield sites and encourages car use from outside the town centre. Plenty of research on Cambridge park and ride. Denser housing development is more environmentally sustainable, but with increased density there needs to be increased regulation, both in how the land is used, and in determining the most appropriate use of space. Regulation and by-laws need to ensure that people who value the use of the space pay for it. If change of use is appropriate then make sure those that benefit pay and those who do not benefit are compensated.</p>	<p><b>P&amp;R2</b> <b>PT</b> <b>O</b></p>
142	<p>In order to reduce reliance on the private car, as a mode of transport, the following steps are required:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. locate large scale, high trip generating, developments in Brentwood town centre and other locations which are highly accessible by public transport, cyclists and pedestrians;</li> <li>2. locate small scale facilities, which cater for the day-to-day needs, close to the local population that they serve; and</li> <li>3. generally enhance public transport, and pedestrian and cycle facilities, so that they become a viable alternative, for more people, for more journeys.</li> </ol> <p>Whilst these key issues are reflected in some of the Statements, set out under this Theme, a number of are not directly related to land use planning matters. Many, particularly towards the end of the list, relate more to funding issues. New developments, which are located in the town centre and other highly accessible locations, should generally be designed to discourage car use. It should be recognised, however, that, even in these locations, an element of car usage will take place, and has to be accommodated in the design of a scheme (otherwise the facility will not be attractive to local people and will not, therefore, be viable). If sufficient parking spaces are not provided, local people will, instead, use similar facilities in competing centres (to the detriment of the town centre and the Borough).</p> <p>It should also be recognised that, in the rural areas, where public transport is</p>	<p><b>SER</b> <b>CA</b> <b>CA2</b> <b>PA</b> <b>PT</b> <b>CY</b> <b>FP</b></p>

	currently poor and is unlikely to be significantly improved during the life time of the Core Strategy (to the extent that it becomes a viable alternative, to the private car, for the majority of journeys), local facilities will still need to be designed to accommodate the use of the car.	
152	Agree with principles and objectives.	O
153	Public transport infrastructure insufficient to make it an attractive option to travel to town centre of Shenfield. Lack of transport infrastructure in villages encourages use of cars.	PT
162	Highlight poor public transport services at evenings and weekends as an issue that needs addressing.	PT
174	It is important that adequate consideration is given to the sustainability issues facing rural areas. PPS3 and policy SS4 of the RSS make clear that housing development in rural areas should not be precluded where this could maintain and enhance the sustainability of a rural settlement.	O
177	North East London NHS Foundation Trust considers that there is a need for new residential development to be supported by improvements to transport networks and accessibility.	PT CY FP
184	Need improvement of the 351 service. One of the private companies operating from Chelmsford on other routes could be used. It is important to senior citizens to get out on a regular basis - inability to get out leads to poorer health and then higher health care costs.	PT
189	A ring road is required to ease congestion - it is long overdue.	RO
190	Evidence of Shenfield Road suggest cycle lanes are a waste of money. Brentwood is not large enough for park and ride and park and walk is unlikely to attract visitors to the town. If public transport is improved, this will help to discourage use of car.	CY2 PR2 PT
193	Pedestrian routes often don't feel safe to use if you are female and it's late at night. Cycling in Brentwood area is simply dangerous - no areas are safe given the speed of the cars.	FP CY
196	You will not get people out of their own personal transport.	CA2

Theme 4 Categories - Transport	Total
<b>CA – reduce car usage</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>CA2 – unrealistic to reduce car usage</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>CS – car share</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CY – improved cycle network</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>CY2 – no improvement to cycle network</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>FP – footpath improvements</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>FU – electric vehicle, alternative fuels</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>LOC – live and work locally</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>O – other</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>PA - parking</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>P&amp;R – park and ride</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>P&amp;R2 – no park and ride</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>PT – improved public transport</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>RO – road improvements</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SER – access to services and facilities</b>	<b>5</b>

## Question 6: Theme 4 – Meeting People’s Needs (Infrastructure)

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about infrastructure?	Category
1	BBC continues to 'miss a trick' by not making developers pay serious money by way of Agreements to contribute towards the cost of infrastructure and open space.	<b>FUN ALL</b>
7	Need facilities for young people accessible by public transport e.g. Bowling alley in William Hunter Way, cinema complex.	<b>YP PT</b>
8	If infrastructure is required to facilitate a new development, the developer should be required to contribute. But they should not be contributing arbitrarily to unrelated projects.	<b>FUN DEV</b>
9	Facilities should definitely be accessible to all.	<b>ACC</b>
10	Additional levies, tariffs and taxes to fund infrastructure provision deter development and landowners from bringing sites forward for development and become self-defeating. Only site related requirements should be funded from developments. Additional and modest infrastructure improvements that can be achieved with little investment, to improve sustainability, should also be considered. For example, bus service provision and low cost bus investments such as improvements to bus stops, shelters and lay-bys can improved use of routes and so sustainability of locations. Further information in full response.	<b>FUN DEV PT</b>
11	Developments should be on brownfield sites only.	<b>BF</b>
14	Any standard charge on housing development will make dwellings less affordable.	<b>FUN DEV</b>
15	Housing shouldn't be allowed unless infrastructure in place. Roads should be built before housing.	<b>INF FIR</b>
19	In our experience, some LAs have been adding items into their Developer Contribution SPDs that we regard as spurious. We would strongly oppose any proposal asking developers to make contributions of this sort. It is reasonable to expect developers to make a contribution towards infrastructure that directly supports their development. It is also reasonable to make some levels of contribution through a standard charge. Further detail in full response.	<b>FUN DEV</b>
20	All infrastructure must be in place and functioning before considering additions.	<b>INF FIR</b>
28	Developers should always contribute to provision of infrastructure	<b>FUN ALL</b>
33	Unsympathetic extensions and poorly conceived developments must be discouraged.	<b>SU</b>
34	What are community facilities - halls? Parks?	<b>O</b>
37	Concerned if new infrastructure would involve Green Belt. Need more information on tariff payments to make proper comment, but must be specific to a particular development.	<b>FUN DEV</b>
41	Much of the infrastructure is outside the remit of the council. Most of the responsibility of: gas companies, electricity companies, water/sewerage utilities, Essex council and central government. Does our council have much say with these bodies?	<b>CR</b>
43	Maintenance of infrastructure should be improved. Existing facilities are sometimes found to be in great need of work done to them.	<b>MAIN</b>
48	If a developer makes a profit from a development the developer should include in the development all the infrastructure necessary to make development viable.	<b>FUN ALL</b>
49	Developers make their money and move on. They don't care if their projects have a detrimental impact on the surrounding environment.	<b>SU</b>

51	Get someone to research how ECC developed south Woodham Ferrers, then replicate that on a smaller scale i.e. at Mounnessing & Herongate. All the increase in land value from the granting of planning consent comes back to the community.	<b>COMF</b>
55	We potentially have a wonderful place - the Brentwood Centre - but it is badly run and has gone down hill over the last 2-3 years, and nobody seems to care about this. What a waste.	<b>MAIN</b>
61	New developments contribute through standard charge - this may/will be passed onto the buyer/tenant.	<b>FUN ALL</b>
62	Developers (i.e. those building for profit) should pay a levy which is used for repair/improvement of areas only - not just going into a central pot.	<b>FUN DEV</b>
63	Any proposed developments should first of all consider the strain on existing services and invest and improve these prior to commencement of any building works.	<b>INF FIR</b>
69	With regard to the 1st and 2nd statements, should only be allowed if existing facilities and infrastructure exists.	<b>INF FIR</b>
71	It is always essential to provide infrastructure, this should be legally binding.	<b>FUN ALL</b>
75	Wheelchair users are unable to travel on 351, 551, 81&82 bus routes because they are old buses and not low floor. This is unfair on the disabled.	<b>PT ACC</b>
79	Developers should contribute towards all areas affected by their development, not just the immediate area of the development.	<b>FUN ALL</b>
83	We would urge the Council to enter into early discussions with water companies to ensure that there is both sufficient capacity at sewage treatment works and within sewer networks to accommodate development proposals. Alternatively, the Council should consider undertaking a water cycle study to help ensure that adequate water supply and waste water infrastructure is in place, any additional infrastructure is provided in accordance with a strategic approach, there is a strategic approach to the management and use of water, the environment has sufficient capacity to receive increased waste water discharges and the potential for grey water reuse and the implementation of SuDS is fully realised. Further analysis required to assess if a WCS is necessary. The EA is keen to promote the provision of green infrastructure and have produced a green infrastructure guide for Milton Keynes and South Midlands that should serve as a useful reference. Further information in full response.	<b>REQ SU</b>
86	The HA would like to see more detail on where funding will come from to provide necessary infrastructure.	<b>IMP</b>
92	I am sick of the obsession with catering for parents with small children. For example parking spaces for mothers with children... far too many and why are they necessary.	<b>PA</b>
103	Need to be careful that promotion of meeting peoples needs is not entirely focused on 'groups' - the majority of the resident types should be assessed and their needs met as a priority. For example there is a high number of home owner families residing in Brentwood with an increasing number of young people who need somewhere to go and things to do that are not expensive. Provision of services should aim to co-join groups of old, young, able and not able to really give balance and future sustainability where care begins with each other in the community.	<b>YP SER SU</b>
105	Developers should bear the cost of building up the infrastructure at the same time as the development. Village areas smaller than Ingatestone have had a continual drip of developments without infrastructure expansion/improvement leaving an infrastructure put in place decades ago to take the strain.	<b>FUN ALL</b>
106	Developers should pay for all infrastructure, including increases to capability for council provided services such as police and environment.	<b>FUN ALL</b>
114	Developers should contribute to infrastructure beyond their immediate	<b>FUN ALL</b>

	development to assist knock-on effects further afield.	
125	(4) As set out in Circular 5/05, unless CIL is introduced.	<b>FUN DEV</b>
127	Support for existing community facilities such as village halls could ensure better use of existing facilities.	<b>MAIN</b>
128	Development should be restricted in areas where infrastructure and services are inadequate AND unlikely to be capable of improvement. I'd strongly agree with that, but not with the original statement. Being picky, I know, but I have to disagree with Facilities and services should be accessible to ALL, including the young, elderly, disabled people and parents with small children/pushchairs. This is because not everyone needs access to all facilities. For example toddlers to a rifle range, or people in wheelchairs to trampolines! Change the statement to include 'all who can take advantage of them' and I'll fully agree.	<b>ACC SER</b>
130	I agree that developers should contribute towards the cost of infrastructure but should it also include the surroundings of their development otherwise what happens. Extra congestion caused by the development would be borne by local council taxpayers.	<b>FUN ALL</b>
131	New housing and new infrastructure in rural areas will lead ultimately to a poorer existence for their inhabitants, unless they are allowed to continue as villages and not small towns. As an example, our villages often do not have street lighting, which is in my opinion a bonus, reducing light pollution and saving energy. Unfortunately, people who move to rural villages from towns often want to make their new area the same as the one they have just left by having things like street lighting installed. We need to protect our villages and the surrounding countryside.	<b>VIL SU</b>
135	Planning obligations should be used to deliver compensatory or mitigatory measures in order to permit development or to reduce the impact of development to an acceptable level. We propose a strategic policy detailing the working of planning obligations in the Borough.	<b>FUN DEV</b>
142	The policies and provisions of the Core Strategy need to recognise that, not only is there likely to be less public money available to provide necessary infrastructure, but that, for the foreseeable future (and for the same reasons the global recession), there is likely to be very little money coming forward from private sector developers. Accordingly, the policies and provisions of the Core Strategy should be flexible enough in order to ensure that any contribution sought from developers does not render a development unviable. There is a very real danger, in the current economic climate, that over ambitious targets, in terms of the financial contributions to be raised from development, will make many developers/applicants hesitant about bringing forward development proposals. If this is the case, the planning gain that a development would otherwise have realised (i.e, the provision of dwellings to meet regional targets), will not be forthcoming.	<b>IMP</b>
152	Would like to see the provision for green infrastructure within Brentwood's SCS. Further details in full response.	<b>GI</b>
159	Development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. It is essential that the CS does consider such water and sewerage infrastructure and its potential for delivery over the timescales. New development may need to be phased to allow prior completion of the necessary infrastructure. Thames Water's funding and infrastructure delivery processes need to be reflected in the CS. Need to consider impact of growth in wider infrastructure such as wastewater and also consider the need to upgrade or construct new facilities. In general terms, it is easier to provide for a small number of large sites than a number of smaller less defined sites. Any sewerage infrastructure must be in place ahead of occupation of development. Developers must demonstrate that adequate capacity exists both on and off site to serve the development. Policy proposed to address these issues. Further details in full response.	<b>REQ INF FIR</b>

160	Future iterations will need to provide more detail of infrastructure requirements and any constraints. The proposed infrastructure study should prove useful in informing this.	REQ
163	Must set developer contributions in the context of development viability. The funding of infrastructure must be set against the requirements to deliver development and employment in line with regional targets.	IMP
174	Supporting the viability of existing infrastructure, particularly in rural communities, should also be a consideration.	MAIN
177	North East London NHS Foundation Trust considers that whilst improving infrastructure needs to be addressed as part of future development, provision of new infrastructure and contributions should be managed on a site by site basis and should take into account the viability of proposals.	FUN DEV IMP
187	Do not understand what [is meant by] 'there is a need for more local area community facilities in the Borough'.	O
189	A bold approach is required - look to the future.	O
190	Does BBC support existing community facilities? Don't know how contribution to infrastructure through tariff payment would work.	MAIN
192	Ensuring good and easy access to schools, community facilities, shops and open spaces are important. New developments need to be designed to include good access and where applicable facilities within the design.	SER
194	We have significant infrastructure requirements and require full mitigation of development impact if we are to maintain an acceptable service.	FUN ALL
196	What are your thoughts on Railtrack? No mention of a major affect on the borough.	REQ

Theme 4 Categories – Infrastructure	Total
ACC – accessible to all	3
BF – developments on brownfield sites only	1
COMF – community gain from increased land values	1
CR – council remit	1
FUN ALL – developers should help fund all infrastructure	11
FUN DEV – developers should only fund infrastructure for their development	9
GI – provision of green infrastructure	1
IMP – implementation and viability	4
INF FIR – infrastructure in place before development	5
MAIN – better maintenance and use of existing facilities	5
O – other	2
PA – parking	1
PT – improvements to public transport	1
REQ – need to consider infrastructure requirements	4
SER – access to services and facilities	3
SU – sustainability	5
VIL – protect villages	1
YP – facilities for young people	2

## Question 7: Theme 5 – Ensuring a Healthier Lifestyle and Safer Community

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about ensuring a healthier lifestyle and safer community?	Category
1	See comments above regarding BBC's abysmal record on cycling.	CY
7	Cycle path needed from A127 to Brentwood up A128. Secure cycle parking facilities in Brentwood and Shenfield centres.	CY
8	Facilities should be retained wherever possible. Care should be taken before allotting funds to new facilities, that the need for it is there.	COM FUN
9	Too many vehicles on paths and irresponsible cycling by younger people on pavements.	PA SAF RESP
15	Sport and leisure facilities – as long as they are available to all the Borough and affordable. How can fear of crime be reduced? Health care everywhere is poor – staff need to be paid higher wages, should stay for the time they are paid for and need better training and supervision. Travel time should be at the expense of the provider.	LEI AA SI HEA HF
16	More CCTV cameras in outlying villages and at small shopping areas and on estates.	SAF CCTV
17	There continues to be a great shortage of youth leaders for all types of groups.	YP
19	Population projections point to a significant increase in older people. We think that the priority should be given to the provision of appropriate facilities and housing to meet the needs of an ageing population. Social inclusion is all-important to realise exactly the level and type of need. This also includes provision for all sectors of the community including single, young marrieds and families. Appropriate designs and layouts can allow for local communities to consolidate.	DEM SI D
20	Aim to eliminate pollutants arising from major roads. Report levels recorded at sites regularly and impacts on population	ENV P
23	We definitely need more hospitals for Brentwood. We only have Basildon or Romford as main hospitals apart from private ones. From the recent reports on these hospitals, it does not paint a glowing picture for our health problems/treatments.	HEA HF HEA HOS
27	We feel work is being done here.	DOC
29	Brentwood needs more facilities for teenagers.	COM YP
31	Crime is the duty of the police.	COU
33	More cycle and footpaths required similar to Holland. More policing required on our streets and in public spaces and access to the police must be improved.	CY SAF POL
34	What are facilities? Too vague for me to comment on.	DOC
37	Full needs survey required to ascertain requirement for facilities.	EVID B
40	Basildon, Chelmsford and Romford all have hospitals with accident/emergency facilities – we don't.	HEA HF HEA HOS
41	In the main it is not the councils business to intrude into our lives, only if individual requested.	COU
43	There is a disparity in community provision throughout the borough. E.g. West Horndon has to maintain own village hall and gets no help in obtaining grants to fund maintenance or improvements.	COM FUN
48	There is a lot about providing facilities but nothing about the cost to the individual	COM

	or group of using the facilities. It's all very well providing facilities for the old and the young only to find they are not used because the poorer (on average) people don't use them because they can't afford them.	<b>AA</b>
49	Sort out high street, no more restaurants and clubs.	<b>HS BC</b>
51	Free parking for Brentwood residents at South Weald and Thorndon park and gateways to footpath and bridle way network.	<b>PA</b>
53	Again, 'social inclusion', 'diversity' and all such fashionable buzzwords are not (or should not) be the business of a Local Authority.	<b>COU</b>
55	In general the health care is good regarding local doctors and the new community hospital is great.	<b>HEA HF</b>
59	Social inclusion and diversity would appear to be political rather than planning objectives. Certainly their inclusion under 'healthier lifestyle and safer community' seems out of place.	<b>DOC</b>
60	Believe in individual responsibility but should ensure fair access for all.	<b>AA</b>
62	More police on the beat at all times of the day and night. Visual policing.	<b>SAF POL</b>
65	Safer community – no mention been made of the blight of traveller communities who, it seems, are above the law, and treated preferentially compared with 'ordinary' taxpayers. Brentwood is becoming overrun with traveller sites (legal or not). They need to be managed differently.	<b>G&amp;T SAF POL</b>
66	Walking to be encouraged within the Borough to create healthy human beings.	<b>HEA WA</b>
73	Funding should only be given to the provision of facilities for younger people if it can be shown to counter crime and anti-social behaviour.	<b>YP FUN</b>
75	We need more policing on the estates to stop youngsters vandalising our bus stops on a regular basis and also important bus notices on the east ham estate.	<b>SAF POL</b>
78	Good facilities at Brentwood centre. They need promoting better. More promotion to encourage people to take up healthier lifestyles.	<b>LEI HEA WA</b>
103	Existing facilities should be assessed to determine if they are meeting 'local' needs and if so then continue and if not – enhance to meet those needs. There is a danger that people that are old or have special needs are being isolated and selected as different instead of encouraging a generally wider shared use of facilities and a joining together so that appreciation of each other can be given and received. If schools were more open to difference and had more focus on attention to sharing, caring and improved social skills – the number of vulnerable would be reduced as people learnt to look out for each other.	<b>COM SI</b>
106	Healthcare in Brentwood? Caught between Queens in Romford and its co-holder of worst in the UK Basildon! When I moved to Brentwood there was a quarter of the people and 6 times the number of hospitals!	<b>HEA HF HEA HOS</b>
117	With the projected increase in the older population, weight needs to be given to their perceived needs.	<b>DEM</b>
118	There needs to be facilities for the elderly too not always the young.	<b>COM ELD</b>
122	More police presence in the High Street and the villages.	<b>SAF POL</b>
127	Local community groups are key to delivering results on actions in rural areas. Local Parish Councils should be encouraged to engage residents through Parish Plans and Village Design Statements and to create action plans that support the Boroughs visions.	<b>COM PC</b>
135	In order to promote sustainable development, proposed developments should include good designs that are in keeping with the scale and character of their surroundings, and sustainable development principles. In order to ensure that major sites are developed appropriately and to involve stakeholders in the development of the proposals there is a need for Design Briefs to be prepared for such sites. It is important to ensure that there is good safe design, which is	<b>D</b>

	fundamental to the development of high quality housing and contributes to the creation of sustainable, safe, mixed communities.	
137	Whilst Brentwood has adequate sports and leisure facilities, these existing facilities need to be improved/developed and utilised to their maximum potential.	<b>LEI</b>
139	Large estates aimed at key working should be avoided as they were not that successful. Personal responsibility should be encouraged, not just human rights.	<b>D RESP</b>
140	As stated above, it is very important to protect and retain all urban open spaces. These mean so much to those already living in residential areas and are vital for the well-being of our local population. They provide areas for children to play. Everybody can use these areas for recreation, walking, enjoying nature and getting away from the general hubbub for a while. The Brentwood Neighbourhood Watch scheme used to thrive under Barbara Waltham. There does not appear to be a similar role at the moment and the impetus of local NW groups has declined. We believe such a role is worth funding to increase NW involvement and to encourage and support the development of safer communities and reduction of the fear of crime.	<b>ENV OS SAF NW</b>
142	There is general agreement with the Statements set out under this Theme. However, it is disappointing that the Borough Council is not asking for comments as to whether there is a deficiency of existing community/health care facilities. On the other hand, it should not be automatically assumed, even where there is an existing deficiency, that an existing community facility should be retained for that or a similar purpose.	<b>DOC COM</b>
152	Agree with principles and objectives.	<b>DOC</b>
157	Provision of local facilities for culture and leisure should be addressed on an appropriate scale to accommodate current and future communities.	<b>LEI</b>
158	Welcome identification of the need to safeguard existing community facilities and provide for appropriate development of new facilities as these are pertinent to meeting the community's sports needs. The Council's PPG17 study is also welcomed, but we have some concerns on this that should be addressed: - the assessment of outdoor sports facilities is not comprehensive and does not include adequate playing pitch assessment which would robustly identify playing fields needs in accordance with the guidance in PPG17 or Sport England's guidance on playing pitch assessments. The method used does not identify quantitative and qualitative deficiencies in any detail and does not assess latent and future demand for facilities in detail. There is also not much evidence of consultation with local sports stakeholders. Sport England considers that the completion of a playing pitch strategy is an essential part of the evidence base to justify protection of outdoor sports facilities and to seek additional provision. This is also now a pre-requisite for a LA wishing to enter the BSF programme. – the assessment relating to indoor sports facilities pre-dates the regional sports facilities strategy and the Essex Sports Facility Strategy which provide an overview of the issues and key needs. The assessment of indoor facility needs is not based on up to date data and does not use the full range of strategic sports facility planning tools available to Local Authorities and appears to be based on limited consultation. Further details in full response.	<b>COM ENV OS EVID B</b>
165	Cultural activities should be seen as essential for a healthy population, rather than an additional, but nonessential, component of life. The document lists the provision of cultural facilities as being a key issue although this is not reflected in the comment form. Theatres Trust would expect a suitable policy to safeguard cultural facilities as well as community facilities. Would also expect there to be a description in the Glossary for the term (example included). Ask that the document provides sufficient protection to ensure continued theatre use in other venues.	<b>LEI DOC</b>
174	The first consultation statement in this section provides that existing community facilities should be retained for that or similar purposes. We strongly support this statement and urge the LPA to consider carefully how this can be achieved in	<b>COM SPO</b>

	the district's villages and how an overly centralised growth strategy for the district (i.e. Spatial Option 1) could prevent this.	
184	Increase in fees for adult classes has lead to fewer people participating. Interests keep people active for longer.	<b>AA</b>
189	Firm enforcement of by-laws by Council wardens or similar.	<b>SAF ENF</b>
190	What does promoting social inclusion and encouraging diversity mean in practice? Not sufficient current information on facilities to express an opinion.	<b>DOC</b>
192	The need for further services should be investigated fully, looking closely at current services and future and current demography, and the views of residents, before moving forward.	<b>DEM EVID B</b>
196	So many unasked questions.	<b>DOC</b>

<b>Theme 5 Categories</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>AA – accessibility and affordability</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>BC – bars, cafes &amp; restaurants in town centre</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>COM – community facilities</b>	<b>10</b>
FUN – funding community facilities	3
<b>COU – none of Council's business</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CY – more cycling and better cycle facilities</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>D – design</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DEM – demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DOC – consultation document (inc. comment form)</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>ELD – more elderly facilities</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ENV – environment</b>	<b>3</b>
OS – open space	2
P- pollution	1
<b>EVID B - evidence base</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>G&amp;T - gypsies &amp; travellers</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>HEA – health</b>	<b>10</b>
HF - health care facilities	5
HOS - hospitals are all outside Borough	3
WA - encourage walking and healthier lifestyles	2
<b>HS - high street</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>LEI - leisure &amp; culture</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>PA – parking</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PC - parish councils</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>RESP - more personal responsibility</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SAF – safety</b>	<b>9</b>
POL - need more police on streets	4
CCTV	1
NW - Neighbourhood Watch	1
ENF – Council: improved enforcement	1
<b>SI - social inclusion</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SPO - spatial options</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>YP - more young peoples' facilities</b>	<b>3</b>

## Question 8: Spatial Options for the Future Development of Brentwood

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Are there any other comments you would like to make about the spatial options?	Category
1	Development on or adjacent to A12, and centralised growth in the town centre makes good sense. The villages (Mountnessing, Ingrave, Ingatestone etc) have all suffered from overdevelopment in the past. New development is not acceptable except on brownfield sites or in exceptional circumstances.	BF
7	Linked to local shops.	SER
8	Pursuing the centralised growth approach has led to overcrowding of the main centres, especially Brentwood, and a lack of development outside of these, leading to shortage of housing in rural areas. House prices have risen and younger people have been priced out leaving older people and wealthy commuters.	OP1:OC OP1:LN2 OP1:AFF2
10	Centralised growth and transport corridor led growth are complimentary and not really separate options. Public transport corridors are the key strategic factor. All corridors should be considered, especially the A128 north of Brentwood where settlements such as Pilgrims Hatch, as well as Shenfield, Warley etc close to Brentwood centre. Further information in full response.	OP2:PT
11	I don't want to see the villages developed any further than they have been.	VIL
15	Because West Horndon has a train station, seems that it is always targeted for development.	O
19	We think option 2 is the best for balancing the various strategic objectives. Given that commuting to London is likely to remain one of the local economy's dominant characteristics, it makes sense to relate proposed growth to railway routes. There are significant constraints on the expansion of Brentwood - to the east is a narrow green wedge that almost separates the town from Shenfield/Hutton, to the south are a number of environmental designations, to the west any significant expansion would take it close to the AQMAs next to the M25, to the north-west is the South Weald village conservation area and the Weald Country park. However, expansion north around an existing larger settlement such as Pilgrims Hatch would not infringe on any existing environmental designation, neither would it undermine the fundamental aim of the Green Belt in preventing coalescence of settlements. We would therefore conclude that north of Brentwood is the best area of search for releasing Green Belt.	OP2:PT OP2:URBE
20	Is there a need for this growth? Ensure infrastructure is in place first.	LIGRO INF FIR
23	Do not understand what is in Brentwood council's mind, or the Government's. Have a feeling we are being turned into a concrete jungle at least in the south-east area. If we had wanted to live in a concrete jungle, we would not have moved to this area in the first place.	LIGRO
25	Disagree with option 2 because it places too much pressure on Ingatestone but links with Crossrail is a plus.	OP2:IMP OP2:CRO
33	Dispersed growth is the only fair and equitable option for the Borough.	OP3/4:FAIR
36	To make Brentwood a better place, it needs the housing centrally to encourage less car use and more late night shops etc to be a young and vibrant town.	OP1:VIB OP1:CA
37	We believe that option 1 would minimise use of Green Belt land, keep surrounding areas open countryside and avoid risk of coalescence. Increased densities possible to meet needs in urban areas.	OP1:GB OP1:HR2

41	Ribbon development and infill between selected rural housing on main roads even if some green belt land may be lost.	<b>RIB</b>
44	Difficult to understand without much more info.	<b>O</b>
48	This has to be tackled on a case-by-case basis. Building within existing boundaries is probably preferable. There should be no building on greenbelt land.	<b>GB EXS</b>
49	Everyone in Brentwood should bear the burden of growth. It should not be borne by just those in the town centre.	<b>OP3/4:FAIR</b>
55	Most people who live in the surrounding villages came here to get away from the rat-race and like the slower pace of life in the countryside. They do not want to change that.	<b>VIL</b>
59	The impact on local settlements under the dispersed growth option could be severe, because although the number of houses being built at each settlement might be smaller than those in the other three options, those smaller settlements would by definition, only have a comparatively small number of existing dwellings to start with.	<b>OP3/4:IMP</b>
61	Different parts of the borough have differing needs - villagers may appear to want reliable bus services, these will not replace the car for convenience.	<b>PT CA2</b>
62	People need more space. If you can't build with this in mind, then don't. It's not all about raising more community charge. Quality of life is essential.	<b>QoL</b>
66	Brentwood is overdeveloped at present though brownfield sites occasionally become vacant. Land outside of town centre are not used for crop, cereal, forestry and livestock, but devoted to growing grass to provide future development.	<b>GB2</b>
73	Option 4 offers a greater range of possible sites. It expands housing in out-of-town areas where employers may be seeking staff. Offers buyers a wider choice when considering which part of the borough best suits them.	<b>OP3/4:LN OP3/4:RAN</b>
80	Centralised growth appears to be the only option not encroaching on the Green Belt. I think it is very important to keep our Green Belt.	<b>OP1:GB</b>
86	Support option 2 most because it focuses growth around existing larger settlements but does not put pressure on just one location. Option 1: support because development within Brentwood may result in the smallest increase in trips on the A12 trunk road, provide a more sustainable mixed use settlement, access to services and public transport, strategic vehicle movement would use two trunk road junctions 11 and 12, provides the best opportunity to minimise the total amount of new motor vehicle traffic. Option 2: support because development may result in a relatively small increase in trips on the A12 trunk road, provide a more sustainable mixed use settlement, access to services and public transport, strategic vehicle movement would use a number of trunk road junctions (11, 12, 13), Ingatestone and West Horndon already have railway stations and therefore development here may mitigate the inevitable increase on number of vehicles on the network. Options 3 and 4: don't support because not all villages have good access to services, not all villages have good access to public transport, may result in increased need to travel and increased car dependency. Further detail in full response.	<b>OP2:EXS OP2:SER OP2:CA OP3/4: CA3 OP3/4:SER2</b>
92	Yes. None of them.	
93	The villages should not have any further development as they do not have the resources to cope (schools, doctors, transport) and their unique character is lost forever.	<b>VIL</b>
105	It seems that only Brentwood and possibly Ingatestone have a viable infrastructure sufficient or easily expandable to be able to accommodate extra growth. Smaller villages like West Horndon are straining to support today's requirements. Housing and business development has outgrown the infrastructure which has not really changed since the middle of the last century.	<b>OP1:INF OP2:INF VIL OP3/4:IMP</b>

	<p>People move to a village because they want a small quiet place to live and are willing to forego facilities that the larger towns have, whereas people move to towns because they like a large area with the facilities nearby. Also, a town has a large range of businesses and dwellings ranging from small bedsits to large houses.</p> <p>Therefore Centralised development is adding more of the same without changing the character of the place, which is not true of a small village. Some villages already have suffered from blots on the landscape by putting a block of flats in the middle of small rural dwellings.</p>	
106	<p>No Greenfield development. 50% of all developed brownfield sites revert to rural/light agricultural, more joined up approach, not council initiated, they are administrators! not social engineers and architects!</p>	<b>BF</b>
110	<p>Villages and the lifestyles of their residents should be protected and preventative measures should be taken to prevent Brentwood becoming a suburb of London.</p>	<b>VIL GB</b>
113	<p>I would not consider any of these proposals until all brownfield sites are used up. Also how many long term voids does BBC and Newham have in Brentwood. Ensure all these properties are filled before any new social homes are built. Consider how many flats above shops are empty. Encourage the landlords to get these occupied before any new market rented places are built.</p>	<b>BF EMP</b>
115	<p>High density growth within the town could create poor, congested living conditions.</p> <p>The Borough should protect its Green Belt heritage at all costs.</p>	<b>OP1:OC GB</b>
117	<p>Centralised growth is bound to promote further traffic congestion in Brentwood town centre. The High Street "improvements" appear to be designed to decrease traffic. Any centralised growth will require a 'Park-and-Ride' scheme for Brentwood in order to prevent complete gridlock in the town centre.</p>	<b>OP1:OC OP1:P&amp;R</b>
118	<p>Our pretty villages must be protected.</p>	<b>VIL</b>
122	<p>Villages should be kept as villages (pop. max 2,500). No green-belt to be built on.</p>	<b>VIL GB</b>
124	<p>You did not include adding a brand new and self contained development with its own additional services and transport connections - that would be my choice.</p>	<b>NS</b>
125	<p>Spatial Options 1 and 2 best reflected the EEP Panel's comments that Crossrail "may bring development opportunities / pressures to Brentwood - Shenfield that will need to be positively planned for and harnessed to the maximum appropriate extent" (para 5.146).</p> <p>If Option 2 is favoured any urban extension must be at Brentwood / Shenfield</p> <p>Options 3 and 4 will not generate sustainable growth.</p>	<b>OP1:CRO OP2:CRO OP2:URBE</b>
128	<p>As I said earlier, please don't destroy Blackmore by overdevelopment. (And much as it would be sensible to do so, please don't build all over the fields opposite me in Doddinghurst!)</p>	<b>VIL</b>
130	<p>Very difficult to say which, if any, is the correct one. I feel Brentwood has provided its fair share of housing development in recent years and certainly within the town centre. Building on green belt should be prevented and resisted at all costs. I feel this is one of the main features of living in Brentwood in that at the moment we have large areas of undeveloped land - long may it remain so.</p>	<b>GB</b>
135	<p>We consider that the vast majority of new housing should be focused towards the town of Brentwood. As the only town and largest settlement in the Borough it should be seen as the prime focus for growth. Brentwood is accessible and well served by public transport and there is potential to benefit economically from the introduction of Crossrail. Other settlements within the Borough are less accessible and not able to satisfy sustainable transport needs in accordance with PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development.</p> <p>Whilst a significant amount of the housing requirement is already committed in the town, the availability of suitable and deliverable sites may not meet the entire development requirements. It will therefore be necessary for the residual requirement to be provided through an urban extension or extensions of the</p>	<b>OP1:SER OP1:INF OP1:CRO OP1:URBE GB2 PT</b>

	town into the Green Belt. As the entire Borough falls within the London Metropolitan Green Belt it is inevitable that, in order to meet the increased requirements for housing and employment, a degree of development will occur within the Green Belt. The most sustainable approach to protecting the wider benefits of the Borough's Green Belt is to allocate sites for development which no longer perform the critical functions of Green Belt land and which are well suited to achieve the provision of housing utilising existing infrastructure. The timescale and phasing of these housing sites will need to be subject to a more detailed policy.	
139	Brentwood Town has a lovely character and a wide range of shops. To encourage people to come into the town, and increase economic activity, more parking, park and ride, and bigger shops would be great. Brentwood is a strength and could be made stronger more easily and give quicker economic and cultural returns than trying to strengthen various multi-locations.	<b>PA P&amp;R</b>
140	It is very important to protect and retain all urban open spaces. These mean so much to those already living in residential areas and are vital for the well-being of our local population. They provide areas for children to play. Everybody can use these areas for recreation, walking, enjoying nature and getting away from the general hubbub for a while. This category should also include all habitats of protected species and other species at risk as well as retaining land used by the Hopefield Sanctuary and other local charities.  Therefore our preference, however difficult to swallow for all involved, would be to use or encroach on a very limited amount of green belt if no brown field or other suitable (non-recreational) sites can be found, provided the habitat of protected species and others at risk is fully protected. Subject to this protection, this means going for Options 3 or 4. The decision should be supported by public funding for better and enlarged transport systems with suitable capacity and availability from all relevant residential areas to the location of the new jobs which are to be created and to town centre shopping facilities, doctors' surgeries, hospitals and other community facilities.	<b>OS NA GB2 INF3 SER</b>
142	As is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, each of the proposed Options performs differently against environmental, social and economic sustainability criteria.  The purposes, and provisions, of the Core Strategy, and other Local Development Documents, will need to pursue a course that incorporates elements of Options 1, 2 & 3.  Whilst large scale developments, which generate the greatest number of trips, should be directed to Brentwood, and particularly the town centre, some other high trip generating issues can also take place at, or around, public transport corridors and nodes. This will have to be the case as there is insufficient land in the town centre to accommodate all the development that will need to take place during the lifetime of the Core Strategy.	<b>MIX</b>
144	Option 4 spreads the burden amongst all current settlements. Increasing development is not realistic for continuing harmony and option 2 disfigures the green belt landscape.	<b>OP3/4:FAIR OP2: GB2</b>
146	Option 1 may increase congestion but impacts least upon the green belt. Option 2: Ingatestone infill already on most small plots, the village is deficient in recreational provision - further development could put existing provision at risk. Ingatestone railway station used by commuters from other villages.  Further development would increase pressure on parking. Option 3 & 4 disperse or spread the problem. There are some villages where basic facilities are lacking including public transport and basic amenities. While the costs of infrastructure in such locations is seen as a weakness, for some residents the provision of such facilities might be a lifeline.	<b>OP1:OC OP1:GB OP2:IMP OP3/4:SER3 OP3/4: LN</b>
147	Option 2 best protects the social and economic wellbeing of the residents of the Borough.	<b>OP2:QoL</b>
149	All development should be confined to brownfield sites.	<b>BF</b>

150	Option 1 would provide growth where there is existing infrastructure, cause less carbon footprint and stop decline of town centre, bringing in a range of ages groups in the evening to avoid the current binge blight. It is the only option to fully protect the green belt in the villages. Option 2 - the train and bus service in Ingatestone is poor and at capacity so this option would just encourage more car use. Similarly for options 3 and 4.	<b>OP1:INF OP1:CA OP1:VIB OP1:GB OP2:CA3 OP3/4:CA3</b>
152	Development should be lead by the principles set out in theme 4.	
153	Need to recognise the importance of commercial development and impact on environment. Development should not be too dispersed as there would be little commercial development and increased impact on the environment	<b>SER</b>
156	Don't develop West Horndon. I chose to live in the village because it was not developed and not overpopulated with many blocks of flats. I don't want this to change. Also, increasing public transport might bring trouble to the area. I am happy to take my teenage children where they need to go in the car.	<b>VIL</b>
157	Locations for potential development should be determined according to their potential to increase economic and social sustainability. Development in rural areas should support the viability of agriculture, diversification of the economy, provision of housing for local needs and sustainability of local services.	<b>OP3/4:EC OP3/4:SER</b>
160	Lack some detail - residual housing requirements, deliverability of each option and impact in terms of sustainability.	<b>DET</b>
162	No indication regarding potential distribution of housing in key settlements identified, in terms of overall capacities, the distribution within settlements and any direction of growth on the edge of settlements. This should be progressed through the LDF preparation. Detailed comments regarding the delivery of ECC services and potential infrastructure can be provided once preferred locations for growth are identified.	<b>DET</b>
163	By directing new housing and employment towards Brentwood, option 1 would provide development with access to key services and facilities, including retail food stores.	<b>OP1:SER</b>
166	Spatial Option 2 would result in excessive development in the village. Understand the pressure to build more homes, but this must be done sympathetically. Future development should be shared in the borough - Spatial Option 4 is preferred. This approach gives maximum flexibility ensuring all available brownfield and non Green Belt sites were utilised, limiting the amount of Green Belt lost. Would also mean that local facilities in smaller villages could continue to be viable. Greater choice of areas also means greater opportunity to select areas of Green Belt for development which have the least impact on the Borough as a whole. New development in some areas could help them retain their viability whilst residents could remain in their local areas benefiting from affordable housing. May not be so if new development is restricted to a few larger locations.	<b>OP2:IMP OP3/4:BF OP3/4:GB OP3/4:RAN OP3/4:LN OP3/4:EC</b>
167	The focus of development on the main urban area (option 1) is broadly supported.	<b>OP1</b>
168	The focus of development on the main urban area (option 1) is broadly supported.	<b>OP1</b>
169	Option 4 to disperse housing growth to support rural areas is supported.	<b>OP3/4:LN</b>
173	We support the focus of new development on the main urban area (option 1).	
174	The spatial options are based on the proposed settlement hierarchy, this hierarchy does not adequately reflect the role of Key Service Centres as set out in policy SS4 of the RSS. The provision of housing in well serviced smaller villages is vital to maintaining and where possible enhancing the sustainability of existing settlements and recognised good practice under PPS3. Mountnessing benefits from the services listed in the RSS in relation to Policy SS4 aside from primary care facilities, which are available nearby. Mountnessing should be considered as a Key Service Centre, which should play a full role in the future	<b>SER</b>

	development of the district. Centralised Growth and Transport Corridor Led Growth will not meet the requirements of PPS3 and policy SS4 of the RSS, which accept that allocating housing to rural settlements can be beneficial to rural sustainability. More comments specific to Mountnessing as a key service centre follow.	
176	The town of Brentwood must retain its status as the highest order settlement. It should be the focus for growth as it offers the greatest accessibility to employment and other services.	<b>OP1:SER</b> <b>OP1:INF</b>
177	North East London NHS Foundation Trust supports the principals set out in spatial option 1 for future development. This would be more sustainable than other dispersed options and direct development away from more sensitive areas of Green Belt. Would also create opportunities for use of previously developed land and such sites in Green Belt surrounding the built up area, such as Mascalls Park site.	<b>OP1:GB</b>
179	Brentwood cannot sustain much more in the way of housing development. It is already crowded, but if I had a choice, I would choose Option 3 of Semi-Dispersed Growth.	<b>OP1:OC</b>
180	Preferred Option is One – Centralised growth. Option three and four are the least preferred as these would impact on Doddinghurst and Ingatestone wastewater works that as explained above does not have the capacity to accommodate .	<b>OP3/4:INF2</b>
182	The town of Brentwood is in need of investment and development. Much of it is drab and run-down and in need of demolition and re-development. The refurbishment of the High Street is a welcome start but much more needs to be done. The town should be a bright beacon for the whole Borough. If radically re-developed, retaining the best of the old but with a well-designed new, it would attract inward investment with new jobs and facilities. An example is Chelmsford, now a prosperous town following much re-development. As for the outlying villages, such as Ingatestone, their development needs are not nearly as great. Their development can be more 'organic'. These outlying settlements will in any case benefit in various ways from a revitalised Brentwood town. Appreciate that funds will not permit huge investment in the whole of the Borough at the same time, hence my suggestion for a concentration on the Centralised Growth option.	<b>OP1:VIB</b> <b>OP1:EC</b>
187	Resist all growth.	<b>LIGRO</b>
190	Option 3 raises possibility of enhancing transport infrastructure.	<b>OP3/4:INF3</b>
197	Support option 2 as it seeks to achieve greater provision of new housing and jobs at sustainable locations and particularly at transport nodes. West Horndon industrial estate could address the stated weaknesses of option 2 because: the site is a brownfield site where a range of housing could be provided; a relatively high density of development could be provided; the site will be available in the near future for a mix of uses; impacts on other facilities could be mitigated against or provided as part of a mixed use scheme; there would be no impact on the Green Belt. Further details in full response.	<b>OP2:SER2</b> <b>OP2:GB</b> <b>OP2:HR2</b>

Spatial Options Categories	General	OP1	OP2	OP3/4
AFF2 – doesn't address affordable housing		1		
BF – development on brownfield only	4			1
CA – encourage less car usage		2	1	
CA2 – unrealistic to reduce car usage	1			
CA3 – increased car dependency			1	2
CRO – Crossrail		2	2	
DET – not enough detail	2			
EXS – existing larger settlements	1		1	
EC – local economic growth and viability		1		2
EMP – empty properties	1			
FAIR – fair and equitable				3
GB – protect Green Belt	5	5	1	1
GB2 – Green Belt can't all be protected, encroaches on GB	3		1	
INF FIR – infrastructure first	1			
HR2 – encourage higher densities		1	1	
IMP – impact on villages			3	2
INF – good infrastructure		4	1	
INF2 – not enough infrastructure				1
INF3 – opportunity to improve infrastructure	1			1
LIGRO – limit growth	3			
LN – consider local needs				4
LN2 – doesn't address local needs		1		
MIX – mix of options 1, 2 and 3	1			
NA – nature protection	1			
NS – new settlement	1			
O – other	2			
OC – overcrowding and congestion		5		
OS – protect open space	1			
PA – parking	1			
P&R – park and ride	1	1		
PT – public transport	1	1	2	
RAN – wider range of housing locations				2
QoL – quality of life	1		1	
RIB – ribbon development	1			
SER – access to services and facilities	4	3	1	1
SER2 – poor access to services and facilities, but opportunity to improve			1	1
SER3 – opportunity to improve services and facilities				1
URBE – urban extension		1	2	
VIB – town centre vibrancy		3		
VIL – no development in villages	9			

## Question 9: General Comments

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	If you have any further comments, please write them here	Category
7	Where village shops are struggling, it is worth supporting new residential development. Some commercial sites are not fully used and some businesses could be supported to move and improve facilities and access, thereby releasing brownfield land for residential development. Redundant farm buildings could be supported for residential development. Ingrave does not have a shopping parade, so not category 3. Herongate only has one shop and petrol station.	DEV DEV BF SH
8	Would prefer to see low level development across the Borough to ensure affordable housing and vibrant communities in rural as well as urban areas, supported by suitable facilities/infrastructure and public transport. Centralised option would lead to sterile nimbyism, rural landscape and overcrowded urban centres with falling quality of life.	DEV SP O AFF T COMU INF
10	The best spatial option for strategic sustainable development within the district is a combination of centralised and transport corridor led growth, with existing settlements on the corridors acting as 'nodes' for further development.	SP O DEV
11	I have lived here for 54 years and already think it has lost a lot of its old charm. I would not want to see it over-developed	LD
14	A more broadly based response would result from a simplification of the document and wider publicity	DOC
15	In West Horndon, the land owned by Mr Croll (village green), cannot be built on as an inquiry ruled that a space must be left between the industrial site and housing. Building more houses in West Horndon will only exacerbate the neglect that the village faces. Pavements are in need of repair and Council owned garden space overlooked.	SP O INF
16	Please keep our lovely rural villages as villages and no more estates which look out of place and encourage crime and vandalism	LD SAF
20	Central and regional government housing plans to 2031 for this county and our borough cannot be sustained. Where is the water to meet these needs? Locally, there needs to be accurate knowledge of the number of people living in the Borough, using the Borough and usage patterns	RSS INF
22	A surplus of residential land throughout the Borough would ensure the annual requirement for housing becomes available when required. Many small sites are available adjoining or within existing settlements.	DEV
23	Don't forget a lot of land around this area i.e. West Horndon/Thurrock, is fen lands. A new town was planned along Fen Lane but was refused about 20 years ago. The pub and lane were not called 'fen' for the hell of it. It is our flood plain area.	ENV FLO
25	Recently main area of controversy has been the proposed cinema/shops and multi-storey parking behind Swan Paddock. Over the past 30+ years that I've lived in Brentwood, many schemes have been tried and we definitely do not need more shops. Parking is a problem. Too many similar shops fight each other, but we are close to Romford, Chelmsford, lakeside and London and I prefer to have a 'day out' now and then shopping elsewhere.	RET T PA COB
27	Again, this is a worthy aspiration. But am I wasting my time, your time, the time of committee members, in filling in columns like this? We do think the Council should be given good thanks for trying.	DOC
31	New High Street was a waste of money - shops remain the same (generally cheap and nasty) and will not attract additional customers. Bus services are appalling.	TC HS T PT

	More leisure facilities are required - but are dependent on better bus services if they are to be used. You can reduce crime by reducing number of pub licences. Entire questionnaire contains loaded questions to obtain results you want.	
33	There are plenty of signs informing us of the presence of police but we rarely see them. I thought the use of 'mobile phones while driving' was illegal? The Dartford bridge/tunnel/toll booths and associated traffic congestion reduces the quality of life for many Brentwood residents. If £7.2M was spent improving the High Street, the snow should be cleared and salt put down.	<b>SAF T RO TC HS</b>
41	After attending the citizens' panel, it would appear that ECC and central government need to have their own roadshow so that a joined up strategy could be discussed with the paying public of Brentwood. So much of what is wrong in Brentwood is the fault of these two bodies.	<b>RSS</b>
42	Parks and open spaces could attract more visitors by offering seasonal activities i.e. lake pedalos, pensioners 'fitness trails' pensioners exercise equipment, special weekend/weekday attractions. Fishermen and Anglers are too well catered to the exclusion of the rest of the community.	<b>QoL</b>
43	Brentwood is (at present) a pleasant country town surrounded by villages of varying sizes, in the main, people have chosen to reside in these villages because it suits their needs and lifestyle. Excessive development could change the nature of these villages, probably leading to a movement of people out of the borough area to more desirable locations. We want our community improved but without a change to their desirability.	<b>LD OD</b>
48	One of the barriers to social inclusion is 'poverty'. Health care facilities are mentioned, but not child care facilities - always a need for affordable childcare facilities.	<b>COMU child</b>
49	Council has not impressed residents recently, as per negative reports on performance issued by relevant gov authorities. Council need to get this right and keep everyone fully informed.	<b>COU</b>
53	The country town atmosphere, together with its good access to London and other parts of the country, is one of the reasons I chose to live here. If Brentwood and its environs become just another concrete sprawl, the time will come to consider leaving. Please don't spoil it by overcrowding, or we may as well be in an anonymous London area.	<b>LD OD</b>
55	Overall Brentwood is a fine place to live. Please do not spoil it by becoming big like Romford and Ilford. Less eating places and more general shopping places in the High Street would be a good thing. Also fewer night clubs open until the early hours.	<b>LD OD BC</b>
62	Too much jargon. The language used will alienate residents who are not professional and have the least clue about what's being asked. Brentwood is developed enough, I don't want to see more housing.	<b>DOC OD</b>
63	Instead of further development in the borough to make it like Romford etc. Perhaps local government should oppose any further directives from central government and tell them to focus their plans on other areas in the country and not the south east.	<b>OD GOV P</b>
65	Good consultation. However would've liked one for regional plan.	<b>DOC RSS</b>
66	Brownfield sites within town centre to be used for improving town centre without necessary for housing but employment business, cultural, retail uses etc. [Sic]	<b>DEV DEV BF TC</b>
73	Option 4 - spreads the expansion rather than 'cramming' too many properties into the centre of Brentwood. It should prevent the outlying areas of the borough from dying, i.e. closure of local amenities, shops, pubs.	<b>SPO</b>
75	The form is too long.	<b>DOC C</b>
77	No more development.	<b>OD</b>
80	There is no mention of facilities for dog owners to place their mess. I live on a	<b>SAF DOG</b>

	corner and am appalled to find bags of dog's mess at the side of my property. There is also un-bagged mess.	
81	Too many questions.	<b>DOC C</b>
86	Hierarchy of settlements is supported, as it is acknowledged that the larger settlements tend to have good access to services. Main issues highlighted are: lack of evidence - modelling, lack of information on funding, lack of a commitment to provide demand measurement measures. Further detail in full response.	<b>SH EVID B</b>
88	One building that could be turned into flats is the large Council office.	<b>SITE</b>
89	I believe that all the points you wish to achieve are developed in a 'Transition Town.' You can find out more through the 'Transition Handbook' and at <a href="http://www.transitionculture.org">www.transitionculture.org</a> and I would urge you to do so as the organisation of the movement needs local government backing. It would seem a good time for you to back this at a point where it can be incorporated into the new plan.	<b>DEV</b>
97	I have expressed my comments previously. Please don't let Brentwood become just another London suburb and let it maintain its country town feeling.	<b>OD LD</b>
101	Most of this is sensible stuff but all too often there is little actual support for such actions by local councillors and a general lack of vision. The dearth of local public transport provision within the borough is a result of the area having been considered wealthy and car-centred for so long. This may be alright in the good times but in a recession, such as now, when environmental matters come to the fore, it may be too late to do more than tinker with what is left. The situation is worsened by an increasingly elderly population who now look to public transport for support. Vote winning schemes like the Free Over 60s Bus Pass are not enough on their own.	<b>COU T PT DEM</b>
106	Questionnaire structure gives selection of questions that are biased toward development, irrespective of the wishes of those questioned. Where is the statement "All development in the Brentwood area should be suspended until a complete borough-wide plan is formulated and agreed by public vote?" Contact addresses for those who wish to become more involved in the process should be included, if you spend 45 mins doing this form then maybe you can help out with local issues or at least represent those in your street/area?	<b>DOC C</b>
108	Any future development should be only within the guidelines currently in place for Green Belt policies, a greater emphasis should be placed on keeping rural areas and values to avoid the creation of an urban culture across the borough, villages should remain villages.	<b>GB1 LD</b>
112	Whilst this system of involving the community seems to be a good thing, it does not address the problem with planning regulations and this is not a dig at local planning department but central government and the introduction of the new quick fix system where the local opinion means nothing. E.g. local planning refuses planning permission, this goes to appeal and nine times out of ten the inspector allows the project through. Some would say this is dictatorship democracy.	<b>GOV P APP</b>
116	There is so much going on here it's hard to know where to begin. I would like to comment on theme 3. The environment issues. As an elderly person who has no garden, it's very important for us (and there are many) to be able to go out and maybe sit in a local PARK. I have noticed in the park adjoining the Hutton community centre that there is not one bench to sit on, this is an appalling situation. I also notice that right next to Brentwood Council there is a piece of land with a lake in Ingrave Road. The seating there is dismal, with broken benches and a filthy lake. If the Council cannot address the problems on its own doorstep I shudder to think what public money actually goes towards. The street cleaning is inadequate because the streets are only cleaned where the council thinks most of us cannot see it. Take Rayleigh Road, there is a small wooded area on the right of Rayleigh Road going towards the Shenfield end which is a real state and never tidied up because it is not easily seen.	<b>DOC C ENV OS COU</b>

	There is also a bank on the same side which slope downwards which also always has the same unsightly litter in, so if I think that these issues will be addressed, having not been dealt with for years I would be stupid to think they will be addressed now. As council executives/managers get a very good wage and still see unresolved issues it makes me wonder what they actually get paid for.	
117	I feel that housing, transport, health and education infrastructures are vital to any population increase in Brentwood Borough. The strategy needs to concentrate on enhancing these areas along with any planned developments.	INF
121	Every question is "should" given the questionnaire - i.e. a mostly agreeable answer.	DOC C
122	2,000 dwellings is at least another 4,000 people to accommodate in and around Brentwood. Our resources will be strained as well as our utilities. This needs to be thought through very carefully.	OD INF
125	The acknowledgement of the need for urban extensions into the Green Belt is welcomed. These should be positively planned for through the Core Strategy, particularly as larger sites will have a long lead in time. It is not clear what scale or number of the urban extension will be, but we would support larger extensions which can generate sufficient critical mass to be sustainable and offer significant planning gain.	GAR GB1 SU PG
126	It is becoming increasingly apparent that one area which has leapt over these plans is the issue over what are termed (by some) "traveller sites". The continuing lack of an approved relevant and enforceable policy is a major issue to people - especially in the outlying areas which are increasingly being targeted with unapproved developments (and attempts at retroactive planning approvals). There is no mention - that I saw - of this specific issue within this plan which seems to me to be a major oversight. I can state clearly that I'd strongly agree with keeping development to the main current centres - not destroying the character of the out lying areas (which are much more poorly served with transport and other amenities reachable without a car) and keeping development to Brownfield sites wherever possible BUT piecemeal invasions of Green Belt (on purchased or invaded land) breaks all the current planning / Green Belt rules and - I would contend - be outside any possible outcome of this investigation. As a major issue it MUST be highlighted in any such enquiry - as is social housing, shops, sports activities etc. - Exclusion of a question on these points (even if there is a separate consultation in progress) seems to me unacceptable and in need of explanation and amendment.	G&T LD T DEV BF GB1 DOC C
127	Town and Parish Councils play a key role in ensuring issues at local levels are highlighted and addressed. They can achieve this through the development of Parish Plans and Village Design Statements. These plans are very useful in developing detail which underpins the Core Planning Policies and can help to target areas where priorities are in most need of being addressed. The voluntary sector is an important body for the delivery of facilities and services at a local level.	PC VS
128	It rather seems to me from what has happened with the Travellers of late, that anyone can now buy a plot of land and build on it overnight without the Council being able to do anything to stop it. It must now be clear to any local landowners that they can sell off chunks of green belt land at huge profit with no ill effects on themselves apart from comments from their neighbours. It therefore seems to me that the Council must do anything in their power to prevent a big rash of such sales. This includes lobbying parliament extensively, possibly by mobilising a citizens' protest of some sort.	G&T
130	I feel I have provided this elsewhere. I strongly feel we need to make Brentwood different especially when it comes to the High Street and the shops we have there. We should not pedestrianise it and have a ring road. This destroys towns. We need to retain as much green belt as we possibly can. Use of	LD TC GB1

	<p>redundant office buildings as happened at Chapel High is an excellent use of resources except I did not agree it was necessary to add two extra floors! Building on gardens should be a no no even though our present Government encourage it. We will regret mistakes made now if we continually increase the density of developments and infill.</p>	<p><b>DEV BF GAR</b></p>
135	<p>The Core Strategy seeks to set out both the number of additional dwelling units that need to be provided and develop a locational strategy for how these additional units can be distributed throughout the Borough.</p> <p>In order to demonstrate that this is the right approach to find the necessary sites for the required housing numbers, it is important to identify suitable locations where these units can be accommodated. To this end we would propose a site to the north of Brentwood, located to the west of Doddinghurst Road, between Brentwood and Pilgrims Hatch see Plan 1.</p> <p>This site would allow for a small sized urban extension, providing for approximately 200 homes, together with associated open and amenity space. The particular benefits of this site include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Located on the edge of the existing settlements and has good access to public transport compared to the rest of the Borough; the site is approximately 2.5 km from the train station, and 3 no. bus services (routes 73, 73A, 261, 657) travel along Doddinghurst Road;</li> <li>- The site is located well in terms of accessing Brentwood town centre, which can be reached by public transport, cycle and foot;</li> <li>- Due to its proximity to Doddinghurst Road there is an ability to get access off the highway relatively easily. In addition, there is also the option to get secondary accesses to Site B in from the housing estate to the south, off Russell Close and Karen Close;</li> <li>- The site is surrounded on three sides by built form, and as such the site would be a classic rounding off, and would not result in an intrusion into the countryside, and have the minimum impact on the Green Belt;</li> <li>- There would be no loss of specific landscape / habitat / biodiversity designations;</li> <li>- The land is not within a functional flood plain and is not liable to flooding;</li> <li>- The site has the ability to link-up existing areas of open space, and create green links, with access to the wider countryside beyond, taking into account the needs of children;</li> <li>- It is a regular shaped site, which is also relatively flat, this would enable a sufficiently diverse development to ensure that the site is used efficiently but with a landscape setting, notably along the A12 boundary, which would form a landscape buffer / green link;</li> <li>- The site is of sufficient scale to ensure a wide mix of housing in terms of tenure, type and price to cater for a wide range of needs and demands, including households with children, single people and elderly and ensure that it would result in a balanced community;</li> <li>- The scale of the site is of sufficient size to pay for improvements to infrastructure costs and would allow it to be undertaken as a viable phased development;</li> <li>- The site is in one ownership; this will ensure that it is available and deliverable.</li> <li>- The relationship of this site would mean that not only would it result in a sustainable development, within easy walking distance of schools, shops, and open space but will also marry in well with existing settlement.</li> <li>- The additional units proposed would bring more households to the area and in turn spending power, which would bolster the local shops in Brentwood.</li> <li>- Furthermore, the development of this site would be compatible with the Borough's evolving employment strategy for the area, as it would not result in the loss of an existing employment site and would permit more residents to work in the Borough as opposed to commuting out to other places of work.</li> </ul>	<p><b>DEV SITE</b></p>
136	<p>I reiterate my concerns over the changes to the mission statement and the removal of the responsibility of the local council to keep people, communities SAFE - I strongly ask for the word and the concept to be reinstated.</p>	<p><b>VIS SAF ENV</b></p>

	2) I have concerns about effects of the pollution - poisonous gases currently reported as being present at Wilsons Corner and urge that the removal of the problem should be a high priority for the council and figure large in the new documentation. (I do not support the destruction of buildings to facilitate better traffic movement as solution).	
137	<p>Brentwood is a great place to live and needs to retain its individuality whilst providing better and economically viable facilities. With the new High Street works completed, the Council now needs to provide the shopping facilities that will attract locals and visitors to the area. Brentwood Railway Station and its surrounding area needs to be improved as this is a major part of the town and is heavily used by commuters and visitors alike.</p> <p>Brentwood already has many facilities whether it be leisure or cultural, and I feel these need to be explored thoroughly to ensure that they are being used to their maximum potential before any new developments are considered. Any new developments need to embrace the character of the town and its heritage.</p> <p>More affordable housing needs to be provided and developments need to be carefully monitored to ensure that they are located in the most suitable place for the occupants and their families with regards to transport links, schools, leisure and health facilities etc. Green Belt land should remain untouched and villages should remain villages.</p>	<p><b>LD</b> <b>COMU</b> <b>TC</b> <b>DEV</b> <b>AFF</b> <b>GB1</b></p>
138	Reducing traffic quantity and speed through residential areas is very important and there does not appear to be a strategy in place to achieve this. There are many areas around the town that are within easy reach, if it were safer and more pleasant to walk or cycle.	<b>T CY/FP</b> <b>SAF</b>
140	<p>We strongly believe that the required number of houses imposed on Brentwood in the plan should be challenged on the basis that when the figures were originally agreed, we had not entered the current economic crisis and did not have the focus on climate change and associated environmental issues that now exists. If the current plan goes ahead, there could be difficulties, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it is likely that public sector will experience significant cuts over the next few years making it difficult for Brentwood to fund the level of development required</li> <li>- the planned development will add further pressure on the existing infrastructure, including roads, transport systems, town centre parking facilities, drainage and sewerage systems. These are already under significant pressure with overcrowding, heavy traffic and frequent jams, accidents, closures, roadworks, blockages etc. Further development and increased local population will only lead to an adverse impact on climate change and on the environment</li> <li>- schools, doctors, hospitals and other local resources will all come under further pressure and without further investment (which may also be subject to public sector cuts) will also struggle to cope.</li> </ul> <p>It is only because of these required number that the consultation is needed. Wouldn't it save a lot of time and effort, well worth it in these days of constrained budgets and with further significant cuts likely soon, to not proceed with further development until a challenge and re-assessment has been completed?</p>	<p><b>RSS</b> <b>REC</b> <b>INF</b> <b>COMU</b></p>
141	<p>In the very long term (50+ yrs) it is highly likely that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shenfield and Brentwood will merge into a conurbation.</li> <li>- Land values will continue to rise due to London's economic influence, through commuters and businesses seeking links to London.</li> </ul> <p>So Land Use should consider the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pursue brownfield development in Shenfield and Brentwood</li> <li>- If Brentwood and Shenfield merge into a concrete conurbation the qualities that have made Brentwood desirable are likely to decline. The access to North Weald and Thorndon are unique to the area and as public space becomes more and more limited are likely to become more valued over time and reflected in increased house prices. Consider planning now for another park (similar size to North Weald / Thorndon) in the space between Shenfield, Pilgrims Hatch and Brentwood. Allocate that space now, and establish a compensation mechanism between landowners whose land lies on prime development sites bordering the park and landowners whose land will become the park. Centrally control that</li> </ul>	<p><b>DEV BF</b> <b>ENV OS</b> <b>ED</b> <b>DEV</b></p>

	<p>development and ensure a share of the profits from the sale of prime property on the edge of the park development are ploughed back into a fund for the management of open spaces. Undertake this compensation mechanism now, even though it may not occur for 10-20yrs, to avoid land speculation and increasing land prices until such a scheme loses its value in protecting open spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Actively encourage businesses and sectors that prize a peripheral London location. E.g. Arts and Media (Pixie Lott, various Essex film directors), IT (Amstrad, BT), Financial Services, Legal Services to London law firms, Architecture, etc.</li> <li>- Pursue business development that aligns with London's expected growth in sectors and enables entrepreneurship in those industries. Only those industries that can afford the high London periphery land values will be likely to survive and prosper in Brentwood. Actively encourage these industries to prevent Brentwood turning into an unsustainable dormitory district of London.</li> </ul>	
142	<p>Clearly, the Core Strategy, and other emerging Local Development Documents, will need to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate, and take into account, both the current recession, the emerging recovery (when it takes place) and, given the timescale of the Core Strategy, unknown future factors. As such, the document should not contain any policies that (with the possible exception of the Green Belt) are so inflexible as to rule out any form development taking place, or which stop any change of use of any existing sites.</p>	<b>REC GB1 DEV</b>
147	Information should be obtained from lessons learnt and being learnt from other settlements in Essex and elsewhere	<b>COB</b>
151	Lighting required on footpath that connects Cleves Avenue with Copperfield Gardens.	<b>ENV</b>
152	The planning system is required to base its policies and decisions on the needs of sustainable development. This means, for instance, that development plans should minimise travel distances, provide a well-related mix of housing, jobs and services, and relate the benefits of the natural environment to social and economic needs. New housing on the edge of towns usually emerges as the most sustainable option, but this sometimes conflicts with established green belt policy. However, some greenbelt land will not be suitable for development. This includes environmental designations, floodplains and strategic gaps to maintain separation of settlements.	<b>SU DEV GB1 ENV</b>
154	No specific comments to make.	<b>O</b>
157	The consultation document does not raise any issues of general conformity against policies of the East of England plan	<b>DOC RSS</b>
160	Future iteration of the CS should consider if and how it can deliver the objectives of other key stakeholders. By publication, the CS will need to address the critical and, at times, controversial issues and key critical issues to be addressed will need to be considered. Policies should not be created for every potential issue that may or may not exist. They should be used to deliver the vision and objectives for the Borough. Within the document, although the issues are described, options for addressing these are not as strongly identified. This is an important aspect of the plan-making process and the CS should be able to demonstrate why an option is being taken and that other reasonable alternatives have been considered. Implementation and monitoring: need to see close integration between objectives and policy and the monitoring and implementation sections.	<b>DOC EVID B</b>
162	More locally specific issues should be identified and the inter-relationship of these considered. Too 'inward' looking - need to acknowledge the key external influence and linkages on the district and any policy implications, such as London, Olympics, Lakeside Basin, Chelmsford and other emerging developments. Need to consider where the Borough will be positioned in future in terms of sub-regional strategies. Some further detailed comments within response letter.	<b>COB OLY</b>

166	<p>Parish is surrounded by Green Belt and a Special Landscape Area, these must be protected from large scale development. Development should take place in the envelope between the A12 and the railway, no development beyond this. Surrounding areas need to retain distinct differentiation between Ingatestone and neighbouring areas, preserving rural nature of parish. Growth in Ingatestone can only be achieved by releasing Green Belt - would be detrimental to the local character and rural nature. This would be unacceptable to residents. Whilst the village does have a rail link other facilities are poor, such as local bus services, job opportunities, and car parking. Recent evaluation of open space provision shows that a local deficiency.</p>	<p><b>ENV</b> <b>ENV OS</b> <b>GB1</b> <b>DEV</b> <b>LD</b> <b>T PT</b> <b>T PA</b></p>
167	<p>The release of Green Belt sites in suitable locations is supported in the light of possible increased housing targets. A review of the Green Belt should be undertaken. The local centre at Hutton Village would be supported by the provision of local housing. The site adjacent to Hutton Village and to the south of Lodge Close could provide a mix of housing in an accessible location.</p>	<p><b>GB2</b> <b>GAR</b> <b>SITE</b></p>
168	<p>The release of Green Belt sites in suitable locations is supported in the light of possible increased housing targets. A review of the Green Belt should be undertaken. The local centre at Hutton Village would be supported by the provision of local housing. The site adjacent to Hutton Village and to the south of Lodge Close could provide a mix of housing in an accessible location.</p>	<p><b>GAR</b> <b>SITE</b></p>
169	<p>The cluster of villages to the north of the Borough, when combined provide many of the functions of a higher order settlement and should be considered as such. The three sites highlighted in Wyatts Green and Kelvedon Hatch can provide a mix of housing in suitable locations. A review of the Green Belt should be undertaken as part of the LDF.</p>	<p><b>GAR</b> <b>SITE</b> <b>GB2</b></p>
170	<p>Given the importance of communication links and emerging technologies in terms of economic development and social aims, it is noted that there is little mention of mobile telephony in the document. Suggest a telecommunications policy is included in the emerging LDF, as stated in various guidance including PPG8 - suggested policy wording included.</p>	<p><b>INF MOB</b></p>
173	<p>We support the release of Green Belt sites in suitable locations in the light of possible increased housing targets. A local review of the Green Belt boundary should be undertaken. The site adjacent to Nags Head Lane to the west of Brentwood does not support the function of the Green Belt and would be more suitable as a site for housing and alternative employment uses.</p>	<p><b>GAR</b> <b>GB2</b> <b>SITE</b></p>
176	<p>Inevitable that Green Belt release will be required, whilst it should be broadly retained the Core Strategy should review sites on the edge of the urban area. Release of a limited number of appropriately sized Green Belt sites will ensure that affordable housing, sustainability, appropriate housing mix, housing density, protection of accessible open space, local character and distinctiveness are delivered.</p>	<p><b>GB2</b> <b>GAR</b> <b>LD</b></p>
179	<p>There should be less drinking places for the young and more for families and adults. Since the nightclub was closed due to the fire, the high street has been a much better place to visit and it should be restored to being the coaching inn it once was. How the owners got permission to change it to such an extent is beyond belief!</p>	<p><b>BC</b></p>
180	<p>Anglian Water have three existing Wastewater treatment works in Brentwood area; Doddinghurst, Ingatestone and Shenfield. Shenfield has sufficient capacity to accommodate the growth proposals. Any growth to the Doddinghurst or Ingatestone catchments would require a revised flow and sanitary consent. This would also require investment that would not be available until post 2016 at the very earliest.</p>	<p><b>INF WAT</b></p>
181	<p>It is important to provide local people with affordable housing. However, it is equally important that the ambience of certain areas are kept for the benefit of not only the people who live and enjoy established areas but also for the wildlife and environment. I refer in particular to the Longaford Way, Shenfield area which is under threat from developers. There is an established badger sett on this site,</p>	<p><b>AFF</b> <b>ENV NA</b></p>

	but still the debate goes on as to whether houses should be built on the site which thousands of people have voiced their concerns. You must take into consideration not only the welfare of the animals who have lived on this site for years but also that of the local community whose views far outweigh that of the developers.	
185	Response regarding Friern Manor farm, straddling the boundary between Basildon and Brentwood, and its potential development for a green enterprise zone. The development would create employment, dispose of domestic and non domestic waste, produce 90MW of electricity for national grid or local use, enable brownfield sites elsewhere to be freed up for housing, enable unwanted industries to be placed in a low carbon environment and further release brownfield sites for residential, serviced by adjacent and under utilised trunk roads and could be extended to include West Horndon. Further detail in full response.	<b>SITE GAR INF WAS</b>
188	Some questions e.g. Section 2 'reduce crime etc.' the answer is pretty obvious. Why are questions such as these included? Are they control questions?	<b>DOC C</b>
189	Enforcement of by-laws, patrols of Council/police need to be improved. This will prevent litter, graffiti and damage to local infrastructure e.g. Parking on grass verges etc.	<b>SAF</b>
190	The vision does not appear to include obtaining value for money for residents. It does not contain any promise to be responsive to residents or to communicate better. Many objectives may conflict (e.g. increase business leads to increase car journeys). No mention of objectives regarding noise pollution along A12 corridor. What has happened to the promise to reduce 'street furniture?'	<b>VIS COU</b>
193	I feel the whole questionnaire seems to be that of a cash unlimited dream list. The focus seems totally on low income families to the detriment of those contributing a greater cash amount to the area - equality is correct - not political correctness to the prejudice of those better off.	<b>DOC C</b>
194	Comments provided reflect my views on sustainable development as a planner and not necessarily the overarching views of Essex Police in its entirety. I am however their planning advisor.	<b>O</b>
196	Are you looking too far ahead? Many people aged 65 will be dead by 2031. So what is the projected population for 2031 will we need all this development?	<b>DEM</b>
197	The use of West Horndon industrial estate for employment purposes could be improved whilst retaining the same number of jobs. Further details in full response.	<b>SITE ED</b>

<b>General Comments Categories</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>AFF - affordable Housing</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>BC – bars, cafes &amp; restaurants in town centre</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>COB - centres outside Borough</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>COMU - community facilities</b>	<b>4</b>
CHILD - Child Care	1
<b>COU – Council</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>DEM - demographics</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>DEV - location of development</b>	<b>17</b>
BF - use of brownfield	5
<b>DOC - document &amp; consultation process</b>	<b>14</b>
C - comment form	8
<b>ED - economic development</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ENV – environment</b>	<b>9</b>
FLO - flooding	1
NA – nature & wildlife	1
OS - parks & open space	3
<b>EVID B - evidence base</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>GAR - garden grabbing</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>GB 1 – protect Green Belt</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>GB2 – Green Belt can't all be protected</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>G&amp;T - gypsies &amp; travellers</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>GOV P - Government &amp; national planning system</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>INF infrastructure</b>	<b>9</b>
MOB - mobile communications	1
WAS - waste	1
WAT - water	1
<b>LD - local distinctiveness</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>O – other</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>OD - over development</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>OLY - Olympic Games 2012</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PC - parish councils</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PG - planning gain</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>QoL - quality of life</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>REC – recession</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>RET – retail</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>RSS - RSS figures</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SAF - crime, anti-social behaviour &amp; community safety</b>	<b>5</b>
DOG - dog fouling	1
<b>SH - settlement hierarchy</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SITE - site suggested</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>SP O - spatial options</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>T – transport</b>	<b>9</b>
PA - parking	2
PT - public transport	3
RO - roads & congestion	2
CY/FP - walking & cycling	1
<b>TC - town centre</b>	<b>5</b>
HS - High Street improvement	2
<b>VIS – Vision</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>VS - voluntary Sector</b>	<b>1</b>

## Question 10: Publicity and Availability

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Do you think the consultation document was given sufficient publicity? If No, what else should have been done?	Category
3	Notify residents by every means possible	O
8	A mailshot would have helped	MAIL
10	Not certain	O
12	Councillors should have gone door to door	PUB
14	Letter or leaflet	MAIL
15	Comment form should have been sent to everyone	CF
17	Increase council tax for those that failed to reply	O
23	Visit local areas setting out this proposal. More detailed, easy to read and understand literature.	PUB DET
26	Issue document to local social groups for their dispersal	PUB
27	The citizenship is apathetic	O
33	Visual promotion in Brentwood High Street	PUB
36	Local notices/adverts in shop windows etc	PUB
40	I only heard when I e-mailed the citizens panel. Handout leaflets should be placed in prominent places like the library and significant stores.	PUB
41	letter drop (or email?) could have been included in vision magazine	MAIL PUB
42	Notice on front door, but if delivered as letter may have received it.	MAIL
43	Every household should've received this questionnaire	MAIL
44	Questionnaire sent to every house. Balanced view will not be obtained if residents need to contact one of the above for this form particularly at time of year.	CF
47	ensure every household received a copy	MAIL
49	Out of 8 Brentwood residents, 6 had not received/heard of this doc.	MAIL
55	Whatever you did would not be enough for some!	O
57	A longer lead in period should have been given to make people aware of the upcoming consultation process.	TT
58	It should have been sent to every household in the borough	MAIL
60	Written to all council tax and business rate payers	MAIL
61	Local radio, posters in LA buildings. Publicity is a major and questionable cost.	PUB
62	Mail drop - one for every household	MAIL
63	Every household should've received this questionnaire	MAIL
64	Local papers	LP
69	Should have been sent to all residents	MAIL
70	Deadline to submit too short. More advertising. No leaflet drop in our area. Only saw advert in the Gazette 2 days after the first deadline date.	TT, PUB, MAIL
71	The pathway leaflet should have been to every home, many people did not know about it.	MAIL
73	An advertisement or article in the Brentwood Gazette.	LP
75	Sent to every house	MAIL

78	Not many people read gazette. Should have been posters at public community places.	<b>PUB</b>
79	First I knew about it was when a colourful leaflet came through the door - more local advertising prior to this was needed (newspaper articles and adverts) and major shops.	<b>PUB LP</b>
97	It should have also been done via local flyers via the post.	<b>MAIL</b>
98	More in local paper.	<b>LP</b>
101	Mention was made directly of Ingatestone in the document but I am not sure if IFPC have discussed this in relation to the village or "consulted" residents on it.	<b>O</b>
104	More promotion via local press	<b>LP</b>
106	All homeowners should be mandated to complete a more in-depth survey of what they want for the area..	<b>O</b>
107	Simplified questionnaire through the door for return in a prepaid envelope .	<b>CF</b>
112	Because we all know that absolutely no notice will be taken of public opinion, all be it that we are supposed to live in a democratic country so providing more information would be a further waste of tax payers money	<b>O</b>
117	We appear not to have received a leaflet through our front door. We were not aware of any advertisements in the free papers (Yellow Advertiser and The Enquirer) which would have helped promote awareness.	<b>MAIL LP</b>
121	This would have been better received in August, September, this is not the time for questionnaire filling, you may have had a better response	<b>TT</b>
122	This is completely the wrong time of year to do this exercise. People are too busy with preparing for Christmas and the holidays. The questionnaire is very time- consuming and I doubt if you will have much response. Perhaps this is what the Council wants so that they can get on with their agenda. This could easily have been done in the New Year.	<b>TT</b>
123	Higher profile advertising	<b>PUB</b>
125	Apparently I was sent an email notifying me, but this was not received. A letter in the post may be more reliable.	<b>MAIL</b>
126	I have selected NO because I cannot say YES without any knowledge of the degree of response you are receiving and how this compares with other such enquiries in this and other areas.  I found the document clear and helpful and it arrived in a manner which attracted my attention BUT..... I would imagine that there will be many who see so many words and a complex response form and will be somewhat (and in some cases very) disinclined to spend the time and brain power to read, understand and respond.	<b>DET2</b>
131	To make sure every household receives a leaflet through their letterbox. Not sure everyone did!	<b>MAIL</b>
132	More advertising in the local press	<b>LP</b>
133	The response document should have been made more easily accessible, by inclusion with the strategy outline document.	<b>CF</b>
136	It underestimates the amount of leaflets and unsolicited material which drops through the letter box each week - the consultation materials disappears along with the other materials  The use of churches, school distribution facilities e.g. parents - the railways stations could of elicited a better response. even pubs anywhere where people congregate	<b>PUB</b>
138	I don't know of anyone else who has completed it. The leaflet was quite daunting!	<b>DET2</b>
141	From neighbours	<b>O</b>

143	Local Radio	<b>PUB</b>
145	Public meetings	<b>PUB</b>
155	Would have preferred to receive a paper comment form	<b>CF</b>
185	Issued too late and too short a time for a reply	<b>TT</b>
188	Mailshot	<b>MAIL</b>
189	Put up notices as is done with planning applications	<b>PUB</b>
190	However I understand many residents have not received any information directly from the Council.	<b>MAIL</b>
193	A note to every household should have been sent - Council tax letters always seem to go out, why couldn't notification of this?	<b>MAIL</b>

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Do you feel that the consultation document could have been made more easily and directly available? If Yes, what else should have been done?</b>	<b>Category</b>
3	Tell residents where to obtain it	<b>PUB</b>
5	Should have received survey form and envelope with original letter	<b>CF</b>
7	Link to local website (Inside Brentwood) as well as Council website	<b>PUB</b>
8	But only saw it on the internet	<b>PUB</b>
10	Not certain	<b>O</b>
12	Comment form could have accompanied leaflet. A lot of people don't have a computer and cannot get to the town hall.	<b>CF</b>
14	Letter or leaflet to include where document available for inspection.	<b>O</b>
16	Delivered to every household in the Borough if you really want to get true picture of all views.	<b>MAIL</b>
21	Forms are too long winded	<b>DET2</b>
23	As above	<b>O</b>
31	Comment form could have been delivered with leaflet. There are far too many questions and alternatives to enable an accurate picture to be drawn.	<b>CF DET2</b>
36	Left in places where people go - big shops/small busy shops/library.	<b>PUB</b>
37	Rural houses were not all leafleted	<b>MAIL</b>
40	Make it more visible to residents	<b>O</b>
41	As above	<b>O</b>
42	As above	<b>O</b>
43	As above	<b>O</b>
44	As above	<b>O</b>
47	Give it greater publicity	<b>PUB</b>
48	If documents available at council offices - how are we to know they are there? Libraries could be asked to provide a rack for such documents.	<b>PUB</b>
49	Delivered to every house.	<b>MAIL</b>
53	Why not include the comment form with the leaflet? More people would then complete it.	<b>CF</b>
57	Every household should have been sent the document. I certainly did not receive the document through the post.	<b>MAIL</b>
58	See above	<b>O</b>
61	Could it have gone home with school children?	<b>PUB</b>
62	As above	<b>O</b>
64	Home visits/telephone survey	<b>PUB</b>

66	Collected consultation paper from Tipps Cross Remembrance hall 16th December. May have been insufficient time for some people. Drop in events to be held a week earlier.	TT
70	Every house should have been notified.	MAIL
71	The pathway leaflet should have been to every home, many people did not know about it.	MAIL
73	Distributed by the Council or its agents in the manner of the electoral register forms and voting cards.	MAIL
75	made a lot shorter	DET2
77	Consultation doc delivered with original request for views of Brentwood residents.	O
79	At local post offices and at some major shops	PUB
104	Direct mailing from council	MAIL
113	Make the language used in the document more user friendly .Most people are fed up with the method and terminology used in this type of survey. Use plain English. You have probably put a lot of people off giving their comments.	DET2
175	Link to the document on the main Council webpage or the planning page rather than a small link on the right hand side of the planning page.	PUB
185	We wrote three times to be informed when the consultation was going to start. Never told. Telephone many time told would be informed - was not.	MAIL
189	As above	O
196	A copy put through everyone's door	MAIL

Question 10 Categories	Total
CF – comment form to everyone	9
	1
DET – not enough detail	
DET2 – too much detail	6
LP – local press	7
MAIL – mailing to residents	32
O - other	21
PUB – increased publicity	26
TT – timing and timescales	6

## Question 11: Presentation and Content

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	Did you find the presentation of the document easy to read? If No, what else should have been done to improve it?	Category
5	Full of leading questions - causing concern over the motives	LEA
7	Online via above website	PUB
10	Rather vague and imprecise with choices which could be complementary or integrated show as alternatives. Perhaps more options could have been offered. Diagrams make intent difficult to define - perhaps OS base might assist.	DET
14	Needs to be simplified	DET2
15	Questions not easy to answer without qualifying certain ones. Probably written to get answers you want	LEA
21	Too much gobbledygook and vague phrases	DET
23	Tell the truth - what exactly is in your mind and more importantly the government's?	O
31	Which document?	O
33	Some of the questions are ambiguous and unclear or in need of clarification. Some issues not addressed i.e.. Traffic management, speeding, renewable energy, reducing light pollution	DET O
36	The questions are all geared for positive response and the Council cannot possibly please all of the people all of the time. Many questions are irrelevant.	LEA
44	Some statements are ambiguous. Terminology not always easy to understand.	DET2
48	Dreary. Leaflet - don't use coloured boxes all over the place, label the pictures, cut down on the wording.	DET2
62	Too much jargon - too time consuming	DET2
75	Some questions were not clear	DET
78	But you need to have the initial booklet with you when completing the form	O
80	Some of it was unclear	DET
106	No accessibility functionality as required by the law!	O
123	Less technical language	DET2
124	Everything is too general - most of the questions are combinations so that I could not express my view on a generality without seeming to agree with a second more insidious opinion. e.g. "Transport corridor led growth: development concentrated on transport corridors (Q1) and in the main settlements (Q2)" - why "and in the main settlements" - I want it in a new settlements. It seems engineered to get responses to fit decisions already taken	DET LEA
126	Colourful and well broken into sections.	O
136	Easy is not the right word - understandable, if you're used to acronyms and tecky language.	O
138	It seemed a lot for people to work through, and I was reluctant to spend too much time on something that I was not convinced would have any real effect.	DET2
143	Spelling error page 4 (principal not principle) shopping centre in the Borough.	O
149	Too much information on first page. Should have bolder and punchier title.	DET2
185	Rather repetitious and questions very leading. More a public relations exercise than a planning policy document for considered professional input.	DET LEA
190	The summary was insufficient but even the full document didn't contain all information required to respond comprehensively.	DET
196	Needs more everyday use of English.	DET2

Ref	Did you find that the consultation document was clear and easy to read? If No, what else should have been done to make it clearer?	Category
10	Except diagrams - OS based maps preferable	O
23	See previous answers	O
31	Which document?	O
33	See previous comment	O
39	The headings 'Strongly Agree' etc should have been carried over on every page. I could see 4 spatial options, not 5.	O
44	As above	O
48	See previous answer	O
61	Except for 'spatial options' as government speak	O
62	Too much jargon	DET2
65	A glossary of terms and acronyms would be useful for the lay reader.	GLO
79	But a lot of the questions are very obvious such as public transport should be improved - of course it should, nobody is going to say no - it look like padding!	LEA
103	Pictures were good - detail was a bit jargony and the amount of detail high. At this stage of the consultation the Bigger Picture would have been sufficient and more easy to read and therefore comment on.	DET2
106	Inclusion of alternate text for visually impaired	O
108	The use of plain English would have been helpful and would encourage people to read/complete it.	DET2
112	It would do justice to MI5 even they could not have wrapped up the amount of stealth more cunningly. Why not come out with in big bold letters we are going to build more houses on green belt land whether you like or not.	LEA
113	Was this document and on line survey read by anyone other that its authors? Use plain English please.	DET2
117	It was quite repetitive and wordy in some areas. The Strategy Leaflet, however, was very good.	DET2
121	Bit confusing in places and waffling, having to read things twice to make sense of them.	DET2
123	Too technical	DET2
124	Stop asking dual questions to force people to make a choice that fits in with your policies.	LEA
136	Plain simple English understandable by the average person in the street.	DET2
137	Some of the questions could be mis-interpreted.	DET2

Question 11 Categories	Total
<b>DET – not enough detail</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>DET2 – too much detail</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>GLO – glossary of terms</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>LEA – leading questions</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>O - other</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>PUB - publicity</b>	<b>1</b>

## Question 12: Further Comments

(See end of this section for an explanation of categories)

Ref	If you have any further comments regarding the consultation process, please write them here	Category
15	Took two hours to fill in comment form.	DET2
20	Please send me a copy of the summary of the results for this survey.	O
23	I really don't think what residents want will, in the final analysis, be taken into account. The government has already made up its mind.	LEA
25	Financial crises come and go - people are generally unlikely to be persuaded not to use cars. Gardens have become car parks. Who knows what future technology will mean for jobs. I don't envy difficult choices to be made.	CA2 O
27	One or two committee members felt it very difficult to digest.	DET2
28	Although this opportunity to comment is welcome, we suspect the planners already have firm ideas on ways forward. Clearing drains in areas that constantly flood could better protect the infrastructure and repairing pot holed roads. We hope Brentwood's shopping area is not to be turned into another Chelmsford. We wish not to see our local area turned into an ethnical hotchpotch of racial tensions, something that may be unintentionally or otherwise lurking within the consultation document.	FLO TC
35	A lot of public money spent trying to engage people who have no interest in the subject!	O
37	As noted in some of the questions, it is difficult to comment if detail is not given. It was impossible to copy an online response which is unsatisfactory for organisations like CPREssex where distribution is necessary.	DET IT
41	As travellers/gypsies are seeking to become permanent residents, should not this issue have been included in the 'core strategy' and not just in the proposed separate consultation?	GT
42	Think this was the wrong time in the calendar with xmas. Many people otherwise pre-occupied.	TT
48	Too complicated and not detailed enough. Some items double barrelled and some vague.	DET
51	Tried to complete it online but after about 40 mins I was 'timed out' - if there are limits you should let people know.	IT
55	Care should be given to ensure existing bungalows are not turned into houses.	O
59	Some questions seemed loaded. A lot of questions seem to have too many different implications wrapped up within them.	LEA
64	Survey may have been too daunting/complicated for some. Perhaps requires just 3-4 generic questions from each category. Some questions are repeated.	DET2
71	Too many similar questions.	DET2
73	More time should have been given for residents' feedback. This is a very important matter. Decisions should not be rushed into.	TT
98	I had trouble finding the consultation on the website. I found it very long winded and complicated and time consuming to fill in. I would have preferred to choose between options 1 - 5 presented at the end of the leaflet.	PUB DET2
102	I cannot think of anything else that you can do to get our views. I wonder what proportion of residents will respond.	O
116	Said what needs to be said now will wait for results.	O
121	Send it out at a sensible time	TT

122	Not very good publicity for the drop-in meetings and again wrong time for people to attend.	<b>PUB TT</b>
124	I was really disappointed as I thought we were being given a chance to direct policy. All we have is the choice to disagree with the obviously unworkable and to accept choices you have already planned - there was nowhere to enter original thought - ALL PAGES IN THE QUESTIONAIRES SHOULD INCLUDE 'NON OF THE ABOVE' which would indicate that you have to come up with a new and acceptable alternative.	<b>LEA</b>
125	Our covering letter includes some further points.	<b>O</b>
126	I have the feeling that many residents will be overwhelmed with the amount of paper and the number of questions and that the responses will be from a somewhat (maybe significantly) skewed section of the residents. There is a general issue in attracting attention to complex consultations and - whilst I appreciate the efforts made to make the literature clear and well broken down, I do wonder if there isn't a less massive way of determining the feelings of the residents AND getting a better cross section to respond	<b>DET2</b>
128	I hope I shall be able to email this to you, rather than print and post it	<b>O</b>
129	I have already completed the above form some time ago but forgot to mention a few things. I live on a very nice estate just out of Brentwood. My number for reference is AF10840E. The problems we have is speeding traffic making it very dangerous. We need traffic calming methods of some sort. Also we have boarded up shop's that lower the look of what is otherwise a very pretty estate.	<b>O</b>
133	Late notice of the consultation meetings made attendance impossible.	<b>TT</b>
136	I am happy to discuss further points made in this document.	<b>O</b>
137	The form is too long and I feel many people would have 'given up' half way through. I am not sure that enough has been done to emphasise the importance of taking part in this consultation bearing in mind that it relates to the future development of Brentwood.	<b>DET2</b>
138	I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss these matters further as the consultation progresses.	<b>O</b>
140	None.	<b>O</b>
145	Unable to complete online document.	<b>IT</b>
174	Consultation comments/statements are too prescriptive and leading, precluding genuine consultation. More general questions should have been posed and simplistic statements avoided. Consultation document should be available in word format to allow electronic submission of consultation forms, not just in PDF format.	<b>LEA IT</b>
185	The questions are very leading almost to the extent of being meaningless from a planning policy point of view	<b>LEA</b>
190	I feel that a public meeting in each major locality would have helped to fill in gaps and to give a better grasp of the objectives	<b>PUB</b>
193	Some questions grouped together and too much information to be commented on. Hence gave impression that decisions were being clouded and pushed through to support decisions already made, hence that this questionnaire may not actually be taken into account.	<b>DET2 LEA</b>
194	All questions are very generic and the answers to which a 'reasonable man' would agree in almost all instances. The questions seem to mirror the established objectives of strategic planning policy (national and regional) and therefore this indicates that this exercise aims only to satisfy the need for community consultation rather than to inform the plan making process on a local level.	<b>LEA</b>

<b>Question 12 Categories</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>CA2 – unrealistic to reduce car usage</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>DET – not enough detail</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>DET2 – too much detail /not simple enough</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>FLO - flooding</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>IT – IT issues with comment form online</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>LEA – leading questions</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>TT – timetable and timelines</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>TC – town centre</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>O – other</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>PUB - publicity</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>G&amp;T – gypsies &amp; travellers</b>	<b>1</b>

**END**