



Notes

Meeting: Local Development Plan Members Working Group
Venue: Online via Microsoft Teams
Date: Tuesday 23 March 2021
Time: 17:00-18:35

Members Present: Cllr Bridge, Cllr Jon Cloke, Cllr Keeble, Cllr McCheyne, Cllr Mynott, Cllr Naylor, Cllr Sanders

Officers Present: Phil Drane (PD), Corporate Director of Planning and Economy
Jonathan Quilter (JQ), Strategic Planning Manager
Andrea Pearson (AP), Senior Policy Planner
Thom Hoang (TH), Senior Policy Planner

Apologies: Cllr Morrissey

1. Notes from last meeting

- a) Notes from last meeting (05/01/2021) were circulated for review. No comments raised.
- b) This meeting was scheduled for 9 March 2021, but this was rescheduled to 23 March taking account of updates to the examination programme and committees being scheduled ahead of the pre-election period.

2. Examination Update

- a) PD introduced the update. JQ advised that tasks heading into February sessions included updates to Transport Assessment evidence and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), with agreement reached with Essex County Council (ECC) on key transport matters.
- b) February sessions were originally set for weeks two and three, during this time the programme was updated to add a week four at the end of February and a week five in early March. This was because of discussion in the sessions and actions arising from them requiring further time to discuss and/or review.

Week Two

- c) JQ advised that week two was focussed on site allocations. The first session/day looked at the site assessment methodology process, where no further information



Notes

- was required by the inspectors. This methodology process is different from the strategy to select sites or areas for growth. The sites were grouped together into geographic areas/neighbourhoods for sessions over the following days.
- d) Blackmore and Kelvedon Hatch sites were grouped together, and further information was requested by the inspectors on settlement hierarchy (local services and facilities). Brentwood Town Centre sessions resulted in further information needed on car parking provision with development proposed (examination notes were published and a further session considered this in week four). There was a separate session for West Horndon. The Shenfield session considered Priests Lane and Land North of Shenfield. There was a separate session for employment site proposals. The final session was for Ingatestone sites.
 - e) Cllr Keeble asked about the settlement hierarchy information discussed for Blackmore. JQ responded that information was published by the Council in January, to which further questions were raised towards the end of week five sessions about services in settlements 2-4 in the hierarchy (including Blackmore village). There will be a further note published on the settlement hierarchy to respond to these questions. The Programme Officer will notify those involved in relevant sessions once published.
 - f) Cllr Keeble asked about school capacity in Blackmore. TH and PD responded that the education authority (ECC) view is that the school has the potential to expand with developer contributions. There is no objection from ECC.
 - g) Cllr Keeble asked about site access from Nine Ashes Road in Blackmore. JQ responded that the highways authority (ECC) had provided a view on the appropriateness of the proposed accesses to the sites, which was provided at the relevant sessions by ECC. There is no objection from ECC.
 - h) Cllr McCheyne asked about the proposal to accommodate a care home on site E08 in Ingatestone. JQ and PD advised that the inspectors do not seem convinced by the proposed policy wording to allow for other uses outside of employment that generate/facilitate jobs. An examination note has been published to suggest that the relevant policy require only employment uses on site. Cllr Cloke and Cllr Bridge asked about specific details of the site when compared through the plan-making or decision-making processes. Discussion about the difference between exceptional circumstances required to justify allocation of development in the Green Belt (local plan allocation) compared with the higher tests of very special circumstances in Green Belt (planning application).
 - i) Cllr McCheyne asked about the Lower Thames Crossing and impacts on Brentwood Enterprise Park. JQ responded that this was a continuing work with Highways England and Essex County Council through proposals at M25 junction 29 and delivery of the site.
 - j) JQ advised that the focus from the inspectors is whether the allocations are realistic as to the timeframes for delivery set out in the plan.



Notes

Week Three

- k) JQ advised that week three focused on details of policies in the plan, working through the plan chapter by chapter. There were several instances of scrutiny that resulted in discussion about whether particular policies were needed, either because they repeated national policy or created duplication. Various suggested changes have been put forward and discussed, this will need to be amalgamated into a version of the plan that will have to be subject to public consultation if the inspectors agree the changes are needed to make the plan sound.
- l) Subjects discussed in week three included infrastructure provision (minus strategic transport), Gypsies and Travellers, environment etc. The discussion was technical in nature, several notes were published to provide further information.
- m) Cllr Mynott asked whether there was a figure for removed policies or list of the suggested changes so far. JQ advised that a list of amendments is due to be published in April in response to the inspectors' request that this be clarified and consolidated following the sessions. This will include a reason for the amendment or deletion according to soundness tests.
- n) Cllr Mynott asked whether the number of amendments would require a different type of consultation. JQ responded that there was only one way of consulting and that would be for anyone to respond, although the inspectors will purely accept comments on the proposed changes to make the plan sound. That may then require a re-run of the sustainability appraisal and other statutory documents if relevant. Discussion about the difference between a main modification and other modifications, which are primarily matters of grammar and re-numbering etc.

Week Four

- o) JQ explained that shortly in advance of the week four sessions the Council received the Highways England (strategic highways authority)'s hearing statement. PD set out details of the statement, including objections to the transport assessment evidence on traffic flow discrepancies and matters of detail for mitigation measures required at strategic highway junctions (M25 junctions 28 and 29, as well as stretches of the A12 and junction 12 at Mountnessing). The Council expressed frustration at this position considering the amount of work and engagement undertaken with Highways England throughout the plan-making process. Resolution on outstanding issues was achieved with the local highways authority (ECC) in advance of the week two sessions following further work and discussion. PD published a letter to the inspectors setting out steps to provide further work and resolve issues, as agreed with Highways England. This impacts the timeframes for the examination programme and will now mean that we would be holding further sessions, likely in July. Deferred issues for then will be on the strategic transport matters and air quality.
- p) Cllr McCheyne asked whether railway organisations had commented on capacity according to planned growth. PD explained that positive discussion had taken place



Notes

with operators such as Network Rail and c2c about the capacity of the railway and services to expand in response to increasing demand. TfL expect that wider area growth can be accommodated by the new Elizabeth Line, for example.

- q) Sustainable transport measures were discussed in week four. A continuation was also held on Dunton Hills Garden Village from the week one session, which covered viability as well as detailed policy wording. Also discussed was monitoring and viability, and the Brentwood Town Centre car park sites, considering the information in the examination note published.
- r) Cllr Mynott asked about the car parking sites and proposed levels of parking provision, and whether there would be further discussion on this. JQ advised that the inspectors now have the evidence and will consider whether there is further discussion needed. The inspectors have asked for further evidence on the promotion of the site through Brentwood Development Partnership on the arrangement of joint venture development. This further information is due to be published soon.

Week Five

- s) JQ advised that week five took place in early March, principally covering the housing provision matter that had been held until after the Brentwood town centre sites had been considered. This included discussion around five-year housing supply and overall provision. Further work is being prepared to provide scenarios on delivery according to the shifting situation. It is likely that a further session will be needed on this once further evidence is published.
- t) Further sessions were held on more specific issues previously discussed, such as the detail of Brentwood Enterprise Park policy requirements. A final session was held on the work that is outstanding and due to be published, working through the details required and timeframes.

3. Dunton Hills Garden Village design guidance

- a) PD reminded members of the Policy, Resources and Economic Development Committee's decision to approve consultation on the Dunton Hills Garden Village design guidance document (17 March 2021).
- b) Consultation will take place after local elections in May. This will be for a minimum of six weeks in line with requirements, so that it can be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), at an appropriate time according to any amendments through consultation and the Local Plan examination process.
- c) Community engagement has been undertaken throughout preparation of the design guidance through the co-design process in 2020, and as part of the framework masterplan document that preceded it. Community engagement is a theme for which the Council is a class-leader, as is shown to other garden community projects nationwide.



Notes

4. AOB

- a) No matters were raised.
- b) Next meetings will be scheduled for 2021/22 following local elections in May.
- c) Noted that Cllr McCheyne will not be standing for election in May and so this will be his last LDP Member Working Group meeting. Cllr McCheyne has served for many years on the Planning Committee and the working group.

DRAFT