



Councillor John Mason

Representing the Hawkwell West Ward

Wistaria Cottage
Englefield Close
Hawkwell
Essex. SS5 4LE

Tel: 01702 204377

Email: CllrJohn.Mason@rochford.gov.uk

Member Correspondence

14th November 2008

Mr. Shaun Scrutton
Head of Planning and Transportation
Rochford District Council
Council Offices
South Street
Rochford
Essex. SS4 1BW

Dear Shaun

Public Consultation
LDF Rochford Core Strategy
Preferred Options

This is a formal response which I am making available to you before the closing date of the public consultation on 17 December 2008. This is a letter of OBJECTION.

As you know I have had 8 years direct experience of planning on the District Council, during which I have benefitted from regular training, with a further 8 years on two Parish Councils and I trust that my input will be both respected and more importantly the Council will consider acting on the legitimate planning matters that I am raising with the Council.

This letter also represents the strong opposition that was expressed last night at The Central Area Committee by the many residents of my Ward who filled Hawkwell Village Hall to listen to the presentation on The Rochford Core Strategy by Councillor Hudson and provide the Council feedback. As such it must be given the attribution of a weight of numbers rather than a single representation because I am properly acting as their elected Member of the District Council where these views have been expressed directly to the Council in public.

First of all, before commenting on the preferred location nearest to (in) my Ward, I wish to refer to the overall strategy for the District. This does not appear to be clearly presented enough in that the consolidated and cumulative effects of the preferred development locations are not clearly identified for the District as a whole and discussed.

For example the quantifiable effects of development on traffic numbers using the B1013 and surrounding feeder roads are not even extrapolated. If this high level strategic consideration of sustainability were considered then it would be readily evident that the preferred locations put forward in that part of the District are not viable or sustainable. The number of houses which will feed traffic to the B1013 is around 1750. This means an additional 40,000 vehicle journeys in just one week. Many people do not believe do not believe that the B1013 can take all the extra traffic from this scale of development. Indeed I understand from Essex County Council that the maximum capacity of the B1013 at its present width and traffic profile is just 1110 vehicle

movements per hour in each direction. Other figures suggest the road is running at 72% capacity already. On that basis the additional vehicle movements proposed cannot be accommodated on the B1013 without widening and additional lanes being added !!

The Council's Planning Policy Committee has gone round the District in the last year looking at the land which has been identified in the Call for Sites by landowners. Notwithstanding this specific activity I have been advised that at this stage of the development of the Rochford Core Strategy individual sites are not up for consideration by the public in this consultation.

But the Council may have already chosen sites that it thinks are suitable. The general location descriptions seem to accommodate some specific sites in the consultation but under misleading descriptions. Certainly I believe that this is the case in Hawkwell and Rawreth Parish Council appears to think the same given their published letter to the District Council.

A quotation from the Leader of the Opposition, Councillor Chris Black who writes on the Rochford Lib Dem Web Site also suggests that the sites have already been chosen.

"It seems pretty evident that all of the Conservative councillors knew where the exact locations were - but the Lib Dem councillors weren't informed until the summer."

For the record, as an independent, I was not informed of anything. And I still have not.

For Hockley the deleterious effects of proposals for 1750 houses in the immediately surrounding areas is not identified at all. I will not comment on the detailed issues relating to Hockley because I understand that The Hockley Residents' Association will be making a detailed response in the consultation.

Furthermore the following Option is not examined at all, even if it is to be rejected by the Council. I am referring to the Option put forward by Seaside/Iceni for the East of the District which has been known to the Council for the last few years. I wrote about this in a formal letter to you in September 2007. You requested ideas from Groups on the Council on options that they would like considered for the Core Strategy. Let me remind you of the content.

"I understand that Go-East is broadly supportive of a new outer relief road for Southend, though it stresses this would need to be built in partnership with Essex County Council and Rochford District Council and might be privately funded.

On the basis that Go-East has already signified that such Option should be included in the next Option Appraisal for the LDF, I formally request that Rochford District Council considers this infrastructural change, which has publicly stated Government support, in the way that it might affect Rochford District and the spatial housing planning allocation in relation to such infrastructural development and in particular that the whole requirement of circa 3,300 houses can be placed in the Eastern part of Rochford District in the LDF Core Strategy."

This does not imply in any way that I was supportive of such Option and indeed I would not support the building of a major road through the green belt of Rochford District. I am on the public record at the EERA for being in opposition.

As I understand the current position with regard to a new road it would be possible to develop the Eastern part of Rochford District in conjunction with land in Southend without major relief road. To support this contention may I quote from the Echo.

"A NEW road from Shoebury to the A127, near the Tesco roundabout, is in the early stages of planning, it has been revealed. Southend Council is investigating the possibility of building the road after 2014. Anna Waite, councillor responsible for transport, said the proposals depended on the expansion of Southend Airport going ahead and whether Eastwoodbury Lane would have to be closed. She said: "We would be looking at a new road running from the area of the Tesco

roundabout on the A127 to Eastwoodbury Lane in the area of the Smallholdings. "The council would expect this part of any new road to be funded by the airport and we would only be looking at funding a small road, from the Smallholdings to Warners Bridge, with access to the airport." **"The next phase of the scheme would extend the road from Warners Bridge to Fossetts Farm and finally as far as Shoebury."**

I cannot make further comment because it has been ignored in the Core Strategy and I have no data to consider. But I believe that such an Option cannot continue to be excluded from the LDF Core Strategy Consultation. Without it the Rochford Core Strategy is fatally flawed.

The Council has ignored this Strategic Option and inexplicably so because in the latest documentation from IcenI clearly refers to land in the Rochford District AND development of 5,000 houses up to 2021 which is well within the 2025 target referred to in the Rochford Core Strategy. Here is an extract which says this;

"Two Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) are proposed – Fossetts SDA and Bournes Green SDA. Both are located on the northern urban fringe of Southend Urban Area. **A substantial proportion of the land falls within the Borough of Rochford** although the land traverses both Southend and Rochford Boroughs. Significantly, the land lies to the east of London Southend Airport and new access to both the Airport and the rest of Southend is a central component of the development concept.

The proposal could deliver up to 5,000 dwellings by 2021 and up to 10,000 dwellings by 2031 based on an average annual delivery rate of 500 dwellings per annum."

Another area in the overall Core Strategy that requires particular attention is that I do not believe that the Option for Affordable Housing includes sufficient identification of the ownership models that exist to ensure that Affordable Housing is retained in that status over the coming 50 years.

Turning to my own area now, as a Ward Councillor I do not support the proposal of 330 houses in South Hawkwell because the infrastructure to sustain the development under PPS12 has been grossly underestimated and as proposed the Standard Charges Policy under CIL will not provide the funding for the level of infrastructural change required in this location.

At an adhoc meeting with Essex County Council Highways Engineers on 3 November 2008 it was estimated that highway infrastructure costs could be £600,000 for improvements to Nursery Corner with provision of a footway on just one side of that part of Rectory Road and no dedicated cycle paths. Add these on and compulsory purchase of land for a footway on the other side then the figure goes significantly over £1m. Who will pay this? And this will not include a minimum of £100,000 per annum for a half hourly bus service.

Furthermore ECC acknowledged my concern about the other bottleneck at the railway bridge at St. Mary's Church where it is not only the additional traffic from the South Hawkwell location that will create jams and congestion there but also additional traffic from other developments "rat running" to and from the B1013. Frankly they said that nothing could be done at the railway bridge to deal with this situation. On this basis many of the proposed locations are unsustainable.

Another very significant objection to the proposal for my Ward is that such a development will cause the urban coalescence of Hockley to Ashingdon via Hawkwell. To explain that in detail there would be a contiguous run of houses from Hockley to Hawkwell West and on to Ashingdon. I have been in local government for 25 years and one of the things that I have consistently pledged is to campaign against the (unnecessary) loss of green belt and the loss of community identity which would be caused by urban coalescence of Hockley, Hawkwell and Ashingdon in particular. Rochford District Council has a duty to do everything it can to promote healthy communities and in this area residents fiercely expressed their view at the Central Area Committee that these separate identities must also be preserved in the physical representation of

urban development. In words used elsewhere in this consultation by Rawreth Parish Council I was “flabbergasted” to see such contrary proposals put forward by the Council.

The Hockley Resident’s Association suggested last night that the Council creates some sort of “park” or green non development Zone in Hawkwell West to prevent coalescence. I support this by whatever means that can be effected.

I have created a list of questions which establishes the sustainability criteria that I believe that should be met in order for the Rochford Core Strategy to comply with PPS12. The questions and answers and comments are an integral part of my response and all items must be reproduced in any public document together.

Many significant criteria are, in my opinion, not met. The infrastructural changes required will not be met by Standard Charges Policy under CIL. The general location of South Hawkwell should be removed from the Rochford Core Strategy unless the Council decides that it will obtain full funding from a developer under a Section 106 Agreement and that the developer agrees, even at this stage, that all infrastructure costs, including the cost of a bus service per annum, will be met without question. Personally I think that the costs do not create a viable commercial proposition under PPS12.

If the continued availability of Section 106 funding is not included in Council policy then this is a major omission of policy. It is of note that Section 106 Agreements are not mentioned in the consultation document Core Strategy – Preferred Options. Essex County Council Highways have expressed great concern if full recovery of costs were not possible from the developer under a Section 106 Agreement.

In addition I object to the manner in which the separate location of Hawkwell was allocated with 365 houses by a political decision announced in the Evening Echo in September 2007 by the Conservative Party following the last consultation on the Preferred Options **without** discussion in Council.

I do not believe that the Council has undertaken an appropriate approach in this second consultation to establishing the sustainability criteria that must be met in order for the Rochford Core Strategy to comply with PPS12. I asked for a list of criteria or a template that I could use but nothing was available. On this basis I have produced my own set of criteria.

Because of this I believe that the Council may be allocating inappropriate locations, like South Hawkwell, based purely on the availability of land in the Call for Sites (the old model for local plans as I would call it allocating development land based solely on requests from landowners) rather than making modern and informed judgements against sustainability criteria which flow from PPS12.

I also object to the Council’s political administration continuing to promote this consultation as a sort of referendum which it is not. I attach a discussion of this matter at the end of this paper. This is grossly misleading.

This is what the Council wrote to me “It is also important to bear in mind that consultation on the new development plan documents is not a referendum on the proposals, but where legitimate planning issues are raised, these will be examined and the Council will, of course, report back on its conclusions.”

Unless comments from the public address spatial planning and sustainability then their objections, regardless of numbers expressing opinion and desire, will not alter policy. This is not what they have been led to believe.

In addition the decision of a Planning Inspector relating to the provision of Clements Hall Way made particular reference to the land described then as “West of Clements Hall” but is now

evidently the general location now described as South Hawkwell. The Planning Inspector allowed the provision of Clements Hall Way provided that the land "West of Clements Hall" was NOT developed. Whilst it is understood and appreciated that a different set of circumstances may now apply, this was a material issue in the relatively recent past and the Council has not even bothered to explain why this consideration has changed even though this directly relates to the general location of South Hawkwell.

If the Council can't explain, then this general location of South Hawkwell should be removed because a Planning Inspector stated that there is to be no development in this area. Nothing has obviously changed or this would have been notified in the consultation document.

Here are the sustainability criteria that I believe should be met under PPS12;

1. Will a development in South Hawkwell ensure an intervention in the causes of criminal events; reducing risk and potential seriousness?

Answer

An additional 330 houses on a new estate is likely to generate a new estate based gang of young people who may clash with other local gangs.

This happened a few years ago with the Rochford Crew and the Hockley Crew. We will then have the Hawkwell Crew.

Additional policing will be required in any event because this represents a 20% increase in the number of houses in the immediate locality.

Will the Fire, Police, PCT, Ambulance service be able to deploy additional resource or will the existing service diminish? The Council must ascertain this and assess on a critical basis to understand sustainability in South Hawkwell.

The PCT made a presentation to the Central Area Committee on 11 September 2008 and it was evident that the PCT has no plans to increase capacity in South Hawkwell. In fact the PCT's efforts are about obtaining a procurement of a Doctor's Surgery in South Hawkwell on a permanent basis to meet existing needs only.

2. Will a development in South Hawkwell increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?

Answer

At least 35% must be affordable housing. The population profile in Hawkwell is increasingly skewing towards the retired and frail elderly. Will the development including so many young families be incongruous with the existing population? Will there be flats? Will there be sheltered housing? Will there be executive homes?

3. Is there sustainable access to key services for a development in South Hawkwell?

Answer

Basically No. For all age groups there needs to be regular (meaning every 10/15 minutes) public transport access to Hockley, Rochford, Rayleigh and Southend by direct and regular bus services.

4. Does it meet the residents' needs, as represented by the projected population profile, in terms of sheltered and lifetime homes or those that can be easily adapted so?

Answer

Affordable homes are unlikely to adapt nor are executive style homes likely to adapt either to a population growing at retired and frail elderly categories. The issue of the aging profile of the population of the district is recognised in the Council's Corporate Strategy but the planning for strategic housing distribution in South Hawkwell does not positively respond to this. An increasing retired and frail elderly population needs their specific housing needs to be delivered in existing centres themselves and not 2/3 miles away as South Hawkwell is from the nearest existing centres with some key facilities, namely Hockley and Rochford.

5. Is the location of South Hawkwell an existing centre that should be focussed on for enhancement?

Answer

No. Hawkwell West is away from the existing centres and road congestion and the lack of public transport is an issue.

It should not be in Tier 1 or even Tier 2.

6. Does the location of South Hawkwell promote mixed use and high density development in urban areas? What is the proposed density vs Government Guidance?

Answer

Essex County Council is assessing General Location 13 as described by RDC in the Call for General locations as being 11 Hectares. For 330 houses that means a density of 33 per hectare against the Government preference of 50 per hectare. This infers that there will not be a mix of housing.

7. What provision of infrastructure is required to create a sustainable development in South Hawkwell?

Answer

Residents have great concerns that a standard charge or levy for infrastructural components will be insufficient to meet the real costs of making a proposed general location in my ward sustainable in terms of the policy PPS12.

For example; Arriva have recently proposed that the bus service be reduced from half hourly to hourly. The County Councillor for our Area, Tracey Chapman, has consulted the County Council Passenger Team to find out what it would cost the County Council to return the part of the route that my ward is in (it is an optional loop) to a half hourly service. I was staggered to find out that the figure was £100K a year, recurring. And if Arriva were to cancel the service completely in the next 3-5 years, which is highly likely, then the cost will be in excess of £200K each year.

Quoting from an email from Councillor Tracey Chapman "John, I have spoken to the passenger team and it appears that there is nothing more I can do. There are just not sufficient passenger numbers for the county council to invest more money in the route. Officers have looked at this and the cost to the council taxpayer would be in excess of £100,000."

I cannot see a developer being agreeable to meeting this cost which is wholly necessary to meet the needs of the residents of new affordable housing especially. This will then be an unsustainable development. But will it go ahead anyway but the tariff, based on a simple formula, will not deliver the infrastructure required.

Another example; there is a major junction, Nursery Corner which will need to be improved for capacity and allow for increased traffic flow without significant tail backs. Interestingly the District Council does not even recognise the need. But the County Council does see the need to increase the size but does not recall that the services in the existing site splay will need to be moved at a huge cost. But again a standard tariff will not deal with anything that is not standard.

Rectory Road becomes single file at the railway bridge near St. Mary's Church. This bottleneck cannot be resolved full stop.

A final example. There is no footway one side of the Rectory Road and on the other there are telegraph poles in the middle of the path so that prams and wheelchair users have to go into the road. The cost of this essential infrastructure will be well in excess of standard charges because of the services issue.

Residents are concerned that the infrastructure required to provide sustainability in accordance with PPS12 will not be met by the Government's Policy of CIL because standard charges will not fund these.

From Essex County Council, Highways, Andy Hilsdon

Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate any traffic data at or near this junction and would suggest that a site meeting might be the best way to discuss engineering options to mitigate your concerns.

With regard to the footways in Rectory Road, we have a number of requests around the District for the provision of new footways and these form part of the Locally Determined Budget. There are land ownership issues with the provision of a new footway as the land does not all form part of the Highway. Setting aside land acquisition costs, new footways cost in the region of £10,000 per 100m.

The footpath on the opposite side is not as wide as we would like. Moving telegraph poles is expensive and indicative costs to resite telegraph poles are difficult to come by as it is very site specific. However, this may be something we could discuss further on site?

Cycling provision in this location would be difficult at best. Segregated facilities would require significant land acquisition and I would be reluctant to explore facilities within the carriageway.

I am concerned that this e-mail appears very negative and would look to reassure you that it certainly isn't deliberate. However, we are looking at a complicated set of circumstances.

*At an adhoc meeting with Essex County Council Highways Engineers just this week it was estimated that highway infrastructure costs could be £600,000 **with** provision of a footway on just one side of that part of Rectory Road and no dedicated cycle path. Add these on and the figure goes significantly over £1m.*

Here is traffic data for Rectory Road, South Hawkwell that has obtained by a resident.

This is what he said about the data. Makes interesting reading.....with just under 5000 movements in one day.....or 25,000 in five working days.... Hope this is helpful and will prove that Rectory Road and the surrounding areas are simply unable to cope with even more traffic that new homes would bring. With the Government saying that each home has an average of 1.5 cars - 400 additional homes would bring 1200 movements a day (on the basis of what moves in the morning has to return at night) 1200 a day is another 8400 a week, of course.

However another assessment basis put forward by a traffic consultant says “that a new dwelling in this area generates an average of 5.5 two-way trips per day”. **If this assessment were used then this would mean $(330 \times 5.5 \times 2 =)$ an additional 3630 movements per DAY !!**

Or 25,000 over 7 days, or a week !!

THIS IS NOT SUSTAINABLE OR CAPABLE OF BEING MITIGATED.

What does the independent DTA that Essex County Council say has been submitted by landowners of Site 13 to RDC disclose? This is not in the Evidence Base of RDC .This needs to be thoroughly challenged,

RECTORY ROAD TRAFFIC SURVEY September 11 2008

Between House Numbers 294 - 302

	<u>Cars</u>	<u>Lgt Vans</u>	<u>Lge Vans</u>	<u>3 artic</u>	<u>4 artic</u>	<u>5 artic</u>	<u>m/bikes</u>	<u>Bus</u>	<u>3 Rigid</u>	<u>4 Rigid</u>	<u>Cycle</u>	<u>artic</u>	<u>Total Movements For Hour</u>
7am - 8am	256	41	18	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	1	0	322
8am - 9am	418	59	9	1	0	2	4	8	3	2	7	1	514
9am - 10am	273	30	7	0	2	1	2	4	2	3	6	0	330
10am - 11am	195	24	4	3	1	3	5	3	4	3	2	2	249
11am - 12noon	220	19	15	0	3	4	2	6	1	2	2	1	275
12noon - 1pm	247	23	14	0	1	2	3	2	0	1	1	0	294
1pm - 2pm	180	20	13	4	0	1	8	4	0	0	3	0	233
2pm - 3pm	268	32	9	2	0	2	7	3	3	0	2	1	329
3pm - 4pm	340	48	22	0	0	1	6	5	2	2	7	2	435
4pm - 5pm	515	97	17	0	0	1	13	8	4	1	11	3	670
5pm - 6pm	628	110	27	1	1	1	15	4	6	0	14	2	809
6pm - 7pm	395	36	7	0	0	0	7	5	2	3	5	0	460
Total For 12 Hours	3935	539	162	11	8	18	72	56	28	18	61	12	4920

8. What is the availability of sustainable transport modes in South Hawkwell?

Answer

Arriva have recently proposed that the bus service be reduced from half hourly to hourly. The County Councillor for our area has consulted the County Council Passenger Team to find out what it would cost the County Council to return the part of the route that my ward is in (it is an optional loop) to a half hourly service. I was staggered to find out that the figure was £100K a year, recurring. And if Arriva were to cancel the service completely in the next 3-5 years, which is highly likely, then the cost will be in excess of £200K each year.

I cannot see a developer being agreeable to meeting this cost which is wholly necessary to meet the needs of the residents of new affordable housing especially. This will then be an unsustainable development. But it will go ahead because the tariff, based on a simple formula, will not deliver the infrastructure required.

The location does not have any cycle routes adjoining nor is there safe walking access for schools and adults.

9. Will a development in South Hawkwell encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation than the private car?

Answer

No. The location is likely to generate more private car journeys and it is unlikely that bus or walking or cycling will prove a viable alternative.

10. Will a development in South Hawkwell reduce the need to travel?

Answer

No, it will generate more private car journeys. And the likely place of work for the new residents is claimed by RDC to be most likely the extension to Southend Airport where there is no bus service, safe walking and cycle route access via the B1013.

11. Will a development in South Hawkwell encourage a large volume of people or transport movements that are located inaccessible locations?

Answer

Yes, the location is inaccessible.

12. Will a development in South Hawkwell conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats?

Answer

No it will destroy them.

13. Will a development in South Hawkwell conserve and enhance species diversity and in particular avoid harm to protected and priority species?

Answer

No. it will reduce diversity and, for example, the Muntjac deer will be exterminated in this area by loss of habitat. I have a witness statement from a local resident as to a recent sighting in South Hawkwell. They tend to occupy territories of around 14 hectares, which they rarely leave. The Thorpe Road or Rectory Road site which is being assessed by Essex County Council at the request of RDC is 11 hectares. If Rochford District Council is interested in maintaining real species diversity in the District then it must not adopt a location for development that will exterminate this species in Hawkwell. None of the public open spaces which have been transferred by the District Council to Hawkwell Parish Council Hawkwell are maintained as deciduous woodland nor scrub which is suitable for the Muntjac deer and this Thorpe Road habitat should be removed from the proposal.

As the District Council does not appear to be appropriately informed on the Muntjac deer here is some descriptive data.

Appearance

- Muntjac are Britain's smallest deer. They have a reddish-brown summer coat and a dull grey-brown winter coat.
- Only the male deer (the bucks) have short antlers, of only about 7cm. The antlers fall off in May and June but grow back by October. The females have a dark kite-shaped patch on top of their heads instead of antlers.
- Muntjac deer have protruding canine teeth, these stick out from the upper jaw and look like small tusks.

Habitat and Distribution

- Muntjac deer originally come from China and Taiwan. They were brought to London zoo in 1840 and they were placed into the grounds of Woburn Abbey in about 1900. Since then they have breed and spread across the country. Muntjac's favourite place to live is in bramble thickets/blackberry bushes, especially in young or mixed woodland.

Home

- Muntjac's need bushes to provide shelter from driving rain and wind.
- Although they live in woodland they will also venture into gardens, wastelands and road verges looking for food.
- The deer mark their territory with scent produced from glands on the head, below the eyes and on the feet. They often strip bark from trees with their feet to cover the bare tree with their scent.

Family

- The deer are nocturnal and live alone. The female deer is called a doe, the male deer is called a buck. Muntjac deer can breed all year round. One fawn is born after a pregnancy of 210 days. Soon after the doe quickly becomes pregnant again.
- Fawns can walk immediately and run within two or three days. Their coats are spotted for the first eight weeks. As well as grass, fawns feed on their mother's milk for the first eight weeks. Fawns and their mothers call to each other.

14. Will a development in South Hawkwell maintain and enhance general locations designated for their nature conservation interest?

Answer

No, it will not. Instead of conservation it will exterminate the Muntjac deer.

15. Will a development in South Hawkwell conserve and enhance general locations of geological significance?

Answer

No Information known. Is the Council conducting a geological survey?

16. Will a development in South Hawkwell protect and enhance general locations, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?

Answer

Not known because the District Council has not attempted to find out.

17. Does a development in South Hawkwell seek to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces?

Answer

No, it will not increase the public realm and open spaces.

18. Will a development in South Hawkwell contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe?

Answer

This is the wrong use of the urban fringe.

19. Will a development in South Hawkwell reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?

Answer

It will take a viable Christmas Tree Farm business out of use.

20. Does the proposal for a development in South Hawkwell reflect the scope of using brownfield land where viable and realistic?

Answer

The Magees general location, a brownfield location very nearby, is on the Call for Sites but is not proposed.

21. Will a development in South Hawkwell improve the landscape?

Answer

No.

22. Will a development in South Hawkwell increase the risk of flooding?

Answer

Yes, this area of Hawkwell West is low lying and prone to flooding, fog and freezing fog.

23. Will suitable and effective mitigation against flooding be integrated into the development?

Answer

No Information. There will need to be mitigation paid for by the developer.

24. Will a development in South Hawkwell improve air quality?

Answer

No

25. Will a development in South Hawkwell direct transport movements away from AQMA's and or potentially significant junctions? Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA's)

Answer

No Information. Perhaps the District Council should provide information on this.

26. Is the general location of South Hawkwell in Zone 2 or 3 for Flood Assessment?

Answer

The area nearby is in a flood zone.

27. Could Rainfall be an issue 1/100, 1/250,1/500 years for a development in South Hawkwell? Evidence of local flooding incident?

Answer

Hawkwell West. Yes. 1/100 -93 houses at risk. 1/200 124 houses at risk. Major Flooding in Rectory Road 1989. Road impassable.

There is a "weir" or dam in the Hawkwell Brook at the boundary of South Hawkwell with the public open space at Spencer's Park. It is believed that this could either flood this area or significantly affect the water table and soil water conditions for construction. If it were to be removed then what would be the effect lower down in Windsor Gardens which already floods? This issue is a potential deal breaker and the Council must pay very great attention to this aspect of concern. The Council must contact the Environment Agency.

28. Is a development in South Hawkwell a Brownfield priority?

Answer

It is a greenfield and a nearby brownfield is ignored.

29. Will Affordable housing a development in South Hawkwell be indistinguishable?

Answer

At 33 houses per hectare if the general location is 35% affordable then there will be some very low density housing on general location. Affordable housing will stand out like a sore thumb !!

30. Will a development in South Hawkwell increase light pollution?

Answer

Yes.

31. Is there an existing public transport corridor in South Hawkwell?

Answer

No. Arriva wishes to reduce the service and most probably remove the bus service within 3/5 years.

32. Would a development in South Hawkwell support a virtual community rather than travel? Broadband? Optical delivery?

Answer

Too far from the exchange for the high speed broadband. No optical delivery.

33. From a development in South Hawkwell what is the furthest distance to walk via a safe route to major fixed transport node train every 10/15 mins?

Answer

25 Minutes to Rochford, 20 Minutes to Hockley. Too far.

34. From a development in South Hawkwell what is the furthest distance from regular bus service?

Answer

Arriva wishes to make the bus service hourly. This is not a regular bus service. To Golden X by walking, 15 Minutes, to Hockley by walking, 20 minutes to get to a regular bus service.

35. Is there a network of safe bike routes in South Hawkwell to local facilities?

Answer

No, and the road width does not even incorporate a safe footway in Rectory Road on one side and none on the other. A cycle path could not be included.

36. Traffic management in South Hawkwell – is there safe passage?

Answer

No. Speeding makes Rectory Road unsafe. Essex Police have the data from information which is currently being collected.

37. In South Hawkwell will traffic jams be mitigated by junction improvement?

Answer

This issue is not even recognised in the Rochford Core Strategy – Preferred Options

Request sent to andy.hilsdon@essexcc.gov.uk Essex County Council, Highways Engineer

I have a growing issue at Nursery Corner which is concerning residents right now and could be exacerbated in the future by a major development.

Basically there are long tailbacks at rush hour times in Rectory Road and it is impossible for pedestrians to cross the B1013.

I have a number of requests for information please.

I would like to see traffic data for the junction; from Rectory Road, to Rectory Road and the two way flow from and to Southend/Hockley.

I recall many years ago that I asked what improvements/mitigations could be considered at Nursery Corner and at what cost.

Traffic lights were costed and the figure around 14 years ago was £50,000 !! I recall that the major cost with widening the junction was the issue of re routing utilities.

I would like to revisit the whole question of improvement and increased traffic flow mitigation at Nursery Corner.

I am not looking for a full study just an engineering view of what could be done at what cost and with the existing traffic flow volumes extrapolate the traffic volume from additional homes phased at 100,100 and 130.

I hope that you could help me with the information I need as a Ward Councillor and the ball park figures.

Reply from Essex County Council

Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate any traffic data at or near this junction and would suggest that a site meeting might be the best way to discuss engineering options to mitigate your concerns.

With regard to the footways in Rectory Road, we have a number of requests around the District for the provision of new footways and these form part of the Locally Determined Budget. There are land ownership issues with the provision of a new footway as the land does not all form part of the Highway. Setting aside land acquisition costs, new footways cost in the region of £10,000 per 100m.

The footpath on the opposite side is not as wide as we would like. Moving telegraph poles is expensive and indicative costs to resite telegraph poles are difficult to come by as it is very site specific. However, this may be something we could discuss further on site?

Cycling provision in this location would be difficult at best. Segregated facilities would require significant land acquisition and I would be reluctant to explore facilities within the carriageway.

I am concerned that this e-mail appears very negative and would look to reassure you that it certainly isn't deliberate. However, we are looking at a complicated set of circumstances.

*At an adhoc meeting with Essex County Council Highways Engineers just this week it was estimated that highway infrastructure costs could be £600,000 **without** provision of a footway on both sides of that part of Rectory Road and no dedicated cycle path. Add these on and the figure goes significantly over £1m.*

38. Will a development in South Hawkwell reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?

Answer

No Information

39. Will a development in South Hawkwell lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources?

Answer

No information

40. Any other Comments/Information on a development in South Hawkwell?

The Hawkwell Action Group (HAG) has held two public meetings in my Ward on the subject of housing allocations under the LDF. I was invited to speak at both. The last public meeting resolved that HAG would encourage members of the public who attended both public meetings to write to the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation, Councillor Hudson, to express their concern about an allocation of 365 houses for my Ward which was announced in the local paper by Councillor Hudson on behalf of the Conservative Party.

In the last public LDF consultation there were many identical comments from residents of another area of Rochford District, Rayleigh.

The impression that I got and many residents also got from reviewing the responses on line was that numbers of objections counted.

Indeed the conclusion formed by many residents, including those in Rayleigh, was that Rayleigh achieved a reduction from 1800 to 700 which was announced in our local paper by Councillor Hudson on behalf the Conservative Party immediately after the consultation because of this activity.

When residents of my Ward wrote to Councillor Hudson as encouraged by HAG they have appear to have received the same standard letter. I have been sent copies by two residents. The content that I wish to draw specifically to your attention is as follows;

"Around about October / November a document entitled the "Core Strategy" will be published and this document will be the vehicle that the Council will use to encourage Residents, Partners and Stakeholders to provide their views and opinions.

The "Core Strategy" will identify the locations that the Council prefers to receive the additional housing that we are legally required to facilitate by Central Government.

When we have received the views of all interested parties we shall amend that "Core Strategy" in order to comply with the wishes of the majority of Residents."

HAG has written two open letters to all Members of Rochford District Council. In the second HAG asked Members to explain how this majority view of residents was going to be obtained and presented. An extract follows;

"How do you propose to analyse and present the results of the next public consultation so as to clearly and fairly present the majority view of residents?"

To give an example how would say, 500 objections from Hawkwell be viewed in comparison with 500 objections from Rayleigh where the population is many times higher?"

As far as I was aware nobody had replied to HAG, so as a Member I asked you for the Council's response.

I received the following;

"All the results of consultation will be very carefully considered and analysed against the detailed evidence base and the requirements for delivering the number of dwelling units specified in the East of England Plan for Rochford in sustainable locations across the district. It is also important to bear in mind that consultation on the new development plan documents is not a referendum on

the proposals, but where legitimate planning issues are raised, these will be examined and the Council will, of course, report back on its conclusions."

My concerns are that because of the letter from Councillor Hudson, at least 61 residents of my Ward will erroneously believe that the public consultation is still a referendum. Which it is not. Only legitimate planning matters will be examined.

The preferred site in South Hawkwell is known to the Council.

I have had a conversation with an Officer at Essex County Council responsible for transport and highway issues who has advised me that RDC has asked it to conduct an assessment of a site he called "Rectory Road". When he confirmed the housing numbers at 330, I concluded that this was the whole allocation being put forward by the District Council in a "general location" which has been written in a report as South Hawkwell.

I was told that the landowners have employed an independent traffic consultancy to undertake a full and detailed transport assessment.

A second Officer called me about my questions about education capacity confirmed the housing numbers as 330 but he described the site as "The Christmas Tree Farm".

The reference to South Hawkwell is complete nonsense and seriously misleading to those who live in West Hawkwell.

The site to be developed is plainly evident from the number of houses proposed and the fact that no other general location is described as Hawkwell.

It is not capable of supporting sustainable development as required by Policy PPS12 and nor is any other site in South Hawkwell.

Why is the Council going through this ridiculous charade of another Preferred Options consultation when it already can present the sites it wishes to see developed?

And it has summarily ignored the potential strategic development in the East of the District working in partnership with Southend Borough Council and The Thames Gateway in consideration of the overall development of this Sub Region rather than just Rochford as some sort of exclusive patch.

It must be all reconsidered and The Preferred Options consulted upon again **before** formal Submission of the Rochford Core Strategy.

Sincerely

Councillor John Mason
Representing Rochford District Residents (a registered political party)
Hawkwell West Ward