

Hockley Area Action Plan - Summary of responses to consultation carried out between November 2010 and February 2011

This document summarises the responses received to the consultation on the Hockley Area Action Plan Options Report. A detailed analysis of the responses will be prepared and published later in the plan-making process as part of the evidence base supporting the pre-application version of the plan.

Introduction

Comments received, including from Hawkwell Residents Association, who suggested that they would like to retain the village feel of Hockley, but would also like to see some gradual improvements to the village centre. These respondents also stated that they cannot support any of the five options but would like to see some of the improvements included within them. Natural England supports the production of the Hockley Area Action Plan and, in particular, the incorporation of Green Infrastructure principles within various Options. Another comment suggested that low density nature and reasonable character should be retained for Hockley Town Centre.

Context for the AAP options

Concerns were expressed regarding the cost of the study.

One comment suggested that some of the content within the document needed to be amended or updated, as Alldays is now occupied, another supermarket (Costcutters) has now opened, the give way sign on the roundabout does not apply to all exits, etc.

Consultation feedback

SEPT (South Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust) welcomed the plan and believed that it will create more affordable housing for people with mental health problems and will bring job opportunities.

Concerns expressed regarding the size of the document as this would have prevented printing and general distribution, and the complication of the online consultation system is an unfair method for consultation.

A respondent questioned why the Foundry industrial estate is not mentioned in the document. The comment suggested that existing businesses should be encouraged to stay, but consideration (if housing really must occur) should be given to conversion of unoccupied premises. The possibility for the area next to the train station platform on the south side to be used for housing was also mentioned.

Overarching framework and principles

Comments suggested that the Foundry Estate, which is one of the obvious locations for improvement, is missing from the plan.

Comments received, including the from the Hockley Residents Association, claimed that they have made it clear from the previous consultation that highways infrastructure improvements to the key junctions need to be determined as a precursor to any redevelopment, however, they believed that insufficient attention has been paid to these key requirements.

A comment agreed that Hockley has the potential for improvement to cater for the increased population, to keep spending local and reduce the need to travel. It also suggested that the existing character of Hockley does not justify wholesale preservation and change and improvements are much needed.

Essex County Council welcomed the initiative of the HAAP. They trusted that the HAAP would assist revitalisation of commercial and leisure activity at a key focal point in the District and would strengthen the role of the area and help meet the future needs of the local community in support of the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. They also considered that future stages in preparation of the Plan should be assisted by further consideration of highways and infrastructure issues, implementation and delivery, design matters and locations of community facilities.

The East of England Development Agency commented that although the document does contain an overarching framework and principles there seems to be a lack of vision that seeks to promote an economically successful and prosperous town centre that will deliver the regeneration benefits and meet its full economic performance.

A respondent considered that the principles proposed in this document seem to more closely reflect the views of local residents than the previous plan. It was suggested that bullet point 7 (on page 14) could be strengthened to limit the size of retail units in order to avoid attracting large national chains but to encourage new and different types of outlets not found in nearby towns.

BNP Paribas Real Estate UK, on behalf of Royal Mail suggested that new development will create additional demand for infrastructure, services/facilities and public realm improvements. However, they requested any financial contribution towards the provision of such infrastructure, services/facilities and public realm improvements for Hockley is sought in areas where there is an identified need and at a level that ensures that the overall delivery of appropriate development is not compromised i.e. is subject to viability. They also cited government guidance in Circular 05/05 to support their opinion.

A comment questioned why the previously proposed relocation of health facility at Eldon Way to a site near Jones Practice surgery/library has not been

carried over. It was also suggested that land to west of Eldon Way along Spa Road could all potentially be converted to residential use.

Comment highlighted that there are two major obstacles to all the options proposed - funding and the attitude of the owners of buildings and land likely to be affected. It was suggested that at least two events have happened since the drafting of the Plan which could impinge on it. First the opening of Cost Cutters in a location suggested for conversion to housing. Second the new Co-op funeral parlour where the opportunity for consolidating parking has gone and existing parking is reduced. The respondent then stated that the driver supporting the level of proposed houses is not understood.

Option 1

Comment that without more infrastructure further housing cannot be supported, and thus believe Option 1 is the best option for Hockley. Other responses supporting Option 1 argued for no further developments which would lead to more traffic and residents coming to the area thus turning Hockley into a larger town. No plans should spoil Potters (a shop on the eastern end of Main Road).

Comment supporting minimal intervention due to the highly sustainable location of the employment site, which is close to public transport and residential areas and so employment retention makes sound planning sense. The current stock of employment units is necessary for light industrial, storage and other uses. Moreover large-scale employment adds to the viability of the town centre. Comment also suggested it may be possible to incorporate a new library and health centre into this option.

Response supported any proposed intervention to improve facilities provided in Hockley but considered that this option contributes nothing to the provision of housing which is much needed, and felt that this location is much more appropriate and sustainable than in the Green Belt.

Comment suggested that planting lots of trees is a good idea, and believed that additional homes should come from existing brownfield areas i.e. empty retail spaces in Main Road.

Comment that option 1 offered insufficient benefit for the area. Likewise, a respondent objected to this option because the proposal would allow a continued decline in the facilities available in the village and provides no vision for the future or framework. A respondent also questioned the availability of funding for the proposed changes to develop a public realm for Hockley.

Another respondent also agreed that Option 1 only offers very few benefits and does not go far enough in protecting the area. It also claimed that that the document is unhelpful in not naming the current occupier of the premises where changes are envisaged e.g. the warehouse style premises at 2 Main

Road and 34-40 Spa Road. The Plan has also not explained how established businesses are meant to adopt the plan. The respondent felt that opening up the parking is a good idea but with the Funeral Parlour at the former Alldays site, this is unlikely to happen in short to medium term. Various questions were raised such as the usage and awareness of the existing pedestrian link between Bramerton Road and Eldon Way; why a through road from Eldon Way to the Station has not been considered as this would link two industrial sites, provide additional access to the leisure facilities and remove some of the issues around the station; what does "secondary road treatment" mean on page 22; and would planting trees attract litter and dog mess, etc.

A respondent criticised five areas in Option 1 as well as the whole Area Action Plan. For example, no private funding and no indication of the level of RDC support undermine this proposal; RDC should specify which public realm developments are included in long term plans; new entrance to Potters irrelevant; Potters zebra crossing relevant to traffic exiting Spa Road; RDC should publish traffic flow statistics to enable a meaningful discussion.

A Community safety officer from RDC pointed out that there are some issues which need to be scrutinized in terms of safety and anti social behaviour. For example, fencing around car parks is important (i.e. the potential consolidated Co-op parking); public car parking/potential consolidated Co-op parking should preferably be shut when the shop closes and secured by a gate; the alleyway from Evelyn Road to Meadow Way is not well used and it is a 'hot spot' for youths. It was created as a short cut to the centre of Hockley and is wide enough for mopeds; there are problems with groups of youths congregating along Spa Road; the provision of alleyways should be avoided; damage to proposed trees would be an issue.

Comments suggested the proposal in Option 1, which is to replace existing single story shops near the Factory Shop with single story shops, has already been turned down in a recent planning application i.e. to use the Factory Shop car park for a takeaway food outlet. Parking proposals are not practical and the width of Spa Road should not be reduced with tree planting.

Respondent supported some elements proposed in Option 1 i.e. shop front improvements, consolidate parking at the rear of the former Alldays, open a west entry to Potters car park; improve pedestrian links, streetscape, greening, tabletop crossings. However, some proposals not supported including the replacement of 2 Main Road and 34-40 Spa Road due to the loss of successful businesses, and considered improved station frontage is unnecessary. Suggestions also included more parallel on-street parking in Spa Road and replacing railings with steps

Another respondent, however, believed no further car parking is necessary as people refuse to use the existing pay car park behind the library which is never more than a third full. The comment recommended a minimal

intervention approach with an improved roundabout at the Spa junction; and building housing on the brownfield site of Eldon Way to save the Green Belt.

A business strongly objected to Option 1 and all other options as they felt the Council have not given any consideration to businesses and impact to the customers when proposing modernisation and residential use above Seemore Glass. A respondent also commented that any redevelopment to Seemore Glass would put Seemore Glass and Potters out of business as neither could carry on without their car parks.

One respondent who supported Option 1 suggested cycle paths should be introduced as part of the plan.

Some residents objected to all options and believed that the plan formulated by Hockley Residents Association would be the best to adopt.

Hawkwell Parish Council supported Option 1 which allows optimal intervention and best preserves the character of Hockley. Public realm improvements, green areas and trees, improved access and parking would benefit the village. Employment and Leisure would be maintained on Eldon Way Industrial Estate. The Parish Council considered there will be no benefit of relocation of the supermarket away from the shopping frontage. In addition, the best location to provide housing in Hockley centre would be the north of the railway station on part of the car park in Plumberow Avenue, where replacement parking spaces can be located in the south of the railway on the disused land next to the Foundry site - this would make use of a brownfield site and save the Green Belt land.

Respondent believed Option 1 best reflects the views of the residents which is the least disruptive and has minimal intervention. Proposals to add more trees, greenspaces, and improve traffic flow and parking are welcomed. The respondent also believed that it is best to concentrate all leisure uses on one part of Eldon Way Estate as it is best suited for transport links and is away from residential areas. With regard to housing, this respondent shared the same view suggested by Hawkwell Parish Council. A hybrid version of Option 1 in order to meet housing needs was recommended in general.

BNP Paribas Real Estate UK (Royal Mail) supported this 'minimal intervention approach' in Option 1, and believed the focus should be on improvements to pedestrian links, parking and the public realm and shop front improvements along Spa Road, with a small number of poor quality buildings being replaced by new shops.

Anglian Water do not consider this option would have any major impact to the foul network or WwTW (Wastewater Treatment Works). In addition, surface water treatment measures should comply with PPS25 and be removed from the public surface water (SW) system where possible.

One comment showed that Option 1 would be their preference because it proposes only four houses. It also stated that the Council should stand up and tell the Government that no more housing is needed for Hockley, and believed that building houses would lead to global warming.

Comment that the Co-op funeral parlour has ruined the village feel and one would like to see the Co-op funeral parlour return to a supermarket as it was 25 years ago. Suggested that people move to Hockley to get the village atmosphere and it is important to retain the village feel in the area; claim that a suggestion of every shop being a supermarket would kill this.

Suggestion that free parking would encourage shopping locally and also help local doctors and nurses who are penalised now.

Resident questioned why public conveniences have not been included in any of the options.

Respondent questioned why the Council has to waste money on so called improvements in the current economic climate.

Resident suggested that the Council should introduce a one way system from the first entrance on Cornhill Avenue leading down to the bottom of Hamilton Gardens, then alternate the side of road parking on a monthly basis.

Option 2

Respondents objected to this option because although it forms the basis of an appropriate plan, it does not go far enough. Some suggestions have been made such as improvements to Eldon Way, Station Approach, and Plumberow junctions; added/consolidated parking square behind shops on west side of Spa Road reached via Eldon Way and (if possible) Bramerton Road; redevelop shops on Southside of Main Road, opposite Potters, to remove 'pinch -point' on B1013; change from retail to housing at Costcutters Parade of shops; modernised retail units with 2 added retail units at Factory Shop/Car park area (to remain single storey); redevelop Co-Op undertakers etc and extend to join existing shops either side, removing access roads creating additional Retail; no large format retail units in Eldon Way; housing on north side of Station along Plumberow Ave, to include railway drop-off point; retail option (possibly a market) to be considered for Sorting Office site; options for undeveloped portion of Foundry Estate to be considered, etc.

Anglian Water believe this option, which includes a proposal of 56 new properties, has no major impact to the foul network or the WwTW. In addition, surface water should comply with PPS25 and be removed from the public surface water (SW) system where possible.

Respondent felt that Option 2 is unacceptable and believed that if the Council need to build more housing, Foundry Estate would be a more suitable

location; also cannot agree with the proposal for more office space as the existing office space is not utilised which was echoed by a number of respondents. It was also suggested that the proposed pedestrian link from the train station to Eldon Way should be a road,; there is an opportunity to have a pedestrian link from the High Street and open up existing Car Parks to the rear of most of these properties - as with the area behind the shops on Main Road which is always utilised; and to have a link running though the Pub beer garden or the Old Fire Station area. On the other hand, the respondent found it difficult to understand the meaning of some phrases used in the document i.e. stronger frontage. Another major concern the respondent had was that the Council is using redevelopment of Eldon Way as an excuse to move businesses to the airport. The respondent continued to comment that Site C on page 35 could be used for housing, and the Council should also consider road entry/exit via Eldon Way to the Station and exit only from Station Approach, and/or alternate one-way on Spa Road between Station Approach and Eldon Way. A question was also raised about deliveries on site.

Concern expressed in relation to the proposed office space in the plan and in general respondents believed that there are many empty units on the Foundry industrial estate and therefore additional offices are not required. Suggested that the Plan should replace the Co-op funeral parlour, but not other single story buildings, however, it was also commented that existing shops should not be turned into residential dwellings. Respondent also highlighted that a new home on Spa Road, close to the train station is unnecessary. Furthermore, the respondent suggested that the proposed redevelopment of the existing library and health centre to provide a new combined community centre with library and health facilities should not be squeezed into the area allocated and should not include shops in that area. It was added that consideration should also be given to include and replace the Indian restaurant area and the shop opposite Walton & Stanton's to bring the building line back from the road for Spa Junction improvements. Modern computer controlled traffic lights with additional lanes were suggested to improve the traffic flow in the Spa junction. Other suggestions include access to the car park from Woodlands Road, the creation of a new parking area on the south side of the train station, the vehicular drop-off and pick-up points should not be in the car park but at the station, seating area at the side of Kilnfield House could be better utilized, the parallel parking proposals may not be practical and the width of Spa Road should not reduce with trees planted close to shops, Potters parking should not be changed especially as parking for flats would be necessary and if a green link walk way was created through the churchyard a crossing should be provided to cross Southend Road at its end.

BNP Paribas Real Estate UK (Royal Mail) supported this option as it provides a slightly higher level of intervention in the centre, and would strengthen the uses in the centre and provide greater improvements to the public realm. It also pointed out that although Royal Mail's Hockley DO is not identified for

development within Spatial Option 2, the site located to the immediate north, which abuts the boundary of Royal Mail is identified for development, therefore should any sites surrounding Royal Mail's Hockley DO be redeveloped it would be vital that their design are consistent with and sensitive to Royal Mail's existing operations.

Respondents suggested that the proposed layout of the car park entrance would not be safe for the pedestrians as that is too near to the already congested mini roundabout. One respondent also raised a few questions such as if there would be a proposal to define the proposed footpath, why has the proposed change of use of the retail units on Main Road to Rayleigh been dropped in Option 3 and will the remaining existing buildings on the corner of Bramerton Road be revamped.

An objection to this option because of the reduction in the type and number of employment units for which there is no alternative accommodation in a sustainable location. The respondent considered that alternative employment such as offices is not satisfactory as it harms current light industrial and storage provision. And, there is no evidence of a need for ice skating locally. In terms of residential use, the respondent believed that there is no longer a need to focus housing in this location given the intention to abolish the RSS and more importantly housing should not replace employment. Furthermore, there is lack of evidence of funding for this option or how CPO will occur.

Response supporting Option 2 except for the proposed pedestrian link through the church garden as it would attract a lot of litter, and that would only be acceptable if there is a substantial reduction of the paving area in front of the Spa Pub; the implementation of traffic calming in Spa Road; improvements for the Spa junctions; and the unnecessary changes to the library area. Another response also supported this option except the increasing parallel parking in Spa Road. Some major issues that need to be considered have been highlighted by another respondent such as major improvements at Spa roundabout, support from landowners, disruption to shops and services, funding issues, infrastructure/services in place and support/compensation to businesses in Eldon Way.

Respondent who objected to Option 2 did not see any advantages to having a link through the church garden from Spa Road to Southend Road, and believed that it would only attract graffiti, litter and disruption to the church's services.

A resident commented that all the options published in the Plan have positive aspects and try to address residents need. A respondent believed that there is a need for central parking facilities, traffic lights instead of the roundabout at Spa Road and pedestrian crossings further away from the roundabouts. It was added that a huge supermarket is not needed and is important to retain small retail shops in order to preserve some vestige of 'village' atmosphere.

On the other hand, a respondent believed that a few high rise flats could blend in the Hockley centre if designed properly. A respondent also considered that more seats in the High Street would encourage shoppers and to enlarge the library as well as the community centre would promote the facilities for both young and old people. Moreover, it is also very important for the Council to protect existing Green Belt and woods.

One respondent objected to Option 2 due to inadequate highways infrastructure. Although the respondent recognised that there is a need for housing, she questioned whether the roads and services can cope with the development.

A resident supported bullet point 1-3 listed in the Development and Land uses section in Option 2, but has concern about the loss of business. In bullet point 4, although the resident believed parking space is essential, she believed that no more offices are needed. The respondent then asked if someone has offered to create the skating facility in the proposed new leisure space in bullet point 5 and questioned why consolidation existing leisure has been suggested in bullet point 6 without a problem at present. Support was given to bullet point 7 which is to improve frontages to existing buildings on Eldon Way. The resident is also positive towards the consolidation of Hockley centre in bullet point 8 and would like to see more protection of the Victorian houses. Bullet points 9 and 10 were not welcomed as the resident believed that there is no further space for the library and the GP surgery has just spent a large sum on modernisation. In addition, the business unit on Spa Road should not be a new home but be added on to the Local List. The resident then questioned where funding is coming from and whether the public convenience will go when there is a cut on spending.

In the Traffic and Parking section, the resident supported bullet point 1-3 and creation for a new parking area in particular. There was concern about pressure added to the increasing amount of the proposed parallel on-street parking. Opening the western entrance to Potters car park in bullet point 5 was supported by the respondent.

In the Movement and Public realm section in Option 2, the resident believed that no improvement is needed for the train station frontage. However support was given to bullet point 2-7 and the respondent would be pleased to see the establishment of the proposed links and streetscape improvements in the Plan. In bullet point 8, objection was given to enhancing the public realm at the new combined community centre, and in bullet point 9, it was felt the meaning of “strengthening the link between Spa Road and Eldon Way” was unclear. The resident objected to bullet point 10 and raised concern about security risk and anti-social behaviour to the church and the surrounding areas. However, support was offered to bullet point 11 which is enhancing the environment and improving safety in front of the existing leisure uses in Eldon Way.

One respondent believed Option 2 seems to be positive in improvements but not impacting too much on the village. Another respondent believed that the only thing Hockley need is a better flow of traffic at the Spa Junction, building more houses will only increase the traffic.

Respondent questioned how consolidation of Hockley can be implemented i.e. where to and how can Cost Cutters be persuaded to move, and also asked whether there will be enough space for a centralised and growing GP Practice with enough parking space for the increase number of patients to use, therefore, consider a combined community centre would be impracticable. In addition, a respondent suggested that there should be an increase in parking in the centre where possible. A respondent continued to suggest that there should be new Leisure facilities in Eldon Way and there is opportunity to extend the building of flats in Station Approach into the Foundry Industrial estate with suitable screening converting the new unsold office block to flats.

A Community safety officer from RDC pointed out that there are 4 issues that need to be scrutinized in terms of safety and anti social behaviour for this option. Firstly, natural surveillance is important for the proposed link through the green space to the side of the Church, therefore some trees may need to be thinned back and there is potential for gates to lock/ secure the area with no benches provided to avoid people to congregate there. Secondly, a footpath alongside Eldon Way would be a concern, proper fencing is needed and potential for closure of the route should be looked at. Thirdly, an improvement in lighting is suggested. Lastly, consideration should be given to a link from Eldon Way to the train station as it would be an issue if youths were congregating there or using it as a cut through or escape route, etc.

Respondent who objected to Option 2 believed that the picture illustrated in this option makes Hockley look like any other clone town with all the individuality and charm lost.

Respondent welcomed improvements to the fronts of retail units and using existing brownfield sites for retail/housing, but cannot agree with developing Eldon Way for business use and believed that area should be used for public services (e.g. leisure/youth/public gardens) and/or partially used for housing. In addition, the respondent did not consider a new car park in the train station area is a good idea and the retail areas should only be used by existing residents of Hockley not encouraging more traffic and people into the area.

Another respondent who supported the plan believed that there are some aspects of this option that need to be changed to form the basis of a sound plan, balancing the need for a clear way forward. Respondents were concerned about the dependency on the co-operation of property owners which would affect both public and private sectors ability to deliver the plan, therefore suggested that the next stage of the process should engage with these bodies to establish the level of support they have for any changes.

A respondent objected to this option because of the reduction in the type and number of employment units for which there is no alternative accommodation in a sustainable location. Alternative employment such as offices is not satisfactory as it harms current light industrial and storage provision. And like what the respondent suggested in Option 1, there is no evidence of a need for ice skating locally. In terms of residential use, respondent believed that there is no longer a need to focus housing in this location given the intention to abolish RSS and more importantly housing should not replace employment. Furthermore, there is lack of evidence of funding for this option or how CPO will occur.

A business in the centre strongly objected to Option 2 and all other options as they felt the Council have not given any consideration to businesses and impact to the customers when proposing modernisation and residential use above Seemore Glass.

One respondent objecting to Option 2 asked whether the village needs to have 2 funeral parlours and suggested that local shops could be improved with another supermarket to rival the Co-op supermarket.

Spatial Option 2a

Objectors to this option, commented that it proposes inappropriate changes and missed opportunities. The look and feel of the proposed new shops and flats is bland and characterless.

Comment that this option proposes a bit too much development, although it was noted that there are aspects that could be taken forward in the final plan.

Comments that whilst they agree with the development of existing brownfield sites, the increase in housing and retail units will exacerbate the existing traffic issues.

Respondent objected to this option and commented that there are similar benefits and issues as Option 2, but this option has inappropriate changes. For example flats proposed above modernised retail units at 34-40 Spa Road would create a 2-storey building which is inappropriate due to the proximity of the houses behind. Respondent commented that the replacement of 34-40 Spa Road with shops/flats is ok but concern was expressed regarding loss of business and it was also emphasised that it should be ensured the flats do not impact on the bungalows behind.

Concern was also expressed that there would be a disruption to shops and services for a long period during the development of the supermarket and sorting office area and that shoppers would have to shop outside of Hockley during this period and may not return. It was commented that older residents and non-drivers would not be able to cope.

Respondents commented that this option also appears to replace existing single story shops near the Factory Shop with single story shops, and it was noted that a recent planning application to use the Factory Shop car park for a takeaway food outlet has already been refused permission. Another respondent commented that the changes made to the factory shop car park are seen as beneficial as it is utilising space that is essentially doing nothing now. It was commented that something should be included to replace the Foundry area. It was commented that the area from Waters & Stanton to Harrison's restaurant should also be replaced and additional parking provided.

Respondent commented that the proposed layout in this option means that the existing footpath will exit onto Southend Road pavement between two vehicular access points (for the Indian restaurant and the new car park entrance), opposite the vehicular entrance to the Spa Pub and near to the Old Fire Station, and also where the zebra crossing is. It was questioned whether this proposal is safe for pedestrians.

Concern was expressed regarding the link through the churchyard from Southend Road to Spa Road, which it was noted is owned by the Church, and it was commented that an alleyway could create graffiti, litter and a disruption to services. It was stated that this link would encourage a minimal amount of people to use the car park behind the library. It was commented that if people will not walk around the Spa Pub then the walkway will not encourage them either.

Respondent commented that the village green seems to have been a key point raised in previous consultations and would create the village feel. It was commented that this also gives opportunities for the café culture.

Respondent objected commenting that whilst they recognise the need for housing, especially affordable housing, there are concerns regarding whether there will be infrastructure provided alongside any development. It was commented that proposed development in Rochford will have an impact on the existing highway network and concern was expressed regarding this.

Furthermore another respondent commented that the addition of housing would still be required to increase business within the centre of Hockley. It was noted that this option brings 56 new units of accommodation, which should be coordinated with any changes to business premises to incentivise business moves/re-locations, offering the attraction of significantly more trade. It was commented that more housing should be incorporated into this model on the Eldon Way site as set out in Option 3 and housing on the railway siding as proposed in Option 3a could also be erected. It was also commented that more affordable housing within the area would give opportunities to first time buyers and enable families to move onto larger accommodation if required. It was commented that the availability of such housing is scarce.

Respondent raised strong objections to the changes concerning Seemore Glass (modernisation and four flats above). It was commented that Seemore

Glass is a long-established, family run business. Concern was expressed that inadequate consideration had been given to the impact of the proposals on businesses and customers, particularly in the current economic climate. However, another respondent commented that the proposals for Site 1 (page 36) are good and the image shown on page 49 would give a nice balance to the centre.

Support for this option was expressed by one respondent. However, some modifications were suggested including a drop-off turning circle for the northern side of the station so that cars and passengers are dispersed quickly during peak times, and additional use of the southern side alongside the platform for parking with foot and vehicle access through the Foundry to Eldon Way industrial estate.

Respondent who attended one of the drop-in events at Greensward Academy commented that a lot more thought had gone into the ideas than previously. Support was expressed for this option. It was commented that general improvements to the road layout at the Spa roundabout are preferable to traffic lights or the one-way idea for Woodlands Road. It was felt that traffic lights at the junction would make it almost impossible to exit Bramerton Road particularly at peak times.

Support was expressed for this option and it was commented that it represents an overall improvement. It was commented that the current level of housing in the vicinity is not adequately served by existing facilities. It was also commented that any improvement to the pedestrian environment in Spa Road is welcomed.

This option was considered by one respondent (the Fryery), with some amendments, to be the best option all round. It was commented that given the issues they raised for Option 2, Option 2a seems to give scope for some solutions. It was further commented that if they did need to relocate they could see potential to move to one of the new units proposed on the Co-Op site to prevent any break in their business. It was highlighted that relocation costs and appropriate compensation would have to be built into any agreement to move their business, although it was noted that there still may be some planning issues with units being built above their shop but they would anticipate advice from RDC about this.

Respondent commented that in general Option 2a would be preferred to Option 2 as it addresses more issues. It was suggested that the centre would then have a more consistent feel, although it was felt that some of the shopfronts to the south of Spa Road need more improvements than those to the north but they have not been included.

It was commented that the changes to Eldon Way are welcomed, and hope was expressed that improvements to leisure facilities might help to address the anti-social behaviour issue of youths in Hockley in the evenings. It was commented, however, that the site of the consolidated leisure facility

proposed in Option 3a is preferred (shown on this model as O), which would also give scope to increase the number of housing units in line with those set out in Option 3. However, concern was expressed regarding a large leisure facility at Eldon Way and it was commented that housing would be more beneficial to the area.

It was commented that on-street parking is welcomed and will increase trade from opportunistic buyers that want to just pop into any business along the high street.

Respondent did not support the proposal to replace the Co-Op, flats and sorting office with new shops and flats. It was commented that the 1960s Co-Op building replaced houses and the remaining house features in Options 3 and 3a. However, it was commented that the proposed building is better than the existing building but it is out of character. It was questioned where the businesses and flats will be accommodated during redevelopment. Funding was highlighted as an issue and it was commented that the proposals do not seem realistic.

Respondent objected to this option and suggested an amended version for example improvements to Eldon Way, Station Approach and Plumberow Avenue junctions and pick-up/drop-off points both sides of Hockley Station, and it was suggested that options for the undeveloped portion of the Foundry industrial estate should be considered.

The Council's Community Safety Team in discussion with Essex Police (Rochford) Neighbourhood Specialist Officer commented that trees may be a problem; if young/small they are likely to be snapped. It was commented that the proposed route from Spa Road north to Eldon Way needs to be visible from Spa Rd so that you can see right through, and it was suggested that CCTV should also be pointed in right direction e.g. on top of retail units to deter youths from gathering. It was emphasised that there is a need to be able to see what people are doing. It was questioned whether there would be drinking premises there. It was commented that the first floor flats above the retail units leading onto the leisure facilities may cause an issue with noise nuisance, and it was emphasised that there should not be an off licence etc. below. Restaurants would be a good idea because they are an evening use as this would provide natural surveillance. It was commented that there may be an issue with empty retail units as in other areas which can attract vandalism and flats above can be an issue. It was commented that undercroft parking to south side of Spa Road may encourage youths to gather if no cars are parked there, and it was suggested that a single storey building would be better. It was commented that rows of restaurants are better.

The Council's Community Safety Team in discussion with Essex Police (Rochford) Neighbourhood Specialist Officer also commented that CCTV on top of buildings can act as a deterrent for youths hanging around and it was highlighted that they need to be high up so they cannot be damaged. It was

suggested that maybe there could be a precondition for businesses to have their own CCTV. It was commented that leisure uses could encourage youths to the area, and that a mix of leisure and industrial uses are ok as long as the units are secure (see for example the mixed uses at Festival Leisure Park). It was also emphasised that the area needs to be accessible for the police, have CCTV, be well lit and managed.

The replacement of the sorting office with new dwellings was not supported by some respondents. It was commented that the sorting office is an essential facility in Hockley and it was commented that if it is removed then residents will have to travel to Basildon, Chelmsford and Colchester to collect their mail. It was commented that the Southend sorting office may be replaced by a Tesco. Respondents commented that the sorting office area should not be used unless a replacement is built first as jobs should not be lost unnecessarily. It was also commented that if the sorting office area was used the junction of Eldon Way and Spa Road should be widened with a roundabout and Eldon way should be used to access a new free shopping car park.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail noted that this option is the same as Option 2, however there is a slightly greater level of intervention on Spa Road. It was noted that Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office is identified in Option 2a for houses/mews houses and the provision of amenity space. It was also noted that the figure on page 40 identifies Royal Mail's site, reference 3c, as part of a wider site with the land to the west which is identified for shops with flats above. Furthermore, the table on page 41 indicates that Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office will provide 6 residential units totalling 700 sq.m of gross external floorspace. It was stated that the Hockley delivery office is a vital operational site, and it was commented that for the site to come forward for residential led mixed use development in the future it will be essential to relocate or re-provide Royal Mail's existing operations. However, it was commented that there are currently no plans or timescales for the relocation/re-provision of Royal Mail's operations. Notwithstanding this it was commented that the Hockley delivery office site presents a good opportunity for a range of uses as part of the redevelopment of Hockley centre, including large scale and small scale retail, residential, employment uses. Further, to come forward, it was commented that redevelopment must generate values sufficient to make a relocation viable and attractive to Royal Mail.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail also stated that they request that the Council includes Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site within the emerging Hockley AAP for mixed use development, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the re-provision/relocation of Royal Mail's operations prior to the site's redevelopment. It was commented that this will ensure that the Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their licence issued pursuant to the Postal Services Act 2000, which requires the provision of a 'universal service' for the UK. Furthermore, as a provider of infrastructure, it was commented that they

would promote in such circumstances Royal Mail receiving assistance in their relocation. It was also commented that should any sites surrounding Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office be redeveloped it would be vital that any new uses be designed so that they are cognisant of and sensitive to Royal Mail's existing operations. It was commented that their requests accord with paragraphs 10 and 36 of PPS3, and various sections of PPS4.

Spatial Option 3

Respondents objecting to this option, commented that it proposes inappropriate changes and over development. Respondent objected to Option 3 favouring Option 2 but stated that major improvements at the Spa roundabout, support from landowners, additional infrastructure and support for businesses in Eldon Way are required. It was also noted that disruption to businesses and services etc. would need to be considered and it was suggested that funding could be a challenge. Comments were made that an increase in dwellings in the centre of Hockley would impact on the highway network and put pressure on health, education (e.g. larger class sizes) and other infrastructure. It was also commented that it offers less parking and leisure facilities than Option 2. Respondent commented that improvements should only be made to the shopping area and pavements etc. and another respondent expressly stated that the proposals in Option 3 would change the character of Hockley centre to that of a small town.

Comments stated that to replace the relatively modern building opposite Potters which currently appears to be in use does not make sense. It was also commented that the proposed redevelopment of the existing library and health centre to provide a new combined community centre with library and health facilities should not be squeezed into the area allocated and should not include shops in this area. Furthermore another respondent objected to redevelopment of the library and health centre, and it was commented that the doctors surgery has been modernised. The funding for this proposal was questioned. The proposal to move the Eldon Way health centre to a new combined community centre on Southend Road and replacing it with housing was objected to by a respondent. The funding for this was questioned and concern regarding disruption to services was raised.

Respondents suggested that the unit containing the Indian restaurant and the units opposite Waters & Stanton should be replaced to bring the building line back from the road for the Spa junction improvements. It was also suggested that the units opposite Waters & Stanton should be replaced with homes not shops and that these should only be accessed from Woodlands Road, however, it was also commented that existing shops should not be turned into homes. It was commented that this junction should be replaced with traffic lights with additional lanes and the access to Southend Road car park should only be from Woodlands Road.

Respondent commented that the scale of redevelopment would significantly erode the industrial estate and the particular type and nature of units available. It was commented that Eldon Way performs an important role in terms of the mix of units suitable for different commercial operations and that replacement offices would not be satisfactory compared with the loss of industrial, light industrial and storage units. It was commented that the report does not explain what alternative accommodation is available for the occupiers and that this in itself indicates that delivery is unproven.

Respondent also commented that there is no evidence in the plan of a need for large-scale leisure uses in Hockley and it was stated that it is not considered appropriate to direct such uses to this area. It was also commented that although the plan indicates that a key objective is to provide more housing thus avoiding the need to identify Green Belt land for housing, it was stated that this is unnecessary given the Government's intention to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies. Furthermore it was commented that there is no evidence of how the proposals will be funded and concern was expressed regarding the various funding options identified in the plan. It was stated that it would be wrong to put forward options which cannot be realistically funded or do not have any prospect of funding. It was also noted that a scheme the scale of Option 3 would require tenant and landowner agreement and it was stated that no discussion with landowners has taken place. It was commented that CPOs would be required and it was questioned whether this would be viable.

Respondents commented that additional offices are not required as there are empty units on the Foundry industrial estate and at the Spa roundabout. It was commented by one respondent that they cannot see the benefit of creating more office space, especially where this can be more usefully utilised for housing or retail units. It was also felt that this detracts from the village feel referenced throughout the HAAP. It was commented that the housing proposed in Option 3 seems a good idea and would make use of what is not well utilised currently.

Another respondent objected stating that the removal of the former Alldays building and a building on Eldon Way would result in the removal of some leisure facilities for offices which are not needed. It was also commented that the former Alldays car park is needed for public parking. The replacement of the Co-Op was considered to be unnecessary. Another respondent commented that the large supermarket does not have adequate space for parking and shoppers would have to take trolleys to new parking areas at Hockley station which is not practical and would drive shoppers to supermarkets outside Hockley that have adjacent on-site parking facilities. It was also commented that small local shops would not be able to compete with a large supermarket. It was commented that this option also appears to replace existing single story shops near the Factory Shop with single story shops, and it was noted that a recent planning application to use the Factory

Shop car park for a takeaway food outlet has already been refused permission. Another respondent stated that replacing 34-40 Spa Road with new retail units is not supported. An objection was raised to the replacement of the office block on the corner of Woodlands Road/Southend Road by a respondent as it is considered to be presentable and useful.

Respondents commented that a new home on Spa Road, close to the train station is unnecessary. Another respondent suggested that 59 Spa Road should go on Local List and its replacement was not supported. It was commented that the proposed car park to the south side of the train station for commuters is a good idea but concern was expressed that it would not be used by weekend shoppers. It was commented that the vehicular drop-off and pick-up points should not be in the car park but at the station. The proposed new parking area south of the train station and the narrowing of the roundabout were supported by another respondent. However, improvements to the station frontage were not supported by a respondent and were considered to be unnecessary.

Concern was expressed in relation to the parallel parking proposals and it was commented that the width of Spa Road should not be reduced due to tree planting. It was commented that this junction should be replaced with traffic lights with additional lanes and Potters parking should not be changed especially as parking for flats would be necessary.

Comment that parking should be within the main shopping centre, and that parallel on-street parking would put pressure on bus services etc. Support was expressed by a respondent for the proposed pedestrian links, paving improvements tree planting and the table-top crossing etc.

Comment that the dwellings proposed in the churchyard is a curious option, and it was questioned where the access for cars etc. would be and how it fits with development proposed on the Factory Shop car park. It was commented that it is unnecessary development. Respondents also commented that if a walking route was created through the churchyard, then a crossing should be provided to cross Southend Road at its end. Concern was expressed by another respondent regarding the link through the churchyard from Southend Road to Spa Road, which it was noted is owned by the Church, and it was commented that an alleyway could create graffiti, litter and a disruption to services. It was stated that this link would encourage a minimal amount of people to use the car park behind the library. It was commented that if people will not walk around the Spa Pub then the walkway will not encourage them either. Another respondent objected to the proposed dwellings in the churchyard and it was stated that this is a small area and there is no parking. It was questioned how the link between Spa Road and Eldon Way could be strengthened.

Respondent noted that a footpath is proposed along the new car park entrance to the rear of the library, however, it was questioned where the access would be to the rear of the Indian restaurant to service the proposed dwellings and retail unit. It was also noted that the car park entrance is proposed to be relocated close the Spa roundabout which is a busy junction. It was noted that the footpath is not defined and it was questioned what, if any, proposals are being made to define the public footpath. It was questioned why the proposed change of use to the retail units along Main Road have not been included within Option 3. A respondent expressed their support for improved parking facilities etc. along Main Road (page 44). It was questioned by another respondent whether the remaining existing buildings would be refurbished – the building on the corner of Bramerton Road was highlighted as an issue. Furthermore, a respondent expressed their support for shop front improvements but only where necessary.

Respondent highlighted that the former Alldays store is mentioned, but it is unclear whether this includes the other shops next to it or not, and it was commented that if it does then this should be stated. A business (the Fryery) commented that they could only be located in their current position or the unit immediately next to them to ensure that they have the same level of footfall which is crucial to their business. It was commented that they cannot see how this could be achieved without any break in their business given that the re-design would have to be so significant. A respondent commented that they are in favour of the increased housing presented in this model, but would prefer for it to be incorporated into option 2a.

Respondent raised strong objections to the changes concerning Seemore Glass (modernisation and four flats above). It was commented that Seemore Glass is a long-established, family run business. Concern was expressed that adequate consideration has not been given to the impact of the proposals on businesses and customers, particularly in the current economic climate. However, in relation to the key elements of Option 3 (page 42), a respondent considered the replacement of the shops at 2 Main Road to be ok but concern was expressed regarding the loss of businesses.

With reference to the bullet point “Replacement of poor quality building on Southend Road” (page 42) it was questioned by a respondent which building this refers to as it is not stated, and it was commented by other respondents that this building cannot be located on the maps. However, in relation to the replacement of the building on Southend Road, an objection was raised by a respondent stating that this is a single storey extension to the adjacent building and the proposed dwellings are in the rear car park. It was commented that the proposed development in this area would impact on the existing business there. It was questioned whether the public toilets would be lost.

With reference to the bullet points relating to table-top crossings (page 44) doubt was expressed whether the comparable sites are as busy as those

intersecting at the Spa roundabout. It was commented that a major issue at this junction is that drivers fail to take care and drive appropriately e.g. speeding. A flexible bollard to ensure vehicles navigate properly at low speed was suggested. Another respondent expressed their support for the proposed shared surface at the Spa roundabout and the opening up of the western entrance to Potters car park.

With reference to site 6 (page 53) concern was expressed that the proposal to replace existing businesses with numerous dwellings has not considered the impact on infrastructure e.g. drainage. Another respondent commented that replacing the Co-Op etc. with new retail/housing was not supported and it was questioned where they would be moved to. Replacing two buildings on Eldon Way with housing was not supported by a respondent. It was commented by another respondent that this option includes 80 dwellings on Eldon Way Industrial Estate against the wishes of local residents and creates additional traffic in Eldon Way, and there would be a loss of 2 large Industrial/leisure buildings on Eldon Way industrial estate for residential uses.

Respondent objected commenting that the option proposes to replace the present leisure facilities with houses and flats and it was noted that these facilities are popular. It was commented that they serve neighbouring towns, not just Hockley, and can be easily accessed by foot and public transport. It was commented that moving them to Southend would be detrimental for the local community. It was suggested that there are similar issues with the proposals for the Co-Op supermarket and funeral parlour. Conversely one respondent stated that a huge leisure complex is not wanted or needed and would take away from the village feel of Hockley. It was also commented by another respondent in relation to the proposal for new leisure space that this is smaller than the existing facilities, and it was questioned whether there has been an application for a skating rink. This proposal was objected to. Where it is stated that the environment and safety would be improved in front of existing leisure uses (page 44), it was commented that the existing leisure facilities are proposed to be moved within this option.

Respondent objected commenting that whilst they recognise the need for housing, especially affordable housing, there are concerns regarding whether there will be infrastructure provided alongside any development. It was commented that proposed development in Rochford will have an impact on the existing highway network and concern was expressed regarding this.

Another respondent objected to this option. Concern was expressed that there would be a disruption to shops and services for a long period during the construction of the supermarket and that shoppers would have to shop outside of Hockley during this period and may not return. It was commented that older residents and non-drivers would not be able to cope.

Support for Option 3. It was commented that the industrial estate requires refurbishment and that this would be a suitable place for dwellings and retail

units close to all amenities. Similarly another respondent commented that brownfield land can be used for housing instead of Green Belt land elsewhere. It was also commented that this could be the same as the new terraces next to the Spa and Spa House. A respondent commented that the photograph of Option 3 (page 49) makes the centre of Hockley look much more attractive. It was commented that Option 3 seems to keep everything central which was considered to be better by one respondent. It was commented that Hockley lacks any public area where pedestrians can sit away from traffic. Support was expressed for Option 3 which was stated as going some way to remedying this. It was commented that there is also a need for a supermarket of a larger size than the existing premises. It was stated that the Eldon Way industrial estate is a real eyesore and contains too much wasted space. Support was expressed for the highest level of intervention and it was commented that Hockley is currently stagnant and is a poor shopping environment. It was commented that any intervention and improvement is better than nothing. Furthermore it was commented that the current level of housing justifies this level of intervention, and any visual enhancement would hopefully encourage investment.

Anglian Water commented that the area covered in the Hockley AAP is served by Rochford Wastewater Treatment Works where there is adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed flows from all three Spatial Options. It was commented that currently there are no significant issues with the sewerage network. Specifically in relation to Option 3 it was noted that this proposal includes a total of 159 properties (95 flats and 54 houses), and that the full impact to the foul network will have to be properly assessed to determine if infrastructure upgrades will be required prior to connection. It was commented that surface water should comply with PPS25 and be removed from the public surface water system where possible.

The Council's Community Safety Team in discussion with Essex Police (Rochford) Neighbourhood Specialist Officer commented that they like the long stretch of buildings from Spa Rd north to Eldon Way as there is nowhere to hide, and restaurants with offices above are preferable. It was commented that the more open area in these options are better because you can see from end to end. It was highlighted that there may be an issue with the road to the south of the consolidated leisure uses leading to parking behind the retail/office units and there may be a problem with youths, however, if the car park can be closed when the offices close at night it was commented that this would be ok. It was commented that Option 3 is not supported, due to the presence of housing and there is less leisure space. It was suggested that there should not be any houses on the green space by the Church, although it was commented that the dwellings to the north of the railway line are ok. It was also commented that people congregating outside the supermarket is an issue, and it was questioned whether there would be an issue with the proposal to the rear of the Indian restaurant. It was commented that direct access from the new station car park to Eldon Way (north to south) would be preferable to the route through the Foundry industrial estate.

Respondent objected to this option commenting that the sorting office would be taken away and probably combined with Southend or Chelmsford.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail noted that the Hockley delivery office is identified in this option for a supermarket in conjunction with the adjacent site to the west, and it is identified as Site 3 on page 53 as part of the land to the immediate north and west. It was noted that the land to the north of the Royal Mail's site is identified for leisure with the land to the north-west for shops with flats above. It was also noted that the table on page 53 states that the redevelopment of the Royal Mail's site would provide 22 flats totaling 1,830 sq.m of gross external floorspace. It was requested that the Council clarifies whether Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site is identified in the AAP Option 3 and 3a for a retail supermarket or residential units. It was reiterated that the Hockley delivery office is a vital operational site.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail also stated that they request that the Council includes Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site within the emerging Hockley AAP for mixed use development, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the re-provision/relocation of Royal Mail's operations prior to the site's redevelopment. It was commented that this will ensure that the Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their licence issued pursuant to the Postal Services Act 2000, which requires the provision of a 'universal service' for the UK. Furthermore, as a provider of infrastructure, it was commented that they would promote in such circumstances Royal Mail receiving assistance in their relocation. It was also commented that should any sites surrounding Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office be redeveloped it would be vital that any new uses be designed so that they are cognisant of and sensitive to Royal Mail's existing operations. It was commented that their requests accord with paragraphs 10 and 36 of PPS3, and various sections of PPS4.

Respondent commented that a residential opportunity has been identified in the Woodpond Avenue end of the car park behind the library. It was questioned where this came from as there is no mention of it in the options.

Additionally it was commented that there should be no building on Green Belt land and agricultural land should be retained for that purpose. It was also suggested that whilst most comments may be negative, some praise is due to the Council in providing and working on the HAAP.

Spatial Option 3a

Objections to this option pointed out that it proposes inappropriate changes and over development. Concern was expressed regarding the infrastructure to support the new dwellings. It was commented that Option 3a has similar issues to Option 3 except that the 80 homes on Eldon Way are replaced by 40 homes at the railway sidings and car park in Plumberow Avenue. It was

commented that although this alternative option retains the 2 large industrial buildings on Eldon Way, there are further issues of additional traffic at the Plumberow Avenue traffic lights, and homes close to the railway line.

Conversely support given for the development of dwellings proposed to the north of the railway line along Plumberow Avenue although concern was expressed that it would increase the traffic at the junction with Greensward Lane and there would be parking problems. It was questioned whether these would be single storey like existing dwellings along the road. It was also commented by respondents that the proposed northern entrance to the train station is a good idea.

Respondent commented that Option 3a is an improvement on Option 3, provided that the existing leisure space is retained with the existing facilities, and it was commented that a skating rink is also very welcome.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail noted that the Hockley delivery office is identified in this option for a supermarket in conjunction with the adjacent site to the west, and it is identified as Site 3 on page 53 as part of the land to the immediate north and west. It was noted that the land to the north of the Royal Mail's site is identified for leisure with the land to the north-west for shops with flats above. It was also noted that the table on page 53 states that the redevelopment of the Royal Mail's site would provide 22 flats totaling 1,830 sq.m of gross external floorspace. It was requested that the Council clarifies whether Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site is identified in the AAP Option 3 and 3a for a retail supermarket or residential units. It was reiterated that the Hockley delivery office is a vital operational site.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail also stated that they request that the Council includes Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site within the emerging Hockley AAP for mixed use development, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the re-provision/relocation of Royal Mail's operations prior to the site's redevelopment. It was commented that this will ensure that the Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their licence issued pursuant to the Postal Services Act 2000, which requires the provision of a 'universal service' for the UK. Furthermore, as a provider of infrastructure, it was commented that they would promote in such circumstances Royal Mail receiving assistance in their relocation. It was also commented that should any sites surrounding Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office be redeveloped it would be vital that any new uses be designed so that they are cognisant of and sensitive to Royal Mail's existing operations. It was commented that their requests accord with paragraphs 10 and 36 of PPS3, and various sections of PPS4.

Respondent noted that a footpath is proposed along the new car park entrance, however, it was questioned where the access would be to the rear of the Indian restaurant to service the proposed dwellings and retail unit. It was also noted that the car park entrance is proposed to be relocated close to

the Spa roundabout which is a busy junction. It was noted that the footpath is not defined and it was questioned what, if any, proposals are being made to define the public footpath. It was questioned why the proposed change of use to the retail units along Main Road have not been included within Option 3a. It was questioned whether the remaining existing buildings would be refurbished – the building on the corner of Bramerton Road was highlighted as an issue.

Respondent objected commenting that whilst they recognise the need for housing, especially affordable housing, there are concerns regarding whether there will be infrastructure provided alongside any development. It was commented that proposed development in Rochford will have an impact on the existing highway network and concern was expressed regarding this.

Concern was expressed regarding the link through the churchyard from Southend Road to Spa Road, which it was noted is owned by the Church, and it was commented that an alleyway could create graffiti, litter and a disruption to services. It was stated that this link would encourage a minimal amount of people to use the car park behind the library. It was commented that if people will not walk around the Spa Pub then the walkway will not encourage them either.

Respondent raised strong objections to the changes concerning Seemore Glass (modernisation and four flats above). It was commented that Seemore Glass is a long-established, family run business. Concern was expressed that adequate consideration has not been given to the impact of the proposals on businesses and customers, particularly in the current economic climate. As with Option 3, Option 3a is considered to represent over development. It was commented that this option seems to focus on provision of office space at the expense of new or refurbished retail units, and that again car parking is less than that offered under Option 2, although the housing proposed under Option 3 in Eldon Way has gone. However, it was stated that there are again some aspects that could be incorporated into the final plan.

The Council's Community Safety Team in discussion with Essex Police (Rochford) Neighbourhood Specialist Officer commented that they like the long stretch of buildings from Spa Rd north to Eldon Way as there is nowhere to hide, and restaurants with offices above are preferable. It was commented that the more open areas in these options are better because you can see from end to end. It was highlighted that there may be an issue with the road to the south of the consolidated leisure uses leading to parking behind the retail/office units and there may be a problem with youths, however, if the car park can be closed when the offices close at night it was commented that this would be ok. It was commented that Option 3 is not supported, due to the presence of housing and there is less leisure space. It was suggested that there should not be any houses on the green space by the Church, although it was commented that the dwellings to the north of the railway line are ok. It was also commented that people congregating outside the supermarket is an issue, and it was questioned whether there would be an issue with the

proposal to the rear of the Indian restaurant. It was commented that direct access from the new station car park to Eldon Way (north to south) would be preferable to the route through the Foundry industrial estate.

Respondent expressed support for this option stating that the centre of Hockley has limited facilities and there are only a few buildings worth preserving. It was commented that this scheme will create new housing, shops, pedestrian links etc. and will make a significant improvement to the area. Furthermore it was commented that the local action group do not represent the view of the population and that the Council should ballot every household in Hockley to get a more realistic view. It was stated that to not have a realistic action plan in place will mean the Council will be unable to defend against inappropriate piecemeal development within the centre of Hockley.

Anglian Water commented that the area covered in the Hockley AAP is served by Rochford Wastewater Treatment Works where there is adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed flows from all three Spatial Options. It was commented that currently there are no significant issues with the sewerage network. Specifically in relation to Option 3a it was noted that this proposal includes a total of 107 properties (82 flats and 25 houses). The full impact to the foul network will have to be properly assessed to determine if infrastructure upgrades will be required prior to connection. Surface water should comply with PPS25 and be removed from the public surface water system where possible.

Respondent commented that a residential opportunity has been identified in the Woodpond Avenue end of the car park behind the library. It was questioned where this came from as there is no mention of it in the options.

Transport options

Comments that previous consultations have emphasised that highways infrastructure improvements to the key junctions at: Spa roundabout; Eldon Way; Station Approach and Plumberow Avenue need to be determined before any redevelopment. It was commented that insufficient attention has been paid to these key requirements and the proposals provided have not been researched and may not be viable.

Respondent commented that most of the congestion in Hockley is caused by through traffic, and the options will not solve the problem. It was commented that the only solution is to divert it which is likely to be expensive, but unless it is solved, any scheme to develop Hockley centre should be shelved, as this would also exacerbate the problem.

Comments on the proposal for increasing the capacity at the Spa roundabout were generally supportive of this option (page 59) and Hawkwell Parish Council commented that this option for improving traffic flow would be of

benefit and would negate the need for traffic lights. It was commented that improving traffic flow is a key priority for the centre of Hockley. It was suggested that pelican crossing lights should be considered to regulate the flow of pedestrians crossing the road outside Potters. Respondents commented that the filter lanes in particular would ease traffic at peak times and improve the situation. It was commented by another respondent that Woodlands Road is frustrating to exit at peak times, however, this stops people using it as a short cut, and the rest of the roundabout runs smoothly during busy times. It was suggested by a respondent that the unit containing the Indian restaurant and the units opposite Waters & Stanton should be replaced to bring the building line back from the road for the Spa junction improvements. It was also suggested that the units opposite Waters & Stanton should be replaced with homes not shops and that these should only be accessed from Woodlands Road. It was commented that this junction should be replaced with traffic lights with additional lanes and the access to Southend Road car park should only be from Woodlands Road. It was also noted that Heavy Goods Vehicles turning into Spa Road from Southend Road require a wide turning circle. The use of 'No Right Turn' signs and the earlier filtering of traffic from Rayleigh turning left at the roundabout were suggested.

On the other hand, respondents expressed their concern at the benefits of this option, and it was commented that slip roads would exacerbate the situation. Another respondent commented that there are insufficient vehicles turning right from Southend Road to permit vehicles to exit Spa Road, and there are poor sight lines for vehicles turning left.

Concern was expressed in relation to the shared space option for the Spa roundabout (page 60) and in general this proposal was not supported. Respondents expressed their concern that this option would be hazardous and should not be considered at this busy junction. However, some respondents did express their support for this option. It was noted that there would be a need to slow traffic down entering all arms of the junction which must be considered.

Respondent questioned how the proposals would cope with an increase in traffic due to the other proposals which the plan is considering. Some respondents commented that a traffic survey is required to analyse traffic at the Spa roundabout before deciding the best solution. However, one respondent objected stating that the proposals for improving traffic flow at the Spa roundabout are likely to have only a small impact.

Generally comments received relating to the parking options on Spa Road (page 63) suggest that this option is not favourable. One respondent specifically expressed their opposition for on-street parking and another respondent commented that on-street parking provision should not be improved but should be discouraged on Spa Road as this would make it more pedestrian friendly. It was commented that drivers should be encouraged to use public car parks instead. Concern was expressed regarding the parallel

parking proposals and it was commented that the width of Spa Road should not be reduced due to tree planting. Another respondent commented that additional parking is welcomed, but it was stated that there is insufficient space to provide echelon parking along Spa Road. A respondent agreed that the retaining wall outside the bank needs to be removed and it was commented by another respondent that the varying heights are a problem for the elderly and partially sighted especially in poor weather. Lack of gritting of surrounding roads and pavement areas is also a concern. It was also commented that there is an issue with buses stopping along Spa Road and cars trying to turn right out of the Co-Op car park. It was commented that the disabled bay should be moved to Bramerton Road. Respondent suggested that deliveries for shops and refuse collections should be restricted to be certain times and enforced, and parking restrictions along the main roads should be extended and enforced. Furthermore it was commented that any plan must give consideration to deliveries especially to the larger retail units.

Comments on improving the drop-off provision at the station (page 64) generally showed a lack of consensus for these options. It was commented that the proposed car park to the south side of the train station for commuters is a good idea but concern was expressed that it would not be used by weekend shoppers. It was commented that the vehicular drop-off and pick-up points should not be in the car park but at the station. The proposed northern entrance to the train station was considered to be a good idea. However, another respondent specifically expressed their opposition to the station drop-off options. It was commented that any changes at the station must include provision for short stay pick up and for taxis. It was commented that the roadway under the railway bridge is very narrow, and it was suggested that pedestrian walkways under the side of the bridge would improve matters.

Essex County Council commented that the options, as currently presented in the consultation document, raise a general issue in terms of the balance to be struck between the need for extra car parking and the need to address congestion hotspots and to make Hockley centre more attractive for other modes of transport. There is a requirement for presentation of a more detailed analysis of the effect of the provision of extra free car parking on the network and on other modes of transport using the network.

With regard to the Southend Road / Spa Road roundabout Essex County Council commented that any changes to the existing layout of this junction would require a detailed design incorporating safety audit and junction modelling, including traffic surveys and vehicle swept path analyses. It was commented that improvement to the existing zebra crossings by upgrading to signalised crossings could potentially improve vehicle flows and manage crossing pedestrians.

In relation to the realignment / provision of parking bays on Spa Road Essex County Council commented that a survey of utilities could potentially identify

numerous facilities along Spa Road, with the cost implication of diversions, adversely affecting the deliverability of the Plan. Any road realignment along Spa Road would need to ensure that visibility splays are maintained to Highway standards. Similarly, any changes to the road width to provide parking bays would also require capacity assessment of the carriageway. The Highway Authority would require further information to assess these proposals.

Essex County Council commented that with regard to Station Approach / Spa Road any extension of car parking facilities at the station would need careful consideration in terms of its impact on the Station Approach/Spa Road junction and also the ability for all modes of transport, especially pedestrians, to gain access to the station. A station travel plan should be prepared for implementation in conjunction with any new works. The removal of the existing roundabout would create a 'crossroads' style junction which may lead to increased safety concerns regarding vehicle movements associated with the existing residential/business areas. The Highway Authority would require further information on pedestrian and vehicle flows at the Station Road/Spa Road junction to determine the need for junction improvements. There are safety implications as the junction is currently used to enable access to the station, residential areas and the business park.

In terms of implementation and delivery, Essex County Council commented that the Highway Authority would promote improvements encouraging modal shift and use of more sustainable forms of transport, including improved public transport infrastructure enhancements and provision for cyclists. Any proposal which seeks to create pedestrian links should also incorporate cycling infrastructure where appropriate. The focus on pedestrian and cycling routes is welcome as a means of widening travel choice and enabling reduced use of motorised vehicles for local journeys. Such routes should also contribute to 'Safer Journeys to School' and be considered alongside traffic speed reduction measures, especially in the vicinity of schools and early years and childcare facilities.

Essex County Council further commented that appropriate text and provision should be included in the Plan for: developer contributions to be sought from future development in the area, car parking provision to conform to the EPOA parking standards, and provision of Transport Assessments or Transport Statements for defined proposals.

Respondent suggested that if the sorting office area was used, then the junction of Eldon Way and Spa Road should be widened with a roundabout and Eldon way should be used to access a new free shopping car park.

It was commented that the footpath down the side of The Fryery needs to be lit at night, as large groups of youths congregate there and cause anti-social behaviour. It was suggested that lighting could deter their presence and give a feeling of safety to others using the footpath.

Respondent commented that when the Area Action Plan is published for consultation, it will be necessary to explain what the costs of the improvements are, how the proposed transport works are to be funded and the programme for delivery. It was further commented that without this the Area Action Plan would not be able to demonstrate delivery.

Funding and delivery

Respondent commented that there seems little justification for further office building when existing facilities cannot be let. It was questioned how it can be justified that demand is strong when there are several retail units which have been vacant long-term.

Respondents expressed the concern that in the current financial climate this kind of development will not happen. It was commented that there is little demand for new shops and offices, the demand for homes is impacted by mortgage restrictions and any new developments would have to be carried out by a major developer who would need to pay for any infrastructure required. Furthermore another respondent commented that in the current financial climate it is surprising that there seems to be a lot of money to spend on so-called improvements to Hockley. It was commented that these are improvements that the majority of residents do not want. It was questioned who will fill the retail units. It was suggested that the pavements in Hamilton Avenue should be improved, there should be double yellow lines at Plumberow Primary School, and graffiti, rubbish and weeds should be removed.

Hawkwell Parish Council stated that they believe the suggestion that the Council could borrow money to fund improvements on the assumption that more business rates would be generated and the Government would release such funds is a dangerous road to go down.

Respondent objected commenting that if the New Homes Bonus is used to fund improvements, building more houses will exacerbate the infrastructure and traffic problems that already exist in Hockley.

Respondent commented that it is assumed that most of this development will fall on the private sector to finance, and any section 106 agreements with developers will need to be enforced.

Another respondent objected stating that the principles underpinning the plan should be to discourage lots of large national retailers. It was commented that under delivery options the bullet points relating to minimum retail unit size should be changed and a limit of only one or two units above a maximum size allowed. Also it was suggested that as office space would need to be pre-guaranteed, some more flexible types of building should be proposed.

Respondent suggested that aside from exploring the funding opportunities, the components that add little or no value should be removed from the Plan e.g. some of the proposed pedestrian walkways. It was commented that any housing developments should be utilised to fund improvements to Hockley centre.

Respondent commented that as Option 1 is their preferred option, they do not think there is an issue with funding, however if the other options are pursued, it was commented that the Council should consider the risks very carefully.

Next steps

Essex County Council noted that next steps in preparation of the Plan will include discussion with key stakeholders, including Essex County Council (Chapter 10, page 70, column 1). The County Council would welcome early discussion of issues relating to delivery of its range of services that arise from preparation of the Plan. It was commented that the Highway Authority will require further analysis to be provided in order to reach a considered opinion on the options identified within the consultation document and to advise on transport requirements for the preferred option.

Respondents commented that it is unreasonable to expect the public to make online responses to this document. It was noted that this is the second consultation on options for the centre of Hockley, and concern was expressed that the public will not respond in sufficient numbers.

The Environment Agency stated that their comments, which included advice on sustainable development, Sustainable Drainage Systems and biodiversity and landscaping, submitted during the 2009 consultation remain valid and should be considered in future iterations of the AAP. They also noted that some parts of the AAP area may be subject to land contamination due to their past uses, and subsequently recommend that consideration should be given to this matter in taking the AAP forward. Furthermore, should the proposed future development include industrial development or other potentially polluting land uses, it was commented that it will need to be ensured that adequate pollution control measures are in place.

Respondent considered the document to be very long and not easy to understand, with specific reference to the models. An executive summary in plain English and a list of the shops referred to in an appendix (instead of just quoting their numbers) was suggested to aid the public's understanding. It was further commented that the document has been the cause of much concern to businesses and it was commented that the reasons for preparing the document should have been clearer e.g. it would lead to a blue print for future development which may or may not happen.

Respondent supported the next steps noting that the Council is planning to meet with shop keepers. They offered their assistance in further discussing

their comments or anything else in relation to the HAAP, and stated that they are very keen to be involved throughout the process in a constructive way. Another respondent expressed support for further consultation with stakeholders. It was noted that the plan is modular and therefore some parts could be taken forward independently of the rest, and it was commented that before the preferred option is published it would be useful to identify the modular components and the issues and dependencies affecting each. It was stated that residents should continue to be involved.

Respondent objected to all options. It was commented that previous consultations have made clear that highways infrastructure improvements to Spa roundabout, Eldon Way, Station Approach and Plumberow Avenue need to be determined before any redevelopment could be considered and that insufficient attention has been paid to these key requirements. However, one respondent expressed support for Option 1 or Option 2 as it was felt that this would be an improvement to the centre of Hockley without too much overcrowding. The other options were considered to cause too much overcrowding in a very small area and are unnecessary. Another respondent expressed support for Option 2a as the retail units and flats were considered to positively contribute to the area. It was stated that large scale development is not welcomed and the industrial estate should be retained. It was questioned what would happen to the Royal Mail sorting office. It was further stated that the Spa roundabout should be kept and the new integrated health centre and library is good idea. It was also suggested that a drop off area in Plumberow Avenue for the station to ease congestion should be considered by two respondents, although one suggested double yellow lines on the road should be included. The scale of development proposed in Option 3 was commented by a respondent to be potentially detrimental to the character of the area, although it was commented that some of the existing buildings in the centre do need improving.

Respondent suggested several ideas to be considered in the development of a single option for Hockley, for example focusing retail development between Waters & Stanton (Main Road) and the Co-Op (Spa Road), increase parking in the centre and continue developments along Station Approach into the Foundry industrial estate.

End of summary