

## **Record of Correspondence between RDC and ECC vis-à-vis Transport Infrastructure and the Rochford District Core Strategy**

Officers from Rochford District Council (RDC) discussed issues pertaining to infrastructure provision, and the impacts of future development on this, regularly with colleagues at Essex County Council (ECC) throughout the development of the Core Strategy. This paper sets out the record of key discussions relevant to the issue of transport infrastructure provision and the Rochford District Core Strategy. Beyond these discussions, specific queries and points of clarification were pursued by each authority as they arose. This paper does not detail correspondence between RDC and ECC in relation to Sustainability Appraisal work undertaken by the latter on behalf of the former, as this was done by a team independent from the rest of ECC, or to issues of other infrastructure provision.

### **October 2007**

In October 2007, ECC and RDC agreed to meet regularly to discuss the Core Strategy as it developed through its various stages.

### **November 2007**

On 13<sup>th</sup> November 2007 RDC Officers met with ECC to discuss current trends with regards to highway usage in the District, to inquire as to what studies ECC would be undertaking in the future, and to discuss possible implications of new development on highway network.

### **September 2008**

Discussions took place on potential highway infrastructure issues in relation to proposed locations during September 2008, and ECC contacted RDC on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2008 giving comments from a highways perspective on several suggested locations for housing within the District.

West Hockley was seen as having no significant issues for a relatively small quantum of development and it was recommended that local junction/access improvements should be sought. West Rochford was also considered to be viable due to highway access and reduced impact on Ashingdon Road. The location would direct strategic traffic onto strategic routes, and minimise non localised traffic on localised routes. It was recommended that sustainable links be provided from the location to Rochford town centre, and there was a potential to enhance existing public transport due to the size of development suggested.

Great Wakering is also unlikely to see negative impacts from a highways perspective, although it was noted that the location is adjacent/close to the Southend Borough Council boundary.

Canewdon (South) was again considered to have no significant impacts on the highway network, although the cumulative impacts may need further consideration.

Locations that presented issues were North of London Road, with access from the A1245 considered a potential issue, alongside public transport penetration to the location. Mitigation measures were suggested in the form of junction improvements at Chelmsford Road and London Road, alongside public transport infrastructure improvements, a new public transport service, and walking and cycling integration measures to the town centre. In discussions, it was also noted that this development location had the potential to engender transport improvements by providing a link between Rawreth Land and London Road.

South West Rayleigh was seen as having a negative impact on Rayleigh Weir, and mitigation measures for this would include local junction and access improvements alongside contributions to the ECC Route Management Strategy proposals for the Rayleigh Weir junction. Discussions with ECC established that a new highway access to the A127 or A1245 would be unfeasible.

South Hawkwell was seen as having a potential impact on the Rectory Road/Hall Road junction and mitigation measures suggested for this were potential capacity improvements to the existing mini roundabout. This location would direct strategic traffic onto strategic routes, and minimise non localised traffic on localised routes.

Ashingdon (north of King Edmund School) was seen as potentially having a highways impact in terms of pinch points within the town centre, and the junction of Brays Land and Ashingdon Road. It was stated that this location should be treated in partnership with South East Ashingdon in terms of cumulative impact. Suggested mitigation measures include using CIL to help improve highway capacity to Rochford Town Centre.

South West Hullbridge was seen as potentially having an impact on the highway network in terms of increased traffic on Watery Lane, and the use of Rawreth Lane. Mitigation measures suggested for this location were to discourage the use of Beeches Road/Chelmsford Road, promote highway improvements at Hullbridge Lane, Rawreth Lane and Beeches Road/Chelmsford Road and to promote public transport service enhancements.

## **April 2009**

A meeting was held between RDC and ECC on the 24<sup>th</sup> April 2009 to discuss the potential amendments to housing locations as outlined in the Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options.

It was confirmed at the meeting that as a result of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment more housing land was being identified than originally seen in the Urban Capacity Study. Consequently the housing locations and quantum in the Core strategy were being reassessed accordingly.

The various location and housing numbers were discussed and ECC gave their view as discussed below, however the discussion was limited until such time as the housing locations and numbers had been finalised.

Concern was noted in relation to the impact of development in East Rochford on Rochford Town Centre.

RDC were asked to confirm final housing locations and quantum, and also to inform ECC of the publication date of the SHLAA. It was suggested that there was potential for RDC to produce a transportation strategy alongside the Core Strategy.

## **July 2009**

A meeting then took place on the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2009 between RDC and ECC. At this juncture the Core Strategy Submission Document had been recommended for approval by the LDF Sub Committee and was due to be presented to full Council on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2009.

Highways stated that there was no issue in terms of the locations East of Ashingdon and 100 dwellings.

The Infrastructure Charging Schedule was then discussed with RDC confirming that Charging Zones are being considered based on settlements. It was also confirmed that RDC will be producing an Infrastructure Charging Schedule which will be subject to EiP.

It was stated that there was time for Highways to consider the infrastructure requirements put forward in the Submission Document, and to let RDC have comments prior to the Full Council Meeting. ECC agreed to review this and provide indicative costings.

An alternative location to the East of Rochford was then discussed in terms of a potential planning application and conformity to and impact on the Core Strategy. RDC stated that they do not support this, as traffic will be directed through a borderline AQMA. ECC were not as negative although noted they had previously raised concerns to the East of Rochford as a potential location.

RDC confirmed that a Transportation Strategy will be produced, and ECC commented that it is necessary to distinguish whether this will be addressing future development or current issues.

### **January 2010**

Correspondence was sent to ECC on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2010, with the draft Topic Paper on strategic infrastructure costs in order to get feedback and buy in from ECC. Comments were received on this in relation to wording and clarification on figures shown. Figures for highway costs were inserted into the draft Topic Paper by ECC, which were agreed by RDC and published in the final version of the Topic Paper.

### **April 2010**

RDC and ECC agree on a joint position statement with regards to highway infrastructure provision and the Core Strategy. Please see Appendix 1.