

Statement concerning the Rochford Allocations Submissions Document

Issue 2 & 3 Rayleigh)

Presented by- Louis Drive Estate Residents Association
c/o 85 Louis Drive,
Rayleigh,
Essex. SS6 9DY

Issue 2(Rayleigh)

Although we would like to see no new development in the area we appreciate the need for housing for the future. It is important to be very aware on the part of any developer, that some of the area to be developed west of Rayleigh is in a flood plain.

The plan is almost creating a mini village on the edge of Rayleigh. Will the council make sure that the amenities needed for such a large conurbation are provided? This was promised when the development was allowed south of the Louis Drive Estate area and never provided.

We question whether a true road survey has been carried out in the area. At the moment traffic congestion on London Road, into and out of the town, is very bad during many times of the day. With the prospect of already another 110 houses (possibly 200 vehicles) being developed on the old Eon site, the congestion must already be close to reaching the point when the road can no longer cope.

The flow of traffic from the planned site north of London Road is not clear. Will this be onto London Road, Rawreth Lane or the A1245? What kinds of traffic junctions are planned? The planned link between Rawreth Lane and London Road could become a “rat run” if it is not properly policed.

We have many of the residents in this area, and not just the elderly, already having difficulty crossing the road.

Public transport is already very poor, would there be any pressure brought to bear on the transport companies to improve on this? If it is the intention that new residents help the town to flourish then it is important that they be encouraged to frequent the shops in the town and not just the outlying supermarkets, therefore good public transport and good parking for necessary cars is important.

To accommodate the removal of the industrial site from Rawreth Lane, it is important that small industry and offices only should be allowed in this area, being so close to a residential area and a primary/junior school. In conjunction with the planned housing development between London Road and Rawreth Lane this could generate a large amount of traffic. What plans would there be to ensure that large vehicles in particular could not access this through the town.

It is important to ensure that there is no encroachment onto the woodland trust land, which is a very important amenity in the area.

What guarantees do we have that the open space between the new development north of London Road and the A1245 will remain that “buffer” which it is intended to be.

For larger industrial work the planned site at the junction of the A127 and the A1245 would seem to be an ideal site, given that there is already access from the A127 and A1245 and good road access for large vehicles travelling from much further afield.

Issue 3(Rayleigh)

If a traveller site is considered necessary for this area, the site identified by Rochford District Council in policy NEL2 would appear to be ideal. This area would appear to be the right site as there is good access from the A127 and A1245.

It is important that the area is controlled well by the local council to prevent an increase in the number of pitches beyond 15. As the majority of travellers appear to be of Roman Catholic religion it is assumed that children will go the local school which is already at its' capacity, this needs to be considered.

Would a number of much smaller sites be more acceptable given that the needs for education and health care could then be spread across a larger area?

A comment by the local council that a nearer site to the town would allow for integration is valueless, as by repute travellers do not wish to integrate, and by the nature of their life are "travelling".

On a positive note the traveller site which is situated East of the A1245 near to Rawreth Lane would appear to be a well run law abiding site, inhabited by people who are permanent and resident in the district, and it would seem ill-advised to make the people move as they also appear to pay their rates and would appear to not want to move to a large site. Is this site legal?

Barbara J Oliver
Hon. Sec.