

To

From

The Planning Policy Team
Rochford District Council
FREEPOST, CL1858
South Street
Rochford
Essex SS4 1BW

Mr. B. Marsden-Carleton
20 High Elms Road
Hullbridge
Essex SS5 6HB

16. 08. 2013

Dear Sir,

Re: Representation Agent: Reference CP15678E. Representor No. 29007. Hullbridge SER6

Further Submission Post 19 June 2013 Planning Inspector Meeting in Rayleigh.

Rochford District Council Allocations Submission Development Plan Document (DPD)

Plea for withdrawal

We invite the Government Planning Inspector to find the **Rochford District Council September 2009** (amended September 2011) **Core Strategy Submission Document (with proposed minor amendments highlighted), unsound**.

In our consideration, the Soundness and Legal Compliance of the plans on the basis of the relevant Legislation Guidance in the National Planning Framework is not:

- Positively Prepared.
- Justified.
- Effective.
- Consistent with national Policy.

Note: Documents referred to in completing this Representation:

1. Rochford District Council Statement of Community Involvement January 2007.
2. Rochford Core Strategy (2011).
3. Allocations DPD – Discussion & Consultation Document. Feb 2010.
4. NPPF Compliance review.
5. L D F Allocations Submission Document November 2012.
6. Annual Monitoring Report 2011-2012 - January 2013.
7. Local Development Scheme April 2013.
8. Development Management Submission Document – April 2013.
9. The Names and Addresses of the residents of Hullbridge are given on a separate excel file, document named Hullbridge ‘HRAG Sorted Residents Master V3.xls’
10. Rochford District Council Allocations Plan Examination

We begin with informing you, regretfully, that a number of Councillors have made public utterances to the effect that **‘this development is a done deal’** and that they (we take it that means the Rochford District Council) had signed off the Core Strategy in its entirety, implying that there is no need for the Community to utter or write their objections.

We are concerned with how to deal with the very people who maintain they have our interests at heart.

The Hullbridge Village faces a challenge from the Parish Councillors submitting a submission for the development of 350 dwellings which will be a further development over and above the proposed development through the Core Strategy. The Community ask why the District Council would allow further confusion by the introduction of this 350 dwellings.

Please take this into account in your response to our **'Plea for Withdrawal'**.

Thanking you

Yours faithfully

Brian J. Marsden-Carleton (Chartered Surveyor – Retired)

FURTHER SUBMISSION Post 19 June 2013

DATED 16TH AUGUST 2013.

TO THE GOVERNMENT PLANNING INSPECTOR

A PLEA FOR WITHDRAWAL

IN RESPECT OF:

SECTION SER 6

OF

THE CORE STRATEGY SUBMISSION DOCUMENT
(with proposed minor amendments highlighted)

ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

SEPTEMBER 2009 (AMENDED SEPTEMBER 2011)

HULLBRIDGE PLEA FOR WITHDRAWAL dated 16th August 2013

THE CORE STRATEGY SUBMISSION DOCUMENT
(with proposed minor amendments highlighted)

THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL SEPTEMBER 2009 (AMENDED SEPTEMBER 2011)

	Page
Letter	1
Contents	3
Plea	4-6
Exhibit 1 – Site capacity	7
Exhibit 2 – Flood	8
Exhibit 3 – Local highways and Infrastructure	10
Exhibit 4 – Community Involvement	10
Exhibit 5 – Amalgamation of issues	11
Exhibit 6 – Allocation Development Plan	11
Exhibit 7 – Health Impact Assessment	12
Exhibit 8 – Preparatory and Enabling Works	12
Exhibit 9 – Localism Act	12
Appendix 1 Agents Residents List	
Appendix 2 Street map	

ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL

THE CORE STRATEGY SUBMISSION DOCUMENT
(with proposed minor amendments highlighted)

PLEA FOR WITHDRAWAL

Presented to THE GOVERNMENT PLANNING INSPECTOR

ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL, ESSEX

By: Hullbridge Residents Action Group (HRAG)

Brian Marsden-Carleton

On 16th August 2013

This document is prepared in accordance with the principles and doctrine of the Rochford District Council Core Strategy Document, principally to cause a Revocation of the section stated as POLICY SER6 – SOUTH WEST HULLBRIDGE.

The broad scope of this PLEA has been given by the Incumbent Residents, to Brian Marsden-Carleton and his team, as stated above.

These powers are hereby given to the ‘Team’ by 3644 incumbent residents of the said Village namely Hullbridge. A list of these residents is appended to this document in Appendix 1

Rochford District Council Allocations Submission Development Plan Document (DPD)**Plea for withdrawal**

We invite the Government Inspector to find the Rochford District Council September 2009 (amended September 2011) Core Strategy Submission Document (with proposed minor amendments highlighted), in particular, **POLICY SER6 – SOUTH WEST HULLBRIDGE** (Local development Framework Allocations Submission Document) as **unsound** because, in our consideration of the Soundness and Legal Compliance of the plans on the basis of the relevant Legislation Guidance in the National Planning Framework.

Our submission is detailed under exhibits 1-9 in this document and we submit that the Core Strategy in its present form in relation to Policy SER6 (6a and 6b) is not:

- 1. Positively Prepared.**
- 2. Justified.**
- 3. Effective.**
- 4. Consistent with National Policy.**

The Community of Hullbridge - Plea for withdrawal is in connection with the following site:**Rochford District Council Allocations Submission Document (November 2012)**

In particular, **Policy SER6 – Southwest Hullbridge**, as indicated on **page 56** of the **Rochford District Council Allocations Submission Document (November 2012)**

Clause 3.155 - The Site extends northwards from Lower Road to West Avenue/Windermere Avenue.

EXHIBIT NUMBER ONE

Clause 3.158- SITE CAPACITY (Core Strategy Policy H2 and H3) to accommodate a minimum of 500 dwellings (Table 2 on page 31) on **Green belt** land during a plan period of 2015 to 2026 (Site identified as Figure 12) at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare, plus a flexibility of 175 **'Tenure Blind'** affordable dwellings. (Cl. 3.162)

This site is classified as a 'sustainable development site' which implies that more **Green Belt** land will be sought. This is contradictory to the policy of maintaining the Green Belt as stipulated throughout the Core Strategy and indeed by Government statements.

This 500 home development will not promote 'Community Cohesion' presuming that the new 'Occupants' will be the younger generation. We are not convinced that this development will be for our indigenous population, but to accommodate the London 'overspill'.

The local Land Agents confirm that the Farm in question is presently not for sale. Therefore, we think there may be a problem with the sale, which would force the District Council to look at the Compulsory Purchase method of acquisition.

Page 158 Cl 3.168 Create a Green Buffer between new and existing development- 0.4 Ha. SER6a

A green dividing strip between the old and new part of the Village, will not foster greater Community **Cohesion** in this Community. This will be a divisive form of demarcation in this village.

Pages 58. and 59. Clauses 3.167, 3.169 and 3.173 Prescribes a total of **3.72 Ha** for Green space and Youth facilities in area SER6a. After deductions, we are left with 17.36 ha divided by 500 homes = 0.0346 ha per dwelling or 347 square metres approximately including external space.

EXHIBIT NUMBER TWO Flood implications

Refer to LDF Core Strategy Submission Document Policy ENV3 – Flood Risk page 85.

This 'site' is classified as 'sustainable Development' over a period of 12 'disruptive' years, as presumed under **clauses 1.30 to 1.32**, there is no proper description of a **Risk Analysis** in respect of **flood** refer to National Planning Policy Framework (page 12).

A document set out by Aviva describes the site as being partially susceptible to flood, but the threat of flood changes annually. The Core Strategy does not indicate the regularity of monitoring or **Risk Analysis**.

The potential **Property Insurance costs** against 'flood risk' and 'subsidence in this area, can range from £2500 to £5000. per household

An exercise on Post Codes SS5 reveals that using the 'Hawkeye' system determining the level of associated risks such as flood, subsidence etc., the combined results show that in both instances, Subsidence is **Red**, meaning these are perils which will either be excluded or a large excess applied in respect of subsidence – usually £2,500.00 (£1000.00 being 'Standard').

And for any areas susceptible to flood, no protection barriers or flood defences will increase the Cost Risk to £5,000.00 per property making 'flood excess' a priority and no claims accepted by the Insurance Companies if this criteria is applied to development in flood areas.

Both results also show that these areas are at risk of flood – the analysis indicator said 'Yes' to '**Flood Proximity Risk**'.

We are warned of '**exceptional costs**' of developments, without the inclusion of 'Flood Defences', will prohibit the selling prices and letting prices generally, making the Development **financially nonviable**.

Insurance Companies are doubtful that flood would be excluded altogether, but this could change in the future, and they have already seen certain areas go from 'green' to red within 1 to 2 years.

A document produced by **Scott Wilson of 6-8 Greycoat Place, London SW1P 1PL** for Rochford District Council labelled "Strategic Flood Risk Assessment", levels 1 & 2, on page 12, clause 3.4.9, when mapped against the national property database Defra, reports that 50 properties are estimated to be susceptible to surface water and pluvial flooding in Hullbridge Table 3-4.(Defra 2009).

We are also concerned that not enough consultation has taken place with the Fire Service regards flood or emergency services in respect of this village.

Page 13 **Clauses 3.4.10 and 3.4.11** Surface Water flood risk is clearly a concern in the District and there is an increasing need to consider the impact of rising sea levels as a result of climate change on the discharge of surface water runoff to tidal systems.

The use of the environment Agency 'edition' of the Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding dataset called the '**Flood Map for Surface Water**' was recommended.

EXHIBIT NUMBER THREE Local Highways Capacity and Infrastructure**LDF Development management Submission Document- Section 5- Transport page 73.****Improvements, to Watery Lane and Watery Lane/Hullbridge Road junction.**

There are no explanations of any improvements to Watery Lane in general that needs to be carried out. This road is not suitable for access purposes, it is too narrow. People find themselves obliged to use this road because Rawreth Lane (to the South of Hullbridge), is the only other means of access but continually **congested** with traffic also joining from Hockley via Rayleigh.

The Core Strategy indicates that the Watery lane/Hullbridge Road junction and Malyons Lane will be access points to the new proposed development.

The core strategy does not state what infrastructure works will be done to alleviate the roads congestion problem. This questions whether any 'Risk' analysis and traffic count has taken place

The writer produced a Road/Street 'Risk Survey' (see Addendum 2) indicating the potential **risk to 26 Streets**, all being directly affected by the development.

This 'Risk Survey' indicates 1521 existing properties directly affecting some 3042 residents (48% of the population). However at times of flood etc. the whole community is affected.

No risk analysis has been performed that the volume of traffic trying to gain access onto the Hullbridge Road traffic will naturally try to find easy access to our village 'main artery', Ferry Road, via other access points.

These other access points will become apparent when development begins, and are very conveniently identified by gates erected at (as identified in our Road/street map, included within this submission- see Appendix 2)

2) Gate at The Priors (facing north at the north end of this street).

4) Gate at the south end Harrison Gardens.

5) Gate at the south side of Windermere Ave.

6) Gate at the South end of West Ave.

7) Gate at the West end of Grasmere Ave.

8) Gate at the west end of River view Gardens.

Gates 2&4 are in development area SER 6a and gates 6-8 are in development area SER 6b.

This proposed development would increase the population to 9200, leading to be over population.

Further reasons for concern are that, the remaining part of Hullbridge (East) will be impacted by the congestion caused by the west.

At times of heavy weather this **congestion** will affect some 5500 vehicles etc.

Our own survey for traffic accessing Hullbridge along Lower Road/ Hullbridge Road is some 8000 vehicles (including vehicles in Hullbridge) etc. at peak times (7-9.00 am and 5-7.00 pm) increasing to about 10,000 in a 2 hour period at peak times of the year.

We are therefore concerned that a proper **Highways Risk Analysis** has not been done and that the Core Strategy has not provided satisfactory information and does not take into consideration 'transparency' as stated in The Localism Act (2011) provides for transparency.

LDF Allocations Submission Document
Page 60 Cl 3.177 and Cl 3.178

Transport Impact Assessment – to be provided prior to development .

The Developer is requested to include in their Tender and Outline Planning Application to allow for infrastructure works at their ‘own costs’. We are concerned that there are no assessments or risk analysis of streets/roads in comparison to our own Survey mentioned above. The economic viability becomes a risk for any developer.

At times of flood (very frequent), in Watery Lane, as a result of flood and or accidents, this causes ‘gridlock’ to the whole local traffic system in Hullbridge with catastrophic results.

We have been informed that Watery Lane is due to close on 19th August for 3 months, please use the above 3 paragraphs to understand what repercussions this will have on our Village.

Sustainable drainage systems;

The existing drainage system needs substantial improvements prior to any links being provided to the new development and should be part of the necessary Infrastructure works.

We have received information from residents explaining drainage blockages due to lack of due maintenance at Keswick Avenue, The Drive, Monksford Drive, The Priors and Abbey Road to name a few.

EXHIBIT NUMBER FOUR Community Involvement.

Refer **Page 7.Clause 1.21 Allocations Submission Document – November 2012**

The Community of Hullbridge is disillusioned that a proper explanation has not been provided by the District or Parish Councils to allow a dialogue between the whole community to distinguish between the advantages and disadvantages.

To this extent we suggest that this clause has been disregarded by the District Council for the reasons mentioned above.

We are now a Community of robust energy, the numbers on our ‘Resident List’ demonstrates our determination to improve our village in a most accommodating manner to satisfy **all our Residents** requirements.

EXHIBIT NUMBER FIVE Amalgamation of Issues**Accessibility to Services.**

Page 60. Cl 3.185 Mains connection to the proposed new development is stipulated as funded by the developer. We believe that the developer will find a way to include it in his costs, this cost being reflected in the 'sale' value which the buyer will have to pay.

We have un-adopted roads making access difficult for the Fire, Police, Ambulance services and general deliveries.

The Community find it difficult to believe, that the Council or Developer will take this issue seriously although it is clearly mentioned that the Developer must take responsibility for the 'infrastructure'.

We have letters giving so many instances of neglect by the District Council and Parish Council for repairs and maintenance citing lack of funds.

Encourage Economic Development, skills, Employment and Enterprise.

This development gives us short term economic advantages only. However there is the danger that inward employment will be insufficient to keep the economic interest sustainable.

Longer term, the nature of the development being only dwellings, we see a disadvantage after completion, the assumed high level of Economic development will disappear.

Promoting a Green District.

The proposed development is specifically in green belt, we are not convinced that the Core Strategy is encouraging the conservation or prevention of erosion of the Green Belt.

We refer you to the 'ambitious' clauses stipulated in the **LDF Management Submission Document- Clause 3 page 33- The Green Belt and Countryside – Vision.**

Short term. The first paragraph stipulates the "openness and character" of the **Rochford Green belt continues to be protected.** but small areas released for development.

As 'small' areas are not defined, we submit that the area **SER6** is too large an area and not suitable, being susceptible to flood (as identified above in **Exhibit 2**) and 'congested' due to lack of infrastructure (access). We are not convinced that the Hullbridge Green belt will remain 'untouched' by Development.

Page 34. Objectives

The Hullbridge Community has no confidence that the District Council will take appropriate measures to safeguard the Green Belt of Hullbridge.

EXHIBIT NUMBER SIX Allocation Submission Document Allocation Development Plan

Assessment of Greenbelt and Brownfield land – see Evidence base Document (Sept 12).

Call for sites – Appendix 1. **Page 14** Clause 2.1 Brownfield sites – see policy ED3.

The core strategy has identified 12 greenbelt sites for potential development of which 2 are Brownfield sites. The sites are as follows: No's 10,15,17-19,115, 124,127. This needs further investigation.

Site no. 66 is the proposed development for Hullbridge. This is greenbelt grade 2 agricultural land which according to the Core Strategy should be protected against development.

EXHIBIT NUMBER SEVEN CI 3.186 Health Impact assessment.

Enquiries at our Riverside Health Centre suggested that the Practice did not have any advance information about this development. The implications can be profound. An increase in the population will mean a proportional increase in Doctors per 1000 patients.

EXHIBIT NUMBER EIGHT**Preparatory and enabling works**

We are not convinced that the **preparatory and enabling infrastructure works** necessary prior to any new development, will also include the necessary **'flood' defences** and **improvement of Watery Lane**. To that extent we are not satisfied that enough consideration has been given to this issue.

EXHIBIT NUMBER NINE**LOCALISM ACT 2011 chapter 20. Item 2.1 (5th bullet point)**

The 'Localism Act' was brought into force in 2011, the community did not have the opportunity to apply the clauses of this act to the Core Strategy and Allocations DPD Documents were published in 2009, 2010 and 2011.

This act stipulates that the Local community has: the **'right to challenge'** (**Part 5, Chapter 2, Clauses 81 to 86.**)

Plans and Strategies – Part 6, Chapter 1, clauses 109 to 113.

Neighbourhood Planning – Part 6, chapter 3, clauses 116 to 121., and gives them the right to Consultation – Part 6, chapter 4, clause 122.

This implies that the core strategy should be

- **Positively prepared.**

It is our observation that insufficient forward planning has been done towards the core strategy in view of the aforementioned exhibits.

- **Justified.**

In view of the aforesaid we do not believe there is any justification to provide 500 dwellings on this Green belt land particularly as the Core Strategy expressly stipulates that Green belt land should only be used as a last resort, many issues which we have demonstrated have not been addressed sufficiently.

According to the Localism Act 2011, we have demonstrated that transparency and consultation were lacking with the community.

- **Effective**

The conditions for the development of the Hullbridge site SER6 have not been satisfied therefore we consider the complete withdrawal of this development for the Core Strategy in accordance with all the issues raised above.

- **Consistent with National Policy**

National policy insists that all the policies stated should be transparent, proper consultation pursued in relations to all the development criteria. We do not believe that proper feasibility studies, risk analysis have been conducted in order to satisfy the requirements of the National Planning Framework Policy. Most subjects referred to in this presentation will imply reasons for withdrawal, in view of new Government legislation which was not available at the time of formulation, i.e. the Localism Act 2011 Chapter 20.

Appendix 1

List of residents represented
In this submission
By
Hullbridge Residents Action Group

N. B.

These names have been acquired from door to door contact and can be verified with the raw data collected. This is available for inspection on request.

Appendix 2

Hullbridge Schematic Diagram of streets adjacent to the Proposed Development

Homes affected by the Development and access points 1-7