

## Minutes

---

### Planning and Licensing Committee Tuesday, 13th December, 2016

#### Attendance

Cllr McCheyne (Chair)	Cllr Mrs Middlehurst
Cllr Ms Rowlands (Vice-Chair)	Cllr Morrissey
Cllr Bridge	Cllr Mrs Murphy
Cllr Faragher	Cllr Mynott
Cllr Mrs Hubbard	Cllr Newberry
Cllr Keeble	Cllr Ms Sanders

#### Also Present

Cllr Foan	-	West Horndon Parish Council
Cllr Lockhart	-	Blackmore, Wyatt Green & Hook End Parish Council
Cllr Hossack		

#### Officers Present

Phil Drane	-	Planning Policy Team Leader
Caroline McCaffrey	-	Development Management Team Leader
Claire Mayhew	-	Governance and Member Support Officer
Sonia Sharp	-	Planning Solicitor
Nick Howard	-	Senior Planner
Lorne Spicer	-	Business Development and Communications Officer
Daniel Toohey	-	Monitoring Officer

#### 232. Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received. The Chair welcomed the newly appointed Planning Solicitor, Sonia Sharp to the committee.

#### 233. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the Planning and Licensing Committee of the 11th October 2016 were approved and signed as a true record, subject to an amendment that Cllr Faragher apologies be included on the attendance list.

#### 234. Minutes of the Licensing Appeals Sub Committee

The minutes of both the Licensing Appeal Sub-Committees held on 18th October 2016 were approved and signed as a true record.

**235. Variation of the Agenda**

**RESOLVED**, following a request from the Chair, to move item 7 - Enclosed dry recycling facility, Brentwood Transport Depot, The Drive, Great Warley, be debated before Item 4.

**236. Enclosed dry recycling facility - Brentwood Borough Council Transport Depot, The Drive, Great Warley, Essex. CM13 3BH - Planning Application 16/01411/BBC**

Cllr Hubbard, Ward Member expressed concerns on future vehicles movement and increases in vermin and smells within the site. The officer confirmed that due to structure, type of waste and location, the increase in vermin and small should be insignificant or non-existent.

The Officer informed the committee that the Tree Officer requested an additional condition in relating to an implementation scheme before development.

After a discussion, Cllr Faragher suggested that the use of the dry recycling site be restricted for the sole use of Brentwood Borough Council.

Cllr Hossack, Chair of Environment and Housing Committee spoke in support of the application and clarified that the application was for Brentwood Borough Council use only and not a commercial venture.

The Officer clarified that if any private operator wishes to use the facility in the future, a further planning application would be required and assessed on its own merits.

A motion was **MOVED** by Cllr McCheyne and **SECONDED** by Cllr Faragher to **APPROVE** the application subject to the additional condition relating to Trees and a mechanism for the facility to be used solely by Brentwood Borough Council.

A vote was taken by a show of hands

FOR: Cllr Faragher, Mrs Middlehurst, Mrs Murphy, Bridge, Ms Sanders, Mynott, Newberry, Morrissey, Keeble, Mrs Hubbard, Ms Rowlands and McCheyne (12)

AGAINST: (0)

ABSTAIN: (0)

The Application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions and the additional conditions relating to the Implementation Scheme and the sole use of the facility by Brentwood Borough Council be enforced.

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved drawing(s) listed above and specifications.

Reason: To ensure that the development is as permitted by the local planning authority and for the avoidance of doubt.

*(Cllr Morrissey declared a non-pecuniary interest under the Council's Code of Conduct by virtue of her working for an on-line Estate Agent).*

## **237. Response to Highways England M25 Junction 28 Improvement Scheme Consultation**

Highways England are consulting on proposals for improvements to Junction 28 of the M25 (Brook Street roundabout, Brentwood). Proposals relate to anti-clockwise traffic connecting with the A12 eastbound towards Chelmsford/Colchester/Ipswich. Views are being sought on three potential options.

In response to the consultation, a proposed response was set out with this report (see Appendix A). As a major national infrastructure project with implications for the Borough, it is important that the Council respond and further consider issues through the Local Development Plan and Duty to Cooperate processes.

After a full discussion, a request from members for some additional wording be added to the response, this was noted by the officer.

Cllr McCheyne **MOVED** and Cllr Mrs Murphy **SECONDED** the recommendation set out in the report, a vote was taken by a show of hands.

### **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY**

1. To approve the response to the Highways England M25 Junction 28 improvement scheme consultation as set out in Appendix A.

### **Reasons for Recommendation**

Brentwood Borough Council's proposed response to the consultation is set out at Appendix A. The response broadly supports the need for improvements to M25 Junction 28.

The response supports the schemes intention to take M25 traffic travelling anti-clockwise onto the A12 eastbound carriageway, thereby relieving Brook Street roundabout somewhat and creating capacity. However, concerns are highlighted that queuing traffic originating from Brook Street A1023 backing up onto the

roundabout and then the A12 and M25, does not appear to be addressed directly as part of these proposals.

The response emphasises the importance of the scheme addressing the potential impacts on Green Belt. This area serves as an important separation between the edge of the Brentwood urban area and Greater London, specifically Harold Park at the edge of the London Borough of Havering. The level of growth being planned in the emerging Brentwood Local Plan is also raised, which is likely to have an impact on Junction 28. Highways England has been encouraged to take into account the emerging highways modelling evidence being produced to support the Local Plan, as well as evidence from other plans being prepared by local authorities in the wider area.

*(For clarity an amended response is appended to these minutes).*

*(Cllr Morrissey declared a non-pecuniary interest under the Council's Code of Conduct by virtue of her working for an on-line Estate Agent).*

## **238. Response to Epping Forest Draft Local Plan**

This report seeks Members approval on a formal response to Epping Forest District Council's Draft Local Plan consultation (October 2016). An early response was submitted to comply with the consultation deadline, subject to the approval of the Council's Planning and Licensing Committee.

The Council's response sets out general support for the Epping Forest Draft Local Plan's strategic objectives and vision, with some concern expressed over the longer term allocation of housing sites within the sub-regional housing market area.

Both Councils have a "duty to cooperate" on strategic priorities, such as planning issues that cross administrative boundaries. These priorities include housing and Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople site allocation, conservation of the natural environment and Green infrastructure. Work is ongoing between the two Councils to continue development of their respective Local Plans.

After a brief discussion, Cllr McChayne **MOVED** and Cllr Ms Rowlands **SECONDED** the recommendation in the report, a vote was taken by a show of hands.

### **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY**

1.1 To approve the response to the Epping Forest Draft Local (October 2016), as set out in Appendix A.

### **Reasons for Recommendation**

It is not considered necessary to object to the Epping Forest District Draft Local Plan consultation on the basis of likely minimal impacts for Brentwood Borough. However, the four districts (Epping Forest, East Herts, Harlow and Uttlesford) within this housing market area have not finalised their agreement for meeting local housing need the target, with a Memorandum of Understanding still in draft form. There is a risk of a greater number of homes being required within Epping Forest District. Brentwood Borough Council should therefore take a precautionary approach under the duty to cooperate.

Specific mention is made to the way in which development is planned around Chipping Ongar and High Ongar, so as to minimise potential impacts on the north of Brentwood Borough and to ensure the benefits of new development are shared across the wider area and local communities.

It is considered appropriate that Brentwood Borough Council express general support for the way in which the Epping Forest Draft Local Plan looks to move forward with challenging development needs, and commit to continued collaboration through the duty to cooperate on strategic issues that affect our two areas.

*(Cllr Morrissey declared a non-pecuniary interest under the Council's Code of Conduct by virtue of her working for an on-line Estate Agent).*

## **239. Brentwood Monitoring Report: Housing Delivery & Five Year Housing Supply**

The Council regularly monitors how planning policies are being implemented in regards to the decision-taking process, as well as progress on the plan-making process for preparation of documents set out in the Local Development Scheme.

As agreed at Planning and Licensing Committee on 1 December 2015, as soon as monitoring data becomes available the information is collated for publication into a series of monitoring updates, each reporting on different monitoring issues, which together form the Council's Authority Monitoring Reports (AMR). For clarity these have been branded "Brentwood Monitoring Reports" to be consistent with the emerging Brentwood Local Development Plan (LDP) and other supporting documents.

Two monitoring updates have been prepared for publication, the first of which contains information relating to housing delivery (for the period 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016), and the second provides an update on five year housing land supply (as at 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2021).

The Officer informed the committee of an additional table that will be added to Appendix A relating to the annual number of planning permissions granted for new

homes compared with completions, and that Table 6 in Appendix A is to be amended to include data on permitted Gypsy and Traveller pitches as at November 2016. The Officer also proposed an amendment to the recommendation to state:

“To approve publication of the following Brentwood Monitoring Reports and publish on the Council’s Website”.

This was agreed by the Chair.

Cllr Hubbard **MOVED** that the recommendations are voted on separately, this was agreed by the Chair.

Cllr McCheyne **MOVED** and Cllr Bridge **SECONDED** recommendation 1(a) of the report.

1. **To approve publication of the following Brentwood Monitoring Report and publish on the Council’s Website:**
  - a) **Housing Delivery 2015/16, as set out in Appendix A**

A vote was taken by a show of hands and it was **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY**.

Cllr McCheyne **MOVED** and Cllr Bridge **SECONDED** recommendation 1(b) of the report.

1. **To approve publication of the following Brentwood Monitoring Report and publish on the Council’s Website:**
  - b) **Five Year Housing Supply 2016-2021, as set out in Appendix B**

A vote was taken by a show of hands and it was **RESOLVED**.

#### **Reason for Recommendation**

It is important that the Council publishes monitoring information in order to share performance and achievements with the local community as information becomes available. It also meets the monitoring requirements set out in the NPPF and Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012, as amended by the Localism Act 2011.

In addition to publishing monitoring information in usual formats, such as a PDF document on the Planning pages of the Council’s website, use of the DataShare site will help meet the Council’s commitment to being open and transparent. AMR data will be freely available to view and download in a variety of formats.

*(Cllr Morrissey declared a non-pecuniary interest under the Council’s Code of Conduct by virtue of her working for an on-line Estate Agent).*

#### **240. Urgent Business**

The Chair reminded all members of the Planning Training taking place on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> December 2016 at 6.00pm in the Council Chamber.

The meeting ended at 20:04

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Brentwood Borough Council response to M25 Junction 28 Improvement Scheme consultation | November 2016 – January 2017**

### **Principle**

1. The Council supports the need for improvements to M25 Junction 28 (Brook Street roundabout). Evidence and extensive local experience shows that this junction is heavily congested. This not only delays journeys but also has a negative impact on Brentwood, and both the local and national economies.

### **Need for junction improvements**

2. The Council notes evidence that Highways England have provided regarding the existing situation at M25 junction and the need for improvements to capacity. It is understood that the need for the scheme was identified as part of the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) and the capacity issues are attributed to:
  - a) High volumes of traffic on movements between the M25 and the A12 towards Essex passing through the roundabout section;
  - b) The relatively high volumes of traffic to and from Brentwood via the A1023 Brook Street, accessed via an uncontrolled intersection on the roundabout; and
  - c) Limited capacity on the roundabout section due to the high traffic levels and the capacity of the signalised intersections.
3. The options that are presented in the consultation brochure look to address the capacity issues through the creation of a loop road that provides a direct link for traffic travelling anti-clockwise on the M25 onto the eastbound carriageway of the A12.

### **Junction improvement options**

4. The Council has the following comments which apply to all three options that have been presented as part of the consultation.
5. It appears that the scheme for a loop road will serve to increase capacity of the junction by removing traffic travelling from the M25 anti-clockwise onto the eastbound A12 carriageway. However, it does not appear that any works are proposed to address the issue of queuing traffic originating from the A1023, Brook Street. The consultation brochure acknowledges that when the signalised junctions at Mascalls Lane and Nags Head Lane operate over capacity during peak times this causes queues onto Junction 28 and then the A12 and M25. The Council has the view that if this is not addressed as part of the scheme the problem will continue to persist as the same levels of traffic will continue to want to access Brook Street via this junction. This queuing traffic will also continue to

add to the existing air pollution at the junction. It is acknowledged that the A1023 is not within the control of Highways England and further work with Essex County Council (local highway authority) will be required to decide on an appropriate solution. It is not clear from the consultation material whether signalling the Brook Street arm of the roundabout would be the most suitable option.

6. While it is acknowledged that a solution is required to address vehicle congestion the junction is also the location for a Byway which crosses the southern end of the A1023, runs south of The Poplars and then crosses the M25 slip-road onwards to Putwell Bridge Farm and Oak Farm, to the south of the M25. The Council is working with Essex County Council on improving the Borough's cycling networks and looking at solutions to overcome major road and infrastructure barriers to connect to wider cycling / walking networks across Essex. These types of considerations will also need to be taken into account when looking at improvements to the Brook Street junction, as part of a more comprehensive scheme.
7. The Council is pleased to note that on page 19 of the Technical Appraisal Report that the Brentwood Local Plan 2005 and emerging Local Plan were considered as part of developing the options. We would emphasise the importance of the Green Belt designation in this area which provides separation between the edge of the Brentwood urban area and Greater London, specifically Harold Park, which is part of the London Borough of Havering. Whilst there is already an existing road structure the addition of a large loop road presents a new incursion into the Green Belt which could particularly impact on the openness due to its scale and height. As the scheme advances the Council would be keen to ensure that this is properly addressed and justified.
8. The Brentwood Draft Local Plan February 2016 did not identify any housing or employment allocations on land nearby to Junction 28. However, it is important to note that there is a significant level of growth proposed in the Borough with a large amount focused in and around the Brentwood urban area. It is likely that this growth will impact on Junction 28 through increased car journeys made by new residents. Work on the highway modeling evidence to accompany the Local Plan is ongoing and we would be keen to ensure that the outputs of this work are taken into account where possible. As part of a more comprehensive approach to traffic modelling the Council is also keen to better understand the Highways England research information on traffic forecasts for this junction. It is hoped that technical information can be shared and discussed as part of ongoing dialogues with Highways England on the Brentwood Borough Traffic Model.
9. The Council is concerned that by splitting the various elements of work identified as required to alleviate congestion and safety problems at Junction 28, will cause multiple and long-term disruption in the area. This disruption will not only impact local residents and businesses, but also those who travel through the junction from across the country. We are concerned that this disruption will impact the wider economy, including London. A more pragmatic solution would be to agree the multiple projects required at the junction and undertake these as closely together as possible, so that works are consolidated into one time period

rather than over a longer period of multiple disruption. Whilst the Council understands the process behind commissioning and funding large infrastructure projects, and that this scheme is focusing on one element of the required works at Junction 28, it is deemed unacceptable that long-term solutions for the entire junction are not being met through this scheme. It becomes particularly important to consider this issue in the knowledge of future levels of housing and employment growth being planned along the A12 corridor throughout Essex and Suffolk – a significant proportion of which is likely to flow through M25 Junction 28 if accessing Greater London or the wider transport network connected to the M25.

### **Future Engagement**

10. We thank Highways England for involving the Council in this key public consultation and note the effort that has gone into preparing consultation material and holding public information events. The Council looks forward to continued dialogue on the subject.

\*\*\*

This page is intentionally left blank