



**Meeting:** Dunton Hills Garden Village – **Project Delivery Board**  
**Venue:** Online via Microsoft Teams  
**Date:** Wednesday 17 February 2021  
**Time:** 14:00 – 15:30

**Attendees:**

Leader Cllr Chris Hossack (CH)	Brentwood Borough Council (BBC)
Phil Drane (PD)	
Coby Tomlins (CT)	
Justin Booij (JB)	
Cllr Phillip Mynott (PM)	
Cllr Maria Pearson (MP)	HTA Design
Ana McMillan (AM)	
Nour Sinno (NS)	CEG
Charlotte Robinson (CR)	
Jon Allen (JA)	
David Barnes (DB)	Essex County Council
Graham Thomas (GT)	
Cllr Mark Durham (MD)	
Cllr Mike Hardware (MH)	
Fionnuala Lennon (FL)	Homes England
Colin Foan (CF)	West Horndon Parish Council

Item	Notes
<b>Previous Meeting Actions</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CT to add key issues raised by stakeholders for regarding SPD to next project board agenda. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actioned and item closed</li> </ul> </li> <li>CT to include supporting infrastructure as an agenda item for next Project Board meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actioned and item closed</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<b>1. Policy Framework Update</b>	<p><b>Local Plan Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PD provided an update on the Local Plan and noted since the last Project Delivery Board that hearing sessions have been held in December 2020 (week 1), and more recently in February 2021 (weeks 2 and 3). PD noted further sessions to be held 23-25 February (week 4) (including DHGV matters) and 9-11 March (week 5).</li> <li>PD explained that recent weeks have focussed on site specific matters and matters outside of DHGV. The DHGV sessions will focus on policy specific wording for the allocation and some</li> </ul>

	<p>matters such as viability and transport that are carried over from week 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PD noted that all Examination In Public material is available online at: <a href="https://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=694">https://www.brentwood.gov.uk/index.php?cid=694</a></li> <li>• PD explained that additional work has been submitted in relation to transport, including the updated Transport Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The hearing session on Tuesday 23 February will look at this in detail</li> <li>• Further information regarding employment has been submitted for DHGV as requested by the Inspectors which related to job numbers within the plan period and longer term. PD noted further information may need to be submitted as a result of the upcoming hearing sessions.</li> <li>• PM asked about participation from Basildon Council and Thurrock Council. PD explained that both were in attendance at week 1 hearing sessions. Basildon raised specific concerns regarding impact to their infrastructure as a result of DHGV and evidence to support the allocation. Thurrock raised issues with the location of proposed development. PD noted that with the absence of a Thurrock Local Plan and the Joint Strategic Plan, BBC are of the position that the Brentwood growth strategy is consistent with the South Essex Growth aspirations. Further detailed concerns were raised by Thurrock in relation to landscape, however those matters have been set out in the SPD at a detailed level. They will have the opportunity to comment on the SPD.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Wider Infrastructure Implications</b></p>	<p><b>Wider Infrastructure Implications (SBGC/ Emergency/ Schools)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PD explained that West Horndon is currently the only settlement within the South Brentwood Growth Corridor and as a result of proposed development along this corridor, BBC has been looking at infrastructure requirements needed to ensure sustainable development in these locations. This has been discussed at length in the hearing sessions and is set out in the IDP. The IDP sets out high level costs to ensure growth in this area can come forward. This includes relevant community infrastructure as well as relevant emergency access points.</li> <li>• PD noted that BBC is aware of a difference of opinion in school locations on DHGV with ECC and CEG, in terms of a co-located site, or separated primary school. PD noted that BBC has resolved to ensure that either option can come forward through the application process. The SPD requires further information be provided to support the relevant school location site and noted that both options can be accommodated within the broader design of DHGV.</li> <li>• GT noted that ECC does not provide for new schools, these will always be academy schools. However, ECC commissions the design work for the relevant schools and support a co-location</li> </ul>

	<p>model. PD noted that through the formal consultation process, ECC should be involved at a detailed design stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CF asked for an update on station access given the range of land ownerships. PD noted that the station access agreement is progressing through discussion with c2c, Network Rail and other partners. Bringing this forward together with West Horndon Industrial Estate redevelopment is key to achieving an improved access.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. SPD Overview and Presentation</b></p>	<p><b>Supplementary Planning Document Update CT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CT provided an update that since the last Project Board, the summary of co-design report has been published. This sets out the key points raised by various stakeholders and the community throughout the co-design phase. This has informed, together with the draft Framework Masterplan Document, and how the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) comes forward.</li> <li>• CT noted that some minor changes have been made to the SPD to respond to the Heritage Impact Assessment which was required by Historic England as part of the Local Plan examination process.</li> <li>• HTA presented an update, which went over detail of the SPD draft and updates since the last Project Board (see attached).</li> <li>• FL commended Brentwood on the work that has been undertaken for the project and the progress that has been made over the last year. DHGV is used as an example across other Garden Communities for how this work should be done.</li> <li>• FL questioned how the co-design benefits are starting to be seen, and how much of the development is open space? CT noted that a number of positives are being seen in relation to the community work that has been done, including a wider expanded programme with our young people; greater number of people involved than typically seen as a result of the online element; and other benefits such as opportunities for sea cadets to influence how community initiatives can be carried forward on the site after design phases. CT noted that the site included 50% Green and Blue Infrastructure as part of the Local Plan policy.</li> <li>• CH commended the work and level of detail that has been undertaken.</li> <li>• GT noted that stewardship is key to bring this to life, including the detailed costing of how to go above and beyond to make this Garden Community successful in the long term. This includes maintenance of trees and open spaces.</li> <li>• FL noted that the earlier this is thought about the better and there are many examples of where other garden communities have gotten it right.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CH noted that getting the Parish Council involved or having a new one may be key to ensuring long term sustainability. CF explained that these conversations will start occurring in the near future.</li> <li>• PN noted that management fees pushing up council tax brackets needs to be considered specifically for affordable homes.</li> <li>• DB/CT noted that this work is already underway as part of pre-application work being undertaken. The model largely relates to core Garden Community principles where the community own, run and manage assets.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Development Management</b>	<p><b>Planning Application</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JB noted that the focus to date has been on working towards the Local Plan hearing sessions and completing the SPD, however in the background the team are continuing to work towards an application which as set out in the hearing session information is set for Q2 of this year.</li> <li>• JA explained that the programme is still on track to submit within this time.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Programme Updates</b>	<p><b>Garden Communities Conference</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CT noted as a result of extensive consultation, BBC were asked to present at the Garden Communities conference on engagement process undertaken for DHGV SPD and its interrelationship with placemaking. Positive achievement for the project.</li> </ul> <p><b>Homes England Funding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CT noted the funding bid was submitted September 2020 to Homes England and thanked ECC and CEG for including a supporting letter with the submission.</li> <li>• FL noted that an announcement by Government is imminent.</li> </ul> <p><b>Art Programme</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CT noted that BBC have been working with Essex Cultural Diversity Project and Arts Council England to develop an arts Programme in collaboration with the community to ensure a legacy at DHGV.</li> <li>• CT noted that the bid process will be launched in March 2021 to request further bids which will worth together with the consultation process.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Any Other Business</b>	<p><b>Next Meeting Timing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CT noted that it makes sense to place meeting following consultation and hearing sessions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Action: CT</b> to send invite to next meeting date</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Actions:**

1. **Action: CT** to send invite to next meeting date