

# ROCHFORD DISTRICT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK



**Rochford District Council**

**SUMMARY OF  
REPRESENTATIONS MADE TO  
*ROCHFORD DISTRICT  
MATTERS*  
QUESTIONNAIRES**

***January 2007***



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

SHAUN SCRUTTON, BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI, IHBC, MBA, MCMi  
Head of Planning & Transportation – Rochford District Council

# General Comments

Rep No	Contact Name	General comments
001	Mr I Haines	Please stop holding on to the past and look to the future and embrace our neighbours and their requirements, which actually are yours <u>ring road</u> is a priority
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	By and large, I think you are doing a good job, you have asked for comments and I have done my best, I'm afraid some of my ideas might be difficult to finance or put into practice, but I do hope lots of others will take a little time to put pen to paper and somewhere along the line there will be an idea worth your consideration
003	Mr A Cooper	Have to face up to need for new road from Rochford to Rayleigh to relieve Hawkwell, Hockley and Ashingdon. Here's an idea for Hockley: Behind all the shops along Spa Road (eg First Choice, Somerfields) have land used for individual bits of parking area. Why not open the land through from Bramerton Road through to Somerfield to create more parking without taking any other land. Attract more shoppers and would tidy up the scruffy backsides of these shops ..... like behind Potters.
004	Mr M Cubitt	Look out of Essex at other Counties. Learn from other areas and Councils. The central government should encourage cross council collaboration.
005	Mrs P R Byres	The biggest problem with Rochford and Hawkwell is that there is only one way in and out. Until that is solved further development is <u>ridiculous</u> . On the morning of last Friday, 6th October 2006 there was a parked car on Southend Road facing towards the Anne Boleyn approx. half-way between Tinkers Lane and Sutton Road. This caused a tailback of traffic for several miles back to the top of Ashingdon Hill. It took 50 minutes for motorists to get from Ashingdon to the Anne Boleyn - Disgraceful at 8 am. If there was a restricted parking in the rush hours this might help. We also need a much better bus service. The 7's should <u>all</u> go to Rayleigh and there should be more buses generally for Rochford, Hockley, Canewdon, Hawkwell and Ashingdon. I would not use my car if I could get to work on time any other way. Ten years ago I always got to work ok, but since then it has become steadily worse. I also have to take and collect my daughter into Rayleigh as there is only 1 bus every 30 minutes at some times. Better buses would alleviate congestion. It costs 3-4 times
007	Ms P Pemberton	As ever - more police presence to deter violence and vandalism - the vulnerable areas are known and only short term policies seem to have been taken. Litter is a never ending problem - thank goodness for people like Myra Weir who takes it upon herself to try to eradicate the problem.
008	Ms S Woolhouse	I am concerned at the number of young people hanging around in the streets after dark. They can be intimidating and discourage people from being out at night. There need to be more youth clubs and youth workers to prevent this nuisance.
009	Ms S Nicholls	Green belt should not be released for building - also most of the communities in this area haven't enough or just adequate transport facilities or road space - more houses mean more cars - the roads couldn't cope with extra travellers by car.
011	R F Wise	As someone who has suffered badly due to so called planners - (there was a by-law in Rayleigh which prohibited extensions outside existing build lines, ie extensions upward but not outward) this was a good bylaw, it protected people's right to light and sight. For reasons best known to themselves local planners ignored local bylaws and allowed an extension into the back garden of No 68 thus cutting off my light in my only living room and I have naturally a very poor opinion of any such planners.
013	Etchells	Many side roads are in a bad state of repair, none more so than the south end of Burrows Way, Rayleigh. This is a North facing hill and can be impassible in a bad weather so needs a good surface. Yesterday I dug a large painful of dirt out of the road side kerb where the grass was 6 inches tall! <u>Please</u> get this seen to.

014	D Hanrahan	The area is slowly losing its respectability. Youth culture is taking over and spoiling areas. If not brought under control quickly these areas will grow and unite the policing must improve, responses must be positive and swift. What do they say about little acorns, the same applies to crime, stop it now. Finally has someone been watching television, the amazing Mrs Pritchard would be nice wouldn't it!
015	F A Robinson	Thank you for this opportunity to pass on my thoughts. I also hope someone will read it and not just place it in some dark and dank archive for the next fifty years.
016	Mr R Fuller	The council should refocus their planning committee to look at these types of issues. Time spent by the whole committee looking at all weather pitches in schools, wind turbines it all is a waste of rate payers money. Schools cost a fortune - securing them increases cost further. However, they are a much underused resource. They can provide a safe and secure venue for many parts of the community and this can be done for 3rd capital expenditure. The council should aim to increase use of these facilities, at weekends and evenings rather than building new. I know Swayne Park have very strict restrictions on the use of their field - this is fundamentally wrong because it denies the people of Raleigh to exercise in a safe environment.
017	Mr L A G Dunford	This is a nice place to live, keep it so. Don't over develop.
018	Mrs Gaunt	3 members of my family came to live in Raleigh 25 years ago, to escape the over crowding in East London. Now there is nowhere for our children to live and play. They will have to move away. In this area you have allowed one property to be replaced by 10-15 on the same site not once but time and time again. When will it stop.
019	Mrs L Allen	Close East Street and pedestrianise the road and square. Change the name of The Square for the new development behind the real square as confusion will reign. Sort out the old Rumbelows store. Create more shops in this area not offices or houses. Have a greater control of town centre public houses to create a more customer friendly environment. Greater use of CCTV in problem areas. We know this is not all relevant to your subject but it is an opportunity for us to say what is relevant to us!
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	I think Rochford Council should be looking at the people of the areas and not the money it might make. I have lived in the area for more than 40 years and as far as I can see the Council has just put up rates year in year out and nothing has changed. Do something for the people? We are the rate payers. Stop development in our area. My road, Golden Cross Road was a quiet country road when I moved here, it is now the road to hell with all the mad drivers and 4 roads all off our road over 150 houses. You want to do something, do something for this area, stop building.
022	Mr R Hockett & Ms C Mobbs	With regard to any traveller site, this should be sited as far away from residential areas as possible. I have first hand experience of problems arising from both "official" and "unofficial sites". My experience is that both are trouble with a <u>bit T</u> , and therefore should it be necessary for the council, tax payer to find such a site, as they say in the estate agent bible "location, location, location" is important, and a non residential area is a must. To consider putting one anywhere else would not only lose the council its re-election, but with the police never wanting to get involved, anarchy would spread. You only have to look at those in Crays Hill who ignore the law, to see what type of trouble would ensue if a residential area was gifted with a site on its doorstep.
023	Ms C J Christopher	Develop Foulness Island. It already belongs to Government! What is going on there that is so top secret that a virtual police state exists so long after the ? Two villages living inside a state perimeter that the public has no access to. This is intolerable in England in the 21st Century!

024	Mr P Williams	Alternatively - We live with avoidable congestion we end up building an air ambulance landing pad at the Lower Road/Ashingdon Road junction - it visits that frequently. We have many more broken mirrors and tempers in Watery Lane. We have delayed emergency service response time along Ashingdon Road. We do not enjoy beauty sports at Stambridge and Battlesbridge to their full. We have the eyesore of Purdey's scrap and tipper wagons. We all get more irate and unhappy. The route from the Anne Bolyn to Battlesbridge is the key to the areas future health and prosperity.
025	Mrs P Clifton	We visited Yorkshire where there are towns as big as Rayleigh and old like Rayleigh. Shopfronts were in the style of years ago but insides were still modern. I would like this to be the case in Rayleigh.
028	Mr J Lickfold	Graffiti brings an area down. People caught causing damage to the social living of the community should be <u>made</u> to correct the damage, with their parents standing the cost. As there are no deterrents at the moment to stop this, and it has got completely out of hand. Especially the beach huts at Thorpe Bay.
030	Mr H May	I do not think that the Rochford area is suited for large scale development. There is always room for improvement in anything, but, overall, I think that the area is well run, but we really cannot expect to develop without good roads and these are long overdue.
031	A R Wetton	It is important that a core strategy should not be ? Too quickly, a review of ? Should be made public so that feed back can be considered before moving forward and making communities. Alternatively representatives for local areas should be invited to the Core Strategy group so that contributions could be made during the review process. It is imperative that the majority of people in this area ? ? to the core strategy. This will only be achieved if there is a full understanding of what is being proposed. This document is a good start.
033	Mr R Balchin	By adding property into already cramped town centres and ? Can cause extreme congestion. Putting further blocks of flats into Rayleigh means further car allocation stretching car parking facilities. In place of new property it's essential that ? Is in place and traffic flow is maintained not only for residents but for commercial business. There comes a time when BIG BIG trailers are kept out of Town Centres and placed out a distribution centre, as in French cities (eg Rawreth Lane).
035	Mr B Deal	I am concerned about the destruction of Rochford as it was. I am not talking about as it was in the last century, I am talking about now, perhaps it is already too late. For the past three hundred years if you looked from rear window of my cottage you could see the Church of St. Andrews and the Hall but now there is just the rear of another block of flats. We must all move forward and I know that times change but why not try to be remembered as those that preserved Rochford as
036	Mrs P Slade	I have concerns over the talks regarding the introduction of weighing household rubbish. This can only pave the way for discarded rubbish on our streets, which will in turn once again cost local authorities huge amounts of cash to clear up. We pay to have our rubbish collected, it should never be an issue of weight. Please look ahead to all the problems this would inevitably cause. As a last note, I am proud and happy to live in Rayleigh and love the High Street.
037	Mr A Bawden	I don't understand why gypsy sites are required or why they should be paid for out of our taxes, these people work for cash and don't pay any taxes, crime follows them around and we don't want them on our door step, why does the trespass law no seem to apply to them, I see them cut fences and set up on farmers fields, set up on industrial sites etc, I have reported these situations to local police, but nothing happens, the gypsies/travellers just move on when they are good and ready! Do laws only apply to tax payers with fixed abodes?

038	Mr J Wright	We are only a small county. We only have so much land. Historically we are the gateway to England. No other County has as much history. It is true you cannot stop development, but it has to be done in a structured manner. The Essex Gateway is a disaster in the making. It is known as Essex Concrete if you build a road, then sooner or later buildings pop up along it. More roads - more traffic (ie new A130, now traffic jams up on the Rayleigh Spur and A127). More houses - more cars, places at schools, hospitals etc more waste. New factories - more jobs. NO! Outsiders come in to fill the vacancies and buy our houses etc. We should be doing more for the policing of our area to keep it safe, more to allow young people to get priority for a home in the district they were born in and while we're about it lets turn Rayleigh Town Centre back to a shopping centre and not a lager brains paradise of a weekend. (nothing against sensible drinking).
039	Ms D Quinn	Rayleigh used to be a very pleasant place to live, it now no longer is. Expansion in housing requires more social and transport facilities.
040	Mr D Huskisson	There is a need for more Civic Amenity sites. We are not allowed to use the Stock Road site any more. One should be built near Rochford (maybe the Purdeys Industrial Estate). Rayleigh is too far to go, burning up more petrol than could ever be saved through recycling. Gypsy traveller sites are needed all over the country but are not popular with settled communities. Rochford remains a rural area, and is therefore better suited than most to offer a site for this purpose. There has to be a solution to this problem.
041	Mr McGee	The off road parking in side roads is out of control, i.e. parking on bends, parking on bus routes, parking across pavements, parking partly on pavements, people with prams have to go into road to get past them. Covering car parks into patios so car's have to park in road. This is just a small part of the problem that no one seems to try to stop or police or council can be bothered with
042	Mr & Mrs Mossman	I am please as residents in the area that we have been asked our views on the Planning for the future. For 3700 homes to be built in this area, all key factors in your questionnaire would indeed have to be resolved. However, my family and I are totally opposed to any further housing development in the South East of England. The general consensus in the vicinity is that our right to breathe clean air and the fundamental need for space, has been eroded. It is not our wish to have any further development in an already overcrowded and overstretched South East and to rescind any green belt is abhorrent. We intend to stand firm and together on this issue.
045	Mr R Abbott	Sorry I am late returning this. No council could do more for its residents than give them the opportunity to voice their opinions. I really had to struggle to answer this questionnaire. It stops to make you think. Thank you.
046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	As you can tell by our comments we feel this country (it's Government) has no idea where it is heading - Development, Immigration, Law & Order, Infrastructure, Health Care. All will suffer (further) from artificial development unless the load is spread over the whole country. Please organize a referendum for and against Central Government Policy - bring back "Local control".
047	Ms J Colbourne	RDC could do more to recycle. There is no way for people living in Hullbridge, without a car, to recycle cardboard, plastic recycling needs to be upgraded - why is it only bottles that can be recycled at the local collection point in our village? Unadopted roads in Hullbridge - what is being done about this issue? The parish council has been campaigning to RDC to adopt the roads in Hullbridge - when can we expect to see a plan for this?
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	It is disappointing to note that residents have had their privacy spoilt by allowing developments and conversions that overlook gardens. Home owners have frequently spent a lifetime acquiring a property only to have their plans dashed by weak planning controls.

050	Mrs J Samuels	Unless this government or future governments create a policy of curbing our current levels of immigration, the movement of peoples from inner London to the outer periphery, to the suburbs of London, then to Southend and Rochford and other coastal areas will continue. Supplying high estates on green belt land will not stop this phenomenon and it will reduce the quality of life for all. Local government should be more forceful and work with the governemnt to protect our environment from the evils of more transport etc. Last Sunday my husband and I had to go to Burnham-on-Sea. It took us one hour to get out of the Rochford and Southend area because of sheer volume of traffic on all possible routes. Eventually, we had to travel along Southend seafront to Hadleigh. Please do not make the visions of Aldous Huxley in 'Brave New World' regarding the environment become a certainty!!
051	Mrs D Langdon	We have a problem with parking in our turning people use our drive for turning and park across our drive etc. We require yellow lines etc. Also why do you not provide parking bays on the service road (London Road) Grange estate Rayleigh plenty of land behind the hedge. The pavement on service road too narrow. People have to walk in the middle of the road - very dangerous. Where are any clubs for the retired in Rayleigh? On retirement a pamphlet from local council advising of all local clubs would be helpful. A bus route for the county to enable us to use our bus pass to best effect while we can.
052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	More facilities for young people and working class. There is too much that costs too much eg Clements Hall, bus fares, train fares. Library in Rochford open 9-5 6 days a week. More cash points to reduce waiting time. Supermarket open until 8pm or later. C.A.B. expanded and protected from "Big Brother" interference. There have been some very impressive improvements in recent years, it is clear some people should be thanked - eg more flats, improved public transport, award winning doctors surgery (Back Lane) new dentist, waste collection, Doggetts wildlife area, low on crime, good reputation for local schools.
055	Mr V Hawtree	The area doesn't have the infrastructure to expand. During rush hours all five roads to the West are gridlocked, the two railways are dangerously overcrowded. We need to build a bridge across the Crouch somewhere between Fambridge and Wallasea and another across the Thames from Canvey. Until we get a more enlightened National Government I suggest you use delaying tactics. Call meetings, form discussion groups, conduct surveys. I expect you will need a few years to examine this core strategy questionnaire.
056	Mr S Lee	As I stated overleaf, Rochford has a unique character and I believe one of the oldest towns in the East, dating back to Roman times and beyond. Perhaps many people are unaware of this and maybe some type of plaque or notice board giving a history of Rochford Square, ie the age of the market, Henry the Eighth, Anne Boleyn, even the fact if my research is correct that Oliver Cromwell visited Rochford. I'm sure this would attract interest from people who are interested in local history and our towns rich heritage.
057	Mrs J Williams	In my opinion, before we build new houses, we need to ensure that systems work properly for the houses and residents which we already have. Recycling and public transport links need to be improved first in order to try to reduce the existing burden on the environment. Once these issues have been addressed, the focus must be on <u>sustainable development</u> , not simply the need to meet government targets.
058	M J Jackson	The state of some roads in the District is appalling, and needs urgent consideration. Traffic crossing attendents should be instructed to give more consideration to traffic flow. More parking spaces should be provided in shopping centres ie Rayleigh High Street.
059	Garfield	Before bowing to the influx of foreigners - homes should be allocated to second and third generation (I'm not a racist - just believe charity begins with the Brits). This part of the country has gone down hill, especially over the last 2 years, and to be honest I'm glad to be moving away from the area.

062	Chris Taylor	This area is to be considered a peripheral area of the Thames Gateway project. Every effort should be made to discourage uncontrolled development. The area is overcrowded as it is. The Green areas are already in imbalance with the existing population. The area must retain its semi-rural character. That's why the existing population are there! Homes for key workers are important and putting them on brown-field sites is a solution. This way they are close to existing population centres. If a traveller site is a necessity, it is better to provide a planned one rather than have them inhabiting location by "invasion". A crouch-side site away from nearby population centres would be the best way to go. Industrial development where needed, should be by expansion of existing sites, such as purdeys, rather than development of new ones. The East of the area needs a recycling site. We have to take green waste from Ashingdon to Rayleigh to dispose of it. 14 miles round trip and half a gallon of fuel with CO2 emissions too. Environmentally friendly?
064	Mrs S Smith	I am a windmill volunteer in Rayleigh. Alas when the windmill was refurbished the character internally was taken out of it. It is devoid of any of its beauty, the brick walls have been covered with uninteresting white plaster, the flooring is uninteresting modern wood or laminate - I'm not sure which, but I think it is wood. The entrance is uninviting, the only features left are the original stairs. If our heritage buildings are treated like this we might as well pull them down. The windmill looks nice on the outside, but some visitors are disappointed about the inside. The planners must be sensitive, about the few remaining places of interest, to retain their character.
065	Mr T Bennett	It is to be ? The Rochford Housing Association will take Hereward Housing's provisions for young workers and single persons very much to heart when surveying and planning for future housing needs. Also the provision of activities to provide interests and advantages for <u>all</u> youngsters to counteract any anti-social behaviour, again on the lines developed by hereward housing association.
067	J D Carr	It would have been extremely helpful if you had printed in the Autumn 2006 Matters Paper a map of the whole area under discussion. I am sure following all of the Governments border changes some of the districts I have all my local maps are no longer part of Rochford. One big development which would have a ? effect on the area in this corner of the country should be a bridge across the Crouch which would reduce current bottleneck at Battlesbridge which is a location which should be developed and for the current railway system to be updated by continuing the current line from Shoeburyness around Wakering to join up with ? line ? new station at airport or between there and Hockley. Eventually this would provide a ? circle line ? South East Essex. A very modern ? on the Roach or Crouch ? also be considered as it ? Southend not interested. We do not have a very modern sports stadium where one of the local clubs cricket, rugby or athletics can ? local population ? of spectators should be considered and ? ? provide a ? here.
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	We are sorry if this criticism isn't what you hoped to hear. However, having lived for half a century and of a mature age, in five decades this area has become cramped, over-crowded and certainly over-priced. Grassland and parks are being built on at an alarming rate. A miniscule example of bad planning, we begged for a roundabout/filter lane at the junction of Downhall Road/London Road. What did we get? Pedestrian traffic lights in London Road and a pedestrian crossing in Downhall Road thus increasing the delay in traffic especially in the school run time, hey ho!



069	Mrs B Buckland	We need to support the local High Street shops now the new enormous Sainsburys has opened at Rayleigh Weir. Please consider reducing parking fees, free <u>all</u> week-end, High Street events like the drama/street theatre held in the summer. This could be linked with other events eg. Holy Trinity Church Tower opening. Bring back the Rayleigh Town Show - a really unifying community event we had until early 1970's street markets, farmers market in Rayleigh (the Rochford one is successful now expand). The Rayleigh/Rochford/Hockley area is a great place to live. Please try to improve what we have - BIGGER is not always better. Why must central government impose on us. Rochford Matters newspaper is very interesting and informative. Can you include a 'Diary' page of whats on over the whole district. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to express our views. I hope we will hear the results and have further input.
070	P Robertson	The Core Strategy should be one that avoids detrimental effects on residents in any of the following: Social climate ie crime and anti social behaviour. Not build or introduce aspects that would introduce inferior quality of life for residents ie casino's, pubs, late night clubs. Consultation with residents regarding future plans.
071	P Williams	There should be indepth studies on all development requests to ensure that the request is or has a real benefit. Strictly following rules and guidelines needs to be done with thought as in most cases the interpretation is a personal one not always seeing the whole issue.
072	Mr & Mrs S J Painter	In 40 years in Rayleigh it has deteriorated from a delightful country town into part of the sprawl from East London. Poor planning has allowed over-housing development without adequate infrastructure. Opportunity has been lost to put in by-pass around town. More and more flats being built, with Rayleigh having increasing and above average older population. Resistance should be made to further building including development on gardens - part of Government brownfield strategy. No to more building in Rayleigh.
074	Mr & Mrs Raddon	All these things you want to do and we are still living in an unmade road since 1960. You closed Park school and now filled the area up with houses. Some families have to pay for their children to get to school from Hullbridge this is dreadful. Last week (Wednesday) an accident on the A127 closed the road, all roads in the area were in chaos, you want more housing, more cars - good luck. We can't wait to move.
076	Ms G Lunn	I have lived in Canewdon for 14 years and love its rural setting and close community. Although I accept that a small amount of development may be inevitable, our village and the surrounding areas would be devastated by development. Canewdon, Pagglesham and Fambridge are the only really rural areas left in this part of Essex once they are gone they are gone for good. I have always treasured the fact that Rochford is slightly different than its large neighbours. Large scale building in anyone area or developing a trendy new town would ruin the area and spoil its unique character. New facilities, including country parks results in new roads being built and car parks, our precious countryside should be protected. We should be planting more trees and protecting the habitats of wild life to maintain the quality of the area.
077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	We live in a beautiful, pleasant, low crime, friendly district and region with more to offer and be proud of than foolish people who insult our County and region will ever realise until they come here and experience it, or are told by others how good it is. The political campaign of slander and insults of our county, men, women and our seaside resorts is a disgrace. It is all without justification. It has caused a great deal of hurt, harm, pity, economic loss, job losses, lost opportunities, under development, loss of inward investment, closures and under allocation of government funds. We could lobby government for greater spending and subsidy due to our losses since the slander started in 1988. Only 2 counties in the UK were in existence when the Romans came - both in 55BV and 46AD! Cantium - Kent, which they walked through to cross the Thames to get to Trinovantes - Essex where an advanced civilisation and agriculture existed under a supreme ruler in the only large stone and brick town existing in England - Colchester/Camelodunum (believed to be Camelot). In Ashingdon we

078	David & Jeanne	Following the large development of "Etheldores" when after many years will Plumberow Avenue be repaired and re surfaced following the heavy lorries that did all the damage. I take it that they all pay the Council Tax and that has gone in the ? How about putting something back into the community?
079	Mrs S Clark	I don't want airport expansion. Cycle routes should be extended. Definitely not an incinerator, but expansion of libraries would be very welcome. I would welcome a green burial site. We need a new secondary school. I don't believe we should have to make way for so much new housing in this congested area. It is most undesirable. Green belt land is our heritage and must be protected at all cost, as must our woodland.
081	T S Papworth	Rochford road infrastructure could surely not cope with even more traffic. I would have to move out of the area or sell up if it gets worse than it is already. The traffic was awful in 1994 and since moving back here it has been ridiculous. Please consider Rawreth instead! Travel to work is disrupted daily by congestion. Living on them busy routes becomes a health and safety issue.
083	Mr F T Russell	Our children will not know what a field is. We really do not need any more housing within the Rayleigh, Rochford, Hockley and Ashingdon area. Every time a building is demolished in Rochford or Rayleigh flats appear under the banner of "affordable housing". It seems that anything will get built under this pretence of being cheap, affordable or retirement homes. Anything is cheap and affordable if you have the money. A substantial amount of new flats are being built in the heart of Rochford, coupled with a supermarket and new library. The supermarket we need, possibly the library, but not the 100-odd flats that go with the deal. I believe the thinking was that the people who buy these would either not have a car or go to work on public transport. Brilliant idea in a perfect world, but we know this doesn't happen. Presumably they are allocated one parking space each, but if they have two cars to a household, where does the overflow go? In the local roads? The boundaries at Rayleigh are being pushed to their limits. I remember when you could stand at the top of London
084	Miss M Andrews	Could some funding be made to improve existing schools as well as improve new schools if required. To improve facilities for primary and secondary education.
085	C G Tabar	The Rochford area will be under pressure from Soutnend for development. It will be difficult to resist - Each project must be decided on its merits. If such development is confined around existing towns or settlements, hopefully the majority of the Countryside will remain.
086	Mr M Gorman	Will my views be listened to. Will local government just move to follow the path the government takes for the future of planning, housing etc. Is this just an exercise that has to be seen to be done. So we are now going to live in a town in the county. I suppose you will carry on regardless of what the community think.
087	Mr I Walker	A common sense co-ordinated approach to national regional and local planning is welcome and long overdue. Other public services must be included in development framework with a degree of local control. A pro-active approach is needed to transport/infrastructure <u>before</u> housing or other development.
088	Miss S Thackeray	Having lived in Rayleigh for over 20 years I feel I am in a position to comment on this area. I don't feel I can make comments on other areas as I do not have the knowledge living somewhere gives you. Local development frameworks - developers should be told they can only build luxury big houses if they are building the equivalent affordable housing for our young and old or we will be living with our parents and our children in these big houses altogether for ever - not a prospect I would look forward to and nor would they!
089	J Weddell	Try and clear drains
090	Mr B Everett	In our area a transfer waste station has been operating for some years without a problem. Since August new equipment has been installed the noise from this is causing the quality of life for the residents to be unbearable. Windows cannot be opened because of the noise. I hope the planning department can look into this.

091	Ms P Bailey	I have lived in Rayleigh since 1956. The green belt that seperated Rayleigh from Hockley, Eastwood, Hullbridge, Wickford is fast disappearing. To retain the Rochford heritage we need to carefully consider what can be lost for the sake of development. Look at work trends - short weeks, flexible hours - working from home - video conferencing, do we really need to expand when business is changing. Could we not stay ahead of the game by predicting less roads required - less new business sites and more and more people stay at home to work or travel at different times (not rush hour)
092	Mrs M Hills	Rochford area is a nice place to live with most housing and industry kept looking clean and pleasant. There are large areas of land around the existing industrial estaes that could be utilised for affordable housing. Light industry ? A ? Leisure facility - use it. Keep parks and open country well maintained - these areas are well used and
095	Mr J Britton	With reference to the attached questionnaire the problem I have is that with all the building that has gone to you quote a figure of 900 homes so far no extra facilites have been created in fact a school in Rawreth Lane has been pulled down and a leisure complex and housing built so in short before any further building work is started I would like to know what you plan to do regarding more Dentists, Doctors, Schools, Hospitals, Fire Stations, the A127 and A13 get clogged with traffic for long periods durnig the week the roads agency or what ever they call themselves now don't help by closing roads completely at the drop of a hat after an accident on Health and safety grounds so if you create the jobs how is the product to be transported around the country in a sensible time frame millions of pounds now are wasted by vehicles in jam's. Affordable housing, I don't understand exactly what ths is I understand that labour costs have halved with the influx of EU citizens and I undersand most building sites are flooded with cheap labour which must mean costs have come down and inturn house
096	Mr W Roberts	Don't be in such a hurry to grant permission to demolish existing house/bungalows to build flats. Developers often don't provide anything like adequate parking so planners must insist on it. Otherwise cars will just be dumped anywhere in the area and developers will make even more profit. Look at Switzerland as an example for re-furbishing existing buildings to modern standards instead of UK example of knocking everything down every 50 years or so and putting up new (usually shoddy) buildings at much greater environmental cost. Look and learn!
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	Projects to encourage wildlife, the area would be supported.
100	Mr R Scates	I am concerned at the amount of development occuring in this part of the country. In the area I live (Hullbridge), I have seen a situation where the Senior School and leisure centre have been demolished to be replaced by more housing and a new 'leisure centre?!' Having children approaching Senior School age has highlighted to me that a situation will soon form where the infrastructure in terms of GP surgeries, schools and recreational amenities will not cope with the additional housing. This is also not taking into account the congestion that occurs on most roads in the area. Furtherore, the housing se being built is not certainly in the 'affordable housing' bracket. It tends to be 4-bed detached property in the main. These issues need to be addressed. Housing is not just about a roof over your head.
102	Mr T Newton	The Schools on Ashingdon Road are causing a great deal of anger and frustration to car and road transport. Could training be given to lollipop ladies to think of the miles of cars queing and delays to peoples journeys. I recently spent 45 minutes travelling from Ashingdon to Temple Farm Estate. I also can do from Ashingdon to Harold Wood (on a good day) in that time. Two different work places for me at 4 miles and 20 miles respectively. Road users are just as important as mums and kids. We all have rights of passage. Ashingdon Road will soon need a walk bridge. A car pull-in within the school grounds may be a thought. What happened about the Rochford by-pass, from Sutton Road (Shopland) to the A130?
104	B Aspinall	I'm looking forward to retirement in Norfolk/Suffolk.
106	Ms P Melito	Our roads and pathways badly need attention, they begin to look like patch work quilts.

108	Mr W J Edgar	Much of the Green Belt is neglected horse paddocks and featureless agriculture. The 'no it's green belt' policy should be modified to development plus associated created habitat. Low maintenance once established. Barnes Common West London sort of thing. Featureless playing fields are as bad. Barnes Common includes playing fields in a landscape of 7 day a week use. Areas for local youth to bicycle, skate board, kick football, kites the area behind Waitrose petrol station was until recently the rendezvous for all sort of clapped out motor cycles, no bother to anybody. Further development implies a new major road East West, and a waste disposal site near Rochford. It's ridiculous that its not possible to cooperate with Southend on both.
109	Mr C Fantides	Your voters chose to live in these areas ie small towns or villages and wish to keep these and do not want them developed any further as it undermines the reason we live here!
110	Mr P Nippard	This whole strategy is driven by a Government directive to construct 4,600 new homes by 2021. What is the rationale for this. Why do we need so many extra houses when there is blatantly no space to put them without encroaching green belt land or inconveniencing existing residents. Why do we not take a firm stance and say enough is enough! If we do have to proceed you should take steps to avoid any expenditure on accommodating gypsies, travellers and immigrants all of which have a detrimental effect on any location for which they are sited. No doubt we can expect another inflation busting increase in our council tax to pay for this ridiculous initiative.
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	I have only lived here a few years. I hope to live in my home for many years to come. Therefore the area is important to my family. I would like to see my son live locally and not move away. We are at the end area of the map we can't move further west only east - north and possibly south. I am not sure what Rochford has available for.
113	Mr & Mrs Rowland	Respite within the Rochford area for carers to have a break - there isn't any! Rochford should promote anything that fills this gap and encourage new business interests to look at this gap. Carers often get direct payments for this service, but can't 'spend' the money as there is nothing to access it with! It seems a waste. Supported living - is there any? The demand is there and it is an area that will grow, creating job opportunities. The learning disabled and physically disabled need more attention paid to them.
117	W R H Beehag	I feel quite strongly that the authority needs to be very careful about planning permissions in Rochford town which allow over development; for example - the new flats in Weir Pond Road next to betting shop are in my opinion a clear case of ugly monstrosities, completely spoiling the picturesque cottages opposite - a great shame - which should never have been allowed. Please do not do <u>anything</u> like it again! Thank you for the consultation process, and the plans you get right.
118	Mrs I Sandell	Rochford was once a pleasant place to live, not so much o now our roads are in a disgraceful state. Too much heavy traffic on roads never meant for it. Much frustration for drivers on the Ashingdon Road and Southend Road especially at commuter time and the school run.
119	Mr C Gabell	The biggest challenge facing Rochford is that with extra homes the District's road systems are totally inadequate - until the policy of resisting by-passes is ceased the roads will continue to be clogged especially during rush hour - try travelling along the Ashingdon Road, Rectory Road, Hall Road, Cherry Orchard Lane and Sutton Road at peak periods and imagine the effects this will produce with the extra homes in the district. Its time the local plan reflected sufficient roads to take the extra homes, businesses. The 'infrastructure' is mentioned a lot but the most essential of this is roads - insufficient roads mean inefficient public and private transport - in this questionnaire, why is transport not given its own section?

121	Mrs S J Attfield	I think the Council needs to look seriously at its current policies and view the long term implications of over population of the area. One wonders where a new town would be built that is not in the flood risk area, one presumes that the town would then have schools, roads, water supplies which would then not be adding to the present difficulties locally. Local affordable housing to meet the needs of local people is the issue here. It is also not viable to look at where industry could be increased, eg Rochford Business Park if there is not a skills match. We have seen in the past that Essex can be a blackspot for work and I think the council needs to show some social responsibility and take this into consideration. Local jobs for local people not for the overflow from London where there is plenty of work. So people move to Essex enticed by new housing to have to then travel back to London to work thus polluting the environment and making the situation intolerable, for everyone in the area.
122	F E Wells	This questionnaire is all about expansions - more jobs = people = cars, more houses = cars, more industrial development = car and heavy vehicles. Where in this document is there any reference to the increasing traffic flow problems that already exist and will get worse. More individual motorist - more CV's involved in construction - Brays Lane is bad enough now with very large wood carriers racing along. Presumably the road structure is an Essex County Highways problem and you leave it to them but your housing and industrial site development policy will make the problem explode. Where is the ring road?
123	Mr K Walcer	Immigration should be stopped unless for special reasons, if it was stop there be no need for more houses, roads. There won't be a demand for it remember the United Kingdom is an island not a great land mass, no room left over the edge, like the lemmings. Southend pier should be rebuilt and with a solid construction like store and clement and a river taxi to London be use for work and tourists cut traffic as well and parking space. Wind farm off Southend would good as well, people will come miles to see it. Global warming must be an issue to be talked about for our food needs and future living space and need for water.
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	Please do not allow Southend to build an outer ring road through the Rochford district. Why should we pay the price for their over development!
126	Mr J Jefferies	Transport. Transport or rather access and conjection are major issues in this area. During peak travel periods movement through the district is extremely slow. Examples include the Ashingdon Road and the Southend Road through Hockley as well as many others. This problem needs to be addressed if amjor developments are to take place. Simple measures such as the refuse collection not occuring during the day on certain routes. This would improve traffic flow no end. I know there will be a cost involved but surely this would be offset by less pollution caused by stationary vehicles.
127	Mr G Ware	This is our fifth year living in Rochford and this is the first time any communication like this has been undertaken by the council that we know of. Credit must be given for this but there is not enough information made available by the council to make a good job of answering the questions you have posed on previous pages. Why not use your "matters" publication to feature information in more detail as summarized on pages 8 and 9 of your current issue?

129	Mr A Clarke	Transport provision with up to 9000 additional vehicles the B1013 would most likely suffer acute traffic chaos at certain times during every 24 hours unless measures are introduced to restrict car use. How acceptable would such necessary action be received. Whilst increased bus facilities - additional stops and routes - would be a very sensible approach, unfortunately would be poorly supported and therefore not cost effective. Similarly additional rail services - stations and lines - would not be viable due to costs and operational problems as shown: Increased journey times. No available slots on joining the mainline at Shenfield. Lack of track availability due to the bottleneck between Bethnal Green and Liverpool Street. Much more costly rolling stock would be required which would be idle outside the morning and evening peaks in consequence would not be earning much needed revenue. As for airport expansion....as far as I am concerned that is a definite NO NO. In conclusion who is going to pay for this inflationary development....certainly not the rich and powerful
134	Ms Innes	Keep a very tight control of so called travellers who park, without permission, on any ground and who, when eventually moved on leave the land in a disgusting state. More patrol police officers. Tighter traffic parking controls.
135	Mr C Blundell	The welfare of the community - ie increasing nos of population using the facilities of doctors/schools/A.E. Hospital facilities. These facilities were established many years ago again as applied to our roads. We do not see any adjustment to these facilities, allowing for the increase in no.s of residents etc. Found "Rochford District Matters" very interesting.
136	Mrs G E Chase	Please remember every time more housing is built, schools, doctors and travelling facilities are needed. Why keep building retirement homes, just trying to bundle us oldies into square boxes into what look like "leper colonies" just isn't on. Build places for the youngsters, their need is greater.
137	Mr & Mrs Acres	I think you made a mistake in making Websters Way 2-way traffic. Traffic was far less congested when we had 1-way traffic. Now we have traffic queing all the way along Websters Way. It must be very annoying, especially for the bus drivers. We would also like to have a swimming pool in Rayleigh. Not everyone has a car to get to Clements Hall. Perhaps you could arrange transport?
138	The Occupier	Public transport should be robust enough to cope with needs to get young people into work. This village is served by 1 bus an hour after 8pm but trains are arriving every 20 minutes at Rayleigh Station. Why not revert to the smaller buses for evenings?
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	We would like to see vast improvements in the recycling initiatives - for example - the collection of all cardboard and recyclable plastics. We have grave concerns that the whole of the area will become over-developed. New housing and facilities obviously draws in more people leading to a cycle of perpetual growth and urban sprawl.
142	D Tilley/R Bhandari	The airport should be supported as a transport facility and area of high tech industry. We do not want to see this valuable resource turn into a shopping estate/housing development, adding to the strain on the infrastructure locally.
143	J E Burfield	Housing - If my memory serves me right, there was such a plan to build a whole estate, covering all the land between the A129 and Rawreth Lane. Would you upgrade either of these roads. They should be upgraded now before more houses are built. But that would be out of character.

144	Mr C Bambury	As you will be aware, the Agency's interest relates to the motorway and all purpose trunk road network that it manages on the Secretary of State's behalf. In the case of Rochford there are no trunk roads within the District although there are two strategic corridors namely the A13 and A127/A1159 which connect into the M25 motorway network at Junctions 30 and 29 respectively. Sections of these roads in the Thurrock and Brentwood borough areas are currently heavily congested, particularly during peak periods, and operate under considerable levels of network stress. Therefore it is important to the Agency that the impact of major development proposals in the Rochford area is considered in the context of future impact on the M25 and the A13 Trunk Road. In spatial planning and development control terms the HA has a duty to safeguard the operation of the motorway and trunk road network as laid down in the DTLR circular 04/2001 (Control of Development Affecting Trunk Road and Agreements with Developers under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980). I realise that you have provided a questionnaire that invites responses to the above document. However, I am sure you will appreciate that it
145	Mr A Lysons	There is no shortage of houses in the UK, it just London sponges up all the wealth. STOP EXPANDING LONDON!! Spread jobs and housing around the country instead of cramming everyone down here, it's stupid. STOP BLOCKING ROADS WITH BOLLARDS AND SPEED HUMP!! You block the roads, then wonder why there is conjection - cretins! When you build a road make it have twice the capacity you need now. Hurry up and bulldoze 'Camp Bling' - twice for good measure. Don't leave anywhere/provide anywhere for gypsies if you don't pay you don't get. Why build flats? who wants to live in a flat? If you have a full time job why should you move to live in a part time house? Houses, need car parking and garages, need to be big enough to get a car in and get out of said car. Houses need space for atleast 2 cars on the drive.
146	A C Barton	The roads are much better with your litter collections, congrats to the cleaners. Provision of more seating although Rayleigh is generous. Has the bench where the top of London Hill been put back? Penalties for graffiti, cameras as evidence. Greater cooperation on siting of signs and lighting. Encourage cooperation for rooms in the roof or adjacent properties for better visual effect and no flat roof above the original roof apex. Cameras used to monitor blue badge parking conformance. Help motorists, paint ends of Websters Way kerbs. Install mirror at rail bridge to enable London Hill traffic to turn right, given London Road traffic able to see and give way.
147	Mr I Randall	I have serious concerns regarding any increase housing within our district. I use our roads regularly throughout the day and am appalled by the conjection that has increased over the years. I am not an expert on these matters and have no positive solutions but more houses, more cars, more conjection! Are you really going to listen to the views of your residents or have decisions already been taken? I think the latter!! Please, please oppose government requirements with gusto!
148	L F Wallace	Who are the brilliant minds in the planning department who decided to sell the playing fields to McCarthy & Stone to erect 62 flats? Depriving the school opposite of their last remaining green area, and why, with all the conjection and pollution to which these children are subjected, has not servious consideration been given to moving the school to Rocheway, an excellent area, tailor made. I appreciate that the Rocheway site is near the airport, but come now Rochford Council, these children stand more chance of suffering from the effects of pollution than the chance of an aircraft accident and the possibility of Southend Airport being developed into anything more than its present form is still as remote as it was when I first moved into the area 37 years ago.
149	Cunningham	I think speed ramp should be sited in and around side roads in Ashingdon

150	Ms N Saunders	If more homes are built the road infrastructure must be in place FIRST. Rochford is lovely - any more development is going to turn it into a nightmare of buildings and roads - not why people chose to live here is it? Leave us alone here - build the homes and industrial areas in the North where they have the space and a greater need. Green spaces give people somewhere to escape the hustle of busy life - lose them and we'll all end up stressed! - as lots already are!
151	Mr R Roles	We are informed by our national newspapers in recent times, there is in the region of 680,000 homes left empty. 300,000 of these have stood unoccupied for over 6 months. Is there a housing shortage? More I suspect a contrived shortage. It looks like housing developers have a vested interest assisted by some dilatory local authorities. Local authorities have the power of compulsory purchase. When are they going to use it? The derelict site of Dr Jones' old house in Southend Road, Hockley and Hawkwell border is a fine example of sitting doing nothing. Shortage of land, shortage of housing. Don't make me laugh.
152	Mr S Crowther	The development that has taken place south of A127 is nothing short of distasteful. Rayleigh/Rochford still preserves a semi rural appearance, its important we don't lose it or underestimate its importance. Whether we like it or not the car is king at the present time and the area's most pressing problem is to develop some form of local transport policy. Inevitably this will mean some alterations to the existing road network.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	Hawkwell/Hockley has always been seen as a semi-rural environment. Open areas and spaces, green fields. I am sure that myself along with other do not want to see this area become another suburb of Southend. We need to keep our boundaries and open spaces for future generations to enjoy, whilst providing small sensitive affordable development on brown sites available. This area over recent years has become a commuter bet area for London, expensive housing, 2/3 car families, the balance needs to be readdressed for future generations. Allowing our children and grandchildren to grow up seeing green fields and living in 'a green and pleasant land'
154	C M Ford	I would suggest no further building which would bring any additional traffic to the Ashingdon Road. In the morning when I travel to work it can take up to forty minutes to get from Golden Cross to the Anne Bolyn Public House. Anyone who travels to the Southend area has no other option than the Ashingdon Road and I have spent ten minutes just trying to get out of Holt Farm onto it. When the schools are not in use it makes a huge difference, but any further building in this area will increase the amount of school runs as well.
156	J W Collins	The development forced on Rochford is fundamentally wrong. New homes mean many more people, more cars, waste, and so on. I for one would not wish to live in an overcrowded, congested urban sprawl, or a district swallowed by Southend. We need to ask where all these people will come from to fill these 4,600 new homes, and what impact they will have on existing residents. Put simply, overpopulation reduces the quality of life. However, much people complain about new and over-development, we all know our views, in the grand scheme count for nought. In future Rochford will be as overcrowded as London is now, but without many of the facilities we rely on. Cynical? It's already happening. Rochford is primarily rural. Everything must be done to keep it that way.
157	F I Curnow	We need a new road in/out of Hullbridge. Watery Lane is now like a motor way due to too much building along Rawreth Lane (used to be). What is the Council's plan regarding this access to and from the new A130. Everyone is now using Watery Lane instead of Rawreth Lane. Watery Lane is now used by cars from Canewdon, Ashingdon, Hockley, Rochford, Hullbridge and all along the Lower Road etc. Are there any future plans? This question is on behalf of many people in Hullbridge.



159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	I do not have any further comments to make as I don't have the time or stationery. Having once worked for Rochford Council I could go on all day about things I have opinions on, planning, highways, policing, facilities for teenagers, building etc etc. I do hope that some of my comments are taken on board but I do not hold out a lot of hope, as with our government, the medias opinion is sought and then completely ignored if it is not what they want to hear. So the majority of us feel that we have been wasting our bloody time!
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	I am very concerned at the comment about the Council considering whether a small number of larger housing sites will enable more and better improvements to be sought to supporting infrastructure. Our present road system is unable to cope, both the Ashingdon and Hockley roads have more than enough vehicles already and are often jammed with long queues. I can't understand why we build the accommodation first and then create work for our new neighbours. If there was a requirement for say two thousand employes in say a new large hospital, it would make sense but for central government to decide that 4,600 new homes are to be built whether we have the space or not is ludicrous.
163	Mr S T Cardwell	I have lived in Hullbridge (Crouch Avenue) since 1970. In all that time I and many other householders have had to cope with living on an unmade road. It is now 2006 and the road has deteriorated to such an extent that it is becoming increasingly more difficult to avoid its pot-holes, lumps and bumps when driving. It is also becoming extremely dangerous for pedestrians - especially the elderly; it will not be long before someone has a nasty fall. My point being is that with all the regeneration that is forecast for the area surely some of the waste amount of money involved could be used to make up all the unmade roads in Hullbridge and bring the village roads up to present day specifications therefore bringing the village into the 21st century and not living in a road that a horse and cart would find difficult to negotiate. Years ago we got a small rebate on council tax for living on an unmade road - not any more. Your response would be appreciated.
166	G W Fleming	More yellow lines around corners in residential areas to prevent blind spots.
167	Mrs J Marshall	Alleyways into Ormonde Avenue - bike riders fly through and onto the road. Drivers can't even swerve anywhere. As before - request dividing railings - get off and walk the bike through - safer for car drivers too. Requested large circle of established holly on Green in Ormonde Avenue to deter ball games - if not your responsibility pass it on to Governing body. Make parking on one side as some idiots are starting to park opposite on blind bend and creating hazards, also difficulties getting in and out of own parking on frontage.
168	Ms L Young	I would like to see more items recycled at the kerbside also the re-introduction of the green waste collection by the council. I do use the site at Castle Road, Rayleigh, but often find the containers full, and last week the glass banks gone (I had broken glass to dispose of). I think the Council do a good job, I want to see them fight against any more development, unless the infrastructure comes with it.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	We have recently had to use Brays Lane fairly regularly and it is a terrifying experience. Enormous lorries passing and travelling at inappropriate speeds. In order to pass, as they can't or won't wait they practically go in peoples front gardens! The roads to Wallasea are quite unsuitable for this sort of traffic. Something needs to be done quickly. Cycle paths have been established but they need to be kept clear, tidy and attractive. It would be nice to have wardens for our public open spaces to keep them litter and crime free. We believe the police keep an eye on them at night, but perhaps traffic wardens could include this duty in the day. The much heralded Rochford Country Park is not accessible to the people of Rochford and surrounding villages. Access from this end of the district should be a priority. Residents should have a duty (enforceable) to keep their property neat and tidy (no junk in front gardens!) whether that property is owned or rented. Garden centres in other parts of Essex have cafes but there are none in Rochford District, is this because they are not

170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	There will always be a need for those in South East Essex to commute to work and the most efficient means (rail, trains, cycling, walking) should be promoted. Faster trains should be improved, first stop Wickford or even Rayleigh and the lowest possible (it can) trains used in more circumstances - 8 are ones on Saturdays ? shopping/football commuting times especially 4-6pm should encourage less use of cars.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	Hullbridge is a good example of a community environment with a good mix of age groups - a balance is achieved. Frequent bus services are an absolute essential life line for the elderly and the commuters from Rayleigh and Hockley. This keeps cars off the road - which otherwise will get more congested. There is nothing wrong with dormitory towns/villages as they thrive on evenings - restaurants/pubs/clubs and at weekends the leisure activities are used, football, recreation grounds. Adequate parking should be maintained at Riverside settlements as this attracts revenue to local businesses from the visitors. Rochford Council areas profile should be raised because of its close proximity/accessibility to London.
172	Miss A M Perry	It would be nice if someone of atleast average spelling skills cast an eye over the content before the paper was printed, thus avoiding some of the more glaring errors for example the word 'tenants' has only two n's not three as shown in the current copy, and though there is such a word as 'education' (I checked in OED) it does not seem relevant to any of the District Councils activities and I feel that the word intended must be education (page 7). Also the word city crept in somewhere - Rochford has never been a city and is never likely to be. A city usually is a place which was much larger than Rochford back in the middle ages, and apparently granted some sort of charter; usually a town with a cathedral (though not always) and possibly some other ecclesiastical qualification such as whether there is a bishop or not. Rochford, like Rayleigh was a large village and large areas of fairly recent development around them simply detract from the effect, but will never turn such places into cities. It would be a pity if the centre of Rochford was altered much - although not the sort of scene
173	Mr & Mrs Cripps	More about energy: Reduction of energy waste in properties together with renewable is a must for our future. This approach must be by encouragement however, for new and the majority of housing stock which exists. Councils could help reduce the costs and so increase demand and then production costs as follows: Lobby government to scrap VAT on renewable products and insulation. Support grants for the same. Reduce community charges where viable renewable products are introduced to properties. Reduce business rates to companies in the business of manufacturing renewable products. Encourage development of local small electricity power plants thus reducing massive transmission of power leakage. Heat produced could be used to heat other developments. These are challenging suggestions but we have to do something. I fear for my children unless we change the way we all live. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my wife and I's view.
174	Mr P Clark	Everybody I talk to is opposed to the amount of building being planned for our area. Travelling through Rayleigh, Rochford and Ashingdon is difficult - particularly in the morning public transport is expensive and inefficient. These proposals should be scrapped altogether.
175	Mr H J Rowland	With inadequate water in the region and totally inadequate road infrastructure, additional building in the district will make life unbearable for residents. Ask all those living now on the "rat-runs" which have grown up over the past three years, as drivers avoid the gridlock and daily traffic jams. And will our Council taxes be reduced as a result? I think not.

177	Mr J East	Graffiti is an ongoing problem. Are perpetrators ever caught? If so what sentence do they get? Litter, particularly along footpaths and verges along main roads are still to be seen. I think boot-sales could be responsible for some. A thankless task to clear but does spoil particularly the approach to otherwise attractive towns or villages. I am proud to live in Rochford District because it is a friendly and pleasant place to live and there is a good community spirit. The Council is doing a good job. My neighbour is someone who works hard and gets things done - even for needy individuals. Thank you for all you do. I hope this hurried written questionnaire is of some help.
178	Mr D Livermore	Despite what you may think, people in Rayleigh do not want to live in a suburb of Southend or worse still Basildon! I bought a house in Daws Heath Road that was not overlooked had a wonderful back garden and waste land beyond. We were asked if we had ponds with newts and frogs which we did. We were asked if we objected to more building which we did. The planners said there would be single storey dwellings (despite the newts) but you built two storeys and we are now overlooked. Land has gone from White House Chase which used to be a nursery you are building a village! My grandparents house in Louis Drive used to look out onto Essex fields where there is now a poorly designed poorly constructed estate of box houses. The list is endless. The kids have less and less open space and you wonder why they end up in the High Street pissing off the rest of us with their adolescent behaviour. Just stop the building, let us live in peace and please try to improve what we have rather than make it even worse. The whole area is crowded and rapidly becoming a bad place to
179	Mrs F M Wilson	We should concentrate on building areas where youngsters can skateboard, practice BMX bike riding etc. A proper area well away from housing could be used for mini-bikes, instead of having to put up with the constant noise over the back of our house - in the playing fields!
180	Mr R Swain	I'd like to be able to install solar heating or a small wind turbine, but find the cost prohibitive. There are supposed to be savings in generating the electricity yourself - I'd be happy to pay some of the cost of the installation/purchase with the savings I make. I don't suppose you know if this is available anywhere?
184	Mr T L Ellis	More roads and more parking - this eases congestion and cuts pollution, as vehicles produce more waste as they sit in traffic or are continually in low gear. Better upkeep of existing facilities and parks - this will give the population more pride in their community. New building should be - smart, bright and have adequate parking to avoid even more street parking. Existing homes where practical should have - Front gardens turned into hard standing to avoid on street parking.
185	Mr J K Mills	Housing for Travellers - I accept provision need to be made to accommodate traveller families, but these need to be closely regulated and inspected frequently to avoid unlawful extensions and nuisances by occupiers in the form of rubbish and litter. Employment - New employment should be provided within existing area or by the development of brown field sites. Leisure - a) Hotel and conference facilities; appear to be limited. b) The Green belt and rural nature of Rochford and district needs to be protected at all costs. Transport - Facilities appear adequate, but this may change if Southend Airport expands. Community Facilities - Should the area increase in size there will be a major issue for doctors, dentists etc together with schools and waste disposal.
187	Mrs K Jesty	Cycle paths are badly needed in this area. This would help reduce road traffic and pollution. One or two strips in a road is not good enough. Motorists ignore the cycle ways if they are not a reasonable enough length. Somewhere to cycle for pleasure would be a benefit in this area.

188	Mr A Mackay	Hello, I'm a human being - I live in this area please treat me as though I have some intelligence, do not tell me 'central government has set Rochford the requirement to construct 4,600 homes by 2021' without telling me why? Why my area requires 4600 homes, or about 9000 cars 12,000 people. How the hell do these numbers improve my life in this area, or those of my friends or families? Rochford Council is elected by us suckers to represent us not to represent central government! In that respect I think it's about time the council showed some balls and told central government that Essex - especially our corner of Essex - is FULL.
190	Mr G J Tinsey	The core strategy is based on sustainable views. I would add the following; Any warehousing and distribution centres must be rail connected. Public transport should be more integrated, and better bus services are required. Some of the county councils 'sustainable' transport policies need to be in progress, such as lorry route/restrictions, a change from road only, to rail and water for freight and other new ideas. A new railway station/interface at Southend Airport could also have a basic cross-dock platform for a multi-modal company to support employment, poss - parcel company using air, rail and road! Do we use our rivers for commercial use? All housing/industrial areas should have direct pedestrian, cycle routes, but stops/routes and good links to railway stations.
193	Ms S Swift	The side roads and pavement are in a bad state of repair. Since moving here over 5 years ago I have noticed the drop in standards of these and also the weeds on pavements and in gutters and alleyways especially. Some are nearly impassable. There has also been a great increase in cars and motorbike in the Bull Lane/Derwent Avenue area. This seems to be people using it as a rat run to the Hockley Road and on to Rawreth Road, due to the new build estates there but no road planning for the increase in traffic eg 2 cars per house at least. The High Street in Rayleigh is also suffering with empty shops, and those opening are haridressers and nail bars. A fresh fish shop and greengrocers would be useful! This would mean we could get all our shopping in Rayleigh, hense bringing income to the town. How about a farmers market on a Saturday in the car park opposite Holy Trinity?
194	Mr C Hutchinson	Ref 8 (2) Water storage tanks - sewerage charges usage from tanks for use in toilets can easily be metered, therefore water companies could not reasonably oppose this - overflow from tanks once full can be treated in the same manner that roof guttering is routed by underground drains/soakaways. I believe this is done on the continent - so why not here? Ref 1 - Another possible area for a new town might be Canewdon?
195	Mr B M Gilbert	I think that too much emphasis is being put on "building affordable homes" in the South of England. We are already overcrowded. The whole infrastructure is under a great stress. Travel? A127-A13-M25-A12 - the railways Liverpool Street and Fenchurch Street lines, overcrowded. People leaving earlier and earlier to travel to this place of employment each and every day. One major hold-up and the whole of Essex shuts down. Water? I do not need to tell you what a problem that will produce. Travel up to the Midlands or further North and see the capacity for commercial and housing growth. New towns and industrial sites space a plenty. If Rochford sits back and lets itself be pushed into more housing etc we shall be standing on each others shoulders before long. The unemployment situation is far worse up North than here! Is Rochford Council assuming wealth will come out of more housing etc?
196	Mr A E Hodges	Weeds growing in gutters and unswept streets does not give a very favourable impression of the area to either visitors or prospective residents. More effort required on re-cycling.
197	P McAllister	My comments are a bit vague as I don't know the area that well, as we have only been here a short time. The reason we did come here is that Rayleigh is a very pretty town, semi rural with friendly people, and sometimes over development spoils all that and good people move out. We were very taken when we went into Rochford village so pretty , please don't lose that either.

198	Mr J Clamp	Building for an ageing population is important but not at the expense of low cost housing. Whatever the development it should be around an infrastructure planned before development and just not as an afterthought. Road congestion on existing roads will not go away in the short term without better planning.
200	Mr T O'Shea	I do actually think you are doing a very good job under a lot of pressure put on you by Government. I am sure you realise that whatever you decide thousands of people have to live in it. Unfortunately because of the intolerable pressure put on them in todays age any help you can give them in better roads and services and open spaces will be appreciated. Not too happy with car park in Websters Way, total waste of money, front brick wall is a hazard as you leave the car park - difficult to see traffic approaching from right. Also 'Rayleigh' sign post in walkway just erected - I know I'm in Rayleigh!
201	Mr M Thomas	What ever happened to government and EU regulation to cycle lanes. I was amazed to find it has not included Hall Road Cock Inn roundabout to Hockley and beyond. Was this only to apply to affluent areas and new developments.
203	M T Conaty	Could the community police officers and local police get out of the care and walk some of the roads of the main highways. More prosecution of the people who are blighting the area with graffiffi. Better street cleaning. More litter bins.
204	Mr R Gould	Please stop building!
206	Mrs G Harper	Infrastructure - if you work on a main road in this local connurbation you will know that it only takes one accident to cause a snarl-up that brings the whole area to a standstill. Before any consideration of encouraging more building, tourism and leisure activities in the area, we need to get the area ready to cope with it all. An accident on one of our main roads should not condemn us all to take two and a half hours to go three miles home at the end of a working day. Incinerator - nobody wants one on their patch, but if we keep on building we will soon have to bear the burning of rubbish at ground level on someones doorstep. It might be better to bite the bullet now and start planning for a proper incineration system that produces electricity from the waste it burns. I am incensed at the way some local authorities are willing to allow waste to be shipped around the world for someone else to deal with. I trust that our council will be rigorous in ensuring this does not happen and that bales of unwanted clothing are not sent to poorer countries to be sold in markets there. Local small textile
207	Ms G Yeadell	Government allocated a housing quota for District of 4600 by 2021, 900 already built. Planners and Councillors want 90%of this in Hockley/Hawkwell/Rayleigh/Ashingdon/Rochford, 10% to go in rural conservation villages, eg Hullbridge, Paglesham etc, excluding Foulness. But vested interests will oppose much more housing in 'ancient' Rochford and Rayleigh and half of Hawkwell is greenbelt. Once can see consequences for the remainder; as "bigger sites" eg Park School etc are now scarce will be "infilling" and "brownfield" development - Mr Scrutton described latter as eg 1 house and garden to be "regenerated" with 2 or more dwellings. One already sees piecemeal building of monsters intentionally designed out of scale with neighbouring houses, with the object of snapping them up at bargain prices once so blighted by such planning permission - a backdoor version of compulsory purchase - so more of the same can be built on the remainder. S E Essex is too small for a "new town" which would also need massive new road construction. Map of Rochfrod is a mass of green - your much prized 9 10ths greenbelt, with 3 "urban" centres roughly corresponding to the above - tiny in comparison. You will have to re
208	I Gyres	At what point will planning authorities realise that this area doesn't have unlimited resources and roads etc. It seems that Essex (in the South East) is increasingly the dumping ground for "affordable housing" that seems so trendy at the moment. I have yet to find any member of the public that is pro more housing, can you explain why our elected government and councils continue to press more and more on use. I thought they represented the peoples views?

209	Mr P Le Blond	In general terms, we recognise the description of the Airport in the Spatial Potrait and, in particular, in the Spatial Vision for the District and we wish to acknowledge how the document notes the importance of the Airport to the sub region. We have the following comments on certain parts of the draft. In paragraph 1.6, a number of documents which have been considered are listed. This list should include the Airport's Master Plan 'A Future for Southend Airport - Serving the Thames Gateway and Meeting Local Demand', published in July 2005. You clearly have taken the proposals in the Master Plan on board and the Air Transport White Paper of December 2003 indicated that airport master plans should inform the content of local development frameworks. In paragraph 1.11, there is a reference to previous restrictions on passenger flights due to runway length issues. While runway length was one of the issues, it was by no means the only one. It is suggested that the words 'which had previously been restricted due to runway length issues' be deleted and replaced with 'in line with the Air
210	Mrs M A King	I have lived in the Rochford and Rayleigh district for 30 years now - and have seen great change and development, not all for the benefit and good of people living here. The road infrastructure cannot cope with all the added traffic - schools and dentists and doctors are struggling. Stores and supermarkets becoming giants it is no longer the lovely clean peaceful town it was - its become flat city - with less neighbourliness than ever and no pride is taken now with lots of dwellings and gardens.
211	Mr B W Williams	Key locations for future development question - have local authority drawn up your overall scheme! You seem to have highlighted our needs in general as noted under the various headings ie housing and employment etc they are all essential and are all linked to road construction and transport. They are in my opinion the two main key items. Lood forwards in reviewing your overall planning proposals. The travelling communities need to be catered for, but must be placed in sensible locations and in small numbers. They must keep sites clean and pay rates as we all do.
212	Master J Richards	I think the district is a pleasant place but could be improved by the planning strategies.
213	Mr M Wheeler	Although administratively inconvenient for the council's planning officers - priority should be given to small scale development of under utilised building and development envelops. Dealing with large scale developers obviously creates less work for the planners than dealing with a larger number of smaller developers but the net result is the continuation of a policy of large scale developments which use up large areas of existing green belt and leave the derelict and under utilised areas which have already been partially developed to continue as before.
214	Mrs M Doherty	I've lived in Rochford since 1958, and I'm so pleased to see the old buildings in Rochford Village having money spent on them to preserve them, they do look very nice, Rochford used to be old and gloomy, now it looks much better.
215	Mr T R Thompson	Not wanting to make you believe I am Victor Meldrew, I honestly believe we are chocker block. There are not enough poilce, hospital spaces, adequate roads or any other public sector workers ie Ambulance/firemen to cope. If any more housing the roads would be a traffic jam.
220	Mrs S Clarke	Please see the attached plan of our land which I should ask could be brought into consideration when looking at requirements for housing. As may be seen it is built upon behind, in front and both sides. It was, I believe, erroneously classified as being green belt several years ago although I feel this is very hard to justify. As the infrastructure is in place (water, electricity, gas, sewerage, schools, bus routes) it would appear more advantageous to develop land such as this as opposed to breaking into swathes of green belt countryside.
221	Mr G Hoy	Hullbridge contains several roads that have remained un-adopted for the last 40 years. A scheme to adopt these roads has always been discussed but never implemented. Many of these roads are becoming dangerous. With all of the building work being passed by the council and the continuous stream of heavy lorries now using these roads, the problem is getting more serious almost on a daily basis.

222	R Luck	The whole Rochford area is growing out of all proportion, when we first moved to Rayleigh 29 years ago, it was a lovely little town, now it seems to be twice as big and facilities eg doctors, schools etc seem hard pressed to cope. The roads are frequently grid-locked and I would love any more developments to be halted. However, due to Government requirements this is unlikely to happen so I doubt when your local development strategy will mean anything when it comes to central government.
225	Mr P Court	This is a broad-brush document, my Company's interests relate primarily to a particular site at Hawkwell, which we would wish to eventually see allocated for housing. Our response to the document has thus been produced on this basis.
227	Mr & Mrs Haskew	I think it would be good to develop day time flights at the airport and an additional station at the airport. Must keep Rochford station open! This in turn could attract people who want/need to stay in Rochford. If this happens - need to develop the Wallasea ferry/seal trips etc as well as promoting/developing good walks and ensuring footpaths etc are in good condition. How about getting King Edmund School involved - they do a tourism course and would know what they think could work in Rochford. It would be good to have something ambitious like a dry ski slope - poss where the circus goes - not sure where.
228	Ms A Henderson	As I walk through Rayleigh at night, I notice groups of young teenagers gathering at the bus shelter, and in front of Mill Hall. They're talking and laughing and are noisy. Perhaps they need a youth club near the town centre where they can meet in more pleasant surroundings. But where?
229	Mr J Robinson	The South East is over crowded already. Transport, roads are far too busy. Any 'improvements' only move the problemj to the next junction. Point 6 noted the lack of water, the Government policy is badly thought out but the Local Authority has no choice. It will be a big mistake but it will certainly happen and somebody else will have to try and ease the problem in 2 or 3 decades time.
232	Mrs A Robinson	A lot of the subjects listed I don't know enough about to comment. One other item that I would be interested in would be the creation of a 'green burial ground' such as Woodland Glades, Maldon. Rather than a wooden coffin, a biodegradable one is used and instead of a headstone, a native tree is planted and a plaque/or book of remembrance in a chapel is recorded. The woodland, once full, becomes part of a 'reserve' the one in questino will be managed by the RSPB. I beleive for those wanting cremation, there is provision for that also. This would surely be better than rows of headstones, which often fall or subside and graves which become untidy as the living do not have enough time to care for them, myself included.
233	Mr G Congram	The council should provide managed and policed sites for travellers with the necessary facilities, however, travellers should not be allowed to stay in one place for more than a year. They decided to live a life of travelling so developing sites themselves on land not suited for housing should not be permitted. The council should make it easy for them to book a site in advance, so coming into the area they will know with certainty what is available. The council needs to spend more time ensuring ditches around villages are kept clear in order to reduce the chances of major flooding.
236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	I paid over £300K for a greenbelt property. The threat of the surrounding fields being sold for development is dreadful and would devalue my home significantly. With tax/stamp duty running so high would it be possible to have relaxed planning rules on most existing green belt housing? 35m rule is good but is it always appropriate? Lets review on a case by case basis. Supply recycling to Rayleigh Downs Road please.

238	Gill Tilson	I feel the water shortage as it is now needs to be addressed with priority and all new developments put on hold until we can afford to supply new developments with water, without creating even more water shortages in the coming years, as I will be the first to complain, as the shortage is being created mostly by the expansion of new housing and industrial buildings, and not due to lack of rain fall which we are lead into believing. How can the councils continue to let new build continue which will create even more demand on the already failing water supplies. The reservoirs have remained unchanged for years, but the drain on these supplies continue to grow ten fold, million times more than the lack of rain. Surely the council must see that if we now have a water supply problem with the current amount of buildings, that building more will only escalate the problem, unless of course they are not going to give new builds access to water? Which is the only way we can continue to build.
239	Ms S Martin	Although this survey has been sent out to all the areas, from personal experience the views of local people are rarely taken into account when planning decisions are made. Government targets usually take precedence over local needs.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Expand the roadside recycling - include ALL roads, plus collect more eg plastic, garden waste (for free) and encourage all to use. Help explain to residents how important it is to protect and save our environment and how each of use can help. Save water, recycle, compost etc. We note many of our neighbours don't recycle, why? Target those that don't and help them understand. We ought to encourage the 'house for life' - if people like their surroundings it helps, but size is important too. Provide space/flexibility to allow sensible extensions. We feel 'green belt' must be kept, but relax the rules a bit re extensions. We rent an allotment, which really made us appreciate home grown fruit/veg. Could small scale allotments be provided in new developments? or even existing estates?
241	Mr & Mrs Harper-Ward	We write firstly to commend the Rochford District Council's excellend planning article published in the centre spread of the Autumn 2006 edition of 'Rochford District Matters'. This article clearly explains the issues which need to be addressed to provide all future additional facilities for the district up to 2021 and possibly beyond. The overall requirement being around 3,600 new homes, with an affordable percentage, and all the facilities and infrastructure such as schools, health centres, libraries, shops, new roads, public transport, office/commerce parks, light industry, general industry, cemeteries and an improved airport to provide sustainability. Our greater family have lived and worked in the Rochford District for over a century so we can say we are reasonably familiar with the District. Although we are in agreement in principle with the Council's favoured viewpoint to share future new development among the three main towns of Rayleigh, Hockley and Ashingdon/Rochford to take 90% and the second tier of smaller towns, Hullbridge, Canewdon and Wakering to take 10%,
242	Mr D Batchelor	The council is elected to work for the people but are ? By useless governments.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	All new housing must have off road parking with capacity befitting of the number of adults likely to be accommodated. It should also have solar panels fitted with the developer and purchaser sharing the cost of the installation. This consultation document is very useful for those living in the district to be able to express their views on certain issues that will affect the future development of the area. Many issues will be worthy of a vote. When local elections are next held why not ask the voters to also express their views on key future planning issues by including a questionnaire when casting their vote.
244	Mr P Raiswell	Sport England has published guidance for Local Authorities on how to incorporate sport and recreation into LDF - Core Strategy documents. This guidance is contained within the Sport England website and can be accessed as follows <a href="http://www.sportengland.org">www.sportengland.org</a> then searching on 'core strategy'
245	M J Burpitt	As I made clear in the first section, I am seeking, along with other plot owners on the Rayleigh Park Estate, to build homes on plots 143 to 167 and 179 to 199 (aprox) using The John R Bishop Partnership as our agents.



246	Miss M Seward	<p>Since the new Cherry Orchard bypass has been built the area of 'Stroud Green' Hall Road has become too busy and it will get worse if you continue to build in this area. Building in Shoebury will also encourage a lot more traffic trying to get off. You need to build more inland rather than coastal. I am very pleased to see the country park has been built and feel that we need to continue this around the area of Rochford. The development of Toomeys (Cherry Orchard Way) will encourage too much traffic especially if a petrol garage is allowed. Tesco's is only a short drive away, so why do we need this. God forbid what happens if the airport is allowed to expand and think of the pollution to the area and the country park let alone air traffic noise. I am embarrassed when friends come to stay as the area is so busy and has changed so much. I used to be really proud to live in an historic town of Rochford (especially because of its history). Please do not spoil it (Preserve it).</p>
248	Mr A Presslee	<p>We support the option to focus the majority of new developments in and around the top tier of settlements, including Rochford/Ashingdon and that the majority of new development will be focused on the most sustainable sites around these settlements (4.6.7). It is acknowledged that brownfield land should be identified to meet RSS14 housing requirements. However, in practice it will also be necessary to release green belt land for developments, where it is most sustainable and where its development would not undermine the objectives of the green belt. The eastern side of Rochford/Ashingdon represents just such a location. A suitable extension to the settlement will utilise an area of the green belt that makes a limited contribution to those factors which would normally determine such a designation. The enclosed extract from the Inspector's report into the Replacement Local Plan highlights the sustainability and other factors that support development in this location. We acknowledge that the core strategy stage of the LDF process does not seek site specific allocations.</p>
249	Mr I Hill	<p>To ensure a consistent approach with adjoining Councils, the Core Strategy should identify how various cross boundary accessibility issues, including proposed new road links, which are essential to the implementation of various regeneration objectives, will be addressed. More specifically, the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy identifies a 'proposed new road link' which will be required to traverse land toward the south eastern part of the District of Rochford in order to achieve regeneration objectives in the Shoeburyness area. The 'Issues and Options Paper' makes no reference as to how the Council will seek to either address the proposed link road or implications for the Green Belt boundary potentially arising during the plan period as a result of the improved road infrastructure. Therefore, in order to ensure that the Core Strategy provides a comprehensive spatial and strategic framework for the District, it is requested that the Council's approach to transport and accessibility, including cross boundary issues, is embodied within the document.</p>
251	Mr B Guyett - Chairman	<p>We are writing to express our concern at the wording of some questions in this questionnaire, which are not open handed. In particular, questions 1 (housing) and 3 (jobs) imply that release of more land is necessary, when existing reports do not support this. For example, the Housing Provision Report Para 2.14 says "These figures show clearly that, taking into account a very conservative level of housing provision from the urban capacity study figures, the structure plan housing provision figure of 3050 units will be satisfied. There is no requirement for sites to be released from the Green Belt in the period 1996-2011." Likewise the Urban Capacity Study reaches the same conclusions. Therefore there is not need to release Green Belt land in the medium term. The target required is 4,600 homes but the Housing Report shows that 4,017 are available, leaving a shortfall of less than 600. Fulfillment of this figure is entirely achievable over a 15 year period by infill. The Inspectors' Report makes similar statements re land for jobs. If this is to be a true public consultation exercise,</p>

252	F Harrison	New Town - This may be the answer, but new towns tend to be ?less places; especially if high rise flats are involved. Infilling in urban areas - This is costly and time consuming and perhaps in areas undesirable. Infilling has trundled along in the past and is now becoming rarer as sites diminish. Note the present trend to demolish and rebuild. In any extent such ? ? of development would barely dent the figure of housing required. Best leave it to the private developer. Residential estates - Satellite housing could be established. They could range from small, say the size of the King George playing field in Rayleigh, to the large, as the Grange estate between Langdon Road and Little Wheatleys Chase off the London Road in Rayleigh. Type of residences - could be as follows - Semi-detached houses, 1930's style perhaps with stretched 'box' room to provide reasonable sized thrid bedroom. Small blocks of flats, not more than two storeys to cater for people who perfer flats. Semi-detached affordable bungalos for disabled and for elderly people who cannot cope with stairs and for first-time
253	Mr M J Smith	A recycling centre is needed in or around the Rochford area. Because of the lack of this, more and more rubbish is being dumped at the roadside and in our beautiful estuaries.
254	Ms V Stanesby	I think the whole situation is very sad. Whoever you speak to lately feels the same. I never complain or would sit and wirtre my views to anyone but this is how strongly I feel. I worry about how the area is going to be when my children grow up and am always detabing moving away - as are a lot of people. I appreciate the Governemnt sets these tasks and that people are looking to move into the area but how long do you go on. We are ruining this area. Perhaps by not building people will look at other areas for employment and housing rather than encouraging people here. As I say improve our services, doctors, dentists, hospitals - prove we can cope with our population then extend.
255	Mr S Chilton	Rochford is a great place to live and I think that radical change could potentially damage the place greatly.
256	Ms P Butler	I would like to provide details of three potential sites that we are proposing for development at this early stage, and would welcome the opportunity to speak with you further about them. All three sites are located near the railway on brown field land. The sites are therefore in sustainable locations to be considered for redevelopment for residential use. The three locations as shown on the attached plans are: 1. Land at Hockley Station to the immediate north of the station on Plumberow Avenue. 2. Land at Hockley Station to the east of the station - accessed from the Station Approach. 3. A smaller residential site off Preston Gardens. I would request that these sites be considered for inclusion in a future site allocation's DPD for residential development. If you require any furhter details at this time, please contact me.
257	Mr T Dodkins	I act of behalf of Mr G Marshall who owns land to the south of Sutton Court Drive. During the Inquiry into the Replacement Local Plan, we raised concerns over the limited lifespan left in that plan, and the ability of the Council to bring forward an early review in the form of the LDF. I am happy that these concerns have been disproved, and that the Council are proceeding apace with the LDF. I know that you are familiar with my client's land, and that you have discussed a number of matters with him. I will not therefore dwell on site specific matters, although as you know it is very close to shops, services and employment, notably those close to the airport. In particular, it is well related to public service provision including the new airport railway station opposite. The allocation and development of the site would secure affordable housing provision, together with other potential benefits such as new pedestrian and cycle links; open space; and traffic calming etc. The questionnaire into the Core Strategy asks a number of questions relating to specific issues, which we have addressed

259	Mr M B Rogers	The Council says that flats are aimed at helping the young to get on the property ladder where in fact over 70% are taken by pensioners. Old fogies like me have had a lifetime to learn to amuse ourselves. The youngsters of today need more facilities and guidance that way they will have more fulfillment and the rest of us will benefit too. We need cycle paths so that parents can take in safety out into the country. I suggest at the end of Bull Lane a footpath goes left to Hockley Woods following the edge of the woods going towards Southend you can almost get to Southend before you hit any main road. As Rayleigh has had to forego the swimming pool because of the cost and our summers are getting hotter and longer may I suggest that a lido would be an acceptable substitute tagged onto the Park School site.
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	As I have mentioned before about the unsightly messy view out of my window at 12 Bedloes the recreation fields are always kept shortly cut while most of the year we have to put up with the odd cut, thus having thick grass all over the paths of which they just go off and leave. I am sure the contractors are missing us out more than they should (cut backs not here I'm afraid). Pardon the pun. My compliments for the way you look after the children's play areas. It has great memories for me as my grandson whom I had most weekends since a toddler is now 14 had great fun and also my other two grandchildren. I know you do your best with the money that the government allows. Well done, my grandson is now able to go one better thanks to your skatepark at the old park school. I'm 71 years of age and I went to Rawreth school so my memories are all around me. Regarding the recycling, I have noticed out of all of us around here there are only the odd few who care. Could collectors make notes of those that don't bother we pay enough rates attitude?
261	S A Skinner	One thing we don't need is an incinerator! I would not oppose the provision of a prison - the local criminal fraternity might think twice if they could see where they were going to be locked up when caught. If it was well-designed, it might not be an unattractive building. There could be perhaps be scope for planning gain. The existing Bullwood Hall prison has not caused any problems after all, and has been there a very long time. Pressure for new roads should be resisted. Somehow public transport has to be helped to take a greater role. This will take a few leaps of imagination. Where there is room for it, how about having a bus shelter with a small mini-shop or cafe, so that waiting for a bus could be a less boring occupation. The shop supervision could allow comfortable seating for instance, somewhere like Rayleigh High Street would have space for this kind of kiosk / shelter.
264	Mr K Coleman	The attached brochure provides a summary of our proposals for a Retirement Village at Cherry Orchard. This development would assist in meeting the housing needs of the district on a large 'brownfield' site, in accordance with the objectives of the strategy. Although we are currently working on preparing a planning application for the site, it is a proposal that could usefully be included in the Site Allocations DPD in due course.
265	Mr R Pomery	Many of the points made in the draft plan are inappropriate within a 'core strategy' for example: - paragraph 4.11.5 landscaping issues; - paragraph 4.13.2 energy renewal; - section 4.14 compulsory purchase; - paragraph 4.15.7 deals with some issues in relation to community/leisure/tourism which are development control matters. The draft core strategy acknowledges that the district road infrastructure is poor. The core strategy is an appropriate vehicle to tackle such issues and therefore the opportunity should not be missed.

266	Mr I Anderson	These representations are made by Iceni Projects on behalf of Seaside Limited. Seaside is seeking to promote and ultimately deliver a private infrastructure-backed major regeneration opportunity to the south east of Rochford and on the northern edge of Southend-on-Sea, encompassing land both within Southend and Rochford District. Working in consultation with major landowners and key stakeholders, Seaside is looking to pursue the following: The delivery of comprehensive new highway infrastructure in order to provide a long-term solution to Rochford and Southend's traffic congestion and access difficulties; A willingness to incorporate high quality public transport and new technology, including the development of hybrid bus/tram systems, and a focus on improving connectivity between Rochford's railway station and the town centre; Working in tandem with Regional Airports Limited to help the expansion and function of London Southend Airport, and in particular, to help promote Rochford and Southend as dynamic employment locations within Essex Thames
267	Mr D Pointer	The Roach Valley to the east of the Southend/Rochford road should be developed as a new country park along the river banks. Transport is critical. Car parking at and near stations should encourage the use of trains for short journeys. Using the train to go from Hockley to Southend is not cost effective when parking is £4.00. Small hopper buses should provide a new bus network centred on linking the towns and villages just within the district. For example the bus serving Canewdon does not need to go to Shoebury via Southend - a smaller more frequent service linking Rochford, Paglesham, Canewdon and Hockley would serve the local community more effectively.
269	Mr R Scadding	Representations made on behalf of Asda Stores Ltd. One of the principal aims is to encourage a thriving local economy, however there is no mention within the Issues and Options version of the Core Strategy of the economy, and more specifically how it can be ensured that the District has a successful retail sector. At present the Core Strategy does not cover future retail development within the District. PPS6 sets out the Government's key objectives for town centres and new retail development, seeking the continued vitality and viability of existing centres. This will be achieved by planning for the growth and development of these centres through focusing development in them and encouraging a wide range of services in an environment, accessible to all. PPS6 states that in order to promote social inclusion, policy should seek to ensure that communities have access to a range of uses and that deficiencies and provision in areas in poor access to facilities are remedied. The guidance encourages local authorities to plan positively for growth and development including
270		We are concerned that paragraph 2.24 refers to road improvement around Rochford town centre. These are not detailed but we hope they do not refer to a "Rochford Bypass" a scheme which has in the past been opposed by both councillors and residents and which the EWT would oppose strongly. It must be made clear that the inclusion of such wording in this document does not imply backing at this stage by RDC for such a scheme. Similarly in respect of the road to Essex Marina and Baltic Wharf at Wallasea Island. The roads leading to this area are integral to the countryside 'feel' of this area of the district. The use of large sums of public money to upgrade these roads for the use of essentially two private businesses must be supported by rigorous cost benefit analysis of the return to the local communities particularly in view of the new port developments within Thames Gateway at Shellhaven. It should be kept in mind that the Wallasea sites will be unable to be expanded further without encroaching on what is already protected coastal land described in 4.44 as "one of the most
271	Mr & Mrs Jobson	All wildlife areas require buffer zones around them, this needs to be factored in when deciding on boundaries.

272	Mr A Patton	The core strategy makes no reference to retail development within the district. PPS6 paragraph 2.15 states that LDF core strategies should develop a hierarchy and network of centres. One of the main town centre uses to which PPS6 applies is retail use. Paragraph 2.16 goes on to say that local planning authorities should assess the need for additional retail floorspace and identify deficiencies in provision both quantitatively and qualitatively. PPS12 in paragraph 2.10 states that core strategies should "set out broad locataions for delivering the housing and other strategic development needs such as employment, retail, leisure, community, essential public services and transport developments". Whilst the core strategy does indeed identify a hierarchy of centres it only does this in relation to how much housing development settlements in each category could acommodate based on the level of services they provide. There is no mention of where retail development should be directed or any attempt to identify the level of need and areas of deficiency in retail provision. The
273	Mr J Wilson	The core strategy makes no reference to retail development within the district. PPS6 paragraph 2.15 states that LDF core strategies should develop a hierarchy and network of centres. One of the main town centre uses to which PPS6 applies is retail use. Paragraph 2.16 goes on to say that local planning authorities should assess the need for additional retail floorspace and identify deficiencies in provision both quantitatively and qualitatively. PPS12 in paragraph 2.10 states that core strategies should "set out broad locataions for delivering the housing and other strategic development needs such as employment, retail, leisure, community, essential public services and transport developments". Whilst the core strategy does indeed identify a hierarchy of centres it only does this in relation to how much housing development settlements in each category could acommodate based on the level of services they provide. There is no mention of where retail development should be directed or any attempt to identify the level of need and areas of deficiency in retail provision. The
274	Mr S Mckinnon	Whilst the green belt policy is good it can sometimes be detrimental to the good of the district. Where appropriate the policy should be 'relaxed' where the benefits can clearly be seen to improve the district.
276	Mr M Barrell	Thank you for the consultation on the document. At this stage we have outlined some general principles and key issues that we feel should be included and addressed in the Core Strategy. We would welcome further discussions or consultation to consider these issues in more detail if required, ahead of the preferred options stage. <b>Core Strategy Issues</b> - While recognizing that the core strategy should not restate national planning policy, we feel that the document should specifically refer to flood risk locally, which is a key issue for the district. Reference should be made to the Thames Gateway South Essex Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (TGSE SFRA), and the role that it will have in influencing development locations and the types of flood mitigation required across the district should be outlined.
277	Ms S A Elkington	We have some fantastic facilities in Rochford area, the activities run need to be more widely advertised so attendance is higher. Housing is a problem as first time buyers need huge mortgages to start.
280	Mrs M A Tyrell	I hope our views are noted and that decisions have not already been made and that this is just to be able to say that 'residents have been consulted'.
285	Mrs B E Dale	With regard to leisure. Does the Council monitor the condition of the Leisure Centres in the district? Clements Hall is not kept to a very high standard at present. I thought things might improve once Virgin were in control but so far it certainly has not. The standard in the swimming pool is very poor. The whirl pool has been out of use many times. The automatic entrance doors not working. The gate by the turnstiles not working. Lockers with broken keybands - I could go on - oh yes the floors are extremely dirty at 8pm Friday. I realise the children are just leaving then but someone with a hose and mop would be greatly appreciated.
286	Mr L F Knight	Finance directors distruction of any means of paying council tax except for direct debit or one bank in most inaccessible part of Southend. I can pay all my other bills at post office - water, gas, electric etc or at least make reasonable means of paying at about 6 places round district council area.

287	Mr R Forster	The government targets set for Rochford is way too high. This whole area is becoming congested and not as nice a place to live as years ago other parts of the country would benefit from better housing and jobs the government should be looking at that. The infrastructure in this area can't cope. More people means more cars and this area has enough transport problems. Webster Way area, Rochford, Hockley the list goes on with congestion. People sitting in traffic jams causes more pollution.
289	Mrs J Warner	The major distraction, to the detriment of the whole area, is rubbish, litter and graffiti and vandalism! Deal with these issues as top priority otherwise people will not want to live, work, play or visit the area.
290	Ms E Davis	If this is in our best interest and non profit making, go ahead we suspect this will be the outcome anyway - if there are any dangers, loopholes or snags - they don't appear in the proposals. My bathroom needs a makeover as I cannot use the bath, it has been an ongoing request for a walk in shower. Being able to comment gives us hope but it's on a beleive it when we see it basis.
291	Maydo Pitt	The Government Office's Role Our role in DPD preparation is to help ensure that submitted documents are sound in relation to the tests set out in paragraph 4.24 of Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12): Local Development Frameworks. During the early production stages, our focus is to seek to identify any serious omissions and obvious errors in relation to the tests, rather than provide a full and detailed assessment of the consultation material, much of which may still need to be formulated, refined and tested through ongoing engagement with the local community and stakeholders and through the sustainability appraisal process. This letter reflects our role at this stage and sets out some general information relating to the early stages of DPD production. We also provide some comments on aspects of the consultation material's content. We will take a more detailed look at the proposed DPD's content at the preferred options stage, and would be grateful if you could send us 4 copies of the material then, as required by PPS12, paragraph 4.13. In the meantime, if the authority
293	Wai-Kit Cheung	I write on behalf of my client, Fairview New Homes Limited. Fariview New Homes Limited is a leading house builder that specialises in the provision of new housnig on previously developed land to provide accommodation at the more affordable end of the market. They are therefore very familiar with the issues arising out of the redevelopment of previously developed land and the costs that can often be involved. They are also a major provider of affordable housing and therefore it is hoped that their views will be appropriately taken on board during the progression of the LDF.
294	Ms K Fletcher	Spatial Portrait Para 1.11 We note the reference to expansion of Southend Airport. Our understanding of current proposals is that this will not adversely affect the grade I listed chuch close to the runway. <b>Vision for the district</b> We welcome the inclusion of heritage in the aims in para 2.2 and the reference to enhancement of sites in the 5 year vision. We hope that the analysis that you have carried out of the historic environment will also assist in bringing forward high quality new development reflecting the district's underlying distinctiveness. <b>Core Strategy issues</b> Para 4.4.9 It would be helpful here to refer to the Historic Landscape Characterisation work carried out by Essex County Council. 4.5 Housing numbers options. We suggest that the 'probable options' box should refer to the re-use of buildings as well as land. 4.9 Good Design and Design Statements. The Urban Place Supplement, while a helpful initiative, needs to be fine tuned in terms of the distinctive character of individual districts. This is particularly the case in relation to the small settlements and market towns
295	Mr A Dodgson	With the increasing development pressure and competition for suitable building land and property, I am simply writing to ask that you please allocate sites for worship within the formulation of the Local Development Framework.
298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	There is already too much traffic for our roads. All new building should be stopped.
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	We would like to see an expansion of the recycling collections; maybe collecting plastic and card. You might try looking at Southend's scheme which has recently been expanded. We think this is a good way to involve residents and we hope we will see some feedback on people's comments.

300	Mrs Upson	I have answered this to the best of my ability. Note housing. I was nine years old from 9 of us living in one room since I was born 2 adults 7 children. Council house then in Dagenham then the war, those who married on a list and had to wait till a lot of London was cleared then ? for 10 years, I wonder why they have not come back to help the housing problem ? to Rayleigh so I consider I do know what it is like for people on those lists for housing are told (no room at the Inn, my husband was told that, 4 years ? ? service when he came home again from abroad 1945. Is it just pep talk.
301	Ms K Kelly	2.2 Principle aims The RSPB is pleased to see that Rochford District Council ('the Council') wishes to improve the diversity and quality of the environment. In order to ensure this target is met, we recommend that the Council consider all planning applications against their ability to avoid or minimise adverse environmental impacts, reduce energy and water consumption and deliver biodiversity gains. <b>2.5 &amp; 2.17 Green spaces</b> The RSPB recommends that the Council assess proposals against their ability to provide an environment accessible to all, incorporating multifunctional green spaces delivering wide benefits for both people and wildlife. The RSPB believes that green spaces are vital not only for wildlife but for the communities around them. Green spaces provide opportunities for recreation and education as well as contributing to pollution reduction and flood risk management. The Council should be seeking to incorporate existing green spaces and features into developments wherever possible, and continually seeking new opportunities for multifunctional green space
302	Mr B Short	Ensure that travellers etc are removed from illegal sites quickly.
303	Mr K Hatfield	I expect the council to fight central government on the issue of 4,600 new homes in this area. Hockley/Hawkwell do not wish to become suburbs of Southend and the increased traffic from new development and the rise in air travel expected from Southend Airport is intollerable. Don't you think the community has suffered enough from over development!
304	Mr A Rutter	Rochford needs to be a little more sophisticated like Leigh with good shops and cafes. Rochford is getting very down market and the jobs are winning. I certainly don't walk in Rochford in the evening you need to do more to brighten, enliven the town before it's too late.
307	Mr J Snow	Totally against any type of Southend relief road in Rochford area. If Southend need one then there is enough space in their local area to contain this idea. Encourage more local transport schemes or subsidise current bus companies etc. Hockley is in need of an area or club for youngsters and needs an "upmarket" type of bar/restaurant. Do you really want to see all our free monies going out of the Council area ..... ie Southend.
308	The Occupier	Council tax cannot keep going up at current rates without pension increases to match or it will become unpayable and more of us will have little option but to default. Prison threats are no good if the money isn't there! This needs to be borne in mind in costs of plans.
309	Mr J Smith	By all methods and means possible the Rochford area needs to maintain its very pleasant rural aspect for its appreciating resident community.
310	Chris Teeder	I think it is about time the local council listened to the residents they are supposed to be serving. There seems to be too many controversial developments in this area being allowed to go ahead with relative ease. Many of these plans are totally unthought through, unnecessary and only seem to serve the purpose of making certain people vast sums of money. Rather than benefit the local area's ecology and residents. Time and time again I am seeing vast chunks of green land disappear forever to provide us with another cramped housing estate or another industrial estate. Please think about what you are doing before it is all gone and Hockley becomes another district of London, with nose to tail traffic and thick polluted air.
311	Mrs P A Watson Jones	There are plenty of empty premises which can be taken for new job opportunities and businesses. Why create yet another estate which uses up more precious land.

312	Mr D Foyle	I accept that new housing is a necessity but am totally against land being made available for gypsy and traveller sites. A lesson should be learnt from Crays Hill that if you make ANY land available it will be totally abused, the area will become run down, schooling will suffer and so will house prices. We are the people paying the rates and taxes within the area and should have the right to say NO! I do not think any further development should be made to the prison in the area. I think it disgraceful that the nature of the prison at Bullwood Hall has been changed without any consideration to the residents who live close by and it is not LOCAL people who are detained there.
313	Mr B Sellwood	Green Belt Probable Option : Given the likely level of the housing provision in Rochford District to 2021, the Housing Chapter of the draft DPD accepts that some greenfield development will be required. Given the particular characteristics of Rochford, greenfield releases will also be Green Belt releases. In this context, it is considered that the 'probable Green Belt option' (p14) is misleading in that it gives no indication that whilst overall Green Belt policy will be maintained, some Green Belt land will be released through the Allocations DPD to meet housing needs to 2021. A more accurate form of words would be to add a new sentence after the first sentence stating "Some land adjacent to the main settlements will need to be released from the Green Belt to meet housing needs to 2021". General Development Locations Probable Option (p26) : The probable option of concentrating 90% of all new housing at the three main settlements is supported as being the sustainable option which accords with regional and national planning policy.
314	Mrs C Quennell	Something needs to be done now, for cheaper housing for the young, not in 10 years time. Whether now or in 10 years nothing will change, only get worse so lets get on with it, and release some of this in-between land, and give the young something to stay in Southend for.
316	Ms S Copeman	Clearly define Green Belt areas in a positive way so that people can plan accordingly rather than sit on plots of land 'hoping' for housing development.
317	Mr D Harris	We are hoteliers, trapped in a 'green belt' situation our 34 letting rooms are not consistent with the current trend by 'lodge' operators to build hotels of 60 letting rooms, (thereby diluting fixed overhead costs across more letting units, and thus reducing the operating cost per unit). This allows lodges to sell their rooms at very competitive rates. Market conditions demand that we must compete with the lodges and therefore we have had to reduce our letting prices or lose custom. As a result of this pressure on letting prices our profitability has been squeezed dramatically. If our hotel is to survive for the long term, we need to compete with other hotels/lodges on a level playing field and this means that, in todays market, we should expand to 60 letting rooms. Our green belt setting is a serious obstacle to our expansion prospects which will eventually kill the viability of our hotel.
318	Ms W Hatton	No one wants their backyard developed. Remember we all get older. If there are no nice landscaped easy to keep retirement properties. The older people will not leave there nice family homes so new families can move in to up keep these homes before they are only fit for demolition. Where are all the petrol stations going there are more cars and less stations.
319	Mr M Lang	To encourage people to come here (private and businesses) more should be done maintaining roads, path etc, street cleaning better. Make a better appearance over all.
321	R J Feather	I hope councillors and officers will have similar views as a result of this consultation. The farcial situation regarding Asda planning application shows a complete lack of understanding and knowledge of residents wishes - this must not happed - perhaps the officers need to change, as we vote for the councillors.



322	Ms J Hitchcock	I have read the Rochford District Council Local Inquiry Statement - and I was pleased to read the Council's intention to review the inner green belt boundary with reference to housing land supply. I understand that one review has already been taken. There is so much that seems to be involved and of course each applicant thinks they should be considered and that suitability of site is in their favour. It is mentioned that this site is part of a strategic 'gap' between, Hockley/Hawkwell and Rochford/Ashingdon, but it is surrounded by houses, both sides, at back and in front and has properties between 'it' and the green fields. One four bedroomed house could be considered one step up on the ladder, from a first time affordable property. Just one and a quarter miles from the station it is in easy access for anyone, commuter or otherwise, to walk (as promoted by the Government) for travel or for both school and shops. There is a bus stop in front of the land and it is surrounded by houses. Development on this site would be sustainable. I was very interested to learn of the Governments
323	Mr T Beebee	Rayleigh as you say in 4.6.3 is not capable of further expansion, infilling and redevelopment. 4.6.6 again this is a false assumption. Rayleigh cannot accept new developments. RETHINK YOUR PREMISE. Rayleigh cannot cope with existing levels of population and traffic. Where do the council get their ideas from in the first place. They cannot live in Rayleigh or are they being helped with their preferences by the developers. Your definition of green belt should not be compromised. All developments should be sustainable. Use planning gains to make the developers provide houses that are from renewable energy and provide the same area of new parkland to match area of housing they develop.
325	Mr D Elwell	I consider that notwithstanding the intimidation of central government on local authorities no development of the scale proposed is sustainable in an area which already suffers from road infrastructure problems etc. District councils should fight such intimidation from central government. I doubt that my comments will be taken seriously as on previous occasions I have not received help from your authority on other issues. Bearing in mind the above comments what is the value in a public consultation where a pre conceived mandate does not allow RDC residents to object to the basic objective.
326	Owner/Occupier	Local development framework - core strategy? How about using plain simple English?! Public transport is very poor and could be improved immensely. Need more frequent services, especially late at night and on Sundays, buses rarely run to time and information at bus stops is normally absent.
327	Mrs C Taylor	Planning applications should be put onto the website - even though I don't have access to one - many people do and may encourage people to be pro-active and just to keep people informed. A better cycle network and bridlepath network along our side our rivers and sea walls thus creating access to all not just walkers. A park and ride scheme from Rochford Airport into Southend or Southend rail station - reasonably priced. Council to promote our P.R.O.W - a great free way to enjoy our lovely countryside. Encourage more people to use Rochford market on Tuesdays. Print a leaflet about all the pubs in Rochford and churches giving a brief history and some short stories about the people who used them.
328	Mr A Stones	We would argue that Canewdon is a good location for a modest allocation of residential land. It is four miles from Rochford and seven miles from Southend, to both of which it is linked by a regular bus service. The village has a number of local services:- two shops, two pubs, a primary school, village hall and parish church. Some extra population within their catchment would underpin the viability of these services. The village does, however, have a sensitive landscape setting, with Green Belt on one side and the Coastal Protection Area on the other. Any release of land for housing would have to ensure that the compactness of the village and the relationship to its landscape setting was not compromised. The site comprises the curtilages of Three Acres and Birch Lodge, two detached dwellings with outbuildings on large plots fronting Anchor Lane. In total it comprises about 1 ha. with a road frontage to Anchor Lane of approximately 80m and a return of frontage to Church Road of about 120m. A substantial equestrian building formerly occupied the central part of the site, but

329	Mrs M J Snowdon	I consider this area is becoming rapidly over developed with the facilities for traveling without a car getting more and more difficult. There are many older people and also youngsters under driving age who have to rely on the rapidly diminishing bus services. It seems build more houses and take off the transport in the policy.
330	P Mansbridge	Overall this is a pleasant area to live in but how long can this balance be maintained? We are in danger of being over developed eg Rayleigh. Much of this development does not add to the community spirit and can create social problems. If more people live in an area therefore more money should be raised to provide the infrastructure and facilities the people need. We have to face issues such as i) The development of Southend Airport. ii) The Northern relief road - but not with lots of roundabouts and a housing development on each one defeating the object of moving traffic. iii) The lower Thames crossing. iv) The improvement of public transport. The development of 'bus only' routes cutting out the bottlenecks eg Eastwood Road going via Grove Woods. A more imaginative approach to linking communities such as opening up back roads thus preventing all traffic being funnelled into the few 'main' roads.
331	Mr A C Cooper	2 local suggestions for Hockley/Hawkwell: 1) The 2 industrial factories along the main road in Hawkwell just before Potash Nursery provide valuable local employment. However, parking is a problem. Employees park cars on the roadside verge (as you might expect). Why not build a long layby here to facilitate the parking. This would tidy up the area and make for safer parking - no good pretending people won't use cars. 2) Hockley Spa Road - compulsory purchase the back yards of the shops from Bramerton Road to Somerfield and create one long carpark. Similar to behind Potters).
332	Mr & Mrs Jones	Before anymore infilling and building is even considered infrastructure needs a total overhaul as higher densities of homes requires far better roads etc. than we have at the moment. The Government etc. would like more people to use public transport and cut the use of cars but are unwilling to provide a viable public transport system, when did you last use a bus etc regularly, most journeys are impossible to make and prohibitively expensive and uncomfortable service providers need a good shake up and to lose their monopolised hold on local communities.
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	To build and create new larger housing sites would completely destroy the existing character of this area. North West Rayleigh has already absorbed our 200 new houses and anymore would destroy the area. To have these new developments spread evenly and fairly throughout the district would allow them to be absorbed more easily - the necessary supporting infrastructure would benefit the whole community.
335	M J Darkins	Ref: The Planning process being considered, this carpet building is a bad idea a mass in one small pocket = schools = doctors = access for vehicles x amount of houses = 3 times more cars etc. Therefore, spread the developments more fairly.
336	Mr D L Howard	With regard to the proposed swamping of our part of Essex with the proposed 3000 homes. I reluctantly suggest that if I have to choose one of the three distasteful options, it would be the option one ie spread them fairly throughout the district. I think that Rawreth has already suffered enough, its time someone else took a turn.
337	Mrs J Crocker	I understand that Rochford District Council have been told by the Government to build another 3000 houses within the District. Please, I ask not all in one place, Rawreth. Spread them fairly throughout the district. Rayleigh, Hawkwell, Rochford, that would be fair, not one place. Not Rawreth fairly all around the district.

338	Mr & Mrs Saunders	We have been informed that the Government have told Rochford District Council to build 3000 houses in the district. Of course we realise this has to be done to house people but we request that they are spread fairly throughout the district not in one place, and that place being Rawreth, we have far too many houses here already so much so the infrastructure can not maintain the houses which are already here. We have lived along Rawreth Lane for the last 35 years and each year it gets progressively worse, what with volume of traffic and also the speed of which the traffic travels along the Rawreth Lane. If you have to build new houses, please do so that they are SPREAD FAIRLY across the district.
339	Mrs J Robertson	I understand Rochford District Council have been told by Government to build another 3000 houses within the district. Rawreth can't cope with housing now - road chaos, only one utilities don't seem to cope now. Out of the three options I want them spread fairly around the district.
340	Miss A M Churchley	I understand that you have been instructed by Government to build 3000 more houses in the district. Of the options available, surely the fairest to us all would be to distribute them fairly throughout the area. The idea of putting them all in one place would be sheer stupidity. As for putting them all in Rawreth, which I am given to understand is an option, should definitely be a no-no. The roads for starters, just couldn't cope, is the infrastructure in place for such development. Please make my views known.
341	Mr & Mrs Latter	I want them spread fairly all around the district.
342	Mr & Mrs Willey	It has come to our attention that the government has told the Rochford District Council to build 3000 homes in our area, and that the Council are considering building them all in Rawreth. We already suffer more traffic than our roads can take and have very few amenities for the amount of Community Tax we pay, what happens to these amenities when we have to share them between a further perhaps 5,000 residents? Surely it would be much fairer to share this new housing around the whole district and not just dump them all in one area. We look forward to hearing your views.
343	Mr & Mrs Giles	We have been informed that the Government have told Rochford District Council to build 3000 houses in the district. Of course we realise this has to be done to house people but we request that they are spread fairly throughout the district not in one place, and that place being Rawreth, we have far too many houses here already so much so the infrastructure can not maintain the houses which are already here. We have lived along Rawreth Lane for the last 35 years and each year it gets progressively worse, what with volume of traffic and also the speed of which the traffic travels along the Rawreth Lane. If you have to build new houses please do so that they are spread fairly across the district.
344	Mr & Mrs B Craddock	We understand that within the planning process there are three options at present being considered by Rochford Council. 1. Spread them fairly throughout the District. 2. Spread them around the 3 main centres of Rayleigh, Hawkwell and Rochford. 3. Put them all in one place. We feel to put 3000 houses in one place is totally unreasonable, especially in Rawreth where the roads are already becoming congested due to the recent new developments. In our opinion the only sensible solution would be to spread them over as wide an area as possible throughout the district.
345	Mr A J Stone	I am in receipt of a circular from Lyn Hopkins (Rawreth Parish Councillor) written to make local residents aware of the Governments directive telling Rochford District Council to build another 3000 houses within the District. The circular gives advice on the three options at present being considered by RDC and recommends that residents submit the option they would prefer. Although I am not in favour of any further large scale housing development, especially in Rawreth and Rayleigh, because the infrastructure is already saturated. My only choice is to spread them fairly throughout the district. Please record my views under this category.

346	Mrs F E Stone	I am in receipt of a circular from Lyn Hopkins (Rawreth Parish Councillor) written to make local residents aware of the Governments directive telling Rochford District Council to build another 3000 houses within the District. The circular gives advice on the three options at present being considered by RDC and recommends that residents submit the option they would prefer. Although I am not in favour of any further large scale housing development, especially in Rawreth and Rayleigh, because the infrastructure is already saturated. My only choice is to spread them fairly throughout the district. Please record my views under this category.
347	Mr C Rooke	Is it significant that you have not included a section on transport. I believe this will be one of the biggest issues in years to come. Is public transport up to the need of an ageing population? How do people drive ? Is an area that is becoming clogged up. Where do people park when they go to London to work by the train? What other provision can be made. RDC should be working to maintain the post office service. We have a number of smaller communities which will take a severe knock if post offices close.
348	M Suckling	Thank you very much for not informing us about the survey which closes at Christmas. I realise the best way not to get opposition is not to let the public know about it and then claim no one objected to it. As a resident of Rawreth I think due to the vast increase in new housing which the roads cannot cope with already it is totally unfair to add another 3000 houses to this area alone. It is only fair that the new housing should be spread fairly over the district as to prevent our area being blocked at peak times every day. No one area should be targeted with such an increase which will only cause problems with schools etc being full.
349	Ms C Paine	This area is very special. Please keep it that way.
351	Mr Clelland	We have lived in Rawreth for the last 22 years, we have seen many changes in that time. We are very concerned about the news that 3,000 houses are to be built in Rawreth. This is not very fair, we have had Park School site built on already, you want to put more houses in this area. The fairest option is to spread them around the district.
353	Mr R J Saward	Please do not take offence of my remarks - its just suggestions. I was thinking that making up of the land could use clay and soil from development sites in the Rochford area to save filling up tips.
354	Mrs Smith	With massive profits to be made by developers and the council in regard to council tax, more involvement by the local residents in decision making as to whether a new development is in their interest, should be observed by the council and planning office. All developments should be looked at in the long term, how will this work and look in 30/50/50 years time.
355	Mr K Vingoe	Pressure for an east-west bypass for the relief of Southend continues to put pressure on the greenbelt and its viability in future years. Similarly proposals for development on our boundaries with Southend and Chelmsford/Battlesbridge, threaten increasing pressure on our infrastructure. This is a precis of the Council's response to the consultation document which did raise concern over the inclusion of some items, namely issues such as the provision of incinerators. Public expression in recent years has been clearly and unambiguously opposed. The County Council, the relevant waste disposal authority, have declared that no new incinerators would be envisaged within the county. Therefore it is difficult to see why such an item should be included in the document. That said, the Parish Council through its newsletter and provision if necessary for public meetings, would support the widest and most meaningful consultation.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	Every effort should be made to prevent infill between Southend and Rochford areas. Noises in the press give the impression that a predatory Southend is hell-bent on eroding the buffer between the two areas and imposing development that is incompatible with the historic character of the Rochford District. Should it ever be built, the suggested road to the East of Southend will have significant effect on Rochford including an almost intolerable pressure to include ribbon development along its length and significant infill across the Green Belt it encloses.

357	Ms V O'Malley	Perhaps the government should site all the new homes they want in Wales or Scotland, there's plenty of land there!
358	Mr & Mrs England	Rochford and surrounding historical villages are still unspoiled. Please do not turn them into urban sprawl like Rainham, for example. Please plan a new town at Rawreth. Children could even go to school in Colchester or Chelmsford instead of being bussed into Westcliff like those from Billericay and Maldon.
359	Mr New	There is a need for more general community activity to get people mixing and away from the television. Organised District tours in the summer is a possibility.
360	Mr A J Eisenhower	Regarding transport - clearly people have got to get out of their cars and onto buses and trains. Air travel is not a proven environmentally friendly alternative. More pedestrian and cycle routes are required but to suggest 'roadway stations' is nonsense. The Southend airport station will use up Rochford Station anyway and if by 'passenger interchanges' you mean better co-ordinated travel options into and out of the District it's about time!
361	Mr R M Sellwood	Whilst I accept that the period for representations has ended, my recent experience appearing at a Core Strategy public examination may be of relevance to the form of the next state of the Core Strategy. At this recent public examination, the Inspectors were very keen to have a clear audit trail of a settlement heirarchy which would then inform the Site Allocations DPD. In particular, they were concerned that the Core Strategy should defferentiate between settlements on the basis of their sustainable credentials. In the case of Rochford District, this would suggest that the current approach of allocating 90% of all new housing development to the three main settlements may not be sufficiently precise. A more 'sound' and robust approach would be to prioritise Rayleigh, Rochford/Ashingdon and Hockley/Hawkwell on the basis of their sustainable credentials (ie. range of facilities, services, shops, public transport and population). If such a prioritisation wsa undertaken, the resulting sustainable sequence would be 1. Rayleigh. 2. Rochford/Ashingdon. 3. Hockley/Hawkwell. The Site Allocations DPD would then seek to locate a greater share of new housing allocations at Rayleigh then the other two main se
363	Mr S Croucher	Council discussed the consultation regarding the alternative opportunities arising out of the Governments Regional Spatial Strategy requirements to build a further 4600 homes (or net some 3500) in the district. Rawreth residents have already indicated both in the questionnaire that preceded the Parish Plan and the plan itself that it would not welcome any further development in the area except for lost cost/affordable housing. Like Canewdon, any large scale development would destroy the character of the community. The Residents of Rawreth love the Village for its peace and tranquillity, its friendliness and truly rural character. They hope to keep it that way. If District choose to ignore the contents of the Parish Plan it makes mockery of the Parish Plan Process. Council are apposed to any small community having large housing development against their expressed wishes and believe the best option to be adding housing in proportion to the existing development. It is their understanding that there are no proposals to improve the existing infrastructure and without this it is
364	Mr M Francois	Like other residents in the Rochford District Council area I have received a copy of Rochford District Matters inviting me to respond to your consultation about the council's new local development framework core strategy. Please accept this letter as my formal response to this initiative. As you know, I remain opposed in principle to the present Government's whole approach of national and regional housing targets, which involves unelected regional bodies imposing arbitrary housing targets on local authorities such as Rochford, irrespective of the ability of the authority to accommodate the number of dwellings proposed. We have a number of difficult infrastructure issues as it is, such as pressure on our transport network, our medical facilities and a shortage of secondary school places. Therefore, I do not believe that we can adequately accommodate the additional 4600 houses which Rochford has been allocated out to 2021 without further significant infrastructure investment, which at present does not appear to be forthcoming. If anything the proposed reduction in NHS
365	Mrs H J Springham	The extra homes should be spread fairly all around the district. They should not be put all in one place.

366	Mr S J Springham	Any extra housing should be distributed evenly across the area. It is felt these questions have been constructed to permit council officers to put any interpretation they wish on the outcome - please listen to the wishes of the people who live in the area.
367	Mr R H Noble	I am the treasurer of the Crouch Harbour Authority and am trying to co-ordinate with all the local Government bodies concerned some sort of policy on houseboats. Ian Bell has forwarded your letter of 21 December 2006 to me as part of this process. What has prompted this review is a problem we have had at Battlesbridge for the last few years. It would appear that the traveller community, in particular, may be addressing houseboats as a potential source of homes. Certainly, if you saw the television news recently, we had to deal with a very ugly situation at Battlesbridge as a result of such a situation. We are well aware that the traveller community at Crays Hill has cost local Government enormous amounts of money and it has still not been resolved. We feel that unless a robust policy is in place to deal with houseboats we could drift into just such a situation. Maldon District Council seems to have the only developed houseboat policy and we have, with the approval of Nigel Harmer, enclose a copy of his letter dated 20 December 2006 which includes the details of the policy. We
368	Mr S R Croucher	I have submitted a "Parish Council" comment regarding the options for development and would like to submit a personal comment. I am not sure what notice is ever taken of individual comment from the public as I feel what is considered by any of the Councils whether District or County is the "greater" good. For example 95% of local opinion thought the route for the A130 bypass should not be where it is. Having canvassed local opinion, County still went ahead with "their" preferred route. However, my comments are as follows: At the planning forum last month I got the impression that there was no infrastructure improvements identified with the requirement to build additional homes and employment in the District. Currently vehicular traffic flow east of Progress Road on the A127 and east of Sadler's Farm Roundabout on the A13 is restricted and congested even outside of the peak hours. The A129 out of Rayleigh is also congested at peak hours. Roads like the Hullbridge Road, Watery Lane and Beeches Road, and Rawreth Lane are currently being used as rat runs by
369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	We both enjoyed our earlier years raising our children in Ashingdon and we have both lived in the general area (Southend and Battlesbridge) for 55 years but feel sad at the continual building of business premises and housing in this corner of the south east - obviously central government are mainly responsible - would they enjoy the inadequate roads, public transport, etc - the rural nature has been spoilt and we look forward to retiring to Suffolk or other less developed county in a few years time.
370	Mr G Biner	I am privileged to be given the opportunity to protect and maintain the land that the previous 5 generations of my family have protected and maintained. We own approximately 9 acres in Rayleigh's rural outskirts and therefore my views are those of a person who would profit tremendously if our land were to be taken off of greenbelt. However, our view is that this land should be passed on to future generations and not cashing in to make a huge profit that would lose Rayleigh's rural assets forever.

# **1. HOUSING**

Where should land be released from the green belt? Should the Council continue to develop in and around Rochford / Ashingdon, Hockley / Hawkwell and Rayleigh? Should we think about allocating land for a new town? What other options are there?

Rep No	Contact Name	Housing Comments
001	Mr I Haines	Ashingdon - Canewdon - Hawkwell - Stambridge
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	A firm stand against the use of any green belt for housing and standstill should be called on any more large scale development. Other options are the same as private development, ie, the purchase of any sites suitable for developemnt and quickly putting it into use. Don't sell any more council properties, if tenants wish to buy give a <u>small</u> grant for them to move on, retain the property - upgrade it - yes, it would be money well spent.
003	Mr A Cooper	Rochford, Ashingdon, Hockley and Hawkwell are saturated and the only road between Hockley and Rayleigh is totally congested at peak times. Look further out - Fambridge, Stambridge, Canewdon but must have new roads, schools, doctors and most important - <u>hospital NOT</u> more shops
004	Mr M Cubitt	It should NOT be released. The green belt was assigned for a good reason. Rather than build on it, redevelop derilict sites and reduce the intake of people, especially those requireing housing benefit, stealing homes from those who cannot afford to buy. Central government should rethink.
005	Mrs P R Byres	Land alongside Cherry Orchard Lane could be developed. However, apart from this there should be <u>no more development in Ashingdon and Rochford unless there is serious improvement to the road structure in this area.</u> The Governments directive to build 4,600 houses in this area is totally unrealistic and impractical. If somewhere has to be provided for travellers they should be charged for staying.
007	Ms P Pemberton	No!! The area is already overcrowded with barely sufficient green fields and countryside to cover existing needs. Sorry - no comment as to other options. People with a 'second' home in our areas should be penalised. Houses not lived in permanently should be investigated
008	Ms S Woolhouse	Between Little Wheatleys and Chelmsford Road
009	Ms S Nicholls	Land from green belt shouldn't be released at all and there is no where to put a new town or the necessary transport facilities for it.
010	Mr A Devlin	No, what is the point in more houses when the crrrent roads, the doctors etc cannot cope with the number of people
011	R F Wise	As a Rayleigh resident since 1956 I have watched with horror the erosion of Green Belt land in this district in spite of politicians promises to retain. Rayleigh now is becoming a dormitary town with roads approaching gridlock, electric supply is now subject to power cuts due to excessive numbers of users, flooding is becoming more frequent due to excess of hard surfaces - a new town in Foulness which could be increased in size by reclamation from the sea would be preferable to any further development in this area
012	G Hemmings	In fill sites such as the development just refused planning permission at No. 1 Harper Way even though it was recommended for acceptance by the planning office <u>why was this</u>
013	Etchells	No, no, no land should not be released from Green Belt. No more development. The North East of England would be a good place to develop



014	D Hanrahan	I do not agree further green belt should be used. Why. Because our roads, schools, doctors and other services are poor now. Roads are cracking up and over used. Schools are degrading the area especially King Edmunds with their lack of responsibility for the neighbourhood. Doctors lists are full. More people more trouble, same facilities especially policing. Not on. Development where industrial estates are currently being used only. As for a new town, and what would we do with the new old town we all love and patronise, no new town, having seen Basildon, Harlow and a few others it means trouble. Other options look in any estate agent plenty of houses for sale, adequate for the demands of "everyday" people. There is enough provision for, the old, the sick, the idle and the single parent element any more would increase council tax.
015	F A Robinson	In my opinion land should not be released from Green Belt. The Council has not done any development ni Rochford/Ashingdon/Hockley/Hawkwell or Rayleigh to the best of my knowledge, the Council has been persuaded to allow developers to build buildings which they will get well paid for, while the relevant councils get very little for. In my opinion, there is no need of a new Town in this area. Reduce immigration.
016	Mr R Fuller	Firstly we should look for gaps in towns for small development (4-10 houses). This won't satisfy all 4600 but is the most painless way to get housing in. A new town is ok providing it comes with all amenities and a miniture of luxury and affordable houses. We don't want to build something that will be a ghetto in 15 years. As for location, you should ignore all responses that show a 'not in my back yard' tendency (eg. people in Rayleigh saying build in Rochford)
017	Mr L A G Dunford	No more land if possible. No. Not a lot we are rapidly becoming a part of Southend
018	Mrs Gaunt	I think <u>NO</u> land should be released from the <u>Green Belt</u> and no more development should take place in Ashingdon and Rochford in particular as it has been developed ten fold in the last few years - enough is enough.
019	Mrs L Allen	I feel strongly that Rawreth Lane area has already reached its absolute capacity. <u>Schools, Services and Roads</u> are at breaking point - Build 3 plus bedroomed properties there will be at least 2 children per household you <u>closed Park School</u> to build <u>houses</u> . Traffic try getting along Rawreth Lane/Hullbridge Road/Downhall between 7.30-9am 4-6pm. Poor bus route - no room to breath. Why not use land on new road between Hall Road and Aviation Way and Tesco's <u>NO TO A NEW TOWN!</u> London Road area is also <u>FULL</u>
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	There is too much compacted development in the centre of Rochford town. We think the infrastructure will suffer. Do you know how mahy empty properties are in your district? This includes private (compulsary purchase!) as well as rented. Why are they empty? Is there any brown belt land available?
021	Mr P Jermyn	No for all the above
022	Mr R Hockett & Ms C Mobbs	<u>NO land should be released from the Green Belt. This is a Government problem, not Rochford District Council. Additional housing should be challenged - we only need extra housing because the uk government is intent on receiving hundreds of thousands of overseas immigrants - build around 10 Downing Street and Buckingham Palace.</u>
023	Ms C J Christopher	Hands off Green Belt. Use of underdeveloped sites in the Hospital centre area of Rochford Town has been tastefully done and adds good housing unobtrusively taking Green Belt will ruin the 'country' feel of the town for all of us. No new towns - Basildon is bad enough!

024	Mr P Williams	Absolutely no further housing should be sanctioned until the traffic chaos during school morning and afternoon hour and the problem is caused by 1) Double queuing (timewise) outside Holt Farm Primary School as the automatic lights go red, even when the lollipop lady has no children to help - The Panda/Pelican/Tucan crossing lights need to be worked by her, not in competition to her. 2) The bottleneck between the fire station and the Anne Bolyn needs dual carriageway or a by pass, all traffic from Southend and Shoeburyness to Hullbridge, Hawkwell, Fambridge, Ashingdon, Canewdon, Wallasea, Stambridge, Lower Hockley, Rochford and through traffic to Battlesbridge, Rettendon, Wickford, Chelmsford and the Dengie Peninsular including Woodham Ferrers fight through this daily morning and evening - its madness and when there is a parked car, road works or an accident - it's gridlock. <u>Temporary measure</u> re-style Anne Bolyn junction to a fastrak system changing priorities at different times of day to match direction of volume and giving priority to the volume
025	Mrs P Clifton	No Rayleigh and surrounding district built up enough. Leave Green Belt alone!
026	Mr A Lantaff	It would be better to use Farmland than the few remaining 'wilderness' areas. If green belt land <u>has</u> to be used the Rochford/Ashingdon area is probably most practical. I don't think there is enough space for a new town. Is the council searching hard enough for 'brownfield' sites?
027	Mr B Fuller	No more land should be released. Definitely no new town - we are already over populated. Planning permissions seem to be rather lax.
028	Mr J Lickfold	Green Belt should <u>never</u> be touched. <u>New Town</u> If it's based on Basildon <u>NO</u>
029	Mr White	No Green Belt land should be released. There is enough brown field sites which should be developed first. Also, scrap Southend Airport which is barely used, and build all houses on there. If extra capacity for air travel is released build the extra runway at Stansted - why have 2 airports so close to each other.
030	Mr H May	Sutton Road adjoining trading estate. I think our historic road system is not suitable to carry any more traffic from new development. Our 'corner' of Essex is not suitable for a new town. There are limited options for smaller developments.
031	A R Wetton	Green Belt land should only be considered as a <u>last resort</u> and not as an option at this early stage. Other option: reclaiming land from sea and mud flats. New town would be too much cost for infrastructure try to use existing.
032	J Morley	Around Sutton Road area because there is a lot more Green Belt around there, also there is a need for more shops so people don't have to travel into Southend for their weekly shopping.
033	Mr R Balchin	Ashingdon/Hockley but infrastructure is of prime importance
034	Mr Hart	No to all
035	Mr B Deal	No, unless you want to destroy any character that yet remains of Rochford you should stop. All it needs is a slight hold up and all traffic is brought to a stop. Enough is enough.
036	Mrs P Slade	I can only speak for Rayleigh and believe the only land to be released should be restricted to areas already concreted over. No new fields/grass land should be built on.
037	Mr A Bawden	Land should not be released from Green Belt and the Council should not continue to develop in and around the above stated areas, the current existing infrastructure can not cope with the population we already have, without adding to it! (There is lots of land in the North of England and Scotland, you need to regenerate those areas).
038	Mr J Wright	Land should not be released from the Green Belt. We have not got enough and is the thin edge of a wedge. We have a lot of areas within towns we could build on a lot of small plots can add up to a big one.
039	Ms D Quinn	Not at all from Green Belt

040	Mr D Huskisson	The Ashingdon Road/Hockley/Rayleigh corridor surely cannot sustain any more traffic. This rules out development in satellite towns and villages feeding into this corridor (Canewdon, Pagelsham, Stambridge, Hullbridge, Farnbridge) as well as developing open land bordering the main traffic route itself (Hawkwell, Ashingdon, Hockley, Bullwood/Hambro, etc). I cannot comment on Great Wakering, Barling, Foulness. My perception however, is that the A127 cannot take any more commuter traffic east of the Southend Borough boundary. Development closer to A130/A127 junction may be the best site for achieving a satisfactory blend of housing and all-important infrastructure.
041	Mr McGee	Do not release any more Green Belt. Rayleigh is overdeveloped, there is a lot of areas in Rochford and Hockley
043	Mr M Yorke Wade	Should not release green belt left the South East is over populated. There is run down areas which should be regenerated.
044	Mrs R Beaumont	What makes Rochford area special is its size, to drive over the airport bridge after a day's work is like walking into an open space, its refreshing, we don't want to lose that.
045	Mr R Abbott	Continue to develop in and around Rochford, Ashingdon, Hockley and Hawkwell and Rayleigh. No new towns please. There are no other options.
046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	The central Government policy of developing the South East of England is fundamentally wrong - it is already overcrowded with a stretched infrastructure. Why target the most dense/expensive real estate area when there is room Nationwide - small local development in many places is better than giant development in one place (obvious!!).
047	Ms J Colbourne	No land should be released from green belt - this makes a mockery of the green belt scheme. There has already been too much development in the area - the housing estate off Rawreth Lane is a prime example - it is not yet finished but traffic has already over loaded this road.
048	Mr S Reeves	We should not be developing green belt. The infrastructure can't cope as it is, build more homes at the detriment to the present community. How on earth can we sustain another new town. The place is over crowded as it is. Develop further at your peril!!
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	No land should be released from the Green Belt. No the council should not develop in and around Roch/Ash/Hoc/Haw/Ray the area is too built up already. No land should be allocated for a new town. Only build on brown field sites.
050	Mrs J Samuels	No! No! No! The Rochford District still retains some green belt as opposed to Southend District which is concrete jungle up to its boundaries. Otherwise you would have to travel nearer to London to places like Epping and Ongar. We should resist the pressure to keep expanding and a new town an anathema.
051	Mrs D Langdon	No more development. No new land for any new town. No more Green Belt to be used.
052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	West of Rayleigh appears the common answer. Careful re-use of Brownfield sites means less trouble. We are full up from expensive properties; there is an urgent need for housing for working class people. Those who oppose fair play on housing, should be named and shamed.
053	E Winn	Green belt land should stay as green belt. A new town round this area will cause grid lock
054	Mr & Mrs Todman	No land should be released in the Green Belt. The Council should not do any development. The South East cannot sustain a new Town. Any new development should be infill development within.
055	Mr V Hawtree	Please go to any other comments
056	Mr S Lee	Rochford has its own unique character. Although housing is necessary it would be a shame to see more Countryside swallowed up. I moved here 2 and a half years ago from Ilford and still appreciate walking up the road to see trees, grass and open land.

057	Mrs J Williams	Land should not be released from the green belt. The new housing should be spread equally across the whole district. We do not need a new town. Where possible, existing sites should be redeveloped eg. Sites which have derelict buildings on them.
058	M J Jackson	Rayleigh is already log jammed between 8.15-9.15am and 3-5.30-6pm. Until services, particularly road systems have been greatly improved <u>NO</u> release of Green Belt land must be considered. Only infill or redevelopment to be allowed.
059	Garfield	No. I believe Rochford and surrounding areas have had enough development. More will only increase traffic on the roads, adding to the congestion.
060	Mr S J Herbert	No land should be released from the Green Belt. Ie no new town traffic is a major problem already!!
061	Mr G W Slaughter	No further large development in Rayleigh
062	Chris Taylor	A holistic approach must be made in considering expansion. Do transport, schools, hospitals, roads expand too? Unlikely if past experience is a guide. The areas mentioned cannot support more growth, except for the possibility of 'brown field' development. In this region the capability of East West Links A127/A13/A12 are a serious restriction.
063	Mr B A Stammers	Large gardens in the green belt (brown) should be allowed development as it would help to maintain the numbers required for local schools and shops. My garden (1 Acre) and my neighbours (2.6 Acres) are on the edge of the green belt and built up at the right hand side and bottom and could be developed to the advantage of us in the village.
064	Mrs S Smith	Before releasing more green belt there is still brownfield sites still to be used. The infrastructure round the options above are not capable with coping now eg roads, water, sewage, schools and hospitals. There is a lack of community centres, parks etc as well. A new town should be considered now, and all the infrastructure, planned and roads, shops, doctors surgeries etc planned as well. May I suggest north of Poynters Lane and incorporating Great Wakering. On the map I have in front of me (A-Z street atlas) I see there is a small industrial estate, and maybe the railway could be extended out from Shoeburyness. Hullbridge could also be developed more.
065	Mr T Bennett	Green belt land <u>must</u> be released <u>sparingly</u> and only when <u>all</u> possible brown field sites have been rigourously examined as alternative sites for such re-development. <u>No</u> "new town" please! Consider probabilities for "law and order" violations.
066	Mr G Langhorn	There should be no surrender to Government demands for more houses to be built in theRochford area. Green Belt land should remain green belt. Rochford area is if anything over-developed now. The roads and parking cannot cope. Public transport is inadequate, and expensive. Once a field, woodland natural scrubland is built on it is gone forever where in future will we grow crops or graze animals.
067	J D Carr	The only Green Belt land which should be released in my opinion would be around one of the smaller village boundaries such as Barling or Paglesham depending of course on the flood plain around these areas. In addition an improvement could be made between the road at Stambridge back to the village. Whenever, application is made for new residential housing following the demolition of a current building every effort should be made for two properties to be built on that site. If not then ? type properties not that ? should be considered. Land betwen Hatifled Estate, railway and A130 could also be ? on basis that ? land ? ?
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	Absolutely no more building or developing. We have lived in Hullbridge/Rayleigh for 50 years. Essex (and particularly this immediate area) is completely saturated. Schools, hospitals, police utilities etc are stretched to breaking point. Options? A complete halt to any more development.
069	Mrs B Buckland	Why has central government set Rochford DC to build 4,600 new homes in an already densly populated area? Rayleigh (where I have lived since 1958) is already too big. Traffic congestion, pollution and noise are already a nuisance to us all. Green Belt land is too precious to release. And as for a new town - will it be a Basildon or a Notley Village? Where would it be - Wallasea or Foulness?

070	P Robertson	Rayleigh and the surrounding area has a far too high population density currently and Rayleigh centre is a constant traffic jam. We have had constant problems with sewage system locally so these services would not cope. We need to retain Green Belt land. The south east Essex is far too densely populated at the moment. Any increase would be a very bad thing.
071	P Williams	New Town. To release the current small amounts of Green Belt would have an adverse effect on local environment and the quality of life the districts people.
072	Mr & Mrs S J Painter	It is presumed that you are trying to implement government policy to increase housing stock nationwide. The town of Rayleigh is over-developed. It lacks facilities, there is no land to build essential needs, eg doctor's surgery/Audley Mills has one-third of needed spaces, a local church needs land where are the theatre/cinema/swimming pool. Do not lack of school places existing.
073	Mr S Learmouth	Green belt should not be released. It should be protected. Rayleigh should be kept as a district town and not merge into Southend/Wickford.
074	Mr & Mrs Raddon	Leave Green belt alone. Once gone, gone forever. We need our open spaces, woods and park lands. No new towns.
075	Mr K A Cooke	Generations ago we had politicians with real vision, who set up Green Belts around our Towns and Cities to enable residents to breathe fresh air and prevent our Towns from all becoming joined to each other! I am appalled that you are even thinking of building on Green Belt land. If only Green belt land is left, your only option is to build up, replacing houses with blocks of flats! I recently read that 60% of U.K. population live in the south-east now, which I feel is too high already. As a 61 year old, unfortunate enough to be born in Rayleigh I have witnessed the accelerating decline in quality of life due to increasing overcrowding, only family ties prevent me moving to a less crowded part of the country. Gypsy sites should be sited <u>only</u> beside trunk roads or railway line where the settled community would not wish to live.
076	Ms G Lunn	Any land released should be close to existing developments to avoid spoiling our limited countryside further. Any greenbelt land that is to be released for any kind of development should not of been done without full consultation with the residents most local to the land as it is human nature to suggest building away from one's own locality.
077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	Green Belt land should not be released. If land is to be released for building, let them do it in London, The Midlands, The North in existing urban areas, many deprived. You should not develop in and around Rochford, Ashingdon, Hockley, Hawkwell, Rayleigh. Only allow fining in existing gaps and spare plots. There should be no new towns, anywhere.
078	David & Jeanne	No! No! No! Why do we need options?
079	Mrs S Clark	I don't think any green belt should be released. That is what is the beauty of this area. There are already too many pressures on doctors, hospitals and schools to continue developing the comendations mentioned; nor should Rayleigh and Wickford become any closer together.
080	Mr C Hathaway	No land should be released from the green belt. There is precious little natural environment in the region as it is without destroying that which already exists. There should be no more development in this area. We do not have the necessary infrastructure to support it. Roads are already clogged, there are insufficient GP surgeries and NHS dentists are non-existent.
081	T S Papworth	Rawreth/Rayleigh. Rochford station roundabout is almost impossible due to green belt in Ashingdon having been used already.
082	Mr J Adkin	There should be <u>no</u> new land in this area for development. The council should look to unused plots around the borough. Use compulsory purchase orders if necessary.
084	Miss M Andrews	Feel that the existing towns will struggle to provide 90% of the housing development. Some support from green belt may be required.

085	C G Tabar	Green belt land should be released next to existing towns, developments. No new town or development in countryside.
086	Mr M Gorman	No land should be released from the green belt, there will be none left if we keep building on it. No land should be allocated for a new town, they are very 'brickie' cold unfriendly places. No more building needed in the area. Less people being allowed into the country would mean less housing needed. Why do Essex need to build more?
087	Mr I Walker	Near railway/transport links. Battlesbridge. No new town unless clear infrastructure plan (transport/amenities). Similarly no new build where infrastructure is overloaded.
088	Miss S Thackeray	We do not have much green belt land around Rayleigh. Spring Gardens playing fields are locked up - are open and used a few hours a week - this space is underused and not available. Lets spread housing out, in Rayleigh 'garage space' is being converted into housing!
089	J Weddell	Before you think about development, please put roads in to take extra traffic and stop road congestion which we have now and consider 40 ton vehicles using horse and cart roads.
090	Mr B Everett	Land should not be released from Green Belt. Seek brown field sites for building houses.
091	Ms P Bailey	No Green belt land should be released. Councils should only develop on land that has previously been developed. No new town look for industrial units that are no longer being used - brickfields Shoebury, lower lambricks etc.
092	Mrs M Hills	Land should not be released from green belt, unnecessarily. No to a new town. Yes to small developments. There is a lot of land in the area around the Airport - is this all green belt. There are a lot of open spaces between Rochford and Wickford. Small well planned estates could be built without harming the general countryside feel of the area.
093	Mrs M J Owoo	Yes developing in those is a good idea
094	F A Browne	I consider that there are already enough houses (and cars particularly) in the areas and no more land should be released whatsoever from the Green Belt. These new houses mean more cars and increasing traffic congestion, which is already increasing.
095	Mr J Britton	Should land be released from green belt - NO continue to develop NO see comments allocating land NO see comments
096	Mr W Roberts	Infill. Yes. No new town. Real problem building flats on brownfield sites. Parking supplied is inadequate. Planning departments must insist that developers provide enough parking even at the expense of some of their profits.
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	No further development of Green Belt in Rochford. As Rayleigh is fairly well built up and has good links to London, it would seem better to make that the town and Rochford the village.
098	Mrs N London	A new town? Where is the water coming from, sewage disposal? Schools, hospitals, road, rail improvements, work places? No more large scale development should be allowed in an already overcrowded, south east corner of England.
099	Mr & Mrs R G Headley	We have lost enough of our green belt already. Only develop sites abandoned by businesses or where houses are no longer viable and are demolished. We do not need a new town, this is supposed to be a rural area. This was the reason a lot of people moved here to be out of the large towns. Water is already short here and so are services such as schools and medical facilities. We cannot put any more pressure on these things.
100	Mr R Scates	No where! Green Belt is green belt for a reason! If the people of Rochford District wanted to live in a concrete environment they would re-locate to city. Look to re-developing existing urbanised areas rather than destroying the last areas of countryside we have. I notice plenty of abandoned industrial areas around the country.
101	Mrs S Parsons	No land should be released from Green Belt for any reason. We need our lungs.

102	Mr T Newton	Firstly why are you suggesting a new town? Have we a housing problem? Why encourage Londoners to cheaper housing, moving here to clog the inadequate road system whilst trying to travel back to London to work. You cannot release any more green belt than you have in previous years, with the density or building plans being passed by the council planning department. I have watched too many small bungalows with land demolished to build five or six houses with four or five bedrooms with eventually 3 or 4 cars per house.
103	Miss B Dickinson	The above question should read 'should land be released from the green belt' and the answer is simply ' <u>no not at all, ever</u> '
104	B Aspinall	No more building on Green Belt should be considered. Unless improvements to roadways are made - more house building is ludicrous. Land for a "New Town" what a joke.
105	Mr R J Aldridge	None. Ashingdon Road is too busy with traffic now. Hospital and doctors have too many patients any new homes should be built in Surrey, they can afford them.
106	Ms P Melito	No to further development around Rochford/Ashingdon Hawkwell. Roads are congested, no further schools are planned, not to my knowledge. The youth need facilities such as skate/ice rinks, bike parks etc. to keep them off the streets.
107	Mr P S Reid	No land should be released from the Green Belt - there is ample brown belt sites that should be utilised thus also clearing eyesores. Development is a continuing process - we would not have what we have today without it.
108	Mr W J Edgar	Land south of Poynters Lane Great Wakering. Land south end of Anne Boleyn estate numbers of infill sites, single dwellings. How can a plot between existing houses contribute to the Green Belt?
109	Mr C Fantides	Further development in Rochford, Ashingdon, Hockley, Hawkwell and Rayleigh Wakering should be stopped as it is destroying the environment.
110	Mr P Nippard	None should be released. No new town. If there are no other options then say no growth is possible
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	If you have enough land to build a new town, and the infrastructure is in place and it doesn't! It is a strain on existing resources. The roads locally A13 127 are chaotic now. So any extra would be crazy using brownfield areas could be considered for some housing perhaps small towns/village type communities <u>not</u> some new Basildon it has a lot to do with what is available and what is feasible.
112	A J Smythe	The figure of 4,600 houses required by the government is completely ridiculous, it is in line with the insane policy of Prescott to cover the south east with concrete. It is quite obvious that the supporting infrastructure (additional services, such as water, sewage facilities, schools, hospital beds, etc ) does not and will not exist. Local councils must oppose this. NO GREEN BELT LAND SHOULD EVER BE GIVEN UP. The "green belt" has already been eroded, chipped away bit by bit in the hope that no-one would notice, since the war. It must remain sacrosanct, as was the original intention.
113	Mr & Mrs Rowland	Specialised housing for disabled people and supported living housing should be built - even if this means some green belt has to go. Residential cottages for those with severe learning difficulties need to be created.
114	Mr & Mrs F Blake	Rochford & Rayleigh are at saturation point - we don't have the infrastructure to support any further housing and certainly not a new town. Our sewerage can take no more. Only a short while ago we suffered drainage back up. Our power would cut off suddenly leaving us in the dark without heat. Our schools are full our roads too. Our hospital is full to brimming.
115	Mr W J Wharnsby	I think major roads are firsts before building more houses.
116	R S Barton	Before any further land is released every effort should be made to use brownfield sites and existing properties that are standing empty. NO further development in Rochford/Ashingdon. If there is no alternative to releasing new land then it should be as far to the west as possible, so as to reduce traffic flows through already congested roads.

117	W R H Beehag	Not around Rochford which is over busy with traffic and will be worse when the new town centre development is brought into use. Canewdon could benefit by enlargement if services and facilities were improved to match. Definitely <u>not</u> within 2 miles of the Airport.
118	Mrs I Sandell	We have lost too much green belt and both I and my husband feel there is too much development in and around the Rochford area.
119	Mr C Gabell	Some Green Belt land should be released and the homes spread around the country villages of the district - not Rochford, Hockley/Hawkwell and Rayleigh - wherever they are built a new transport plan needs to ? By-passing the 4 towns above - the Rochford by-pass from South Woodham to Southend should be built.
120	Mr B Poole	No new town. Green belt release - local infill only and then <u>only</u> if absolutely necessary.
121	Mrs S J Attfield	No, I think land should not be released from the green belt. No the council should not continue to develop around Rochford/Ashingdon/Hockley/Hawkwell and Rayleigh. Rayleigh has seen significant new houses/lats being built over the last few years, none of which are affordable to the young professionals in the area who are unable to get into the housing market.
122	F E Wells	Only if traffic problems solved first.
123	Mr K Walcer	No Green Belt should be given to developers. Houses been not live in for 2 years. Should be compulsory size to live in again.
124	Mrs Slater	No more in Essex. Suffolk there is vast amounts of open space.
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	Build new small villages, not too close to existing towns/villages. There are plenty of fields which are uninspiring to the eye and have no real ecological value. Build sympathetically to the surroundings and peoples needs. No monotone housing estates.
126	Mr J Jefferies	i) Preferably away from original flood plain sites, in view of rising sea levels. The suggested areas could all sustain a certain amount of new development but only if the transport infrastructure is improved. ii) Rawreth Lane are could be a site of interest, but not for a "new town". Some green belt land will obviously have to be used.
127	Mr G Ware	As more homes are compulsory, they should be encouraged wherever and whenever possible. The Green Belt concept is very dated now and its spirit should be kept at the planning forefront, it should be relaxed enough to allow modern development for homes, jobs and infrastructure. Imagination should be used in design and building, for example, use of flood-threatened coasts and esturies for developemnt by building on stilts and foundations that allow occupation at upper levels. South-east Essex has an abundance of these areas. High-rise living and working should not be the preserve of cities. Siting on coastlines would make buildings desirable and far removed from 1960's council blocks. The green belt restrictions operated by Rochford Council will obviously have to go. At present, they are only giving rise to the commonly held belief of corporate hospitality surrounding buildg that is going on while petty , out-dated restrictions are put upon small scale individual development. Small/medium building spread over existing developed areas (where wanted) is a much
128	Mr H Snell	Green belt land should be released where it already has a house on it and ajoins or is close to the existing brown land area. The divide between Hockley and Rayleigh is so small this could be developed without losing any real aminity. Farm land should be released as a last resort.
129	Mr A Clarke	No to any intrusion into green belt land .... Redevelopment of brownfield sites should be pursued and only brownfield sites. This crisis is as a result of five decades of mass mismanaged immigration, irresponsible life styles and misguided economic policies. Central Government is elected to hanle these issues, not pass the buck to local authorities to undertake inapproriate development in already overcrowded areas to solve their problems.



130	Mrs S Martin	Small plots from each area could be developed. No new town too much pressure on local infrastructure eg traffic on main road through Hockley, Hawekwell has increased considerably since the new road through Cherry Orchard Lane has been open (what about Marsh Land around Thurock for new town)
131	Mel Bennett	There will be a continuing pressure for housing as the population grows and South East remains the preferred location in UK. Consideration for some brown belt other than green, however biggest problem is road/rail infrastructure to service any expansion. A mini town concept maybe favourite but must have necessary road/rail services etc. to support any such moves.
132	Passfield	NO land should be released from the green belt in the Rochford/Ashingdon area or any other area. The roads can't cope with the traffic now!! Rectory Avenue has now become a rat run in the rush hour (with cars speeding down the hill) trying to avoid the never ending traffic jam along the Ashingdon Road.
133	The Occupier	No land should be released from Green Belt . The existing road, sewer and public services are already past saturation point. Any development should be on brownfield sites.
134	Ms Innes	(a) None should be released. (b) No. (c) No. (d) Somewhere other than Essex. We seem to be the dumping ground of south east England.
135	Mr C Blundell	Ashingdon - definitely has no more available land for development. Rochford - with the development already taking place in the centre of Rochford ie Somerfield and flats, plus the gross of flat developments on the perimeter of Rochford will cause total chaos on our present road structure, plus car parking for shoppers/visitors/friends in flats will add to the problem.
136	Mrs G E Chase	Green belt land should be left. We will soon be living in a concrete jungle if this government has its way.
137	Mr & Mrs Acres	No land should be released from Green Belt. Rayleigh has had too much housing development ie Rawreth. We do not need a new town. Schools are already full to capacity and utilities ie, water, gas, electricity stretched to their limits, especially water, the reservoir at Hanningfield is often very low and as there are concerns about future droughts.
138	The Occupier	No. Yes in a fill-in basis, but where there is increase to possible transport. No new town
139	Ms A Clark	No new town. No more green belt to be lost. Re-develop shops ribbon development and run down industrial land. Sea front area also could be utilised. No more supermarkets are needed.
140	Mrs J Davies	Continue to rebuild on available brown sites however this will only be a small percentage, therefore the possibility of having to release green belt land is looking more probable an area that springs to mind may be around the lower road, Hullbridge area. I certainly have nothing against this region, and I know they enjoy the 'village' type life but it does not seem from observation to have a huge amount of agriculture it could do with it's infrastructure being enhanced, with a police station included. Compulsory purchase is horrible I have experienced this first hand it does effect lives. Other possibilities include small additions to all towns naed around the perimetres. If you met the total number that has been set by government it will not be the end of it mark my words. They will just set a new amount for you to fulfil. Make an attempt to fulfil more amounts but by no means to total amount asked. Good luck to you.
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	Land should not be released from the green belt. Only existing brown field sites should be used and making better use of what we already have. No we should not be thinking about allocating land for a new town. We believe that this would only perpetuate the problem.
142	D Tilley/R Bhandari	More use of brownfield sites preferable. Also, lack of public transport service a major issue, lack of NHS dentists, lack of decent shopping facilities in Rochford centre which has gone downhill with too many shops having turned into domestic dwellings.

143	J E Burfield	Build! Build! How about infrastructure. It seems all council build regardless of whether the roads can cope. Have you even bothered to drive around Rayleigh, Hullbridge and Hockley any time of day.
144	Mr C Bambury	I would encourage the Council to adopt a policy that sought to locate development where access to day to day facilities and services is readily available by public transport, walking and cycling thereby reducing the need to travel, particularly by car.
145	Mr A Lysons	West of Rayleigh Weir, it's no good going east of Rayleigh because there isn't enough space for houses, business and roads, every thing has to come out East to West. The population is almost static, why do we need new towns?
146	A C Barton	Preferably nowhere, enough is enough, we have our share. New town with infrastructure - maybe
147	Mr I Randall	Land should not be released from the green belt. Green belt should mean green belt! Increases in housing has already had a detrimental effect on water supplies and our sewers are overflowing when we have storms, not to mention traffic conjection.
148	L F Wallace	No the council should not consider any new development until a proper road and services have been provided. Perhaps those who make the planning decision are on a different planet to those who have to endure the misery and pollution caused by the incessant traffic on the road from Rayleigh to Southend, or the conjection experienced by travellers plus traffic noise.
149	Cunningham	Leave the Green Belt alone. Traffic is heavy enough now. No more development in or around the above towns.
150	Ms N Saunders	Land should never be released from green belt - green belt land must be left as green. I think a new town would be better than squeezing flats and houses into tiny spaces. Another option - leave Essex alone and build new houses further North!
151	Mr R Roles	The green belt has been lost to such an extent. Housing has been built from Rayleigh to Southend border. Small patches remain, which if building housing continues will also disappear. Enough is enough. Leave the green belt alone.
152	Mr S Crowther	Continue to develop in and around settlements in the Rayleigh/Rochford area. A definite no to the building of a new town.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	If possible no more land should be released from the Green Belt areas. Brown field sites should be used (this should not include gardens being sold off). Development around Rochford/Ashingdon/Hockley/Hawkwell should be kept to a minimum, as so much development has taken place over the last 20 years.
155	Ms A Boulter	Rochford is becoming very conjected - there is enough housing in the area. More use needs to be made of derilict/empty buildings eg West Street.
156	J W Collins	Rochford simply does not have space for 4,600 new homes. This figure has been foisted on the district by central Government who do not appear to have a clue. Rayleigh in particular is suffering over-development. Will we one day see one long urban sprawl from Rochford right over to Wickford? Worse still, will the whole area become a borough of Southend City? A new town is not ideal either. A new Village(s) are the way forward - if they have in full range of local amenities and infrastructure.
158	Mr & Mrs White	We appear to have already met the housing requirement for Rayleigh Town in the "new town" adjoining Rawreth Lane (west Rayleigh) further building nearer to town centre is futile - as roads are already jammed and "rat runs" also at peak times are at capacity.
159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	Land should NOT be released from green belt we will soon have none left! If necessary to develop in towns already existing, although I do not agree with this either. We do not have the infrastructure or transport to cope. These should come first before any more housing. Because we will soon find out to our cost if we do not and it will then be too late. The other option is not to build more hosing in the South East but the North where there is more free land available.

160	Ms S Barnes	No green belt should be released. Housing should be put to existing building area such as Rochford Hospital and Park School.
161	Mr S J Benee	Small areas attached (Green Belt) or within established communities should still be released which in some cases, with carefull design can enhance the area.
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	No further development should be considered until vastly improved road and rail links are established.
163	Mr S T Cardwell	Before all these new houses are built much thought and discussion needs to be done. Main issues need to be addressed in order of priority. In my opinion roads must come near the top because this corner of Essex is slowly coming to a standstill. The Lower Road/Ashingdon Road between Hullbridge and Rochford barely moves with the traffic now - especially morning and evening rush hour. It only takes the slightest accident and the whole system comes to a complete halt. Also Watery Lane is becoming a very dangerous rat run that needs to be addressed before any more houses are built thus causing increasing congestion/pollution and damage. Of course any new roads will also cause more objections etc, but ultimately this may be a necessary evil.
164	Mr I King	Before releasing any <u>open</u> green belt land why not infill existing plots on green belt sites in all areas. (Example Eastwood Rise area has already been used).
165	Mr G Searles	Why am I bothering to reply? We have no land to spare for God's sake, STOP building in this area. A;ready the roads are at grid-lock. How much proof do you need?
166	G W Fleming	Where would a new town be built? Where is enough land in the area to even consider this.
167	Mrs J Marshall	Where is there enough land for a whole new town? Perish the thought. Quite built up enough here.
168	Ms L Young	We should not release green belt land, we are already over-developed, every time a house or bungalow is demolished either two or more houses or a block of flats seems to be built there. The infrastructure is not in place to support any more people.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	It may be necessary to build one fairly large new village/development, but we feel every village in the district should have a proportion of the government inposed housing. Stambridge, Canewdon, Paglesham, Sutton etc need an injection of homes and people to keep them viable. Improved public transport would be needed and also a few shops and/or small businesses could be included. Areas in Hullbridge have room for some development with a little space available in Rayleigh. We would consider that Rochford and Hockley have probably had as much development as they can take.
170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	We do not consider that there should be a new town as much as possible should be built on brownfield land and where expansion is required Rayleigh is an obvious choice - Rochford and Ashingdon have been overdeveloped in the last 10 years. As little as possible of the green belt should be sacrificed.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	We should not let central government bully Rochford Council into releasing green belt. This can be justified by ensuring all present empty properties or sites are refurbished or developed only. Definitely no NEW TOWN as this will entirely alter the areas nature and place pressure on transport links presently under developed by central government.
173	Mr & Mrs Cripps	By returning this form we do not accept the premis that Rochford District should find room for 4600 new homes without the roads to support it. Green belt should be protected with vigor generally. There may be a case for development where green belt is sandwided between development ie between Seaview and Goldsworthy Drive, Great Wakering quality of life must come before dictates of Government. Rochford and Southend appear at saturation point and further development
174	Mr P Clark	I think releasing the small pockets of green belt around Ashingdon/Rochford etc is a BAD idea. Residents would be opposed to losing these green areas and the roads are already over conjested (especially the Ashingdon Road) a new town would seem a better proposition but a new road would be needed into Southend and the A127 would have to be widened. The traffic in our area is diabolical! Especially in the morning rush hour.

175	Mr H J Rowland	I believe in 1) Maintain the Green Belt. Once built on, it can never be reclaimed. 2) Use every possible means for/to in-fill. Especially in conjunction with "clean" commercial units. 3) Affordable housing is a red herring - it leads to a lower quality of building. 4) Close Southend Airport and build on it.
176	Mr R Abbott	Land should be released only in areas where there is quick access to major roads eg A127 to alleviate traffic through villages, which is already at breaking point. The area cannot sustain a new town without coming to a standstill on roads (try getting from Ashingdon into Rochford during rush hours/school time). There is also insufficient amenities eg schools, doctors, dentists etc.
177	Mr J East	Land around Purdeys Industrial Estate - this is near to those who would work there, near to railway/airport, near to River Roach for leisure. Land between Eastwood Road and A127 (Rayleigh to Leigh). A new town could be a good answer with quality planning. No housing on high ground where the skyline which is of trees or open fields would be affected.
178	Mr D Livermore	It should not. No. No. Stop now. The overcrowding in our towns is causing friction and an inner city atmosphere. This continuous building has resulted in the basic infrastructure of this area being stretched to breaking point. The roads are a nightmare, teenage gangs are out of control in Rayleigh and Hockley the police cannot cope and we don't even have enough water! Stop now; please!
179	Mrs F M Wilson	No land should be released from Greenbelt. This should remain protected - at all costs.
180	Mr R Swain	Land should not be released from the green belt, brownfield sites should be used. I remember reading that if housing had been developed in the 19th century at the same density it is now, London would occupy the whole area inside the M25! The current towns should be developed rather than a new town. Any improvements in facilities then can be shared by all. Any new housing should be located close to where the jobs are, so people can walk or cycle easily.
181	Mrs M R Hutchings	Why not look into empty houses and flats where people have died and put them in order, making 1 house into 2 flats and the gardens divided down the middle, with an outside staircase for the upper flat to gain entrance to the garden, we really don't want another town, and if that the only way build affordable housing.
182	Mrs V Wisbey	There is a lot of land around these areas. It is wrong to keep developing around the above named areas, a new town is not necessary. Let these places breathe. Clear some of the old unused land, also some of Foulness.
183	Tomassi	No new housing.
184	Mr T L Ellis	No green belt land should be released. Building should and must be restricted to previously developed sites which could be utilised to greater advantage. ie derelict sites, underused commercial sites and those areas which are unsuitable for any other purpose apart from infilling and then only where water and sewage facilities can be provided.
185	Mr J K Mills	Consideration should be given to further develop recently extended ie Great Wakering and Canewdon. Green belt land should not be released unless in exceptional circumstances, but never in the Roach Valley - the area of land separating Rochford District from Southend.
186	Mr & Mrs J Halliday	The area is already congested. No new houses should be built on the Green belt
187	Mrs K Jesty	I really do not think land should be released from green belt. The point of green belt is to ensure that wildlife in all its forms has some where protected to live. Our areas are developed enough - its important that we have smaller towns as well as large towns. Land should be allocated from the South East preferably where there are shortage of housing.
188	Mr A Mackay	Land should never be released from Green Belt. If this fully continues my grandchild will need to read a history book to find out what the 'countryside' was. Development must be focused more on regenerating old existing buildings and or sites. West Street Rochford is a sad and obvious example and now after years of neglect still lies dying in the shadow of Rochford's second square. What other options? Might I suggest that when the glass is full you turn off the tap!

189	Mr G Gooding	Allocating land for a new town may be the best option as resources for the existing towns have become increasingly strained.
190	Mr G J Tinsey	Allocating land from the green belt, should come after the search for all possible brown-field sites is taken. I would keep development close to the environs. A new town is not a good idea. Other options are to purchase residential/commercial property without current use.
191	Janice & Alex Brining	Against new out of town developments - leads to social exclusion and lack of facilities. Mainly develop existing towns but crucial to provide adequately for roads/transport/schools/GP/dentists/policing/parking if when new roads built, incorporate dedicated and wide enough bide lanes, can existing roads be widened for bike lanes?
192	Ms B Mean	There is land in Wakering Road which is ideal for housing development especially as it is near to many facilities and between other houses.
193	Ms S Swift	I can only speak of Rayleigh but there is not the road infrastrucute since the estates have been built on the Rawreth Road, Rayleigh High Street, Websters Way, down to the Weir is gridlocked during rush hours, Saturday's and Sundays, and at various times eg school run times. Any more building would bring the whole area to a standstill. Schools will not cope, as will other services eg doctors, dentists etc.
194	Mr C Hutchinson	No further land should be released from the green belt! The infrastructure can not cope with further development - at certain times of the day, it can take an hour to get to the A127! If a new town is to be built, suitable roads should be built, away from the proliferation of houses already built in this area - perhaps the Fambridge area could be a suitable spot with access also over the river! (see 9)
195	Mr B M Gilbert	No to a "new town". Build along the existing A127 corridor after making it wider. What quality of living in Rochford District if it finishes up looking like and extension of London City. This labour government wants to concrete over the whole of S.E England by all accounts.
196	Mr A E Hodges	Any new land released for housing should not be in the flood plain areas. If a Southend-East bypass road is gong to pass through Rochford district, the siting of a new town should be reasonably adjacent to such a route so as to provide good access to such a road. There is a need to avoid additional traffic flow via main road Hockley.
197	P McAllister	I don't think land should be released from the green belt as there has been so much development already especially in Rayleigh. It is going from a really pretty town to being overcrowded. No to a new town.
198	Mr J Clamp	Allocation of green belt in and around these areas does not seem to fit with questions 6 & 7. Better use of unused brown field sites which could then provide an answer to question 2.
199	Mr & Mrs Crockford	We think no more housing should be made in any of these areas this corner is too populated as it is. No new town is feasible in this corner of the country.
200	Mr T O'Shea	Every sane person knows that our area of Essex has reached near saturation with our roads, schools, hospitals at near breaking point. Road rage and stress are now very apparent because of this. However, it will still happen but it is imperative that the necessary services are laid down first ie good feed roads, extra hospitals, doctors, main sewerage (not new pipes into old system), water pressure, bus services (particularly if we are to be penalised for driving our cars). I think Rochford have controlled the situation extremely well so far against the pressures put on them by government. They have allowed infill within the area which has not caused too bad an effect. However, we are running out of large back gardens of old houses. So we look to Green Belt/Farm land to build on? Wickford and Rayleigh will soon be joined. What seperates Rayleigh from Southend - Wyevalas the nursery. If houses and new towns have to be built here let it be done with space and good planning. Our current estates lack gardens, road and parking spaces - they will become slums in 30/40 years

201	Mr M Thomas	No Hockley and Hawkwell have developed enough and no further new development on green or brown belt should take place. The water, gas, electricity, highways, schools and medical services can not cope with any further expansion. It only just manages now.
202	K Cardnell	Hullbridge garden estate. Conservatories should not be regarded as extensions, they should have the same status as in other boroughs.
203	M T Conaty	Green belt land should not be released for any type of building. Government/local authority parish councils keep on berating tax payers to recycle and save water/gas/electricity. The police local authorities parish council provide gas guzzling vehicles 4x4 for the mayor etc. Local authorities/Government should concentrate on doing what local people require ie more police on the beat, more savings in waste in local authority offices etc.
204	Mr R Gould	No - no! A complete halt on all building in Rochford needs to happen. The infrastructure cannot cope with anymore housing.
205	Mrs Whitham	No more housing down Rawreth Lane. The road will not take anymore traffic. England was a green and pleasant land. It has been made an eyesore. No to a new town.
206	Mrs G Harper	I am not in favour of a new town. We have some of those in the area and they are hard places to draw into a sense of community. The placement of new homes needs to be carefully decided in relation to the current and imminent improvements in infrastructure. Short term planning in the past has left this are with some problems to still be overcome and we need to do all possible to avoid more of these expensive blunders.
207	Ms G Yeadell	4.5.2-4.5.3 In spite of above, the quota will not include "windfall sites" - 1 dwelling replaced by several as above, so these would be additional to the 3000+ required. One can foresee much of existing Hockley/Ashingdon/Hawkwell disappearing, except for the much prized new monsters. Councillors "...believed that intensification of existing "urban" areas has not greatly improved character or the environment". So they proposed bigger sites in "urban" areas, rather than several small ones. Presumably as alternative to piecemeal backdoor version of forcing neighbours out cited in 4.6 above, we can look forward to whole blocks of homes compulsorily purchased and sold back to back to a developer for comprehensive redevelopment as per Etheldore Avenue. Is this why we pay council tax? This is in striking contradiction with Statement CA1 of SPD6 - Design Guildelines for Conservation Areas: "...mass of new building should not dominate or conflict with adjoining properties. The height of new buildings should be in keeping with the existing character of the area.
208	I Gyres	No more houses! There is far too much congestion already. If they have to be built, put them where the infrastructure can cope (ie not South East Essex).
210	Mrs M A King	I think no more land should be released for any kind of building.
211	Mr B W Williams	There are area's around Rochford, such as the brickworks site including land opposite which is open land. Also probably should Roots Hall become available housing and industry could be a possibility. These probably are large pockets of land in locations you refer about to accommodate both residential and some industry. I strongly object to your reference for a new town. Roads and services would blight land. 2. Green belt must be left untouched.
212	Master J Richards	The council should continue to develop around Rochford, Ashingdon, Hockley and Hawkwell as these aren't as populated and built up as Rayleigh. I think the view of allocating a town some land is unrealistic as Rochford District is rather crowded and it is unlikely that a large strip of land will be available.
213	Mr M Wheeler	There is plenty of suitable land available within the 'plotlands' estates scattered throughout the district. Many of these plotlands have clearly defined areas within which in-fill development should be allowed. Many of the available plots are derelict and add nothing to the green belt poilcy.

215	Mr T R Thompson	There is far too much traffic now and I feel there are inadequate schools, services and public servants such as police, hospital workers to cope with any new housing around Rochford at all.
216	Mr & Mrs D Strong	We agree with the council that development should be concentrated on the three main settlements within the District. We further believe that there is scope for development to the south of Rochford town. Whilst this is not an allocations consultation we bring to your attention the site detailed on the attached plan as evidence that there are areas immediately adjacent to urban centres which can be successfully re-developed to integrate with existing service provision. We do not believe that there is scope for a new town development within the district.
217	F H Wall Esq	We strongly believe that land should be released from the greenbelt to accommodate development. We agree that land should be released on the boundaries of the three main settlements as set out in the draft document. We further feel there is scope for release from the greenbelt on the north east boundary of Ashingdon (see attached plan). The east side of Ashingdon has the most potential for growth and ability to intergrate with the existing service provision particularly if the land to the west of the settlement will form a strategic gap seperating it from Hawkwell. We do not consider a new town an option within the district. We would prefer a release of greenbelt rather than increased crowding in the urban centres. The extension of the green belt boundary to a more defensible position squaring off uneven areas would be the best way forward.
218	T Wiggins Esq	We strongly believe that land should be released from the greenbelt to accommodate development furthermore residential development should be allocated to minor settlements to enable support of existing services and possible regeneration of village centres. We believe that 10% of the housing allocation for minor settlements is not sufficient to allow growth to existing villages. We would prefer a release of greenbelt rather than increased crowding in the urban centres. The extension of the green belt boundary to a more defensible position squaring off uneven areas would be the best way forward. We believe the following land at Great Wakering offers potential for a sustainable expansion of the village.
219	Mr J Amey	Green belt should remain green belt and none of it should be used for development. Otherwise what's the point of having green belt in the first place? Our current road network struggles to cope with current volumes so I strongly believe only brownfield sites should be used for development.
220	Mrs S Clarke	Land should be released from the green belt, but infill only, preferably. No land should be released for a new town if possible. There is a piece of land in The Chase in Ashingdon for which I attach a plan which would be ideal since there is the infrastructure to accommodate building starter or retirement homes.
221	Mr G Hoy	There is already too much building work. No land should be released from green belt areas. Schools, roads, police and other services should be in place before new housing. This has obviously not been a consideration recently!
222	R Luck	I strongly feel green belt land should be preserved at all costs. Whereever are you going to fund enough land to create a new town. The idea is laughable!
223	C Morris	No no no its not as simple as that all the necessary facilities must come also doctors - dentists - schools, shopping car-parks and 'big roads'. Do not want Rochford to become a concrete jungle it is already too crowded and populated.
224	Mr K S Gee	No land should be released from Green Belt in the Rayleigh area, over 600 houses have already been built in the Rawreth part of Rayleigh.

225	Mr P Court	It is considered that land should be released from the green belt. The most appropriate location for this comprises land off Thorpe Road, Hawkwell (see attached plan). This site was promoted through the last Local Plan Inquiry: although on that occasion the Inspector felt that there was no need to take land from the green belt, he was quite conducive to the arguments put forward by the promoters of the land. Times are now different: there is a need to look longer term and make adequate provision for forecast and potential needs. This site is well-contained, and close to a good range of existing services. It could reasonably be released from the green belt without prejudicing the overall objectives of that particular strategic tool. Furthermore, and in a district such as Rochford, peripheral land releases are considered far more appropriate than the development of a new town.
226	Mrs A Hill	Definitely no to a new town! Why release green belt when there are already so many eyesores that could be knocked down and the land re-used more usefully.
227	Mr & Mrs Haskew	We think Rochford is about saturated! We are very concerned and saddened that with all the new housing there has been no recreational facilities for young people. There is very little open space for children to go to near their homes. If more land is released it is vital that recreational and other support provisions are planned in. Where can young people go to meet with friends?
228	Ms A Henderson	No land should be released from the green belt. We should take responsibility for future generations and ensure that future generations have parks, woods and cuontry areas to enjoy and land for growing food.
229	Mr J Robinson	It would be a disappointment to see more green belt disappear. The current areas are over developed. A new 'town' would be the only answer but this creates other issues as noted later.
230	V G Crick	Land should not be released from Green Belt. No further developments. No new town to even be considered.
231	Mr & Mrs Walker	Definitely no extra housing around the above mentioned areas as the roads are already congested enough and could not handle much more traffic. Without a bypass road, the only area left to develop that can be fed off of a main road would be south of the River Roach. There most definitely should not be a gypsy/traveller site in the area as they only ever bring trouble. Ask my friend who lives near the Crays Hill site what it's like.
232	Mrs A Robinson	If green belt land must be used (as I expect it will) I would prefer to see smaller intergrated development (perhaps where some buildings already exist), rather than the idea of a whole 'new town'. I think we do need to continue some development around our existing towns/villages but with green landscaping and ? ?? for parks and green spaces.
233	Mr G Congram	There should be no release from green belt, instead the council should look at office sites that are under used. If pushed it should look towards the Southend borders. The government has got this wrong! Housing should be developed in less well off areas. There are enough people here to support the businesses locally and in London.
234	Mr J T Dorrell	Before any more housing development the infrastructure must be sorted out ie adequate schools and hospitals, but above all a new road system that can funnel traffic efficiently out of the existing bottle necks. In this time of concern about the environment a major cause of pollution is the static queues of traffic pumping carbon monoxide into the atmosphere, another consideration should be the water supplies, can further building cope with the increased demand for water in this drought area?
235	L W Lewis	Housing land should only be allowed in green belt away from strategic gaps between settlements. Good quality affordable housing should be priority in these areas. I do not believe a new town would be manageable in this district.
236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	The green belt concept is still valid and must be maintained to stop Rochford/Rayleigh joining together to become a sprawling suburb of Southend. If a new town route is taken that new town should be in its own green belt with own shops, stores, etc. It should not be 'attached' to Rayleigh/Rochford, - South Woodham Ferrers is a good example to follow.



237	Mr Sanders	We should not be releasing any more green belt land for development. Only 'brownfield' sites should be designated for housing.
238	Gill Tilson	No green belt should be released for development. How can the council even think about a new town, when we do not have enough water to supply us now?
239	Ms S Martin	A definite no to any new town plans. Could new development be considered along Greensward Lane to the bottom of Ashingdon Hill. New infrastructure must be in place prior to any further development in this area ie doctors, schools, roads etc. Hockley is already under considerable pressure in these areas. Rayleigh is already well developed especially with the recent Rawreth Lane building estates.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Green belt land should be retained, wherever possible - to prevent 'urban sprawl' and keep semi-rural areas. We are against releasing land from green belt. Developemnt should be minimal in Rochford and Rayleigh as else it will loose it's appeal.
242	Mr D Batchelor	No new town. No ASDA, land to be used for housing.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	Many parts of Rayleigh are already over developed and the road network is seriously overburdened. Care needs to be taken to ensure that any development in towns mentioned is very close to rail links. New town likely to be best option outside Rochford area with rail link out towards Canewdon and a decent road network. On a general note the area is becoming increasingly congested and this central government target/requirement should be questioned.
245	M J Burpitt	We have a financial interest in the Rayleigh Park Estate off the Hullbridge Road and are seeking to promote this site as a new settlement.
246	Miss M Saward	I live along Hall Road Rochford and I struggle desperately to get out of my drive, not just in rush hour but various times of day. Saturdays are always busy and late at night is very busy and noisy where people are going home. Do not build anymore around the area as it is too busy. How about Rawreth Lane Rayleigh - on edge of where people are and have good access to both A127 and A130.
247	Mr & Mrs Addison	Yes continue developing smaller areas aruond the district. No to a small town.
249	Mr I Hill	The 'Issues and Options Paper' does not provide a clear indication of the Council's approach to the Green Belt and accordingly clarification is sought. The document states that it is probable that the council will in accordance with national planning guidance, continue to protect the Green Belt from 'inappropriate development' and that pursuant to advice contained within the draft East of England Plan, a review of Green Belt boundaries is not proposed. However, at this initial stage the 'probable' approach is considered both premature and inconsistent with other Council documents relating to the Core Strategy. The 'probable' approach is considered premature given that the Council are yet to complete its Urban Capacity Study (UCS) to determine whether sufficient land exists within the District's urban areas to satisfy strategic housing requirements which are themselves yet to be formalised for the period up to 2021, or whether it will be necessary to release land from the Green Belt. The potential need to release land from the Green Belt to satisfy strategic housing requirements
251	Mr B Guyett - Chairman	The Housing Provision Report Para 2.14 says 'These figures show clearly that, taking into account a very conservative level of housing provision from the urban capacity study figures, the structure plan housing provision figure of 3050 units will be satisfied. There is not requirement for sites to be released from the Green Belt in the period 1996-2011. Likewise the Urban Capactiy Study reaches the same conclusions. Therefore, there is no need to release Green Belt land in the medium term. The target required is 4,600 homes but the Housing Report shows that 4,017 are available, leaving a shortfall of less than 600. Fulfillment of this figure is entirely achievable over a 15 year period by infill. Green Belt should only be released as a very last resort and in order to ensure an adequate infrastructure is provided.
252	F Harrison	Ideally this should go untouched, but in fact some of it not so green or attractive might not be missed?

253	Mr M J Smith	We should not release any more land for housing in the above areas. Any more building should take place in less populated areas, as ours have weakening infrastructure.
254	Ms V Stanesby	No I do not think more green belt should be released. The main attraction of this area was the country feel which is rapidly going. Very soon Ashingdon, Hockley and Rayleigh will merge into one without the fields between. My other worry is traffic and resources. The main road through Hockley, Ashingdon and Rayleigh is dreadful - you realise just how bad when you visit other parts of the country and then return to chaos queing to come back into Hockley for no apparent reason. Our doctors are full - the schools are bursting and being forced to extend to the maximum - dentists are full and hospitals can't cope with huge waiting lists. Improve our area before extending it.
255	Mr S Chilton	No more green belt land should be built on. Rochford specifically is big enough and further expansion would spoil such a nice place to live. Definitely no to a new town.
257	Mr T Dodkins	We acknowledge the difficulty of developing sustainably in the District due to its linear forms with many areas remote from public transport and services. This makes the challenge of ensuring that those few areas available are identified and secured within the LDF. We agree with the philosphy expressed in para 4.2.5 that in broad terms the re-use of brown field land should be prioritised, subject to the caveat that all such sites must be tested against sustainability criteria to ensure that they are truly sustainable in terms for example of accessibility. This will accord with the advice of para 32 of PPG3, which suggests that greenfield sites should be identified if brownfield sites perform particularly badly on recognised criteria set out in para 31. Notwithstanding this, we agree that brownfield land is a diminishing resource, and that it is inevitable that some Green Belt land will need to be released. In relation to the priority for expansion being focused on the top tier of settlements identified in para 4.6.3, we support this on the basis of these towns having a good range of services and facilities as well as
258		No Green Belt land should be released for development. Do not consider a new town - adjoining Councils are considering the issue.
259	Mr M B Rogers	There are hundreds of unmade roads in the Rochford area. The 4600 houses needed could be sited here. Most people wouldn't know they were there with very little strain on the infrastructure.
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	Firstly you must survey the most congested roads but of the above 5 mentioned which to my way of thinking do not leave you much option other than investing more in flyovers and underpassers.
261	S A Skinner	I am opposed to using Green Belt land for housing development. In particular I am totally opposed to the release of any more Green Belt land in west Rayleigh for development. Don't be too eager to fulfil government targets - the developers are eager enough as it is. Knocking down Park School and then finding there is a shortage of school provision is an example of muddled-up planning. Learn from your mistakes.
262	Ms L Parish	Due to the high cost of housing, why can there not be more sites allocated to high standard mobile homes. These are as good as bungalows and could be afforded by younger people if the facility was put in place or longer-term repayment other than, as at present, a maximum of 10 years. Some green belt will have to be released. Also, there are several 'in-fill' plots in green belt that could be released for in-fill housing without being detrimental to the large-scale green belt areas.

263	Mr P Kneen	<p>Where should land be released from the Green Belt? Whilst the Draft East of England plan does not seek to provide for a full scale review of the Green Belt boundaries within the East of England, Swan Hill considers that in order to continue to meet the provisions of PPG3: Housing, and its sequential approach, a review of the boundary will be required. The sequential approach sets out a hierarchy of locations for new residential developments, which the Council should seek to apply as a policy approach in the Core Strategy to meet housing requirements. This should set out that the strategic housing requirement should be met through both the use of brownfield sites in existing urban areas, and through the provision of sustainable urban extensions to settlements. This second tier of the sequential approach would therefore require a review of the Green Belt boundaries around existing settlements, in order for the District to meet its strategic housing requirements. Swan Hill notes that the Council has sought to allocate only 10% of the strategic housing</p>
264	Mr K Coleman	<p>For a new town to be sustainable, it should be large enough to support a full range of services, jobs and facilities and the housing requirement for Rochford District is not sufficient to achieve that. The Green Belt environs of Hockley/Hawkwell are especially sensitive in landscape, ecological and Green Belt terms, and peripheral development would in any event be poorly related to the town centre. Rayleigh has experienced considerable growth and further peripheral (Green Belt) development will be poorly related to the town centre and services. Rochford is therefore the logical area for the majority of new development. The Rochford area should include the periphery of Southend in the Eastwood Area. Priority should be given to the use of previously developed land in sustainable locations in the Green Belt, in advance of further greenfield development. We support Paragraph 4.2.5 of the draft strategy. We strongly support the objectives of the Spatial Vision as set out in Paragraphs 2.22 and 2.23 regarding the need to secure a variety of housing options, and in particular the objective</p>
265	Mr R Pomery	<p>It is acknowledged that a strategic review of the greenbelt (advised by East of England Regional Assembly) will not be required until after 2021. However, the Council still needs to meet its own requirements via local releases. The Draft Core Strategy confirms that there are no remaining major new housing developments planned for the District in the Rochford District Replacement Local Plan. Realistic options for growth need to be identified. Land to the North and East of Rochford town centre is ideally placed to meet the District's growth requirements. (See separate document highlighting development opportunities in this location which we consider should influence the strategy for growth identified in the Core Strategy). Paragraph 4.2.5 puts forward options for consideration in terms of issues relating to Green Belt and Strategic Gaps between settlements. We would argue that this is not a realistic set of options. There is for example no option put forward for limited local releases to meet development requirements for housing and employment, this contradicts the two tier approach to</p>
267	Mr D Pointer	<p>Development should continue in and around Rochford/Hockley/Hawkwell and Rayleigh. Other land released should be medium parcels of land allowing current developed areas to extend slightly into green belt. These should be identified in the plan to avoid uncontrolled ad-hoc development. Development of one village into a town should be allowed subject to full infrastructure being provided first.</p>
268	Mr S Crussell	<p>What is absolutely critical and sadly lacking is the infrastructure to support an extra burden on the area. There should be more redevelopment of existing or brownfield areas rather than into new areas.</p>

270		Essex Wildlife Trust commends the council on its concept of strategic gaps in development within the Rochford District such gaps will act as macro green corridors allowing migration and movement of wildlife. They will also insure as many residents as possible will have local undeveloped spaces to enjoy. Essex Wildlife trust is opposed to the release of Green belt land except where all other options have been eliminated. If green belt land is to be used one or two low grade open field agricultural areas of pre-assessed low biodiversity that can be development without destruction of existing mature trees and hedgerows and adjacent to existing main roads should be considered. Given the spatial shape of the district development at the south western end and/or adjacent to rail transport links would appear to minimise increase in district traffic flows. We strongly advise that current data on windfall development is taken into account when computing the number of new housing sites required. Movement of poorly located within town industrial areas to newer better linked sites may reduce
271	Mr & Mrs Jobson	Green belt land only to be used after sites such as relocating industrial estates have been allocated. Any green belt land used should be near to transport hubs. Perhaps land to South west of Rayleigh adjacent to the A129/A130 junction in the area of lower barn farm which would have excellent transport links access to a local secondary school and Rayleigh town centre and would add little to cross district traffic?
274	Mr S Mckinnon	Housing land 'should' be released from green belt on 'edge' of built up areas where an infill can be created. A good example is the areas around Victor Gardens, Clements Gardens and Clements Hall Lane.
275	Mr C Wickham	The Council should prioritise the use of previously developed land to minimise the need for Green Belt releases. This objective should include all previously developed land not just that within urban areas.
276	Mr M Barrell	Housing Numbers and Phasing This section states that the housing requirement is likely to be met through allocations rather than rely on windfall sites. If windfall sites are permitted it must be ensured that proposed sites are tested against the relative sustainability criteria. In terms of flood risk, all sites must be subject to the PPG/draft PPS25 Sequential Test. This is best applied at the plan stage, which better allows for a consideration of alternatives. Therefore, if windfall sites were likely to be permitted we would recommend that appropriate general locations be identified within the development plan, and it should be demonstrated that the correct procedures in selecting these areas have been applied. <b>General Development Locations</b> As stated above, for all allocations it must be demonstrated that the PPG/PPS25 Sequential Test (and the Exception test where required) has been applied. Clearly the TGSE SFRA will have a key role in this process, and we are able to advise. In all respects, the approach taken must be robust and transparent. The 'probable' approach
277	Ms S A Elkington	No. Build housing that first time buyers could afford. Fill in old sites. Do not build on anymore green belt.
278	Mr P Marshall	Land shouldn't be released from Green Belt not before they have looked into requirements of doctors, schools and road congestion.
279	S J Heeney	I have never spoken to anyone in this district who would like to see green belt released for development.
280	Mrs M A Tyrell	The whole situation grieves me, as it is already very built up - all the places run into each other. It is far removed from the rural area I first came to in 1959. What is the point of having green belt areas if it can so easily be released? Friends are already moving out because of overcrowding. The only option I can see is to extend northwards - Canewdon, Great Wakering etc.
285	Mrs B E Dale	No more greenbelt should be released at all. There are pockets of land dotted all over the Rochford district which could be used to build affordable housing. The site of the garage on the corner of Eastwood Road and Queens Road Rayleigh should be purchased by the council and, flats built to suit essential workers. A new town should certainly not be built in this corner of Essex, the roads are too congested now. Soon this corner of Essex will be grid-locked. Planning permission for large houses should be curtailed and developers encouraged to build smaller units. If we must have a high number of homes then maisonettes or small houses would be preferable to one large house.

286	Mr L F Knight	No more housing without vastly increased infrastructure.
287	Mr R Forster	I don't agree with releasing green belt land to build or, once its gone it gone.
288	Mr & Mrs C Cummins	Before allocating land for a new town consider using infill sites. There is land available between 340/370 Eastwood Road, Rayleigh and the Bartletts. This land is presently designated as green belt, but is flanked and fronted by housing. It does not benefit the community as leisure space and is an unsightly area creating opportunity for fly tipping or travellers.
289	Mrs J Warner	No major development
290	Ms E Davis	Not the green belt.
291	Maydo Pitt	Housing Trajectory We consider it important for the Core Strategy to set out a strategic housing trajectory, expressing the Council's broad expectations for the delivery of housing over the Core Strategy period. We accept that it will need to be done at a strategic level, since individual development sites have yet to be identified, but it would set out the general expectations for the broad quantum (in general terms) and sources of completions (existing commitment, unallocated urban capacity/windfall sites, brownfield allocations, Greenfield sites/urban extensions etc) over the plan's lifetime.
292	Mr & Mrs Goring	Being a resident of Rochford I am reluctant to want to encourage any development as I love being surrounded by farmland and appreciate the countryside - that is why my family moved out of Southend. However, new, affordable housing has to be built for our young people. The facilities (is schools, doctors, drainage) are already overstretched, so it would seem that a new town may be the only answer.
297	Mr S Marshall	I believe that the land to the west of Rayleigh, out towards Rawreth, would be ideal for the creation of a new town. It is near main roads, accessible to Rayleigh Station and it is not exactly inspring green belt land - so not a great loss.
298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	No more flats. No further development in the RDC area. Too much building has already taken place with the destruction of existing dwellings and rebuilding with new, squeezing too many properties onto old sites.
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	We believe that it is important to use all brown sites available and balance the need for more industrial units against the housing need. The Green Belt must be protected as much as possible. We are strongly against a new town. It is also important that consideration is given to the infrastructure, the more houses the greater the impact on resources, drainage, schools, roads, doctors etc, etc. There is a limit to the number of people who can come into this area. You should set a sensible limit and then fight to keep to that and not be forced to do more.
300	Mrs Upson	The green belt should be kept as such as over houseing should be discouraged etc. Also note traffic impossible/2 cars now to one dwelling. Pavements not suitable, water shortage, people outo f work unless on private work. Real jobs not available to many people in this area.
302	Mr B Short	Odd pieces of land between already existing houses, which are not used, would be ideal for building new houses
303	Mr K Hatfield	The road infrastructure cannot take further development in Hockley and Hawkwell. Greenbelt should be released only as a last resort.
304	Mr A Rutter	Yes provided roads, schools, doctors are increased.
305	E L Strangleman	No. No. We do not need any more building in this area, otherwise a new school would be needed, and one has already been demolished.
306	Mr E C Cook	Restrict further development, no new town. No release of Green Belt.
307	Mr J Snow	No land to be released from "Green Belt" and limited development on brownfield sites ie not "toytown" developments. Definitely no to any new town development. I see no other options as these areas are developed enough as it is. Utilize under used warehouse/industrial units to house others and the area of land made available for housing.

308	The Occupier	How can we think of a further quantity of housing without providing an answer to the grid locking of Rayleigh, at certain times it can already take over half an hour from High Street to the A127. If we need new houses, we need new roads and infrastructures to cope. Without further roads and shops, huoses will make life miserable for all, creating hostility and aggression. With all the building of homes in London Road and Rawreth Lane there is a desperate need for a supermarket in that area. You cannot be so naive as to think that people living there will shop in the High Street! If they do, where will they park in an already overcrowded parking lot?
309	Mr J Smith	No more green belt should be released and certainly we do not need a new town another defacement of the green landscape.
310	Chris Teeder	Land should not be released from the Green Belt. We should not be continuing to develop around this area. It is already over developed and the council should be asking the Government to look elsewhere in the country. I think we have more than enough new towns in this area too. This part of Essex seems to be getting destroyed by developers who are only concentrating on making money more than being realistic about how the roads and infrastructure can take it and impact on environment.
311	Mrs P A Watson Jones	Land should be released at Rayleigh end of Bull Lane, it is close to shopping centre and schools '60 homes' can be built here. Not so keen on new towns, which take a lot of green belt away. Many new flats already created and on increase from property which were originally business use ie garages.
312	Mr D Foyle	I think the Green Belt should remain GREEN and housing should be restircted. I do not think the smaller towns/villages should be over developed as this will spoil their character. If an increase in housing is necessary then it should try to be developed within the land available within the area but not by building large estates. Rayleigh is increasingly getting bigger and with it there is an increase in problems such as crime and traffic congestion and it will soon lose its appeal if large scale housing is implemented. I do not think a new town is a good idea either - taking Basildon as an example it is not exactly an 'up and coming area' and one of the reasons for this is because they built large estates of cheap housing which seem to come hand in hand with social problems. Let areas where it is possible to implement extra housing without spoiling the character of the place take it on board and not try to over develop the small towns and villages in the area. If there is not enough land to implement the increase in housing expected then we should turn around and say NO! There must be plenty
313	Mr B Sellwood	Housing Probable Option (p25) : This option is supported.
314	Mrs C Quennell	There should be more infill to housing while in-between there is green belt land. Top end of Rayleigh Avenue, where large houses are built, inbetween, is small pieces of green belt land these could be used for affordable housing, pieces of green belt land in Disraeli Road off Rayleigh Avenue could be built on with affordable houses through to Grove Road. Smaller houses should be built and get young people on the property market.
315	R A Stone	Green belt land should not be released. No new town is necessary, all effort should focus on the Thames Gateway. There has already been too much development without the corresponding infrastructure. There has been too much development of the flood plain.
316	Ms S Copeman	Use existing infrastructure in and around Hawkwell eg Ironwell Lane Nursery, Glebelands Nursery and Widows Nursery (Ivanhoe) therefore not spoiling the countryside end of Ironwell Lane but using existing main drainage and gas supply or a similar location with these facilities accessible.
317	Mr D Harris	I think it is best to allow the existing towns to grow.
318	Ms W Hatton	Brown belt land should be used there seem to be old industrial sites (eye sores) like the one next to the new housing down Rawreth Road that need clearing and starting again (housing would be a good option and the industrial units could easily be relocated to all these areas with for let signs.

319	Mr M Lang	Not down in this corner of Essex. We should be saying no more room down here, roads won't cope, new jobs and housing should go up North to encourage growth up there rather than leading to a North/South divide.
320	J Feather	Not a new town. Fill-in around the whole district, not just Rayleigh
321	R J Feather	Definitely not a new town. Fill in the gaps across the entire district.
323	Mr T Beebee	No housing to be built on green belt. No new development south of the railway line. Any new housing should be sustainable and energy efficient.
324	Mrs Doward	I have lived in this area since 1949 and personally don't think the towns and villages you mention should be further developed. They are losing their identity, their green spaces and traffic problems are occurring. Hockley has been overdeveloped, leaving it with congested roads and Rochford is being squashed with new building and losing its old character. Hawkwell has always been proud of being a "bungalow" village with its farmland and green spaces, but since the expansion of Cherry Orchard Lane, more and more lorries are being channeled through Hawkwell. There is already frustration at the Nursery corner mini roundabout where all the traffic converges causing long tail backs. Please save the green belt around these villages and stop further development. I think people would be more sympathetic to the building of a new town or village as long as it isn't allowed to encroach on existing neighbourhoods. Let there be space between any new developments and the existing inhabitants. I think a lot of the trouble with new building is the fact that they are forced on to local residents without any thought for how the influx of people will affect them with regard to the extra noise, traffic and
325	Mr D Elwell	In my opinion no further development should be allowed in the RDC area. Current infrastructure will not sustain such development and if it is forced by local and central government, current users of local infrastructure will suffer to a great extent. I live in Hullbridge and unless I leave for work early my journey is compromised by traffic congestion. Delays will also be incurred for emergency service vehicles if roads become more congested.
326	Owner/Occupier	Land should not be released from green belt! I thought the whole concept of designating land as green belt was to protect it from development. Efforts should be directed at challenging the central government's requirement. Any development should be on brownfield sites, measures should be considered to help reduce the number of empty houses.
327	Mrs C Taylor	Certainly not - we have the green belt protect ourselves from over crowding, lack of green belt and we would all be living in towns. I moved into the Hockley/Ashingdon area from Rayleigh, which is just a concrete jungle now - so spoilt. No more development in the Rochford and surrounding areas, the roads can't cope, schools are on their maximum capacity, doctors, have to wait days for appointment - general lack of infrastructure don't make it any worse - the Thamesgate way is bad all round. Go build in the MP's back yard - we are leaving here now!
329	Mrs M J Snowdon	I am against any further erosion of the green belt, this area could be liable to extensive flooding and concreting over further land could have disastrous results. I think the areas mentioned above have already been developed too much for comfort over the past few years.
330	P Mansbridge	Small number of larger housing developments combined with existing infilling. Need for improved infrastructure - especially roads/public transport. Leave true 'Green Belt' land as it is. Use areas of piecemeal 'plotlands' and develop to current standards. Need to 'maintain barriers' between areas. Develop mini-towns on redundant farmbuildings. Consider social needs of these developments especially young people.
331	Mr A C Cooper	I would propose a new town type development. I think Hockley/Hawkwell/Rayleigh have become too enlarged and urbanised without much road access improvement. Suggest looking at South Farnbridge, Wallasea Island, Foulness or what about Maplin (which was a very popular choice for London's 3rd airport a few years ago I recall). Must build decent road links - STOP fighting the car - it's here to stay at least for next few decades!

332	Mr & Mrs Jones	Green belt should not be sacrosanct and under no circumstances touched, brown field sites utilised, poor quality ie along noisy rail or road links for shops and industry to aid accessibility to transport systems and homes on land with pleasant environments.
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	Larger housing sites will completely destroy the character of this area. It will end up joining one town/village to another thus swallowing up the essential gaps that exist at the moment. We believe these houses should be fairly spread throughout the district with added/improved schools, health facilities and shops to benefit the outlying villages as well as the larger 3 areas.
334	Mrs Amey	We don't have a great deal of green belt left so I don't think green belt should be an option at all. Our narrow position is between the Thames on one side and the Crouch on the other. Our main roads west are very congested and there doesn't seem to be any space for a bypass around Rayleigh. We live in the lowest rainfall area in Britain, so why is there a need for so many more houses in this particular area? Is it for the residents of this area or for others coming outside this area? Doctors and dentists are full and I expect schools are having a problem too. If you are considering agricultural areas, which I assume is greenbelt for development, what about the farmers? Do they get a say. Probably a new town would have all the roads, schools, doctors, shops, factories, sewerage, etc incorporated and it would probably be better for an area further north with its own road structure that doesn't come near the A13 and A127 this end of the country but joins much further up. Infilling seems a better option for this area. I am very much in agreement that new houses should have rainwater storage
347	Mr C Rooke	Consider existing use, effect on landscape and environment plus lack of access to be considered before any green belt land is released for housing. Lower Road Hockley might well be used for development. It must be ? That in Rochford there is little land that appears to be of immediate use ? max. we havent had much of any brownfield or similar sites expand existing development.
349	Ms C Paine	Every effort should be made to preserve green belt. Much of the area is over developed and infrastructure is strained. We are in danger of becoming an urban sprawl. Concentrate on small developments that can be absorbed without detriment to the area.
350	Mr A James	I believe Green Belt land should never be built on, as this was the reason it was thought up in the first place.
352	Cllr Joyce Smith	Should not release land from Green Belt - it is still needed as a buffer zone.
353	Mr R J Saward	South side of Windermere Avenue Hullbridge should be released from green belt for development for housing. It would improve the conditions we have put up with, dust in the summer, mud and dirty water in winter making this road dangerous, there has been 3 or 4 major accidents in the passed 2-3 years caused by speeding off the unmade roade onto the Main Road.
354	Mrs Smith	By 2021 a new sensible government would have been in place making ANOTHER 4600 homes unnecessary with so many people emigrating out of the UK, where are all these people who 'need' a home coming from? The London/Southend corridor is over prescribed now, but a great deal of green open space is around Brentwood area and with Oldchurch and Harold Wood Hospitals closing the vacant area would accommodate much more than 4600 new homes.



355	Mr K Vingoe	1. Housing Policy - The Parish Council continues to see protection of the Green Belt as essential to the conservation of the district's character. 2. Infilling - Some infilling will inevitably occur, but like the present provision of extensions and alterations is increasing the pressure on both the physical and social infrastructure. 3. New community - As the protection of the Green Belt is essential, it maybe that the provision of a new community of whatever size, is the only way to ensure the necessary infrastructural improvement. To protect against coalescence of new communities along their borders and to ensure that new developments are built to the environmental standards required for future protection of our environment. Wherever such proposal maybe made it will inevitably receive resistance, but the value of this option can only be made after a 'well informed' debate throughout the district.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	As our house backs onto Green Belt we value the visual and aesthetic benefits of agricultural and undeveloped land, but recognise there is likely to be pressure to infill on the outskirts of town. This should be resisted as much as possible, making use of areas already completely surrounded by development; this is where infrastructure already exists. A new town will change for the worse the character of the area unless it is isolated from existing towns. River frontages may be more suitable for high-quality, high-value housing.
357	Ms V O'Malley	We don't have the infrastructure for more homes. The roads around Rochford etc are overcrowded now. We supposedly have a water shortage, where will more water come from.
358	Mr & Mrs England	No more development around Rochford, Ashingdon, Hockley or Hawkwell it will end up one whole sprawl. Use land either side of Rawreth Lane to develop new town of Rawreth. Roads - new A130, old A130, proximity of A127 A12 and railways already in place. This land is not very scenic already.
359	Mr New	4000 new homes, about 16,000 people, about the size of Rayleigh. Infilling is the easy option but puts a strain on already stretched services and congestion particularly noticed in Rayleigh. Looking ahead a new town is probably the best answer.
360	Mr A J Eisenhower	The Green Belt land in the district must be protected and preserved at all cost. Brown field sites should always be used first whether they are small or large scale sites. Of course the development must only be approved where appropriate infrastructure can cope or be provided without damaging the Green Belt or character of the area.
362	Ms M Power	In accordance with sustainable development principles (PPS1, PPG3, PPS12 and PPG13) Rochford District Council should continue to locate new housing development within and adjacent to the key settlements of Rochford, Ashingdon, Hockley and Rayleigh on the principle that these settlements contain existing support and community facilities to serve the existing and new residents. However, it is recognised that due to much of the district being protected by Green Belt, countryside and special landscape designations that RDC will not be able to accommodate RSS housing numbers all on previously developed land. In these circumstances Green Belt land will therefore need to be carefully reviewed in order to suquentially assess the most sustainable locations for new housing land. It is considered not 'sound' to seek to rely on 90% of the housing units to be accommodated on previously developed land within the top tier settlements. It is considered that in order for the RDC LDF policies to be considered 'soound' that it should ensure enough land is allocated to accommodate all
365	Mrs H J Springham	Improvement in infrastructure is important in this area regarless of where these extra houses are built. Green belt should not be released for housing. These extra homes should be built fairly throughout the District, not in one area.
366	Mr S J Springham	Green belt land should not be released. Existing land should be developed to its maximum potential to release green belt land would have too great an impact on the character of the district. Any extra housing should be distributed evenly across the area.

369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	No land should be released. We have lived in this area for over 29 years and it is already over developed with far too much housing too much traffic, overstretched schools, doctors, buses, trains etc. We know the government make local authorities build more houses but enough is enough.
370	Mr G Biner	I feel that land should not be released from green belt except as a last resort, as this land was originally designated as greenbelt for the reason of preservation and this preservation is now more important than ever. Our existing towns cannot cope with any more development. Our secondary schools are overstretched and cannot cope with the amount of children in their catchment areas. In previous years, so called development allowed Park School to be shut and demolished and extra housing built but with no thought to secondary education. The pollution levels in Rayleigh High Street are in excess of EU regulations and our primary distribution routes cannot safely handle the volumes and speeds of traffic now using them. Our local tips are overcrowded and not running efficiently, encouraging fly-tipping. If it is really necessary to increase developments and a substantial environmentally "unimportant" plot of land can be found then a new town would be preferable, but to be effective, enough planning and forethought must be given, not only to cater for the next 20 years, but the next 200 years. The other option that would help to protect and preserve our environment the most, would be to stick up
371	Swanton	No more housing. We have insufficient schools, hospitals, doctors etc. Too much traffic.

## **2. AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

Have we got the figure right? Should we be aiming higher or lower? Is affordable housing a major issue?

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Contact Name</b>	<b>Affordable Housing Comments</b>
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	Affordable housing is an issue, not just for this area, it needs to be tackled head on by the Government, curtail the greed of Estate Agents, Solicitors and Vendors by limiting the amount of profit each can make starting with the Vendors, don't let the market determine how much money each can make so that prices will level off
003	Mr A Cooper	Need total mix across price range but more at lower price end. There are plenty of 4 bed detached already
004	Mr M Cubitt	It's impossible for 1st time buyers. If landlords paid council tax they would be less inclined to buy to let and allow genuinely needy folk to buy.
005	Mrs P R Byres	Affordable housing is most certainly a major issue in this area but it is rather too late. House prices have been allowed to get out of control by the government. Whilst most of the newer properties in this area have been detached houses.
007	Ms P Pemberton	Yes - I believe it is, especially for local young people/families
008	Ms S Woolhouse	More affordable housing is needed. Too many people are moving into the area from London and are pushing prices up making it even more difficult for sons and daughters of long term residents to afford somewhere of their own. Too many flats for elderly residents are being built and not enough low cost flats for the young.
009	Ms S Nicholls	Affordable housing is an issue but needs to be addressed within the area not by building more houses
010	Mr A Devlin	No it is not an issue, I think the current levels are fine
011	R F Wise	There is a need for Council housing at affordable rates these should be built on brown field sites such as the land occupied by defunct brickworks of which there are atleast two in the area.
012	G Hemmings	More 1 bed and studio flats are needed for first time buyers such as those just refused at No 1 Harper Way
014	D Hanrahan	Depends who you are considering. I think the balance is right. Hall Road, Ashingdon Heights and Doggetts that's as far across the board as anyone.
015	F A Robinson	Why must the taxpayer bear the burden of affordable housing? Have we not learned from the last time when Council housing was sold off cheap. The wise or greedy sold them off at a great profit. Affordable housing must be kept by the Council. Then it can be rented out and if necessary Housing Benefit and Council Tax benefit can be claimed. This way only one department is responsible for fraudulent claims.
016	Mr R Fuller	Sorry - I don't know what your number is. I would suggest 65% be affordable. By affordable there should be proper family homes with small gardens, not starter homes or batchelor flats. Two up two down terrace would be ok but should be combined on estates with bigger homes.
017	Mr L A G Dunford	Yes. Possibly a litter lower. No this is affluent society a real domitory town have a look at the local school car park, modern expensive cars parked.
018	Mrs Gaunt	No more housing to be built, affordable housing should be met out of existing building already built and to expensive too little too late.
019	Mrs L Allen	Affordable Housing a joke my son is a Police Officer, single, cannot afford to buy on his own. Even the properties for essential workers are beyond him and others like him. And when is a laundry worker at a care home an essential worker. My other son and his wife had to move over to Benfleet as Rayleigh is out of their price range.
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	If affordable means small, cheap and nasty then don't bother. Otherwise, we have no idea what the mix is.

022	Mr R Hockett & Ms C Mobbs	Affordable housing has only become an issue because successive governments have reduced housing subsidy to local authorities - this has resulted in private rented accommodation increasing, to the extent where rents are vastly inflated and ordinary uk citizens can neither afford to buy or rent. Bricks and mortar are not the problem, just the Government politicians who make the policies. Why doesn't the Government give local authorities same funds as housing associations?
023	Ms C J Christopher	Not an issue. It's always been difficult to get onto the first rung of housing ladder and always will be. If kids stop drinking and clubbing they'll be able to save for a house.
026	Mr A Lantaff	About right.
027	Mr B Fuller	We do not need more affordable housing.
028	Mr J Lickfold	Cheap affordable housing normally ends up a slum. People willing to work and pay their own way in life, should be given decent housing in the first place, which would last longer.
029	Mr White	No, the amount of affordable housing built is pitiful. Why are developments always executive housing? First time buyers should be encouraged more or eventually the whole buying process will collapse.
030	Mr H May	"Affordable" Housing is not provided by the Council and is not really relevant unless there is adequate work in the area. If the Government has set your target at 4,600, you have little choice.
031	A R Wetton	Affordable housing is an issue but the figure should be lower. Affordable housing should be built close to jobs - reduce commuting. There are many brown field sites where affordable housing could be built. Affordable housing tends to be short term as couples have families, turnover should be considered when determining numbers.
032	J Morley	Yes, it is an issue. Too many young couples are struggling to find somewhere to live so there should be more council run homes.
033	Mr R Balchin	Affordable housing must be available for the young and not open to opportunist, labour saving, environmentally friendly solar possible for new design.
035	Mr B Deal	No, the only affordable housing that seems to be being built is retirement homes.
036	Mrs P Slade	I feel that a full time wage earner should not have to budget more than half of his/her salary just on accommodation. House prices must reflect earnings and loans should abide by the old format of calculating mortgages by 3 x salary PA maximum. This will then naturally bring house prices down.
037	Mr A Bawden	No you have not got the figure right, there does not appear to be any affordable housing? I have not seen any kind of property for sale at under 100K for years! How is a young person earning between 12/20K per year even able to get on the ladder?
038	Mr J Wright	We have built far too many high priced houses, which have been bought by moneyed people from outside the area. This adds a burden on our schools, hospitals etc. each one of these adds at least two cars to our roads.
039	Ms D Quinn	Affordable housing - is a major issue more subsidised housing necessary
040	Mr D Huskisson	I couldn't find a figure for A.H. in your article. Nor can I find a definition for the term. Surely everything is "affordable" because overpriced housing does not stay on the market long at that price and eventually gets sold. If you are going to have to accommodate 3,700 additional homes by 2021, the use of planning gain to subsidise "affordable" housing seems a realistic proposition because of the apparently insatiable demand that is driving up prices (and developers profits). I am very concerned about the future stability of our society if our young people do not have access to homes of their own.

041	Mr McGee	Too many houses over £250 thousand called executive houses. These houses take up the room of 2 houses in most cases even room for in there places for well designed flats
043	Mr M Yorke Wade	Affordable housing is a good thing but we should not sacrifice area's just to build houses and loose what countryside we have.
045	Mr R Abbott	Affordable housing is a major issue. Aim lower. Don't build high.
046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	Affordable housing for "keyworkers" yes, otherwise no - what I see is Council's using 'affordable housing' to solve "problem family" issues. Not fiar on the people just across the road who are paying full price - just not a sustainable idea (obvious!!).
047	Ms J Colbourne	Private housing has always been difficult to attain for the younger generation - it is no harder now than it was 30 years ago to buy your first home, people want too much too soon they are not willing to wait for luxury's that they think are essential.
048	Mr S Reeves	Affordable for who? It's about supply and demand surely, let the market place set the prices.
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	Affordable housing in this area is not a major issue. We shold be aiming lower.
050	Mrs J Samuels	Of course affordable housing is a national problem. If we make an analogy to roads, the M25 was supposed to solve all traffic ills! Building yet more houses puts too much pressure on the local infrastructure and social servies. Any housing provided by the council even if the quantity is increased is taken up by asylum seekers who have to be housed first and therefore does not benefit the indigenous population.
051	Mrs D Langdon	How do we know without any figures given. More control over immigration would be the answer.
052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	Rochford's fourth worst in the country for rented housing, the proportion is extremely bad. It has been like this for decades, it is disgraceful and very shameful. How much longer will Rochford be in the red area?
053	E Winn	How can you build affordable housing with prices as high as they are in this area.
054	Mr & Mrs Todman	Affordable housing should not be ? Into high specification development
056	Mr S Lee	Yes it is a major issue. Most people struggle to get on the housing ladder as I did many years ago. However, I feel this generation have no chance.
057	Mrs J Williams	I cannot see a figure in the article. Yes, affordable housing is a major issue as it is already too hard for first time buyers to get onto the property ladder.
059	Garfield	Yes, affordable housing is a major issue but Essex has it's fair share of houses.
060	Mr S J Herbert	The right figure is as close to '0' as possible.
061	Mr G W Slaughter	Leave it as it is
062	Chris Taylor	Affordable housing is a necessity for genuine home seekers. Owner - occupation is highly desirable in order to reduce demand for rented accommodation supported by 'benefit' financed by Council Tax payers. Supply and demand examination will reveal what the balance is.
063	Mr B A Stammers	A mixture of all types of housing together is the best for all the people. Affordable housnig mix as you have it now is correct.
064	Mrs S Smith	I have no knowledge of affordable housing needs or the number being constructed. There is a need for affordable housing - new towns, buses and railways. People needing affordable housing cannot afford expensive travel. This matter is an issue to be under consideration.

065	Mr T Bennett	Affordable (truly affordable!) is a major issue if local service standards are to be maintained and improved...but they need to be made available on some sort of "contract basis", so that their original aim is not sold out for private profit.
066	Mr G Langhorn	Affordable housing will continue to be an issue and stems back to the sale of council houses.
067	J D Carr	Affordable housing should not be a major issue in this area. ? Dare to suggest that majority of wage earners work away from the area in view of the salaries paid in London. Obviously local ? Apply their professions weakly and for their staff along with Police, Teachers and nursing staff some provisions need to be considered.
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	We consider council houses owned and maintained by local councils to be affordable housing. Not housing associations or part ownership.
069	Mrs B Buckland	As I have 2 sons in their early 20's affordable housing is important especially for this age group. Otherwise they will never leave home and be independent. Also for older people who want to down-size and release some equity because their pensions are not worth much now!
070	P Robertson	The figure at the moment is about right aiming lower could have a very bad effect aiming lower could have a very bad effect regarding population density and stretched services and roads.
071	P Williams	Only if we want to make it one. Affordable housing must be a major requirement providing it is not detrimental to the established housing and owners
072	Mr & Mrs S J Painter	Supoprt building new town in the South East. There may be land in Hullbridge.
073	Mr S Learmouth	Unable to answer
074	Mr & Mrs Raddon	If you mean by affordable housing flats which are springing up everywhere NO. We wouldn't have this problem if the immigration was heandled poperly. Make use of unused sites. Stop building useless factories.
075	Mr K A Cooke	As we have predominantly privately owned housing in the Southeast following the "right to buy scheme" affordable housing can only mean high density low quality and therefore low value homes in poor locations. Although interested in this subject for family reasons I have yet to hear of any scheme whereby house sellers sell at below market prices to enable poor people to buy.
076	Ms G Lunn	The types of housing being built should be aimed at first time buyers and should be further limited to very small developments only. We do not want a Chafford Hundred style development fo rthis area it is not only unnecessary, but it also gives every area a uniform and nondescript look devoid of any character.
077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	There could be some more affordable housing but only for the needs of local people and young people who cannot afford today's for too expensive housing. With houses being up to 4 times what they were 10 years ago, with salaries little more than then, affordable housing - for all is a major issue and problem.
078	David & Jeanne	Yes. No.
079	Mrs S Clark	Why are builders given planning permission for 4 bedroom detached properties? Three bedroom semi's are more practical and affordable. There should be more practical houses. It has to be a major issue.
080	Mr C Hathaway	It should be the responsibility of the employers of those requiring affordable housing to make suitable accommodation available to their staff either through leasing or renting arrangements and if necessary with tax incentives provided by Central Government.
081	T S Papworth	Most people I know at my age 30-35 cannot possibly obtain a mortgage for a one bed property most professionals earn 15-25K which is not enough to purchase even council right to buy schemes. One beds are approx 100K.
082	Mr J Adkin	You have the right balance

084	Miss M Andrews	May help in recruitment of workers for NHS, Police, Teachers, Transport workers etc.
085	C G Tabar	More affordable housing desperately required.
086	Mr M Gorman	Yes, it is a major issue. Our children and grandchildren will need to afford housing, where are they going to live. Less people in the country would mean we do not have to build houses for them.
087	Mr I Walker	Not a major issue provided housing 'mix' is right.
088	Miss S Thackeray	Affordable housing is a major issue. We have more 4/5 bedroom luxury houses - bl have two sons 17 and 20, they need one bedroom flats, starter homes. Was this considered at all when planning/building was granted for Downhall Park estate or the development along Rawreth Lane.
090	Mr B Everett	We should build more council - housing ass houses part ownec
091	Ms P Bailey	Affordable housing has always been an issue when my husband and I brought in 1976 we both took extra jobs to pay for it. Why don't we try to stop property developers buying cheaper property to do up and re sell at higher amount - lessons cheaper property for new purchasers.
092	Mrs M Hills	Affordable housing is a major issue. Too many big houses are being built. Small estates of smaller properties for the young and the old shaould be built. Large ? Of empty land around the airport and Rochford to Shopland area available.
093	Mrs M J Owoo	Yes it is a major issue, possibly lower affordable housing.
094	F A Browne	Aim lower, although affordable housing is of some importance, hopefully for young families wishing to get on to housing ladder . A significant problem.
095	Mr J Britton	See comments
096	Mr W Roberts	I think the affordable housing is about right. But it needs constant vigilance to get the balance right. More facilities for homeless people, please.
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	Yes, for single persons under 55, affordable housing is a major issue. Too much is allocated to retirement aged people so that people, like my daughter (27) cannot afford a small property of her own even though she is deaf and registered disabled.
098	Mrs N London	Affordable housing is never affordable by those who need it, council houses should be brought back, people earning £20-£25,000 per annum cannot get a mortgage even for so called affordable housing!
099	Mr & Mrs R G Headley	We do not need any more large 'Executive houses". There are many of these on the market which are not being sold at the moment. People do need some low cost houses to start on the property ladder. Not many of these are being built at the moment.
100	Mr R Scates	Affordable housing is a major issue for new-home owners. It is a shame there is so few council housing anymore then there wouldn't be an 'affordable housing' problem. If you build affordable housing, then allow occupiers to outright purchase it will soon become unaffordable housing. It is not the number of houses built but the policy which is the problem.
101	Mrs S Parsons	Yes - especially for young ones.
102	Mr T Newton	Being a home owner in Rochford/Ashingdon for over 30 years, I am not aware of a problem in this area. Affordable housing is linked to jobs and pay, if jobs in the area stay with the appalling low pay at present, how can young or local workers afford mortgages on houses. Local areas of expensive housing locally are populated by London workers and builders.



104	B Aspinall	In my opinion the current balance is about right.
105	Mr R J Aldridge	We do not need any new homes tell the government we will not build them.
106	Ms P Melito	The prices are rising in this area and more affordable housing for first time buyers is needed. Why must our children move away to let strangers move in. The young have a right if they want to stay within their birth place.
107	Mr P S Reid	It is a major issue - people must have a home to live in.
109	Mr C Fantides	I do not see affordable housing a problem in this area.
110	Mr P Nippard	If someone could explain exactly what constituted "affordable housing" then I might be able to comment.
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	Yes, to keep our younger people in the area, we need affordable housing to help the young get started
112	A J Smythe	Affordable housing really means sub-standard little boxes made of "Ticky-Tacky", of which we have quite sufficient already. As for allocating land for a new town, one only has to look at Basildon and South Woodham Ferrers to see the disaster that this policy would lead to. I am old enough to remember when both were quite pleasant little villages. If you want a "broad area of search" to erect yet more housing, I suggest you search south of the A127, an area which could hardly be made worse. As for "Gypsy and Travellers" - they should be discouraged from any part of the District - remember what happened at Cherry Orchard Way where the mess they left behind was an eyesore for months afterwards. (Crays Hill is the worst example of this blight). No more oppressive blocks of flats!
113	Mr & Mrs Rowland	More schemes are needed to help young people, young families and the disabled to afford to buy housing. Encourage people to take in "vetted" lodges? Scheme with local businesses/schools/hospital workers.
114	Mr & Mrs F Blake	I don't consider affordable housing to be a major issue in this area.
115	Mr W J Wharnsby	Affordable houses are a major issue
116	R S Barton	Yes affordable housing is an issue. The number of affordable homes available should be relative to the numbers of "Rochford district residents" trying to buy their first property.
117	W R H Beehag	There seems to be a good balance generally. Affordable housing is necessary and good, but it needs adequate space and perhaps to be a bit out of town if possible. Perhaps Rawreth is a good area.
118	Mrs I Sandell	Affordable housing is a major issue everywhere, but especially in the Southeast. Young people in particular are affected by the ridiculously high cost of property.
119	Mr C Gabell	What figure? All developments at should include an element of affordable housing.
121	Mrs S J Attfield	Yes, obviously affordable housing is an issue; the younger generation are unable to buy into the housing market when they are on local salaries; they support the local industries and therefore deserve better. Young couples cannot even afford to have children due to the cost of housing and are leaving it latter until mid-thirties before even considering becoming parents. This is a national disgrace we have become a nanny state where we are dictated to at every turn.
123	Mr K Walcer	Any house over £250,000 far too high, take a lifetime to pay off mortgage if ever? Housing market price out by estate agents to greedy. Empty shops cause they can't afford the rent, homeless, no council houses left?
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	Build houses, flats etc. that are part owned by the council or a housing trust, retain your part ownership in perpetuity. Offer incentives to move after a certain number of years. Only allow re-sale to low-income 1st time buyers (except in exceptional circumstances).

126	Mr J Jefferies	Affordable housing is a major issue, but that does not mean that the new stock for this purpose has to be flats entirely. This inspite of the fact of the increase in single occupancy.
127	Mr G Ware	Provision for affordable housing should be a must.
128	Mr H Snell	Enough appartments are being built this is not an issue.
129	Mr A Clarke	Limited development on brownfield sites only. Social housing provision is always subject to abuse...as has already been reported in recent news bulletins....strict guidelines must be enforced as to who should qualify ie only keyworkers in service industries on very low incomes. No to those who have made lifestyle choices to secure a subsidized place on the housing ladder at the taxpayers expense. No also to gypsy and/or travellers sites. BBC Look East news has highlighted the problems with such sites in the Basildon, Wickford area plus also in Cambridgeshire. We have enough anti-social behaviour problems already without importing more.
130	Mrs S Martin	Builders should be made to build affordable housing as well as the more expensive large houses they all seem to build now.
131	Mel Bennett	Housing prices are a problem! Concept of affordable housing fine, but will prices rise/set such that it is always problem for 1st buyer. If possible to construct house for low price then why hasn't it been achieved before? Noted that we are seeing a rash of flats/apartments being built is this how "affordable" property can be achieved but still £150K+
133	The Occupier	The current vision of affordable housing is just creating tomorrows slums. Current market forces will be the deciding factor, and are out of the councils control.
134	Ms Innes	(a) Yes. (b) Lower. (c) No.
135	Mr C Blundell	Yes it is a major issue
136	Mrs G E Chase	What we need is housing for people on lower incomes to rent. All too often flats are built for sale, and as soon as they are sold, the buyers then rent them out. Building societies and banks should put a stop to this. More often that not the rents are exorbitant.
137	Mr & Mrs Acres	Does affordable housing go to the right people? What safeguards are there?
138	The Occupier	Affordable housing is built but much remains empty, especially those built for ? - insufficient publicity is given to the availability. Some have new build where there is poor public transporot service.
139	Ms A Clark	Aim to provide decent family housing for rent. This can be done by re-developing redundant units in town and village centres.
140	Mrs J Davies	affordable housing - yes - but with housing associations buying large numbers and then renting these out nothing has been achieved has it? - only to make these associations riches. From the facts that I have seen and read this government needs to deal with the cause of the problem not the symptoms. I have seen areas in and around London with large numbers of housing standing unoccupied boarded up but of good sound construction. Be brave ignore the figures "aim lower" I have seen a satelite photo of 'Europe at night' we are so densly populated it will shock you.
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	Affordable housing is a major issue - again this would be making better use of brown field sites and what we already have.
142	D Tilley/R Bhandari	Aim lower; spread housing out so as to avoid creating ghettos.
143	J E Burfield	Unless you want your young people to leave you must encourage them to stay. Give them homes they can afford. Flats or houses.

145	Mr A Lysons	There is no way I can afford anything bigger than a beach hut on my skilled agricultural wages. Demand is exceeding supply. Tax second homes HARD. New builds houses are awful my two siblings live in newbuilds and they are cheap houses at expensive prices. There seems to be no shortage of houses for footballers/millionaires/lottery winners/criminals, nowhere for me though. Key workers? We are ALL key workers!
146	A C Barton	Yes affordable housing for the deserving needy. Deserving needs to be defined.
147	Mr I Randall	Affordable housing is a major issue for the young as we should be aiming lower. However, aim too low and social problems increase and/or become an issue.
148	L F Wallace	To suggest you limit ownership of houses to one per family, then perhaps those poor aspiring home owners might stand some chance of owning a home of their own.
149	Cunningham	The figure is about right.
150	Ms N Saunders	Housing has become unaffordable for lots of people - not just keyworkers and unemployed people. I can't afford to live in my house mainly due to my council tax almost doubling in the last 6 years whilst my wages haven't increased.
151	Mr R Roles	Rochford planning department has a very bureaucratic attitude one could say heads in the sand. My next door neighbour applied for planning permission to build a one bedroom bungalow on part of his garden. Permission was refused. I can only think this was based on only one objection. Not a very reasonable objection I must say. Allowing the build would have enhanced the area, replacing an almost derelict old garage and an eyesore of a very ugly, high fence. The build would have provided housing for two people. It does not seem Rochford Planning Department is interested to alleviate the housing shortage.
152	Mr S Crowther	Affordable housing IS a major issue. More homes for key workers and the districts young people in preference to developments featuring 4/5 bedroomed house.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	Any housing needed should be affordable housing, aimed at the young people of the area being able to afford to stay in the area if they so wish, rather than having to move to the cheap areas of Southend.
156	J W Collins	Affordable housing must be a statutory part of any development, big or small. However, this is no use if the properties for keyworkers etc, are not backed up with infrastructure improvements. No one wants to live miles from amenities. Sadly, spiralling house prices are a national issue but it will not be helped by trying to cover Rochford district in concrete!
158	Mr & Mrs White	New estates need affordable housing not just for "essential" workers but for many low paid workers including young couples. Planning permission appears to be available for many smaller bungalows etc. to be enlarged into "mansions" - thus reducing small housing stock.
159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	What figure are you talking about, too many retirement flats are no good for most areas as it puts a drain on our NHS services! What is meant by affordable housing. Anything is affordable if you have the money. Perhaps part share housing could be the answer?
160	Ms S Barnes	There are too many private rented accommodation.
161	Mr S J Bence	Perhaps central government should look to pay essential workers ie nurses, police etc a wage that would allow them to afford a home. Or invest in more "Council" housing for rent and not ask or expect developers to pick up the shortfall.
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	Affordable housing is a major issue across the nation. I foresee first time buyers being priced out of the market.

163	Mr S T Cardwell	Not sure what affordable housing is. Is it a new name for council housing? Or is it where houses can be purchased at below market prices and once then sold at market prices some time later?
164	Mr I King	Affordable housing is a major problem especially for 1st time buyers on low income.
165	Mr G Searles	See above
166	G W Fleming	Affordable housing will never happen whilst developer want a large profit. What ever happened to Council housing?
167	Mrs J Marshall	Higher. Why should non council purchasers pay sky high prices and tenants buy for peanuts - make a killing and move on to better property whilst private owners struggle for life.
168	Ms L Young	Yes, this is an expensive area to buy property and first time buyers do not have much affordable housing. Starter homes are not being built in this area, see above.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	Affordable housing is an issue but not a major one in our opinion. First - what is an "affordable house"? Must be decided, then how do you keep it 'affordable' when buyers move on having made a profit.
170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	Any further affordable housing should be developed close to rail links as most jobs not created locally will require commuting. Again as much use should be made of brownfield land, with little space used to provide parking as adequate public transport exists in the area.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	Affordable housing is a major issue where ever possible sites of existing run down buildings should be developed into maisonettes. This must have owner occupiers not sold to landlords to extract profit. This would rejuvenate the population with professional/commuters as our proximity to London is paramount.
173	Mr & Mrs Cripps	By affordable housing we assume you do not mean social housing. Integrating social housing with new development is ill thought out and a burden on the developer. Affordable housing is dependant on much lower land costs and supply meeting demand. The new 4600 unit proposal will not effect either. Encouragemnet of shared equity schemes should be promoted to help first time buyers. We feel so sorry for young couples who simply cannot afford to get on to the housing ladder.
174	Mr P Clark	I totally disagree with the Governments proposals to build this amount hof housing. The infrastructure is not in place. The roads are over conjested and over polluted. We have water shortages and problems with waste management. Regeneration of brownfield sites is a good thing but destroying green belt and putting another 4000+ cars on our roads is disgraceful.
175	Mr H J Rowland	No, it is a red-hering. We should have more rented property for those who cannot afford to buy. Otherwise, we will have subsidised housing by the backdoor.
176	Mr R Abbott	Yes affordable housing is an issue - unless there is sufficient house prices will not allow our sons and daughters to stay in this area. This will translate into an older population as our families move elsewhere.
177	Mr J East	Affordable housing is an issue. Our daughter, 43, was able to start buying her own home in October 2005 - (single) - and it had to be in Basildon! If people are going to live in this area we want them to work here. This is good for community and transport reasons - very important. House prices are ridiculous. Stamp duty affects low paid workers who ish to buy.
178	Mr D Livermore	If affordable housing projections are correct, refurbish the run down areas in Rochford. Stop crowding us in with more and more building. It is not a major issue, there are rentable properties available.
179	Mrs F M Wilson	There should be more starter homes built on 'brown sites' ie empty industrial unit sites - or burnt out properties such as in Victoria Avenue which have lain empty for years.

180	Mr R Swain	Local jobs are usually less well paid than London (city) jobs. If you want more commuters build expensive homes! The planning article mentions housing. There's no mention of apartments or flats, high-rise flats have a bad reputation in this country, but I have stayed in high quality flats in other countries without being able to hear the neighbours or passers-by. You should be aiming to build a mix of solid sound insulated apartments for key workers close to their work or adequate public transport/cycle paths and amenities.
181	Mrs M R Hutchings	The answer to 'No 1' question, takes care of No. 2 question. I'm sure there are ways and means to advertise pay 6 months for persons to come forward to claim empty properties.
182	Mrs V Wisbey	Aim? Affordable housing is only bought by inventory for renting out to "they don't care who", this in tern then becomes a scuffey tip. Sanctions are required for buyers.
183	Tomassi	No affordable housing.
184	Mr T L Ellis	Affordable, but good housing is essential but must not create "poor" areas. If too many cheaper homes are created in one place, you run the risk of creating future "NO GO" areas. This tends to happen in poorly developed flats, no flats being built in a normal residential use are not liked by visiting residents.
185	Mr J K Mills	I would suggest this may be an issue but unable to comment being unaware of supply and demand. I would also suggest that the Rochford Hospital development may provide a level of appropriate housing, but is this affordable?
187	Mrs K Jesty	Affordable housing is a major issue. My daughter is to be married in August and cannot afford to buy a house in this area. The closest affordable area would be Maldon and that is not good enough for a locally born child. Building small 1 bedroomed flats is not an answer because these are difficult to sell on. Friends who have divorced have had to move out of the area because housing is too expensive.
188	Mr A Mackay	That wonderful political cliché 'affordable housing' just a fantasy I'm afraid, because with the best will in the world man's overbearing greed will ensure it is only 'affordable' to the first buyer. Only a fool would imagine in today's money drives everything culture that it could remain 'affordable' maybe a new cliché is needed here. This is not a major issue for me, if people cannot afford property in this area, in this free world of ours they can move away.
189	Mr G Gooding	The high prices for housing is due to the economic cycle and the high level of immigration. Neither are local factors. Reducing stamp duty would lead to lower prices as it would enable a higher level of transactions.
190	Mr G J Tinsey	Affordable housing is a major issue for local young people. Therefore not only is social key worker housing required, but starter flats and housing, aimed at people working, although still unable to get their own house. Again reaction to this could come about through the above entry.
191	Janice & Alex Brining	Need adequate for teachers/social workers etc mixed in with general housing also needed more single person/small family accommodation plus there is a chronic lack of housing suitable for disadvantaged/pople with disabilities (mental and physical/elderly/infirm) - not "shared homes".
192	Ms B Mean	There needs to be a good balance. First of all to get people on to the first rung of the property ladder and that means cheaper housing and then various other houses going up in price but all to be tasteful and not potential 'slums'.
193	Ms S Swift	Do not know about this.
194	Mr C Hutchinson	I do not feel this is a major issue - see comment on 6
195	Mr B M Gilbert	Lower. Not really a major issue to those that are already on the "housing ladder". Affordable housing tends to be localised in groups and results in problems associated with lower income social groups.
196	Mr A E Hodges	Not too many blocks of flats. Avoid creating future slums.

197	P McAllister	The council should be aiming lower. Affordable housing is a major issue for youngsters that want to get on the housing ladder, but I still would not like to see the area so overcrowded. It effects the whole balance jobs transport road congestion.
198	Mr J Clamp	Build more prefabricated housing on disused brownfield sites - charging lower rents to oung coupled/families unable to afford the more expensive firsttime housing - encourage them to save by assisting with a first time mortgage.
200	Mr T O'Shea	More affordable housing should be made available. But it should first be offered to the children who have grown up in Rayleigh and whose parents have contributed to the area. My son is unable to afford a house in the area he grew up in which is sad. So should he not have the first offer?
201	Mr M Thomas	Yes new starter homes for the young are required not more OAP flats and large 5/6 bedroom houses. Ample parking for developments in an area that does not have saturation impact on its present community and resources.
202	K Cardnell	Affordable housing in Hullbridge is insufficient.
203	M T Conaty	No, property overpriced both existing and new and when it does come to an area certain jobs get preferential treatment ie police, fire brigade, NHS all jobs should be treated the same.
204	Mr R Gould	No
205	Mrs Whitham	You should think long about it before adding another large food store, yes cheaper houses are needed not brick boxes.
206	Mrs G Harper	There is certainly a shortage of cheaper homes in the area. This has been made worse by giving planning permission to developers to turn perfectly serviceable bungalows into 4 be houses, a few of which demonstrate the tendency to always be on the market! Whilst there are still many people who cannot afford a big mortgage, we need to prevent these builder concersions, limiting the planning consents in such cases to the modernisation of the existing space. Affordability - this is a word that seems to have changed its meaning during my lifetime. It used to be that to buy your own home was equal to 10 years of your employment income and you had to prove your determination to save for it by saving the equivalent of three years wages. That would get you a simple two bedroomed home. The current thinking is that you save out of the leftovers of your wages and of course there never are any of those. Determined planning was what used to get you on the housing ladder and it still works. We need more practical maths in schools, for business and industry, but before this for earning,
207	Ms G Yeadell	Housing Needs Survey 2004 found net need for 291 affordable homes p.a. Coincidentally such protected rural settlements as Paglesham have not had a school for years; Foulness primary school was considered for closure years ago. Why? Because no new homes, so no children, presumably.
208	I Gyres	No major issue, why not rent houses society is changing, adapt rather than build houses that are still unaffordable
210	Mrs M A King	I don't think so!
211	Mr B W Williams	Affordable housing is a must. There is clearly insufficient also local authority should take this directly on board for lower income families and those retired.
212	Master J Richards	Affordable housing is not a current major issue but could become one if the building of houses is not recognised. New homes must go near Rochford, Hockley and Hullbridge as these are the only places with transport and are uncrowded. Gypsy sites would be more suited to areas in the east of the district as towns are more rural and there is more space.

213	Mr M Wheeler	We need more affordable housing especially for our youngsters who cannot afford the exceptionally high prices of houses in this district. The more restrictions placed on development the higher the price of existing houses. The proportion is wrong at the moment - too many very large houses are being built in the district.
215	Mr T R Thompson	As stated above I believe we are saturated with our present population and need better roads, new schools and more hospital space now before any new housing can or should take place.
217	F H Wall Esq	We understand the requirement for affordable housing provision but are concerned that small released sites are made unviable because of excessive affordable provision requirements.
218	T Wiggins Esq	We understand the requirement for affordable housing provision and support the council's requirement to provide a percentage of affordable with each development. We support the rural exceptions policy for providing affordable housing in rural areas.
219	Mr J Amey	More affordable housing is required I have a couple of friends who at the age of 30 still live with parents although in full time employment, they still cannot afford to get on the property ladder in this area.
220	Mrs S Clarke	I think affordable housing is an issue and the council should aim to provide affordable housing in areas where there is infrastructure in place and parking for cars.
221	Mr G Hoy	Affordable housing seems to be growing rapidly with the huge increase in developments.
222	R Luck	Affordable housing is a major issue in this area because for example my two sons cannot afford to buy their own houses and are not key workers therefore their only option is to remain living in the parental home which is not always a satisfactory situation - as they wish to be independent.
223	C Morris	No more land to concrete.
224	Mr K S Gee	Probably yes, but it should not be increased. Affordable housing is ok in moderation. If the council is not careful today's affordable housing could become tomorrow's slums!
225	Mr P Court	There is certainly a need for affordable housing. The Council should, however, be clear as to what this means, and adopt a range of measures to achieve it. These should first of all be based on surveys on the nature, extent and timing of the need. Furthermore, the Council needs to accept that affordable housing is just one element of a section 106 agreement, albeit often the most expensive from the landowners point of view. It is often the case, therefore, that a council needs to carefully assess and rank its own requirements from any particular site. In some situations, a degree of flexibility needs to be adopted if the Council is to achieve a range of provisions within a planning gain/section 106 package. A rigid requirement to provide a fixed proportion of affordable housing may result in development not actually taking place. The Council thus needs to carefully consider the economic implications of its requirements before imposing them.
226	Mrs A Hill	We looked at some new houses in Rawreth Lane, Rawreth. As my husband is a fireman we were interested in the affordable housing - out of interest - not for ourselves. We were very surprised to be told that once purchased they could be sold on to anyone! - so very short term use.
227	Mr & Mrs Haskew	I think better use should be made of empty houses and a policy to force house owners to maintain and rent out empty houses. My neighbour's house has been empty for at least 14 years! Such a waste. Need affordable housing. The retirement apartments near us are clearly overpriced and out of reach to most people.
228	Ms A Henderson	I don't know much about affordable housing, but it seems to me that large areas of cheap housing or council houses breed problems. Perhaps smaller groups mixed in with more affluent housing would be better.

229	Mr J Robinson	Housing is too expensive here because of the over crowding.
230	V G Crick	Should be aimed lower. Not a major issue.
231	Mr & Mrs Walker	There should be a lot more 'affordable' housing and not just for the so called 'key workers' who actually earn a reasonable wage compared to many other local people who would like to get on the housing market, particularly our children.
232	Mrs A Robinson	Affordable housing is a must to provide people and essential workers with a home. The larger more expensive properties only serve to to bring more ? Into an already crowded area.
233	Mr G Congram	Affordable housing is a national problem, but not one that is critical in our district.
234	Mr J T Dorrell	Inspite of the decrease in the birth rate the demand for housing increases partly because young people are wanting independence and also because of the early break down of marriages. It would therefore seem logical to build more affordable homes such as blocks of one bedroom flats to satisfy the demand. The greater density of this type of housing could help save the use of green belt land.
235	L W Lewis	Affordable housing of good quality should be a main priority.
236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	If the quality and price of housing goes up the wealth of occupants and the area increases. We should balance affordable with 'expensive' to avoid 'affordable' ghettos. Housing will never be affordable when the average house price is some 7 times the average annual wage.
237	Mr Sanders	This is not a major issue. The economics of supply and demand will sort out this issue in the long term.
238	Gill Tilson	I do not think so as there are places available which people can afford, but as always want the best and want it now even if it is over their budget.
239	Ms S Martin	Higher cost housing is increasing, especially with regard to new build due to the close proximity of high London salaries. Thought should also be given to local people on lower salaries when planning is considered. Flats are not always the best way as this increases the population density in a way that cannot be sustained.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Seems to be a lot of flats, and bigger detached houses (eg 4 beds) in developed areas in Rochford. Should be more in between this, eg look to provide more 2-3 bed homes. Affordable housing is an issue due to the continuing high price. Schemes could be introduced to allow part ownership.
242	Mr D Batchelor	Lower.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	What figure? Cannot identify in the 'planning for the future' article. In any event any new development should have to include a proper mix of housing sizes, so that a good proportion 'fits' the affordable definition. What is affordable depends on many variables which will always fluctuate.
245	M J Burpitt	There should be an increase in the amount of affordable housing both for key workers and for local young people.
246	Miss M Seward	No, as you will need to build more as they are smaller houses - thus more traffic but bigger houses mean more kids, more schools, more resources being needed, which we cannot afford. (more school runs with lazy mums).
247	Mr & Mrs Addison	Yes we need affordable housing. We should stop people having second homes in the district except for proven need eg M.P.



251	Mr B Guyett - Chairman	We agree affordable housing is a key issue. The local secondary school reports teachers moving into the area are having difficulties finding affordable accommodation in the area. However, it is unclear what figure this questionnaire is referring to. The 1999 Housing Needs Survey refers to an additional 340 by 2004. Is there an update on this? Conversion of houses into flats forms one solution and planning policy should encourage such conversions in appropriate areas, particularly sites close to services, town centres etc. Parking provision also needs to be considered to minimise on-street parking. The existing policy of encouraging provision of affordable housing over retail outlets does not seem to be working and needs review/promotion.
253	Mr M J Smith	We are in a reasonable priced area at present and affordable housing is a myth.
255	Mr S Chilton	Rochford specifically is just right.
257	Mr T Dodkins	The difficulty experienced by the Council by its previous strategy of relying on recycled land, is that many of these sites are small, west Rayleigh aside, and therefore do not contribute to meeting affordable housing needs. This has led to a significant shortfall highlighted by the Housing Needs Study, particularly in areas in the eastern part of the District. As a consequence, we agree with the proposed 40% figure, and can confirm my client's willingness to include such a proportion within this site.
258		Figure for affordable housing is about right
259	Mr M B Rogers	The plan mentioned above would of course be Green Belt which is deemed to be precious. If it is so precious why are the Council giving it away? In the future all building in the Green Belt should incur a penalty, i.e. 2 bed £20,000 3 bed £30,000 and so on. This money could be pooled to subsidise affordable housing. The people that want to live in a better state should pay for the less fortunate. It would be absorbed into the general market and after a short time wouldn't be noticed. I have spoken to many plot land owners who would be only too pleased to pay a penalty, most have owned the land for many years.
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	How can you build more affordable houses without them looking like the pre-war properties of which my wife as a little girl lived in one she found them quite warm and cosy. You should consider them as families can no longer afford the builders' prices these days.
261	S A Skinner	There is a danger that developers will seek to use the excuse "affordable" housing to obtain planning permission where it would not otherwise be granted. This should be resisted. All sorts of dubious schemes will be promoted under the "affordable housing" banner. Be sceptical about them all.
262	Ms L Parish	At present, parish councils with lower than 3,000 residents can get affordable housing built, within a green belt area that adjoins the residential area of their village. However, it seems very few parish councils go down this route. Perhaps, because of the small size of their community they feel unable to take this on. Could the criteria be extended to larger parishes who would be able to address these applications to the appropriate authorities. The ownership of the properties within this scheme is 50% owned - 50% rented.

263	Mr P Kneen	Swan Hill recognises the importance of providing affordable houses in new residential developments, in order to meet the specific needs of the existing population. In this regard, Circular 06/98: Planing and Affordable Housing and the Draft East of England Plan sets out provisions and thresholds for affordable housing as part of new residential developments. In this regard, Swan Hill considers that the District Council should set out a provision of affordable housing that meets the requirements of the Circular advice. Furthermore, the Core Strategy affordable housing policy should provide for a degree of flexibility so as to allow all housing development to be considered on their own individual merits. Setting a threshold of 10 or more units is considered to be overly prescriptive, and could in many instances result in new residential schemes becoming unviable, particularly if the Council seeks to apply this threshold with a 50% provision.
265	Mr R Pomery	The rate of 40% affordable housing at paragraph 4.7.4 requires sound justification.
267	Mr D Pointer	Affordable housing is an issue but should be served by balanced developments. A concentration of affordable housing tends to create estates with social problems. A traveller site must be identified to defend against unlicensed sites.
268	Mr S Crussell	I don't see how my children can ever afford to get onto the property market. This is only going to get worse, and is a national rather than just local issue.
270		Figure for affordable housing stated in 4.7.3 and 4.74 are incompatible with the figure for housing given in 4.5.2 vis 291 homes per annum until 2021 is 4365 homes. The total in 4.52 is 3699 homes. Only one of these projections can be correct. Whatever the exact figure it suggests an absolute minimum of 40% is required. Affordable housing should still mean access to gardens and green spaces.
271	Mr & Mrs Jobson	Agree that 40% is a reasonable minimum.
274	Mr S Mckinnon	Affordable housing should be higher with priority given to 'keyworkers'. Any affordable housing developments should be pepper potted evenly through out the district. To avoid creating inferior/less desirable areas within the district.
275	Mr C Wickham	An overall target of 30% of new housing should be affordable in order to ensure that the viability of schemes is not undermined.
277	Ms S A Elkington	There does not seem to be enough affordable housing for my colleagues, public sector workers. 30+ year olds should not still be living at home because of financial restrictions. More is needed at lower price.
278	Mr P Marshall	Affordable housing is an issue
279	S J Heeney	I do not have enough information to answer this.
280	Mrs M A Tyrell	Affordable housing is a major issue, especially for first time buyers. If we are to keep young people in the area they must be able to get on the bottom rung of the property ladder.
285	Mrs B E Dale	This is certainly an issue. Affordable housing is a must. Public sector workers need homes in the localities in which they work. We have a surfeit of houses for London commuters. We will need more police, teachers, etc than ever before when we have all these extra homes so we should encourage them to buy their own properties in the area if need be on part buy/part let schemes.
286	Mr L F Knight	No higher. Will be setting an even more major issue if public service members can't get accommodated in rich areas result no services.

287	Mr R Forster	Cannot comment as I have not seen recent study, but affordable housing has to be desirable and not just squashed in and thrown together.
288	Mr & Mrs C Cummins	Affordable housing is a major issue, together with provision for medium price housing. Large expensive houses are not so important.
289	Mrs J Warner	Who decides what is affordable and for whom? Consult user group.
290	Ms E Davis	Yes, without creating a cheap housing estate with more noise and crime!
292	Mr & Mrs Goring	A mix of starter homes and family homes would be needed, affordable for young singles or couples, and those with young families.
293	Wai-Kit Cheung	Fairview object to the 'possible' option whereby 30% of all new homes in the district be affordable on all sites; as well as 'probable' option of affordable housing to be set at 40% on sites specified in the Allocations DPD (page 28). Policy HP8 of the adopted Local Plan (2006) stipulates that the LPA will 'expect not less than 15% of the new dwellings to be provided as affordable housing' on sites of more than 25 dwellings or 1 hectare or more. The proposed 'possible' and 'probable' options in the Core Strategy document effectively raises the quantum of affordable housing and could have a detrimental effect on the viability of development and may prohibit, if applied inflexibly without having the regard to the merits of each case, housing development in the area. FNH, therefore, request that due consideration is given in the policy to the need to have regard to the specific circumstances of each site including economic viability, when negotiating the provision of affordable housing. National policy guidance makes it clear that there are a number of considerations that should be taken into account when
297	Mr S Marshall	We should be doing more to help young people with more affordable housing.
298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	Affordable housing is a myth, it is a catch phrase. Buying a property post WWII has always been difficult, even impossible. It has been made easier in recent years by allowing the wife's earnings to be taken into account. Also by exhorbitant mortgage offers by financial companies.
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	We do need more starter homes and homes for key workers in our area (not immigrants or DSS). But the infrastructure must also be upgraded, we can't keep adding without a budget for upgrading resources and services.
300	Mrs Upson	Affordable housing is a major issue and houses etc built now are mostly to benefit builders not the lower wage earner.
302	Mr B Short	We do need to build more affordable housing.
303	Mr K Hatfield	Too many multi? Dwellings are being constructed. Too many people in to smaller space will only create social unrest, and ruin the harmony of the community. Affordable housing is not a major issue. I would strongly oppose a travellers site in Hockley or Hawkwell.
304	Mr A Rutter	We do not want TOO much cheap housing as it will affect the town turning it into a cheap ghetto. A balance must be made with more larger houses as well otherwise Rochford will become a discount pound shop!
305	E L Strangleman	No. Yes.
306	Mr E C Cook	See comments section 9
307	Mr J Snow	Aim for a lower amount of affordable housing. Speaking as a Hockley resident, Hockley is an affluent town and does not need an influx of "lower classes". Other towns in the vicinity are more suitable for this ie Rochford/Rayleigh.

308	The Occupier	There is no such thing as "affordable housing" as the market forces will take the housing to the level the market will take it. What is needed are the funds to promote co-ownership. In this a person can get a mortgage for say half the house and pay interest on the other half as a sort of rental. The person is responsible for the house and shares any price increase proportionally.
309	Mr J Smith	This is not a major issue most people are required to make sacrifices in order to buy property.
310	Chris Teeder	There are plenty of redundant properties and industrial premises which could be turned into affordable housing. If house prices hadn't been allowed to get out of control in the first place affordable housing would not be an issue now. Again the area is over developed already and has not got the infrastructure to take any more people and cars.
311	Mrs P A Watson Jones	Yes - how on earth can our young people get on the housing ladder without going into debt and landing in council property - at a greater cost to the rate payers.
313	Mr B Sellwood	Affordable Housing Probable Option (p28) : The provision of affordable housing is supported, however there is no logic in seeking 40% affordable housing from allocated sites and 30% from 'windfall sites'. A clearer and more logical option would be to seek to achieve 35% from all sites (other than rural exception sites). The policy also needs to make it clear that the actual percentage of affordable housing will be set by reference to the characteristics of each site, the economics of bringing that site forward and the availability of public grant.
314	Mrs C Quennell	Yes affordable housing should be a major issue, council's should give a mortgage to the poorer paid with a slightly lower interest rate to get these young people on the property market, like the council did in 1989, at that time it helped a lot of young people, my husband was a poorly paid farmer, that is how we got onto the property market.
315	R A Stone	A sustainable community is the way forward. 40% is too high as a target and out of keeping with the environment. Affordable housing is not, in my opinion, a significant issue compared with major cities.
316	Ms S Copeman	Yes so why are so many expensive retirement flats being built?
317	Mr D Harris	Surely expert analysis is available.
318	Ms W Hatton	Yes it's a major issue. Should aim higher as it will always increase.
319	Mr M Lang	If houses are built down here they should be a very high number of affordable housing (but not apartments).
320	J Feather	You need more affordable housing but then should not be restricted to just key workers. First time buyers need help.
321	R J Feather	Who gets affordable housing - if first time buyers from any background then fine but not restricting to certain employments. 10-20% more realistic.
323	Mr T Beebee	No more than 20% in each development. No allowance for travellers and Gypsy's.
325	Mr D Elwell	The issue of affordable housing is exasperated by the increasing number of immigrants being allowed into the country and the area by central government. Also travellers intimidate local authorities by unauthorised development in green belt areas. Affordable housing is an issue for certain elements but I reiterate no development of any description should be permitted.
326	Owner/Occupier	Should generally be aiming for more affordable housing, but the quality of those developments is important (eg high density housing such as flats can bring its own problems such as a lack of safe areas for children to play). I think maybe house prices have been pushed up by financial institutions willingness to lend too much - this is something out of the control of local government.

327	Mrs C Taylor	If any houses are built in prime areas they are always 5/6 bedroom houses, not affordable houses, flats are being constructed on old garage stations sites. I feel very sorry for people on low wages or young couples starting out, what chance do they have of owning/renting in some cases their own homes. The council should provide some sort of support in these cases for the first few years of mortgage - to be paid back at a later date perhaps?
329	Mrs M J Snowdon	I consider 40% affordable housing is the absolute minimum requirement. We seem to be pretty saturated with 4 bed detached housing already.
330	P Mansbridge	Needs to be made a requirement of granting permission to build new developments. Put limits on over development of existing homes and plots - this prevents people moving to the next stage. Encourage shared ownership.
331	Mr A C Cooper	40% is about right but needs to be a mixture of flats and 1 or 2 bed starter homes (similar to those on Betts Farm estate in Hockley). Affordable housing is important, but not in 'Ghettos' should be spread around with mixture of houses.
332	Mr & Mrs Jones	Affordable housing is a unrealistic dream because even if you gave a house free to a couple in a 'sort after area' when they sold it - it would still be worth the same as everyone elses on the open market.
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	It is an issue but we think it should be lower - probably nearer 30%.
334	Mrs Amey	It does seem that in the majority, very large family houses are being built rather than affordable houses. We could probably do with a few more flats which are pleasing architecturally and with enough car spaces.
347	Mr C Rooke	Affordable housing should be kept ? ? It becomes increasingly difficult for 1st time buyers to break into the housing market. Affordable projects should not be allowed to ? Units? It ? 'property developer' ? But seen as a 'stepping stone'. How about more reasonable rented property?
349	Ms C Paine	Affordable housing is a major issue everywhere in the South East. The question is how do you keep it affordable when the first occupier comes to sell?
350	Mr A James	I think you have got this about right.
352	Cllr Joyce Smith	This is a good proposal but may be difficult to enforce as developers may not wish to build affordable housing.
354	Mrs Smith	Yes, but what do you call affordable, young first time buyers cannot afford these 4 bed detached toytown houses, so they have to try and purchase a pigeon craft flat, some can't afford one of those. All new developments should be built on the understanding 20% and must be solely for first time buyers only, at realistic prices.
355	Mr K Vingoe	4. Affordable housing - There seems little real progress with this policy. Our local school finds that teachers moving into the locality are unable to find realistically prices accommodation in and around Hockley. This problem is repeated throughout the district and no matter what the understandable reasons, no excuse can be tolerated for the failure to successfully address the problem to secure the vaiability of our district. 5. As a result of the Parish Council's observations on planning applications in recent years, we are seriously concerned over the loss of the existing mix of accommodation types, which are not being replaced.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	The term 'affordable' is relative, but 40% is about right. However it is not a major issue as house prices in the area are already generally lower than Southend. Southend has had a difficulty with a developer who had agreed to include 'affordable' housing in Victoria Avenue but there is now haggling over the number actually included in the development that has delayed the whole project which means that so far NONE of the 'affordable' accommodation has so far been provided.

357	Ms V O'Malley	Affordable housing IS a major issue, at least 50% of new homes built should be cheaper accommodation for the many single people and the growing older population, who will be moving into smaller more manageable properties.
358	Mr & Mrs England	40% is fine. If you build new town at Rawreth rather than more estates you can build a selection of different housing.
359	Mr New	Affordable housing is essential. 40% looks reasonable for a large site or new town. ? On small sites is likely to be a bad use of space.
362	Ms M Power	The RSS14 requires that district affordable housing policies will not be less than 30% and should aspire to 40%. In order for the affordable housing policies not to stifle the delivery of affordable housing, in all new developments a requirement of 30% should be set (ie not just allocated sites). The Council will need to ensure that all requirements for affordable housing are considered in the light of site specific criteria and if a case for less affordable housing is pursued that the lower level of affordable housing is linked to a financial appraisal. On rural exception sites, it is not considered sound to require all units to be affordable, this may not be a viable option and therefore the provision of affordable housing should be linked to an assessment of the site location, character and viability considerations.
365	Mrs H J Springham	40% seems too high.
366	Mr S J Springham	40% of housing to be 'affordable' is too great by a massive factor. There cannot be 40% requirement for essential services personnel who cannot afford better housing - lobby the government to increase essential services personnel salaries.
369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	In view of our comments above it is difficult to answer these other sections. The south east in general is over developed and overcrowded. There should be a complete block on further building.
370	Mr G Biner	Surely it should be the young professionals, tradesmen and families that we should be trying to encourage into the area. It seems that the new developments in our existing towns demand such a high premium, which makes them unaffordable to the people that we need in the area. Therefore over-development in our existing towns is not the answer to affordable housing. The most obvious way to achieve affordable housing in this area would be to create a new town and to cap the prices that developers could charge. This may also discourage the large, national, profiteering developers and give more of a change to local smaller companies and trades people.
371	Swanton	Yes - more housing to rent

### **3. JOBS**

Where can we find land for jobs? Should it be around existing settlements? What factors are important when selecting employment sites? Are existing industrial estates suitable for new jobs and businesses?

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Contact Name</b>	<b>Jobs Comments</b>
001	Mr I Haines	Existing sites need upgrading - New <u>light</u> industrial units at Stambridge Mills area
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	Most of existing sites are suitable, some could even be redeveloped getting rid of a lot of hotch potch buildings aain money would have to be spent and as with housing the property would still have to be affordable but the added benefit would be a much better working environment, the next or perhaps the first step would be to make sure there are enough employable staff, ie education
003	Mr A Cooper	Keep jobs local to housing - reduces traffic and emissions. The land is not the problem. What we need are "real" full time, well paid jobs for skilled people. Not part time, min wage jobs in retail warehouses, shops, restaurants
004	Mr M Cubitt	Don't build new homes, no need for new jobs. That simple.
005	Mrs P R Byres	I think present sites seem perfectly adequate. The airport should provide more we lost a great many jobs when Rochford Hospital was closed. Also there are several shops in the area which have closed and never re-opened. It does not seem we need more areas for businesses when the ones we have got don't all survive.
007	Ms P Pemberton	Yes - utilise existing settlement, especially in the area of Southend airport - lots of space. Also easy access to public transport.
008	Ms S Woolhouse	Jobs should be where they can easily be reached by public transport
009	Ms S Nicholls	Put existing industrial sites to better use ie utilise empty properties as opposed to building more
010	Mr A Devlin	Existing seems to be ok
011	R F Wise	There is ample opportunity for expansion of existing local industrial sites and consideration should be given to inducements such as lower 'rates' for business premises to encourage full occupation of such sites.
013	Etchells	Do not know enough about the subject
014	D Hanrahan	Before you need to find land for jobs you need investment, with Southend struggling how can we expect investment in an out of the way area with poor roads, end of the line status, as affecting Southend. Look on existing industrial estates plenty of job vacancies, trouble is its too easy not to work.
015	F A Robinson	Is it necessary to use Green Belt land and parks? If we are to reduce the CO2 emissions, work places must be placed near housing. However, industry must be monitored for noise, fire and explosion. The work must match local requirements, IE the workers. Possibly not. However, if new estates are to be built, think of road access, parking and public transport.
016	Mr R Fuller	A proper business park (rather than industrial park) would bring in good money - located close to the airport to make day trip to the continent easy. Worth reviewing capacity of existing industrial parks to expand as this is preferable to creating new ones.
017	Mr L A G Dunford	Progress Road site. Public transport. Yes
018	Mrs Gaunt	All jobs should be in or around housing locations as getting to work is an important as working. Industrial estates are suitable if they are on the fringe of the housing areas ie Rochford has two industrial estates within walking distance of housing.
019	Mrs L Allen	I work on our local Industrial Estate - Imperial Park, Rawreth Lane. Since the houses and apartment adjacent to it has been built ? Welding have been told to curb their business or move due to noise - Nash Bait are threatened due to the smell - there are plenty of empty units on this site - use these and all the other empty units - Purdy's Industrial site.
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	Before you worry about jobs, you need to encourage businesses to start up. Not easy in this day and age as there are too many restrictions and regulations. Not necessarily yours but Government as well.



021	Mr P Jermyn	There is enough space available on existing industrial units we don't need more, make better use of the existing property.
022	Mr R Hockett & Ms C Mobbs	Generally speaking, jobs should be in industrial (not residential areas) - who wants to live next door to a factory (no thank you). Good transport links are essential, and the impact on local roads needs looking at.
023	Ms C J Christopher	Hate Industrial Estates near residential settlements. Use existing industrial land wherever possible.
024	Mr P Williams	No more industry must ever be built unless alongside a railway line to provide a future rail link as traffic average speed in the UK deteriorates. The Cherry Garden Orchard Lane motortown development is otherwise an ideal method of easing congestion in Southend/Leigh by putting space consumning car dealers onto dual carriageways. Lower commercial rates should be offered to wise usage next to rail connections or dedicated sites as in Cherry Orchard to encourage commonsense and employment.
025	Mrs P Clifton	Existing industrial estates are suitable for new business. Some remain empty even now.
026	Mr A Lantaff	NO more jobs. It is the large number of jobs already that attract people to the area. More jobs will attract even more people and make the housing problem even worse. Jobs need to be created in <u>other</u> parts of the country where the economy is not so robust - this is surely the way to revive impoverished areas and avoid the overcrowding that we are faced with. People only move to the area to find work - they don't just come for the fun of it.
027	Mr B Fuller	Use existing sites
028	Mr J Lickfold	Take the MOD land at Shrewsbury <u>Not Green Belt</u>
029	Mr White	Existing brown field sites - If we are to be encouraging less car travel, jobs need to be local.
030	Mr H May	Land for new jobs should be around existing settlements. Work sites should be easily accessible from road system. We really need a "north" ring road - Rawreth, Ashingdon, Rochford, Southend East - a <u>new</u> road.
031	A R Wetton	Yes, existing sites should be used. Especially for employment. Traffic congestion is a growing problem in the district . Public transport routes and locations must be considered when determining employment sites. A model should be prepared showing existing employment sites and congestion locatoinis before considereing new sites. How accurate is the industrial site records?
032	J Morley	The existing sites are not suitable for employment because there are no bus routes to these places therefore people have to walk to and fro from the main road.
033	Mr R Balchin	Yes so far
034	Mr Hart	Yes, use only brown land
035	Mr B Deal	Carry on, then Rochford will be an island of retirement homes surrounded by a sea of industrial estates.
036	Mrs P Slade	Redeveloping old/existing sites should always be a first option.
037	Mr A Bawden	There is no point allocating land for jobs if no commitment has been obtained from business to relocate to this area or start a new venture! Existing industrial estates are not suitable for new jobs because of our infrastructure, have you ever tried to et off Temple Farm at 5pm?
038	Mr J Wright	As you can see by the trains and roads, the biggest part of the working population work out of the Rochford district. It would be pointless creating new factory sites as it would only bring in more people to the area, local people never get employed. Then the cycle begins again, more houses etc. We have land on existing sites, make better use of it.
039	Ms D Quinn	Public transport to industrial estates needs to be improved. Unemployed people can not afford a car! Extra sites need to be around or <u>in</u> existing sites.

040	Mr D Huskisson	Communities are very vulnerable to the effects of global trading conditions when they rely on big multinational employers. There needs to be a high proportion of employment opportunities reserved for local enterprise (retail, office, manufacturing, construction, etc). Retail parks are too dependent on national names. Town planning showed pressure the opportunities for local people to start up in business. By definition, they should be located close to the people too (for labour and for trading purposes).
041	Mr McGee	There is plenty of land near Mackro warehouse for development
043	Mr M Yorke Wade	There are empty and run down industrial estates which should be encourage to lease at a cheaper rate and encourage new developers to invest.
044	Mrs R Beaumont	Many empty business sites on Purdey's
045	Mr R Abbott	If you find land for new housing development, then you must find land for jobs, preferably towards Southend and the rivers. Build high!
046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	Revolves around item 1.0 - natural expansion of existing sites (ie change of use) would work for the natural population increase - but not for imported labour due to the development of the South East. Unless something tangible happens with Southend Airport, the site is big enough for land for jobs.
047	Ms J Colbourne	There are plenty of 'To Let' signs on the local trading/industrial estates. Why do we need more?
048	Mr S Reeves	London provides plenty of work, so will 2012 Olympics. Lets leave it at this, then perhaps we can deter further settlement.
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	Exisiting industiral estates are suitable and brown field sites should be used for new businesses
050	Mrs J Samuels	Build on existing business parks.
051	Mrs D Langdon	On existing sites and along railway lines.
052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	Huge swathes of land are not necessarily needed to create jobs. Type of work/jobs change as time progresses. The loss of Rochford General Hospital saw a large number of jobs lost, the new half size hospital planned for Southend should be in Rochford. It gives Southend one and a half hospitals, and Rochford a quarter of one. Rochford has failed miserably to secure the new hospital.
053	E Winn	Extend the industrial site at the end of Rawreth Lane.
054	Mr & Mrs Todman	Exisiting states (Industrial) should be ? - Factories should not be put within residential areas.
055	Mr V Hawtree	Please go to any other comments
056	Mr S Lee	Purdeys seems to still have a lot of land, however, seeing metal warehouses can be an eyesore. Surrounding them with trees would help so they don't create an eyesore to the Essex Countryside.
057	Mrs J Williams	Existing settlements should be used where feasible. Employment sites should be easily accessible and should be serviced by public transport links.
058	M J Jackson	Redevelopment of outdated industrial sites should be considered as essential. The further use of redundant farm buildings for light industrial purposes should be encouraged.
059	Garfield	We are already bursting at the seams with factories going down the pan adding to lack of jobs.
060	Mr S J Herbert	Is there 100% employment in Rochford?
061	Mr G W Slaughter	No further land for employment, leave it as it is
062	Chris Taylor	Redevelopment of existing sites and buildings must be put ahead of green-field development. Developers must be encouarged by flexible planning permissions etc to re-develop, rather than create from new. Empty buildings and sites are in areas where there is population and jobs are required

063	Mr B A Stammers	Broardband means that people can work from home. But critical mass is required for industrial estates to work therefore most of the development should be in existing estates.
064	Mrs S Smith	I don't have sufficient knowledge on this
065	Mr T Bennett	Important factors are ease of access and ease of maintenance of high cleanliness and ethical standards.
066	Mr G Langhorn	Present industrial estates should be used to their full potential. Jobs can only be provided if business can thrive. Businesses in general find it difficult to exist with ever increasing costs, high taxes and business rates, interference by every government agency and continual demands by politically correct interference groups.
067	J D Carr	? It still ? To development of local industrial estates on the main sites in Rochford and Rayleigh and if Green Belt land is released then provision will have to be made for trade industries.
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	We have more than enough industrial estates for new jobs etc. some of them are already lying empty.
069	Mrs B Buckland	If we don't build the houses - we won't need the jobs! The incinerator <u>must not</u> be built in Essex (or anywhere) we must re-cycle more and cut down on packaging etc.
070	P Robertson	Brown field sites are the obvious location for employment
071	P Williams	Currently existing and new industrial estates are not used to their full potential.
072	Mr & Mrs S J Painter	The existing industrial areas to be re-developed. Purdeys/Brook Road/Hambro Hill where shells were stored
073	Mr S Learmouth	Unable to answer
074	Mr & Mrs Raddon	Yes, use what we have. Stop building massive supermarkets.
075	Mr K A Cooke	Government have always justified the building of millions of new homes in the Southeast on the persons wanting the high paid jobs in the southeast. Are you saying that people will now move to this area in the hope that we will build industrial estates for them to find employment? If you do not build in new jobs maybe this madness will stop!
076	Ms G Lunn	Jobs are best kept to existing areas as those areas are already spoilt and have the infrastructure to cope
077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	That is a good question! So much commercial and industrial land has been lost in the last few years in Rochford district and been used for housing. Southend-on-Sea, Shellhaven, Tilbury, Thames Gateway, Basildon, Southend Airport and Chelmsford are nearby and are logical places for jobs for Rochford residents. We should encourage their expansion. We should pressure government to resume funding for apprenticeship subsidies.
078	David & Jeanne	We have reasonable low unemployment and this area is semi rural.
079	Mrs S Clark	There seems space on existing industrial estates. If the Sutton Road style is adopted ie attractive units they would attract business in. They should be on the edge of housing developments to avoid traffic and noise pollution. Many jobs are available within London. We are a commuter area.
080	Mr C Hathaway	Surely this depends on what type of jobs you wish to create. The main factor to consider is transport, existing roads are already overcrowded and public transport is inadequate in remote areas.
081	T S Papworth	Exisiting settlements and improvements to those would be beneficial.
082	Mr J Adkin	Some existing industrial units are not fully used. These need to be identified and new businesses encouraged to move into the area.
084	Miss M Andrews	Some jobs may become available from new infrastructure. Eg NHS, school, police, transport, airport as well as industrial units.
085	C G Tabar	Land for jobs next to existing settlements.
086	Mr M Gorman	Existing industrial sites should be redeveloped. No green belt land should be released for land for jobs. Are there already enough jobs, jobs should go to people from this country.
087	Mr I Walker	Rochford is a service and commuter area, majority of local jobs will follow settlements and transport links.

088	Miss S Thackeray	We can find land for jobs but is it a case of housing making more money!
090	Mr B Everett	Look to develop one large area for industrial use one to the east and west. Away from existing residential areas.
091	Ms P Bailey	Ensure good transport system and existing sites will be enough - business is changing, more people working from home now - develop existing sites do not create more.
092	Mrs M Hills	Encourage light industry in pre-existing industrial estates. Encourage "out of London" commerce for office work.
093	Mrs M J Owoo	Yes land should be around existing settlements as it will bring in more opportunities.
094	F A Browne	I do not consider that land should be found for jobs. Existing estates should be investigated for new businesses to be accommodated.
095	Mr J Britton	See comments
096	Mr W Roberts	Existing and new industrial estates not too far from living areas. The old idea of a centre to work and somewhere else to live lead to extra commuting, time, cost etc. not a good idea (ex-commuter to the city!)
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	Existing brown field sites could be further developed. Road links are important to such developments together with better transport (bus) links.
098	Mrs N London	Use only existing industrial estates, houses and industry do not mix.
099	Mr & Mrs R G Headley	Maybe some of the industrial sites could provide more businesses and therefore more jobs, but they must be reasonably paid otherwise people will still go to London, new businesses should be near public transport and have enough parking areas for the staff.
100	Mr R Scates	It is not land that creates jobs, its businesses. Existing business areas should be developed with better infrastructure such as communications at low cost for example, to encourage businesses to move into the area.
102	Mr T Newton	Jobs should be based around existing sites as much as possible. Existing estates are only suitable if clear fast roads or other ways of transporting goods are planned for. We have to decide whether we want people to live and work locally or travel to other larger towns to work.
104	B Aspinall	Land for jobs depends upon employers who may be tempted into this area. Existing Industrial sites still under utilised.
105	Mr R J Aldridge	Existing industrial estates have space for new businesses.
106	Ms P Melito	Progress Road has a lot of industrial premises still empty and for let, if jobs, or rather investors are found surely we should utilise all empty industrial premises first. Rochford cCouncil should work together with Southend and Castle Point ouncils on this issue.
107	Mr P S Reid	Existing industrial estates could be expanded.
109	Mr C Fantides	Jobs should be de-centralised from London and the southeast as it creates overcrowding in to Thames corridor! This overcrowding also compounds the drain on resources and inflates housing prices artificially.
110	Mr P Nippard	We shouldn't - I commute into London - people can easily commute into Southend if they want a job.
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	I expect some new business could go on existing industrial sights. But we need more jobs locally so land that is not suitable for homes could be used, possibly away from bottlenecks. Placed amongst trees. All new buildings should have the set up for solar heating/wind power or anything that will help with energy conservation.
112	A J Smythe	I don't know the answer to this problem, all I would say is that the building of yet more supermarkets must cease. The Asda proposal for a store at the Park Schhol site must not go ahead. The greedy supermarket has, as usual, ignored the refusal for planning permissions and is now using its usual procedure of resubmission in the hope of wearing the Council down. Don't give in. These stores are a blight on the district, and once established, keep getting extended (vide Tescos and Sainsburys).

113	Mr & Mrs Rowland	Apprentaships need to be brought back and a scheme worked with local secondary schools. Demand is there for plumbers and care workers, and many other jobs which need to have trained people.
114	Mr & Mrs F Blake	Jobs mean industry manufacturing etc - these have all gone abroad - there isn't any land for jobs, the industrial estates we have now don't seem to be fully occupied. As far back as I can remember people have always travelled for their work and commuted back and forth.
115	Mr W J Wharnsby	Rayleigh has ? Industrial sites, ? Need ?
116	R S Barton	As there are a large number of commercial premises empty throughout Rochford District area, and even more in the Southend area these facilities should be used first.
117	W R H Beehag	Only in line with limited housing, over development will become a problem for Rochford town if you are not very careful. The roads are narrow and cannot cope!
119	Mr C Gabell	Around existing settlements - consider releasing more land for a retail park - help with jobs - use existing estates for expansion.
121	Mrs S J Attfield	Why should we be providing housing in this area for people to come from outside when there is insufficient work in this area. If 4,600 new homes are to be built that would require with sole owners 4,600 jobs, with a couple buying a two, three bedroom house that would be 9,200 jobs. If it is a couple with children that could double to 18,400 jobs.
122	F E Wells	The development at Purdeys Industrial Estate and Fossett Farm along the Sutton Road will create havoc at the roundabouts. No mention of road infrastructure!
123	Mr K Walcer	Yes existing Industrial Estates are still suitable. Ban immigrations too many people coming here. So we have space for Green Belt, countryside, jobs for our children born here. Lot of space round Sutton Road Industrial Estate.
124	Mrs Slater	I would say existing sites are suitable.
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	Really depends on the nature of the business will it have many heavy transport movements, then locate it as near as possible to main roads and not near towns and villages. Small seed-bed centres can easily be accommodated next to towns and villages.
127	Mr G Ware	This obviously depends on such things as: Is there a developemtn planned for Southend Airport? Is there likely to be one? Is there a planned co-ordinated development of transport in general? Trying to travel by road in Southend gets more difficult year by year. Questions such as these are impossible of course without reference to Westminster PLC, where profit is the prime motivation in these matters.
128	Mr H Snell	Siting of commercial property will depend on a number of factors but minimising travel distances is important.
129	Mr A Clarke	Meaningful employment prospects in the UK are at zero as our manufacturing base has been exported to Asia and the Pacific rim countries...do we want valuable land given over to yet more warehouses for junk Chinese products. Rochford district is mainly a dormitory area where commuting to Southend/Chelmsford areas or London is the norm for employment.
130	Mrs S Martin	Make sure all existing industrial sites are used to capacity before building more.
131	Mel Bennett	In general yes existing industrial sites suitable, noted that Hockley site still has empty facilities. Problems with roads to cope with trucks and parking (near) such as seen at Bank of Scotland facility indicates current planning rules to not match mobility/cars for workers.
133	The Occupier	Globalisation and Governemtn policies have negated the need for industrial development. Existing facilities are therefore available for other areas of employment.
134	Ms Innes	(a) Use the existing developed industrial estates, half of which are empty. (b) Away from housing estates. (c) Yes.

135	Mr C Blundell	Factors - Industrial sites, predominantly on road traffic ie purdeys estate traffic from Southend Rochford is already difficult at this time ie there is no public transport to an industrial estate.
136	Mrs G E Chase	Why build more industrial areas when half of those have been standing empty for ages.
137	Mr & Mrs Acres	We do not need extra land for jobs. There is currently an industrial development being undertaken in Cherry Orchard Lane.
138	The Occupier	Better use of industrial estates ensuring that these sites are served by public transport - young persons have no access to cars (under age) so must rely on public transport.
139	Ms A Clark	Land should be used for agriculture to feed the local population.
140	Mrs J Davies	Dodgy one this - as some good existing places lay unused with no-one (business) wanting them. I find myself asking what comes first 'the chicken or the egg'. If new towns with services to accommodate these towns, then new businesses do come with it so sites must be in or around these areas. Look to existing industrial estates if new housing is to be added in our area but it is down to business wanting to be in our area at the end of the day.
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	As long as no green belt land is used, existing business parks should be developed to accommodate new jobs
142	D Tilley/R Bhandari	We have ample industrial estates in and around Rochford. There do not seem to be any jobs waiting for land: no evidence of job creation locally - an employment blackspot infact.
143	J E Burfield	Where else would you put them in the middle of a road of houses? Don't answer that. Building new units puts more lorries on roads already overloaded plus more cars. But why ask us, you'll do whatever you want regardless.
144	Mr C Bambury	Again we would encourage the Council to adopt a policy that sought to locate employment development in sustainable locations that are accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.
145	Mr A Lysons	I work on the land, if you build on it, I loose my job. I'm not the only one. What ever you build, people will still commute to London.
146	A C Barton	Redevelop existing sites. Atleast housing/flats show what can be done to increase useage. The flats opposite Somerfields amaze me, who made the site bigger?
147	Mr I Randall	Do we have an employment problem? Local transport and ease of access are important factors when selecting sites. I believe our existing industrial areas are suitable for new jobs and businesses.
150	Ms N Saunders	There are empty buildings all along Victoria Avenue. We built houses on the land where the hospital was - losing jobs! Move it all North - there's loads of land there!
151	Mr R Roles	In the Hockley area, there are two large industrial sites, Eldon Way and the Foundry Business Park. Many of these units remain empty and have been so for some time. Why take more land to build more units for places of work for them to remain empty. What logic is this.
152	Mr S Crowther	The focus for employment sites should always be initially on brown field sites or extending existing industrial estates where possible.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	Existing industrial estates should be used for new industry, as often there is already a road network close by. Using existing sites should hopefully lessen the impact on an already fragile environemnt.
156	J W Collins	Existing industrial sites must be developed, but access to them must be able to cope with greater business traffic. The Rayleigh Weir area is ideal, but the A127 is unable to cope (just look at the problems created by just one road accident). Maybe new industrial sites must be adjacent to rail lines.
157	F I Curnow	Road accessibility

158	Mr & Mrs White	Obviously people must have access to their place of work. Maybe we need more local bus routes. A station at Southend Airport would help. There is still spare capacity for commercial expansion in the environs surrounding the airport.
159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	Around existing settlements/industrial sites as to build new ones in new locations would mean more traffic on more roads and as we all know only too well our roads cannot cope already. Perhaps public transport to these sites would help locals to get to work other than their cars! Existing industrial sites are we feel, suitable for new jobs and businesses.
160	Ms S Barnes	Existing Industrial Estates are suitable for new jobs and businesses. There are many derelict areas that can be refurbished or even rebuilt.
161	Mr S J Benee	Again, with carefull planning and design, existing settlements can be used and improved to create more employment areas.
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	As previous, road and rail links. Better bus services to places of employment. Are existing industrial estates fully utilised. If a large factory/offices are built, can employees park in their own car park, or fill surrounding streets. (R.B.S.)
163	Mr S T Cardwell	In my opinion it would be of great benefit to Southend and to surrounding area if the airport could be increased in size thus enabling more flights and may be long haul flights. This I feel would bring more employment possibilities to the area. The airport must not be allowed to close otherwise as we all know a huge housing estate will be built causing even more problems to the area than solving them. This suggestion will obviously bring howls of protest from the nearby residents living adjacent to the airport. However, I believe a thriving airport surely has to be better than a massive housing estate.
164	Mr I King	Develop Southend Airport and surrounding business land.
166	G W Fleming	We must decide if we want jobs or housing - many houses = many needed jobs, therefore, sensible amounts of each would be best.
168	Ms L Young	In common with the rest of the country, much of our industry has gone. If new industrial estates were built, what industry would go on them with regard to business sites, there are many empty buildings in Victoria Avenue Southend. We do not need any more sites, the businesses are not there.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	See comments re housing in villages. Existing sites are suitalbe but need smartening up and the buildings updated. Better signposting within estates is required. A variety of accommodation is needed to encourage both large and small businesses. Sutton Road and infrastructure within Purdey's Estate need improvement.
170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	It is time to be realistic about job creation given the location of Rochford. There remains a question mark over the future of the airport and our location is not over attractive to warehousing/distribution given the ageing population future jobs should be concentrated in the personal services/health services as well as continued commuting to London, Chelmsford and the Thames Gateway.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	The airport should be developed for cargo (and tourism see 7). Creating jobs will result. There are sufficient industrial estates to cater for the services required to support air related industries. Inevitably more Hotels would be required, these can be in industrial areas as parking would be adequate.
173	Mr & Mrs Cripps	We seem to have lost the old tradition of work places being amongst the residential homes. This causes rush hours where everyone travels elsewhere to work. Why not encourage small business developments amongst or adjacent to housing producing a mixture of industrial estates for heavy industry and smaller cottage industry closer to home. Such policy would ease the needs for new roads. Discuss with business whether they would welcome such policy.
174	Mr P Clark	Again - poor infrastructure. However, the area around Rawreth Lane (Makro) the old A130 is not congested since the new road was built and this would link housing and businesses to the A127 and A13.

175	Mr H J Rowland	Around existing settlements, to reduce travel. The important factors are a company which can survive and not pollute the environment.
176	Mr R Abbott	Jobs - are we supplying for people outside our area, thus putting further strain on transport? Is it about the council sustaining their income in rates? The industrial areas should continue to be away from private accommodation eg houses, but, with good access to major road systems, existing brownfield sites should be looked at.
177	Mr J East	New employment sites should be pleasant places to work in, but should not be an eyesore or a blot on the landscape. Most of our local sites are relatively small, unobtrusive and seemingly well used (eg Weir site and Shotgate). How many residents of the Rawreth Lane industrial and leisure site work a short walk from their homes? [There should be some tangible incentive given to those wish to live close to their place of employment - Government money].
178	Mr D Livermore	Enough with this! Create jobs for houses, houses for jobs, it's a vicious circle. The major issue here is that the south east is at breaking point just servicing London it doesn't need more and more people, more and more jobs and industry, more and more over-crowding, more and more lawlessness more and more disaffected teenagers with less and less open space.
179	Mrs F M Wilson	Plenty of existing industrial sites around which are empty - as more businesses move abroad or go bust.
180	Mr R Swain	No new land should be used for jobs. Existing industrial estates should be used wherever possible. Jobs and housing should be co-located. It doesn't seem sensible to locate jobs in one part of the district and housing in another. I see Sainsbury's are developing on Rayleigh Weir site. They have a one storey site with massive car park occupying much land - if this was 4 storey with a 4 storey car park it would occupy one quarter of the land freeing space for development.
181	Mrs M R Hutchings	Making sure there is shopping and transport for people to travel to get to work, before you start building.
182	Mrs V Wisbey	Existing industrial estates need to be re-furnished to encourage investors and big business
183	Tomassi	Existing sites are suitable to be developed first.
184	Mr T L Ellis	Both jobs and housing have to be accessible before either are provided the roads and other infrastructure must be improved. The statement that "if more roads are built, more people will use them" also applies to housing ie the more you build the more people will live in them! Roads and parking first!
185	Mr J K Mills	Develop 'brown field' sites and also the old brick fields in Great Wakering and in Cherry Orchard Way in Rochford.
187	Mrs K Jesty	Industrial areas should be expanded or used appropriately as the infrastructure is in place already
188	Mr A Mackay	Don't know where you get the magic number of 2000 new jobs that need accommodating. Need is implying that these jobs exist now! That only the land is missing and you quote 'aviation related business' which suggests expansion at the airport, a strange conundrum for a council to put to its residents when under the guise of global warming the government is considering 'green taxes' whatever that means, to keep all but the wealthy out of aeroplanes. You need to re-think this one.
189	Mr G Gooding	The problem with the area is that there are few quality jobs. Improvements in the local infrastructure would make the area more attractive to businesses.
190	Mr G J Tinsey	Existing industrial estates are the natural choice to develop further. Although lorry traffic is a problem, with a particular the signpost standard poor. In addition new development should be close to railway access with water transport if practicable.
191	Janice & Alex Brining	Development of existing Southend Airport - always talked about but nothing happens. Would bring new jobs and those that work at airport would want to live near it. Liverpool Street trains could provide better travelling facilities eg air con.
192	Ms B Mean	Many existing industrial sites are under used with empty buildings/offices on them. New industry is better kept to the outskirts of towns and should be in keeping with the landscape. Preferably screened with trees!



193	Ms S Swift	Should be on sites vacated by other companies.
194	Mr C Hutchinson	I feel existing industrial estates suitable for new jobs and businesses.
195	Mr B M Gilbert	Employment sites should not be located adjacent to near or existing settlements (as you call them). Residents do not want the disturbances created by transport etc, delivering materials or personnel to such sites. Remember many residents are retired or want peace and quiet when away from their work.
196	Mr A E Hodges	Local industrial estates appear to have little room for expansion. Any new sites should be sited well away from residential areas, will all new residents want to work locally?
197	P McAllister	Land shouldn't be used near existing settlements they could pose danger as some are dangerous. These mobile phone masts are a blot on the landscape. Don't know if existing sites are suitable.
198	Mr J Clamp	Cleaning up and developing industrial and disused industrial sites would provide more jobs - firstly from the planning stage and secondly from actual development.
199	Mr & Mrs Crockford	Existing industrial sites could be made use of a lot better lots of units empty?
200	Mr T O'Shea	Again road and transport services must be set up. Too much time is spent by people having to get to their place of work. Brown field sites are ideal, but smaller companies can work outside of industrial sites dependent on their type of business and some can blend in with family estates. The placing of the new estate near the old brick works is excellent.
201	Mr M Thomas	It would be wonderful if all factory/office sites currently laying vacant and derelict were utilised for new development with a stonger need to noice/energy and safety for its employees and surrounding neighbourhood. Local people's needs should be a major contributing factor in local development. New employment opportunities are required.
202	K Cardnell	Suitable transpirt and roads required. Develop existing industrial estates.
203	M T Conaty	Yes, Basildon is a good example plus Temple Farm and Stock Road, Eldon Way, Brook Road Rochford. Castle Point a good example of how to provide local industrial/commercial premises.
204	Mr R Gould	As before if a stop to housing is agreed the need for finding more jobs disappears.
205	Mrs Whitham	It is no good building down Rawreth Lane for new jobs and businesses. You will only cause more traffic hold ups. By puttign more cars on the road. You have 1 bus that goes down there.
206	Mrs G Harper	Places of work need to be close to where people live, so that travel is cut to the minimum. That helps the environment. It also helps community, as we have time to build our relationships where we live. Shops should not be located on industrial estates, neither should the proliferation of big chains' outlets in our high streets. Quality shopping is all about choice not sameness. Business creation is all about room for the little guy to successfully offer a good service to his neighbours. We need to beware that globalisation could eastily drain us of all the skills that made this little island what it is and leave us totally dependent on those whose wages are low now, giving us 'bargains' but will surely rise to equal our own and then we will possibly pa without being able to earn. What skills, what kinds of work do we want to encourage in our area? Decide this before decidiong where to put it.
208	I Gyres	Existing unused space toward London.
210	Mrs M A King	Existing sites are suitable and there are certainly enough around Southend and Rochford.
211	Mr B W Williams	The land in Orchard Way ie brickworks and adjoining land would be ideal for new shops, light industry and leisure facility to be combined within the new housing schemes.
212	Master J Richards	I think viewing the list of industries of jobs needed my only major concern is aviation as there are only two airports in the county which are in the Uttlesford District and Southend Borough and are not local for the new residents. For office space there is no problem. This is the same for warehouses, light and general industrial areas.

213	Mr M Wheeler	Too often housing developments are allowed next door to industrial areas ie Rawreth Lane - housing and industrial estates should be kept separate.
215	Mr T R Thompson	If you built on wasteland and came up with housing, shopping, hotels and the like somewhere near Shoebury/Foulness this would generate jobs but once again you need infrastructure of road, rail and airport connections.
219	Mr J Amey	Around existing settlements on existing industrial estates. Many local industrial estates are in need of redevelopment and it's a good opportunity to create jobs in these areas.
220	Mrs S Clarke	The council could consider the airport area and developing the airport further to employ more staff for flights to Europe. Also Fossetts Way, both these areas have roads going in and out. Develop the potential but not by expanding the land.
221	Mr G Hoy	Why not improve existing sites before creating new ones? Rochford already has a new site on its way. Perhaps sites at Rayleigh could be improved.
222	R Luck	I feel existing industrial estates should be improved to enable new businesses to establish themselves. I do not see the need for ever increasing new industrial estates.
223	C Morris	Extend industrial sites
224	Mr K S Gee	The Brook Road industrial estate does not appear to attract more industry. Already there are units of a non-industrial type there. More effort is needed to attract manufacturing companies or computer companies to this estate.
225	Mr P Court	The Council has correctly identified London Southend Airport as one of the main potential generators of new employment opportunities. It would thus make sense if new housing and other investment wereto take place in areas reasonably related to the Airport - and to the Rochford Business Park. The land at Hawkwell referred to in section 1 'housing' would certainly be appropriate in this respect.
226	Mrs A Hill	Existing industrial estates are suitable for new jobs and businesses - infrastructure already there. Employment sites need easy access in an area that is already used as industrial estates - so noise, pollution, traffic etc does not disrupt everyone else.
227	Mr & Mrs Haskew	You should work with Southend Borough to attract businesses into Southend to use existing office space rather than build new. Kids are being taught vocational qualifications the council should see what jobs they are training for and seek to attract that kind of employment.
228	Ms A Henderson	No knowledge of the above.
229	Mr J Robinson	Why create more jobs here. This is what makes the whole strategy ridiculous. People will go where the jobs are.
230	V G Crick	Use some existing industrial sites with consideration to renovate and update existing sites improve layout and cosmetic look eg Brook Road.
231	Mr & Mrs Walker	There obviously needs to be a road infrastructure and/or public transport. Sites are dependant on the type of business, small units could probably be added to existing estates or old units. Could Foulness Island be developed or part of it away from the military area?
232	Mrs A Robinson	Whilst jobs are essential to any expansion ? the cost of business site, and only possiblity expansion.
233	Mr G Congram	If existing sitse are not suitable they must be developed before building any new ones. Public transport is critical to work places. Any new development must have trains and busses available. Car parking must be discouraged.
234	Mr J T Dorrell	There is very little industry left in this country let alone in the district. Most of the existing factory sites have 30% empty. We should be trying to encourage London businesses to decentralize. Why is it that companies like CE Heath and the Customs & Excise moved from the area? Was it too expensive?
235	L W Lewis	Old trading estates should be used for housing and new trading estates should be relocated to land adjacent to our major trunk roads to minimise lorries using unsuitable minor roads.

236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Transport links must be able to accommodate extra cars when at work, there should be lunch/food/small shop facilities built into industrial estates.
237	Mr Sanders	We should not be looking to bring more jobs to the area. This will simply encourage more people to move to an already overcrowded area of Essex.
238	Gill Tilson	Sorting out the water supply first could create jobs.
239	Ms S Martin	Jobs are mostly found in London with the areas being mainly dormitory. Local employment is available in and around the towns. This situation should be maintained. Existing industrial sites are more than adequate as empty space is always available for local business use without the need for any new sites to be found.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Employment sites need to be close to accessible transport links, but taking into account any adverse impact onto existing commuters. Existing industrial estates could be renovated and extended. Run down housing estates could be considered.
242	Mr D Batchelor	Maplin Sands. Existing land estates should be used.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	Too many people spend (waste) too much time travelling to their place of employment. It is important to have a good variety of jobs within existing settlements. Where that is not possible good public transport links are vital. Many existing industrial estates are suitable for new jobs/businesses, but council encouragement and support should be given, and grants considered to promote local job creation.
245	M J Burpitt	Existing industrial sites should be expanded where ever possible and where appropriate redundant brown field sites should modernised and be bought back into use by using commercial operators. Seedbed centres being a good example.
246	Miss M Seward	There are plenty of empty business units on industrial sites. Use them first before you develop anymore.
247	Mr & Mrs Addison	We should stop converting industrial sites into housing estates. Rebuild industrial sites into modern units.
249	Mr I Hill	A number of comments made in respect of 'housing' are also relevant to the Council's approach to 'jobs'. More specifically, if 'Background Studies' conclude that it will be necessary to release land from the Green Belt to satisfy requirements for employment generation during the plan period, the Council should take the same approach toward the identification of sites ie consideration should be given to sites which are adjacent to the urban area including Southend-on-Sea and capable of creating a clear defensible boundary, whilst promoting sustainable development by, amongst other things, utilising existing or proposed supporting infrastructure. The flexible approach to Core Strategy Green Belt policy suggested in respect of 'housing' would also address matters regarding the potential need to release land during the plan period to satisfy employment land requirements.
252	F Harrison	Business parks, trading estates, retail centres exist. Some expansion may be appropriate. A certain amount of commuting to places outside the district is likely.
253	Mr M J Smith	Existing industrial estates.
254	Ms V Stanesby	We should be looking at existing areas. There are many derelict buildings which are left. This should be either improved or replaced. In Southend for example there are so many empty work premises and buildings perhaps people/companies require help or encouragement to improve these rather than building new huge buildings. For example look at all the empty offices on Victoria Avenue and then look at the new offices being built elsewhere - a waste of space.
255	Mr S Chilton	Further development of existing industrial estates and brown field sites not being efficiently used is the way forward.
257	Mr T Dodkins	We support the number of jobs being proposed at Southend airport and Rochford Business Park, and it is clear that a strategy for job creation needs to be integrated with both the growth of housing and services, in order to encourage short journeys between such uses.

258		Land for jobs could be around existing settlements to minimise commuting.
259	Mr M B Rogers	Plan in 1 [comments on housing] would include local labour. At the moment in big estates tradesmen are travelling from Hertfordshire, Kent and Suffolk causing international damage, car fumes and traffic chaos. Sites like Kirbys Breakers Yard at Ashingdon and the Gasometer site at Rayleigh should have been kept as industrial sites. They should have had the top six feet of soil removed to clear any carcinogens
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	It should be away from existing settlements. It will only add to congested roads, they should be built so there is a slow dispersal point out of the factory, not joining already congested points.
261	S A Skinner	The Rochford District lies in the commuter belt for London. Finding ways of making it more pleasant, easier and more affordable to get to London for work should be a key part of the Council's strategy. Please don't release Green Belt land for more industrial estates.
262	Ms L Parish	There appears to be scope to extend Purdey's Industrial Estate in Rochford and Rawreth Lane Industrial Estate in Rayleigh. If Rochford agreed to an outer bypass, some industrial estates could be sited at suitable locations on this route. In accepting a bypass, more protection would be given to Rochford, Hawkwell, Hockley, Rayleigh and Hullbridge. Also finance could be sought from Industrial Estate developers towards the cost of the road and compulsory purchase orders for the land.
263	Mr P Kneen	Government policy on the provision of employment land seeks to ensure it is located so as to minimise the need to travel, particularly by private car. Given the predominantly rural nature of the District, this can be considered somewhat problematic. Swan Hill considers it is important that new employment development is well related to the existing population, and that new businesses are located so as to ensure that those businesses likely to result in the greatest conflict for residential properties, in terms of noise and pollution, are located so as to minimise their impact. The most sustainable way of providing new employment is through the use of mixed-use developments. This would ensure that new houses and businesses are located in relatively close proximity, to enable people to travel to work by sustainable means. As such, in order for the District Council to be able to meet its strategic employment requireemnt of 3,000 additional jobs, it is considered important that they allow a flexible approach to the use of land, particularly in sustainable locations, such as on
265	Mr R Pomery	Insufficient evidence is put forward to substantial the points made at paragraph 4.8.5. Estates referred to in paragraph 4.8.6 need identification. Reference should be made to mixed use development at such locations. The number of jobs (as alluded to in the options - paragraph 4.8.7) should be based on evidence.
267	Mr D Pointer	Further employment sites should be around existing settlements. As existing industrial estates become tired they should be refreshed by replacement of existing units. New units could be larger than existing units.
268	Mr S Crussell	Redevelopment of existing (dated and ineficient) areas should be considered rather than into new. Develop roads and transport links to support and encourage this.
270		We suggest that the widely different target figure of 2000 (section 4.81) and 3000 jobs (section 4.85) indicate the great difficulty in predicting future employment areas. We would therefore suggest that allocating a total number of new jobs in the district for the next 15 years is unlikely to be a helpful exercise. Perhaps a better target would be a intention to reduce UNemployment within the district to below a target figure. This would generate a better quality of life increase for local residents. Any new business developments should be along existing main trunk roads and not involve new road building or major road upgrades. Any placed on green field sites should have strong biodiversity criteria and environmental impact input into potential siting.

274	Mr S Mckinnon	Employment where possible should be created via the development of brown field sites. Loss of employment due to change of use to residential should be avoided. Redundant farm buildings should be given priority to be replaced/reclassified to provide new employment.
275	Mr C Wickham	Employment land should be well related to urban areas and to transport infrastructure, and existing vacant employment sites which are inappropriately located in these terms and/or which have an adverse impact on visual amenity should be redeveloped for housing purposes.
276	Mr M Barrell	As stated, all potential sites should be tested against the sustainability criteria and the PPG/PPS25 Sequential Test. For this reason, we would prefer to see allocations, which will enable these processes to be more easily carried out. At present the document does not consider pollution prevention. It will need to be ensured that all development does not pose a threat to the natural environment during construction stage or during occupation.
277	Ms S A Elkington	Use the industrial areas already in RDC and expand but improve infrastructure.
278	Mr P Marshall	Are the people who the extra houses are intended for, wanting to be working in the local area, and would the types your building for expect the London rates of pay.
279	S J Heeney	Not enough information to answer
280	Mrs M A Tyrell	With the new industrial estate progressing in Cherry Orchard Lane, plus empty units in existing estates. Plus all the empty office space in Victoria Avenue, Southend and the like. I am sure we are well on the way.
285	Mrs B E Dale	Lane for jobs should be around existing settlements. The less people need to travel long distances to work the better. With global warming a reality, if people can walk, cycle or use public transport to get to work so much the better.
286	Mr L F Knight	If multi millionaires set aside farm land.
287	Mr R Forster	If you create new sites, access is important as roads are already congested, take Sutton Road and Rawreth Lane as examples.
288	Mr & Mrs C Cummins	Consider using land each side of the A127 between Rayleigh Weir and Progress Road to create employment sites
289	Mrs J Warner	1. Infrastructure:- people need easy access to place of work - not necessarily by car. 2. Use existing industrial estates. 3. Utilise old industrial sites.
290	Ms E Davis	Building should be carefully chosen on existing sites and not in clumps to make more concrete jungles.
291	Maydo Pitt	We are pleased to see an indication of the number of jobs to be accommodated in the District in paragraph 4.8.5. However, we would expect the preferred options document to clearly indicate the broad extra employment land requirements necessary to contribute to meeting the job figures at broad locations in the District ie the amount and broad locations of new employment land that will be required to be identified and allocated in the Site Allocations DPD. The Government Office acknowledges that not all of the new jobs will be delivered as a consequence of the development of new employment land, and that some will come from increased job density at existing premises, refurbishment of existing buildings and job creation from other uses (retail, leisure related) etc. However, should new employment land be needed to contribute to meeting the policy's job targets, we would expect the preferred options policy to include a broad indication of the amount of land, and possibly even an indication of the broad employment type to be accommodated at the different broad locations, in
292	Mr & Mrs Goring	A new town should incorporate areas for employment. Perhaps our waterways around the River Crouch and Roach should be utilized for water related leisure and tourism based jobs - these are the areas natural assets.
296	Miss S Rom	To ensure sustainable economic growth consider purpose built business park in the west of the district. Business incubation centre or managed workspace. Green belt issues relating to job growth for our existing indigenous businesses for farm diversification.

298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	Nothing more should be done. RDC is within easy reach of Basildon, Southend, Chelmsford, London, and areas between, for jobs.
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	This is another brown site issue, making better use of this land. We must keep industry and housing separate otherwise the quality of life is affected. Better use of public transport is needed to allow workers easy access to their work from their homes.
300	Mrs Upson	Better employment sites factors. Sell or let empty sites first, and try and stop cheap labour from abroad (across the seas).
302	Mr B Short	There are plenty of existing industrial sites already if need be just expand around these.
303	Mr K Hatfield	Industrial estates should not be mixed with residential housing. They should be located on the outskirts of the district and be well screened by trees or earth banking.
304	Mr A Rutter	Enlarge Stambridge area make it a 'garden town area'.
305	E L Strangleman	Yes.
306	Mr E C Cook	See comments under 9
307	Mr J Snow	Utilize existing industrial areas to their full potential, otherwise amalgamate under used sites and release others for housing or redevelopment.
308	The Occupier	Main factors are clearly accessibility, easy parking or frequent public transport. Shops must have parking facilities to carry things home. Without facilities we'll simply drive to where there are parking facilities. Existing settlements or nearby will probably have at least the beginnings of infrastructures esp. important to keep lorries away from narrow streets which affect all our villages.
309	Mr J Smith	Are there not enough farms; commercial businesses in Rochford providing sufficient employment.
310	Chris Teeder	If we restricted development we would not need to provide more jobs for the new residents. I can't believe that automotive industries are being set up in Cherry Orchard Lane at a time when we should be encouraging Green Industries. It would seem that most jobs are being given to people of non-local origins, rather than people who live locally.
311	Mrs P A Watson Jones	Empty properties on existing sites ie Brook Road, Rayleigh, Basildon and Southend Industrial estates should not be ignored. Use these premises, improve Industrial areas we have now.
312	Mr D Foyle	Again, develop the existing industrial sites and shopping/business areas.
314	Mrs C Quennell	Southend, Rochford, and Rayleigh are very central for people to commute to London and outskirts, the airport if extended would bring in many more jobs. More wasted land along A127 could be used as industrial estates if we can get businesses to invest.
315	R A Stone	Better use of existing brown field sites has to be the best way forward. Infrastructure to work effectively with the Thames Gateway will provide further and significant employment opportunity.
316	Ms S Copeman	Further develop existing sites.
317	Mr D Harris	Where existing businesses are prosperous enough to justify expansion, they should be allowed to expand where they are, even if they occupy a 'green belt' site. Businesses that do not adjust (expand) to meet market trends will ultimately become uncompetitive and will fail. It is not always possible to 'move' the business to a larger site.
318	Ms W Hatton	Don't lose the retail areas for conversion to flats they should be always available for employment. New industrial units estates are much more accessible. Tidy Cherry Orchard Way will be a great standard for others to be redeveloped as modern sites.
319	Mr M Lang	No new land available, should use existing land.
320	J Feather	Yes.

321	R J Feather	How will the jobs be created? The location depends on the work surely. Existing locations make sense but the council must support plans for job creation like the airport and Southend United's new ground.
323	Mr T Beebee	The lack of infrastructure means it is not acceptable to built further industrial units.
324	Mrs Doward	As long as there is good access and sufficient parking, I think using existing industrial estates would be a good idea, they should already have the basic facilities required on site, and there may be room for expansion.
325	Mr D Elwell	If any development is forced on RDC resident in many cases jobs of the required type may not be available in the immediate area. This means that more people will have to travel out of the area, causing as identieid before, more congestion, delaying peoples jouneys and delaying emergency services.
326	Owner/Occupier	Why are you even considering building new houses if there are not jobs available for the new residents? There are loads of empty office spaces in Victoria Avenue, Southend - why not work with the neighbouring council to ensure this is not case? Industrial estates are not suitable as they are not served by public transport usually. Automotive and aviation related jobs to be created? How wonderful! Have you heard of global warming?! Stern report?
327	Mrs C Taylor	Victoria Avenue - Southend is full of old empty office blocks, why not use properties already in existence, there is no need to create new settlements for employment sites - disused factory units on factory estates need to be re-used - otherwise they become run-down - a waste of a resource.
329	Mrs M J Snowdon	The most important factor for employment is transport to and from work which is reliable enough to do ? A cost.
330	P Mansbridge	A survey should be made of empty units in the area and how these could be used to encourage new business and employment. More jobs could be created locally to reduce pressure on commuting. With the internet etc many people could work from home.
331	Mr A C Cooper	Employment site must have good communication links for employees and commercial transport. Must provide adequate roads for truck transport - cannot ignore this (eg poor road access to Purdeys estate in Rochford). Public transport links must be planned. Suggest dedicated area for business/industry rather than small sites tagged onto existing towns/villages.
332	Mr & Mrs Jones	The question should not be 'where can we find land for jobs' more like 'where can we find jobs for land' in and around this area there are more than enough sites standing empty and many dilapidated that cannot tempt new employers to open up on our locality. I suspect the 1000 jobs in Cherry Orchard Lane will be predominantly taken by outsiders not local to your plans for extra housing so make a farce of your claims!
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	Land for business and industrial sites should be made available near to existing sites. To establish more industrial areas would be detrimental to the whole outlook of the area and destroy the purpose of the green belt.
334	Mrs Amey	Where the Cherry Orchard Road goes it looks as if land is being built upon probably for factories. How many industrial sites are really needed. There are quite a few around already.
347	Mr C Rooke	I believe that there is scope for expansion around existing sites without blighting green belt with new developments. A careful survey of the whole area is needed with a view to each areas for development. I believe that there is a future for specialist ? - eg marine ? ? ? around the marina.
349	Ms C Paine	Try to concentrate employment in existing business parks. Many of these have vacant land/vacant units that can be utilised.
350	Mr A James	A number of businesses have gone and brown field sites are left. Most new jobs in Britain have left the manufacturing and gone to clerical and retail which with the internet etc require less land.
352	Cllr Joyce Smith	The old Stambridge Mill site has possibilities either for light industrial or residential.

354	Mrs Smith	Yes, with so many offices and industrial estates vacant already for a long time, do we really need more built? The road infrastructure in and around Rochford is abysmal, very busy and pot holed, patched to death. Use and improve what already exists. Why are there so many new car centres springing up everywhere not many people can afford new cars.
355	Mr K Vingoe	Much of the Distict's employment is still provided in London and our surrounding districts. The nature of the availability of employment also changes as a result of national trends. 1. The Parish Council would suggest that consideration could be given to the existing provision on some industrial estates with the possiblity of change to residential accommodation and industrial and commerical provision elsewhere. 2. Many existing estates perdominate in large warehouse type buildings and consideration should be given to their conversion to provide more appropriate accommodation for smaller and 'start-up' businesses. 3. The airport, while offering existing and potential future growth, could with the alteration and expansion provide additional jobs.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	In all the calculations there should not be an assumption that all new jobs will be manual ones. Space would also be needed for offices, technical areas, health and other service areas as well as professional, academic and leisure. Ideally any development that takes place should be near or adjacent to existing employment centres and it is most important to fill gaps in the existing areas - High Streets, empty factory units, etc - before new developments take place. Important factors are convenient and efficient communications - transport (buses, road, AND PARKING) and telecommunications. Many people also work from home these days and this may reduce the need for additional land use, although this is currently not statistically significant.
357	Ms V O'Malley	Obviously jobs should be close to where people live, so that we don't damage the environment with people using their cars travelling lots of miles, public transport should be free to encourage people to use cars less.
358	Mr & Mrs England	Industrial estates are not suitable you can't get in or out of them. Build new town at Rawreth and jobs will be created by the town infrastructure plus can work in London, Chelmsford or Colchester via road or rail with ease.
359	Mr New	Expansion or use of existing on old industrial estates and business parks would seem to be the best answer. It would enable existing services to be more fully used. Remove innate eyesore, avoid overspill and ribbon development.
360	Mr A J Eisenhower	The brownfield sites are available for jobs/commerce and an existing industrial estates even with the expected growth in Southend Airport traffic which will probably tail off after the 2012 Olympics anyway.
365	Mrs H J Springham	Rayleigh, Hockley etc is prime commuter belt to London etc. 3,000 jobs therefore not needed in this area. There is not guarantee that jobs created in RDC would be filled by residents of RDC. A lot of Makro employees come from Canvey, Benfleet etc!
366	Mr S J Springham	Does not council examine employment profiles in its own district. Rochford, Rayleigh etc are dormitory areas the greater majority of people travel out of the area for work. 3000 new jobs are not required.
369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	There are plenty of areas of the country where jobs could be created and businesses encouraged to move to reduce the strain on our area.
370	Mr G Biner	One issue that should be considered is the traffic volumes and parking disturbances on the neighbouring residential areas and the safety issues to pedestrians that these problems bring. Maybe we should be more selective as to what industries and commercial developments we encourage to use the designated land. For example, should we not be encouraging small local businesses, as opposed to giving up all of our land to big national companies.



## **4. PROTECTION**

Are there any other areas or features that the Council should be seeking to protect? Is the Upper Roach Valley a good area for increasing recreational opportunities? Have we got the balance right between protection and development opportunities?

Rep No	Contact Name	Protection Comments
001	Mr I Haines	Stambridge Mills and Upper Roach Valley is a natural and ideal area for recreational development relax protection sensibly
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	Where ever possible increase recreational opportunities, but again don't leave it to the money makers to exploit there is no real reason the Council could not manage this area so that its affordable to all; so many people cannot afford to use such places as Clements Hall for example
003	Mr A Cooper	Probably need to protect areas already designated open areas. Don't need "contrived" country parks. Just need open countryside for everyone to use however they want.
004	Mr M Cubitt	GREEN BELT. The current government sicken me by their arrogant and stupid disregard for it.
007	Ms P Pemberton	Not sure!
008	Ms S Woolhouse	Existing green belt should be protected as far as possible, particularly the area including Hockley Woods, Grove Woods, Edwards Hall Park and Cherry Orchard/Jubilee Park which provides a valuable recreational area for the densely populated areas surrounding it. There are also other areas which should be preserved such as the salt marshes alongside the River Crouch which are a haven for wildlife.
010	Mr A Devlin	I think the balance is fine
011	R F Wise	The balance seems to be about right given the current population level - however, with an aging population you may find that recreation will not be in such demand in the future.
013	Etchells	No development should be allowed in any area where there is liable to be flooding.
014	D Hanrahan	In this world of global warming protection and education about our rural areas is paramount. Recreational is a plenty so is the damage done to their areas. Please don't send good money after bad. Balance must favour protection.
015	F A Robinson	Yes parks and gardens. I do not think it is right that dogs are allowed to poo and wee where our children play. Where is the Upper Roach Valley? As this is the first time I have been asked, also I have not monitored the Council decisions till now! I cannot answer this part of the question.
016	Mr R Fuller	A network of interconnected path for walking, jogging, cycling would be useful. I don't understand why we can't walk the length of the Crouch from Battlesbridge to Wallasea Island and then across to Foulness.
017	Mr L A G Dunford	Along the area of Eastwood Road. Yes providing public transport is adequate and providing we can supply a bus after 4pm. Yes.
018	Mrs Gaunt	All areas should be protected not just Roach Valley, parks, fields we need them all. We need the space and fresh air.
019	Mrs L Allen	Embrace places like Battlesbridge and Hullbridge
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	There should be swathes of protection between developments. Not one patch of development and one patch of protected land.
021	Mr P Jermyn	All the countryside should be protected
022	Mr R Hockett & Ms C	Hockley Woods and the Upper Roach Valley needs protection.
023	Ms C J Christopher	Support increased recreational use (within reason) of Roach Valley - balance good.
024	Mr P Williams	Is Battlesbridge yours? Oh why is the authorities control of that village so poor. Properly cared for it can mature into an equal of Snape Matlings in Suffolk. Sadly, so far, an opportunity is being ignored. Can the Stambridge Mill area be blended into a tourist area/local beauty spot?
025	Mrs P Clifton	Yes so far

026	Mr A Lantaff	As stated earlier please try to protect the 'wild' areas - marshes and woodland. Any recreational developemnt in the Upper Roach Valley should be in keeping with what is already there - extend the Country Park - more footpaths and bridleways, riding stables, create ponds/lakes for anglers.
027	Mr B Fuller	All remaining landscapes should be left - we have enough development.
028	Mr J Lickfold	Parks and Leisure sites plus all the beaches, that are not kept clean from dogs and litter louts including graffiti which turns areas into slums.
029	Mr White	If only brown field sites were developed this would not be an issue. If making additional recreational facilities are people only being encouraged to drive to out of the way places.
030	Mr H May	We should protect our Eastern shore line (Paglesham etc) as a recreational area with good access off the (new) north - southring road (mentioned in 3 above).
031	A R Wetton	Development opportunities depend on demand. Why create something that will cause a problem elsewhere eg access, parking, ammenities, litter, fly tipping, vandalism, noise etc. We should concentrate on improving existing and with lessons learnt consider recreation. I know of parks that are being used for housing ? they are not being used.
032	J Morley	Yes
033	Mr R Balchin	So far ok
034	Mr Hart	Protect what we have
035	Mr B Deal	Why not go to the lower Roach around the site of the former mills at Stambridge or is that earmarked for more retirement homes.
036	Mrs P Slade	Do not know the area.
037	Mr A Bawden	All of our local environment should be protected, I moved here 20 years ago when Ashingdon almost had a village feel about it, it is now over populated, Ashingdon Road is almost grid locked in the mornings, and things are getting worse!
038	Mr J Wright	We still have left some lovely areas, the Crouch Valley for example. The A130 coming back from Rettendon is a lovely view which would be wrecked by building on it. Many people have commented to me on how nice that area is.
040	Mr D Huskisson	I fully support the Council's Green Belt policy. I am also keen to preserve the Roach Valley area, having produced a footpath guide for youth groups several years ago. Whilst I would not advocate access by the public by roads into the park, I believe greater encouragement could be given to the public by better publicity and good car parks at strategic access points around the perimeter (eg Cherry Orchard, Bull Lane, Edwards Hall Park, Hockley Woods, Bullwood Hall). Maybe you have already done this, as I am not so active in the area these days.
041	Mr McGee	Need more recreational areas in Rayleigh for youngsters of all ages, i.e. swimming pool, cinema, and youth clubs. There are many classrooms in Rayleigh that are under used and can be used. (This was done many years ago).
043	Mr M Yorke Wade	Encourage companies in the recreational business to invest in the area. Preserve parks and open areas
044	Mrs R Beaumont	Play areas for the children, there was a small field near Rochford Station where we used to see small children play football, they loved it. Then it was sold for the McCarthy flats. Play areas are vital.
045	Mr R Abbott	People need recreation facilities. Surely good planning can involve housing, industry and commerce, leisure and conservation. Renewal should also be considered - take Hockley High Street - a one horse town if ever I saw one!
046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	Natural growth would not pose a problem - but targetting this area will. E are already impacting the environment - why import a greater load? Policing to protect just about anything should be a big issue - we cannot even protect a park hut.
048	Mr S Reeves	All our 'open spaces' should be protected, and we should be increasing the amount available
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	Leisure act should be developed where these can be used to protect the environment.

050	Mrs J Samuels	If you increase man-made recreational opportunities you reduce natural environment beauty spots. There are already sports clubs, golf courses, plentiful parks and the seafront all in close proximity to Rochford district residents.
051	Mrs D Langdon	Council should be seeking to protect all and every piece of Green Belt and to keep each town and village with its own character. A bungalow down Ronald Drive (Rayleigh) needs looking at it is out of character with the rest.
052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	We should be trying to keep the green belt. Also reducing the number of cars in use on our roads. Public transport should be made cheaper, reducing pollution and lessening the danger from cars. New housing should provide affordable and rented housing, replacing big, expensive properties the proportion is unbalanced.
053	E Winn	Yes
054	Mr & Mrs Todman	The Roach Valley and Hockley Woods are the only true natural areas within the Rochford District and should be conserved at all cost.
055	Mr V Hawtree	Please try to protect as much as you can
056	Mr S Lee	The river that runs along Purdeys in rear of the factory shop could be tidied and utilised, perhaps somehow to be an area to visit. Perhaps tables and benches so that Purdeys staff could sit during their lunch break or just for local residents?
057	Mrs J Williams	Protection should come first before development. It is vital to preserve character.
058	M J Jackson	No further encroachment should be allowed into Green Belt of the Roach Valley which is an area of great local beauty.
060	Mr S J Herbert	Recreational facilities are a good thing so everybody has the chance of enjoying the pleasant surroundings.
061	Mr G W Slaughter	Leave it as it is
062	Chris Taylor	Protection is highly desirable. The areas in the Roach Valley which are 'green belt' must remain so, but there are areas such as Stambridge Mills, and the old brickwork in Cherry Orchard Way which need improvement and could become recreational areas.
063	Mr B A Stammers	Could the general public have more easy access to the sea walls to enjoy the views of the water and birds (with only a short walk from their cars).
064	Mrs S Smith	Each town and village has its own distinct character: Rayleigh has been overdeveloped and has lost a lot of its character and is now in a kind of limbo neither a village as it was 40 years ago or a town. Especially in the newly developed areas, no community or community centre. No other area should be over developed as Rayleigh has been.
065	Mr T Bennett	Recreational opportunities should be created within reasonable walking distance to preclude the parking requirement - except maybe for <u>safe</u> bicycle parking.
066	Mr G Langhorn	All green belt land, historically interesting buildings should be protected and preserved. Existing sports and leisure areas, should be fully utilised before looking to use other land.
067	J D Carr	I am not sure where upper Roach Valley ??? It is at Sutton Road or by the Rochford Town ??? And yes ? Could be made but would assume cooperation of the water or river board could be required. Would agree that current approach is ?
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	There seems to be little protection of land once greedy developers start casting their eyes over it!
069	Mrs B Buckland	The woods, country park (Cherry Orchard) are wonderful and seem to be used responsibly by most people (ie not too much damage, litter etc). Upper Roach valley? Stambridge, Paglesham, Canewdon? What recreational opportunities are proposed? Country walks, picnic areas, wild-life trails - would be beneficial. A green burial site is a good idea.
070	P Robertson	Existing open spaces, woods and footpaths are splendid areas for peace and recreation. I am against vast commercial recreation sites.
072	Mr & Mrs S J Painter	The Green Belt must be protected - no more building!

073	Mr S Learmouth	I believe strongly that Green Belt should be protected. There needs to be youth focused recreational facilities in Rayleigh.
074	Mr & Mrs Raddon	Yes. Our open country, fields, marsh, parks and woods our wild life.
075	Mr K A Cooke	All Green Belts should be protected at any cost.
076	Ms G Lunn	All the Roach valley area should be protected and the release of our countryside should be restricted as much as is possible.
077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	The countryside, agricultural land, pastures, riding stables, woods, hedges and trees should be protected. The ECC and farmers should be asked to limite the savaging of hedgerows and to leave saplings to grow and cut hedges either side. The Roach Valley should be nurtured and protected. The balance will be right providing development is not too much, too soon.
078	David & Jeanne	Yes protect the green belt. Yes. Not quite.
079	Mrs S Clark	Rawreth Lane is fast losing its beauty and identity and should be saved. The area at Gusted Hall Lane leaking to Hockley Woods is well used and should be conserved. You have been doing good work developing Cherry Orchard Lane and Wallasea Island. There are some delightful small woods in Hockley/Rayleigh/Hullbridge which need protection.
080	Mr C Hathaway	Magnolia Park, Spencer Park and the Green Belt between Ashingdon and Hockley should all be protected
081	T S Papworth	Protect the children's areas from heavy traffic please.
082	Mr J Adkin	All green areas should be a priority for the council to protect.
084	Miss M Andrews	Please can we protect grass verges on the Holt Farm Estate in Hawkwell.
085	C G Tabar	More recreational sites can be allocated in suitable areas, such as Upper Roach area/the new country park
086	Mr M Gorman	All green belt and places of history, beauty and culture must be kept. Our culture is being eroded, this country must keep those.
087	Mr I Walker	Protection and developing access should go hand in hand. Improving access, awareness and protection to areas and features close to settlements is more important than Upper Roach Valley.
088	Miss S Thackeray	I cannot speak for areas that I'm not familiar with or any historical knowledge of.
090	Mr B Everett	I agree
091	Ms P Bailey	I believe that the council should fight tooth and nail to retain our open spaces and green belt and white belt.
092	Mrs M Hills	Woodland, riverside and seashore sould remain undeveloped.
093	Mrs M J Owoo	I do not know that area.
094	F A Browne	Yes, the Upper Roach Valley appears to be a good area for increasing recreational opportunities. I think the balance is about right. A very important area.
095	Mr J Britton	See comments
096	Mr W Roberts	Yes we need to keep protecting what we've got and encourage species to return. Cutting hedges durnig nesting time seems to be a speciality in this area. Stop it.
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	Protect market square and old buildings so as to retain 'market town' image. Existing landscapes and woodlands should be retained and like Gusted Hall, further developed.
099	Mr & Mrs R G Headley	The woods and fields in our area should be protected so that families can enjoy the open spaces and be aware of the nature around them. The rivers are also a place where people can find leisure pursuits and wind down after the working week. Some green field sites have been built on to the detriment of local people. The planning laws should be stricter to stop so called travellers from building on the green belt.

100	Mr R Scates	I do not think enough is done to protect the area's features. It is rapidly becoming 'characterless' with respect to many areas of the UK.
102	Mr T Newton	We have long sea and river coasts around us, most of which is not accessalbe for recreation. Only the farmers have th eprivalege of the views and access to remote spots. Yes the Roach Valley could be developed into a nice family place. What about local fruits or the sea (shellfish) - restaurants etc.
105	Mr R J Aldridge	The balance is right.
106	Ms P Melito	If any further increasement of recreational opportunities should be for the youth of today.
109	Mr C Fantides	All current green belt and land should be conserved.
110	Mr P Nippard	No - this whole exercisais based on identifying development opportunities.
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	All places should be conserved for the future places for wild life ponds lankes even if buildings are close by there should be somewhere to let nature run riot, and workers to sit.
114	Mr & Mrs F Blake	This is an agricultural area and should be kept as such. Our green belt land should be left as that and protected.
115	Mr W J Wharnsby	I don't know.
116	R S Barton	Every opportunity should be taken to protect as much as possible of our natural green belt and to develop <u>good</u> recreational facilities for all.
117	W R H Beehag	Flood protection around Stambridge Mill fields and Sutton Road.
119	Mr C Gabell	Balance right at the moment - no more or less needed.
121	Mrs S J Attfield	The council should be protecting the whole of the area from further development. You are creating pollution, at a level unimaginable. You are destroying the environment and our quality of life.
123	Mr K Walcer	Hockley Woods and most important farmlands. Selling off farmland to developer must stop. Where we getting our foods from? What about global warming? I don't want to live in concrete jungle.
124	Mrs Slater	Not sure
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	Increase the number of local footpaths, obtain public access to Foulness and Potton Islands when safe to do so.
126	Mr J Jefferies	Rochford town centre should be protected and the eyesore which is the building to the north of the town square be removed and redeveloped in keeping with the character of the old town. Woodlands and other recreational open spaces should also be protected. As should have been the case of the coachman court site.
127	Mr G Ware	With reference to the green belt, Rochford Council has no balanced approach whatsoever. (see comments on second section of previous page) Some features should be protected but perhaps the debate should be about where the council has gone wrong in it's value judgements in planning decision making.
128	Mr H Snell	We should protect real rural sites and develop near existing housing.
129	Mr A Clarke	Under this heading I would include any prime or low grade agricultural land remaining in the District....we must save it. With the global supply of oil soon to be in terminal decline locally grown food is the only alternative otherwise we face the real possibility of shortages within a generation.....plus increased prices. Also we must take into account possible acts of terrorism on future food supplies from abroad. Need I say more!
130	Mrs S Martin	Yes it is very important to maintain local sites of interest and also woodland.
131	Mel Bennett	Balance ok
133	The Occupier	Vast acres of prime agricultural land have been lost in the local area to so called environmental progress maintaingin the status quo would be a fair policy, particularly in the Roach Valley.
134	Ms Innes	(a) All the precious Green Belt. (b) Yes. (c) More or less.
135	Mr C Blundell	No we haven't got it right. Too much emphasis on development (see previous comments housing).

136	Mrs G E Chase	Protect our areas, we must have parks and areas for playing fields. Everyone is getting too fat, so give us something to at least get the youngsters having somewhere to play. Not everyone can afford leisure centre fees.
137	Mr & Mrs Acres	Lane along the river Crouch should be protected for wildlife.
138	The Occupier	Keep as many green areas as possible. No planning permission should be granted for the development of school playing fields etc.
139	Ms A Clark	Concentrate on working with the development of tides to enable Thames flood plain to work as such. Don't cover it in concrete.
140	Mrs J Davies	I like to think that the balance is about right. I don't want to see any destruction to our countryside. I use our recreational facilities as well as enjoying our countryside but this hasn't solved the problem you face about development has it? There is loads out there already except maybe something for the teenagers - they need to be questioned/surveyed as to what they would like/and affordable to them.
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	The Upper Roach Valley is a good area for increasing recreational opportunities. Ancient woodlands. Green belt and the gaps between settlements must be protected to save the South East of Essex becoming an urban sprawl.
142	D Tilley/R Bhandari	What has become of the Cherry Orchard Park? What is being built adjacent to it with no publicity?
143	J E Burfield	Recreation O.K. but any structure encourages builders to seek ways of building houses
145	Mr A Lysons	The £64,000,000 question.
146	A C Barton	Do not have knowledge
147	Mr I Randall	Rochford has more than its fair share of business premises that have not been developed for many years. These tend to make our town centre unattractive and unappealing. A relaxation on business rates might encourage their usage! Upper Roach Valley is a good area for increasing recreation opportunities. Not sure about the balance!
148	L F Wallace	No, stop the meddling by planners.
149	Cunningham	About right
150	Ms N Saunders	Protect ALL green belt land. There's too much development - we need our green spaces kept green.
151	Mr R Roles	A large area is being developed in Cherry Orchard Way. To display, in the open for all to see a massive car show area. What a monstrosity. Hundreds of cars in view. I'm sure this does nothing to enhance the area. Giving planning permission for this type of development must have been Rochford Planning Department's finest hour.
152	Mr S Crowther	The character of the Rayleigh/Rochford area must be preserved at all costs. South of Rayleigh/Rochford is an urban sprawl from Thurrock to Shoebury. Rayleigh/Rochford mustn't go the same way.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	The balance has recently tipped in favour of development, it is time to readdress the balance for recreation. The proposed extension to the Cherry Orchard Country Park in the Roach Valley is a start. Hockley woods should also be protected from any further encroachment. All green spaces and green belt areas should remain protected.
155	Ms A Boulter	The River Roach at Paglesham needs protection - control re "house boats" litter etc.
156	J W Collins	As more development takes place, green spaces will diminish. Settlements need to be kept away from each other. Once one new rural development is allowed, others will follow and kill off open spaces bit by bit. Remember the old adage you don't know what you've got til it's gone? Future generations will not want to live in an urban sprawl.
158	Mr & Mrs White	The Upper Roach Valley and Hockley woods are much needed and should be enlarged. Would these areas be protected in the future from politicians loony development schemes?
159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	I cannot comment on the Roach Valley as I do not have any knowledge of it! Regarding the balance between recreation and development opportunities there should not be too much of either.

160	Ms S Barnes	There should be more protected areas. All woodlands and rural open areas are what makes this area a pleasant place to live.
161	Mr S J Benee	Yes
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	What sort of recreational opportunities? I think the balance is about right at present but what development opportunities are we talking about.
163	Mr S T Cardwell	Any green belt and areas of special importance have to be protected at all costs.
164	Mr I King	Yes.
165	Mr G Searles	No, you have not got it right. Why constant concern re recreation? Why not leave some land for wild-life, just leave some land alone, why can't you?
166	G W Fleming	Any rec areas are good providing they are planned to blend into surrounding area grounds are maintained
168	Ms L Young	Recreational opportunities should be increase, especially for the youth of the area, who need easily accessible cheap recreation. With regard to the right balance between protection and development opportunities, due to the over development of the area already, any further development would have to be the development of protection.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	Green belt is very important but so is the ability for people to move around within the District and into other Districts. This is very important for workers and businesses. A bypass for the District from Southend to Chelmsford/London is badly needed if it could be done without any (or very little) accompanying building along th route. Some connections to this road would be necessary. Perhaps recreational areas - golf, lakes, tennis courts, ice-rink etc could be established along the route.
170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	? Plans for the development of the Thames Gateway Rochford should remain the "green space/lungs" for Southend and South East Essex. This means pressuring the Country park and coastal recreational areas. This would allow expansion of the area for activity breaks - walking, horse riding, golf, water sports (including fishing) to complement the nightlife of Southend.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	The green belt should be protected where ever possible. Any unused land can be utilised for allotments - especially allocate these to schools. The coastline is one asset which is to be valued see 7.
173	Mr & Mrs Cripps	Depends what is ment by recreational opportunities. Large recreational stadium would be wrong in the Roach Valley. Country pursuits such as equestrian events, treking etc, boating on the Roach, moorings at Stambridge could be encouraged. Tranquility in a balance however, to much country tourism and it is soon destroyed. The Roach Valley must be protected.
174	Mr P Clark	Areas such as Hockley Woods, Cherry Orchard and Magnolia Nature reserves should be protected and expanded. Magnolia reserve could be expanded northwards and off road cycle tracks could link this area through Magnolia Road, Clements Hall, Cherry Orchard and Hockley Woods. This would create a brilliant recreational facility. Coastline should be protected and nature reserves established in coordination with Essex Wildlife Trust and RSPB.
175	Mr H J Rowland	If you concentrate recreational opportunities in one area, you either have traffic and parking problems or the facilities are under used because they are too far from potential customers. We need lots of areas spread around the district.
176	Mr R Abbott	The council should protect all our green belt, especially between viallages.
177	Mr J East	Upper Roach Valley, on the map, look a good place to develop for recreation. Rayleigh has no large open public space. The area between the A127 and the railway from Great Wheatley Road to the old A130 seems a possibility. The development around Kingsley Wood has been, in my view encroached upon without public knowledge.



178	Mr D Livermore	Protect all of the existing open spaces. Make more areas available for parks and just open areas for kids and families to breath in. Development opportunities is just management speak for concreting the south east. The balance is not right you have already gone too far. Stop now and consider how to repair the damage caused by years of building programmes.
179	Mrs F M Wilson	The Roach Valley ok for recreation - but we do not need more houses on protected land (neither the roads, hospitals or schools can cope with more people!
180	Mr R Swain	The council should be looking to protect as much green space as possible - and if possible adding to it, ie adding new woods etc. It can only do this if it increases the density of living accommodation and occupation of space by industry and commerce and that must mean building up and banning the one-storey shed.
181	Mrs M R Hutchings	I've no idea!
182	Mrs V Wisbey	The council is trying hard, the history of the mentioned areas needs to be exploited to the locals. Not many children know how ancient Ashingdon is.
183	Tomassi	More protection required.
184	Mr T L Ellis	Do not create areas that draw in a lot of people from outside the area. This would only add to congestion and pollution. Better to have a situation where local people can enjoy the peace and tranquility of quiet areas and pastimes.
185	Mr J K Mills	The whole of the Roach Valley should be protected at all costs! I believe recreational opportunities are satisfactory, but further provision could be made in Rayleigh West (London Road/Rawreth Lane area).
187	Mrs K Jesty	Our current areas such as Cherry Orchard Jubilee Park should be protected and extended. Areas should be developed which would encourage birds to nest, migrate to/from etc. Ancient woodlands must not be encroached upon, thus protecting wildlife and plants.
188	Mr A Mackay	Yes, the council, as the resident's elected voice should be seeking to protect all the greenery they can because, mark my words if you keep developing our area will become a ghetto of industry and housing, with the odd acre or two of rather nice country park that we may be able to visit probably subject to an entry fee.
189	Mr G Gooding	The council should seek to improve its existing areas.
190	Mr G J Tinsey	Would be on a case by case basis.
191	Janice & Alex Brining	Protect all woodland areas, especially Hockley, an ancient historical site and new jubilee park, keep some green areas in all areas.
192	Ms B Mean	I am not informed enough to answer.
193	Ms S Swift	We could do with another swimming pool for Rayleigh. Some people find it difficult to travel to Hawkwell. The Leisure Centre was a greatly missed opportunity to provide this facility, especially for children living so close to the sea, it is important that they learn to swim at an early age.
194	Mr C Hutchinson	No further green belt encroachment should be made.
195	Mr B M Gilbert	What do you actually mean by development? Development of recreational sites or housing/commercial development?
196	Mr A E Hodges	Protect all existing woodland areas. The open spaces between Hockley/Eastwood and Hawkwell/Rochford need to be protected to avoid blanket development.
197	P McAllister	Sorry, haven't lived here long enough to know this. I did read an article in one of the free papers that Grade II listed's have gone and flats have been planned that's only good for developers not for protected buildings.
198	Mr J Clamp	Keeping greenbelt open. Between the areas mention in your intro and indeed no further encroachment between Wickford/Rayleigh Hullbridge/Battlesbridge/Wickford.

200	Mr T O'Shea	I know I am extremely fortunate to live where I live as within 5 minutes I have green space (although fought for) but in Rayleigh you have got it right we are fortunate that there are a number of good parks where people can relax and get back the feeling of space. I do appreciate the pressures on you but please endeavour to keep the balance you have.
201	Mr M Thomas	All parklands, sports recreational facilities and woodlands should be protected and well managed. The bypass ringroad development to allow traffic to either Southend from East Shoebury would be an advantage. This would be complemented by a river crossing in the Southminster area to link with the A12 allowing for development in that area and relieving traffic on the A130 and A127.
202	K Cardnell	No
203	M T Conaty	No development opportunities ie housing and the increase in flats in the area developers and council seem to take preference over the local residents ie the tax payers.
204	Mr R Gould	All green land and area should be protected.
208	I Gyres	How about protecting our right to be able to move freely and not take hours to travel small distances.
210	Mrs M A King	We don't need anymore recreational sites!
211	Mr B W Williams	Protection of the green belt areas are a must, not only the Upper Roach Valley but also smaller pockets of land such as the Ashingdon part area Hockley Wood etc.
212	Master J Richards	I have never visited or heard of the Upper Roach Valley and so would not be helpful in that question.
213	Mr M Wheeler	We should concentrate on making sure that our youngsters and others can continue to live in the district. Recreational facilities are important but affordable housing must take priority and this means increasing supply.
215	Mr T R Thompson	Need greenbelt land, country parks prior to the whole area of Rayleigh to Southend becoming a concrete jungle.
220	Mrs S Clarke	I would suggest keeping established woodland and parks and areas of beauty. The Upper Roach Valley would be good for developing recreational facilities.
221	Mr G Hoy	I haven't seen much improvement to the local area recently.
222	R Luck	I personally feel there is too much development going on and would like to see more protection in lots of areas but as I also see the need for another swimming pool in the Rochford area, I do not see how this could be done. Plus, as mentioned earlier there is not enough affordable housing in the area, so protection is not really possible.
223	C Morris	Leave the Upper Roach Valley alone.
224	Mr K S Gee	The area between Rawreth Lane and Battlesbridge/Hullbridge needs protection from development right up to the River Crouch. We do not want to see this developed.
225	Mr P Court	The Council is right to wish to maintain its Coastal Protection Belt, and Special Landscape Areas as identified in the Appendices to the Draft Core Strategy. It is important that these areas of primarily quality landscape should be protected, together with Strategic Gaps that serve a specified purpose, rather than the extensive areas covered by Green Belt designation. This is a policy designation that pre-dates most planning legislation. Its extent should not be slavishly adhered to, but seen as something that can, in places, be drawn-back without detriment to the landscape or to the overall objective of the policy.
226	Mrs A Hill	Development - it's like a slow creeping disease gradually eating away at our countryside and way of life! Eg a small garden nursery - then carparks, house, greenhouses. Its happening all over the place gradually spoiling the area. Or one small house along the Crouch River front knocked down and replaced with a huge monstrosity.
227	Mr & Mrs Haskew	Where is the Upper Roach Valley? It would be nice if we could find existing sites. The Cherry Orchard Park is Rochford's best kept secret. It has been in the papers but you can't find it. It is not sign posted. Tried cycling there but too many low branches on cycle path. We think areas around rivers are important to be protected.

228	Ms A Henderson	I think the council is getting things right, generally.
230	V G Crick	Needs to be monitored. Green belt to be retained not abused.
231	Mr & Mrs Walker	I think the Upper Roach Valley area should be protected but instead of just being green belt with footpaths, maybe there should be a country park where people could park up and have picnics and children could play on interesting play areas.
232	Mrs A Robinson	I would hope and expect that the woodland existing would be protected. The Upper Road Valley ? A good area to increase recreation. Pathways joining existing country parks - walks etc are a helpful and usefull way of keeping a green long feel - especially if this were ? ? by all.
233	Mr G Congram	Wildlife and environment are critical, so no development should be allowed around on the natural flood plains of our rivers. Any development will only make matters worse than they are and will increase insurance premiums.
234	Mr J T Dorrell	The Roach estuary has a wonderful opportunity for recreational activities as also the Crouch if only the local farmers would allow access. As it is only the sea wall is open to the public. The state of the tidal limit is utterly disgusting with mountains of debris the whole length of the river.
235	L W Lewis	I believe the greenbelt should be protected the same way as conservation areas to stop the clearance of trees and scrub without the local authorities permission or have a blanket tree preservation order placed on all green belt, this would stop the intrusion into greenbelt by strategy. All greenbelt areas should be signposted on lamposts to make it clear which areas are designated green belt. The keeping of horses in green belt should be encouraged but in a lot of cases landscaping policies should be implemented, clean up notices should be given to any sites which are untidy as this does not give a good impresion of our district.
236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Parks, trees and green spaces are important, not just for now but generations to come. It is our responsibility to pass this on and not destroy green space for a 'quick buck'. Incentives given to those who plant trees and plan land as green space rather than estates.
237	Mr Sanders	The balance should be shifted away from development and towards protection. At present if a developer wants permission to build nothing is done by Rochford council to prevent this.
239	Ms S Martin	Back garden development should not be given planning permission. Existing recreational sites should be preserved and protected for public use by reinstating parkland security ie rangers to prevent vandalism.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Country parks and green areas. People need to appreciate the countryside and encourage their children to play outside more. Therefore, need to provide the right recreational areas. Protection needs to be maintained - we need to keep our woodlands, landscapes and green belt lands.
242	Mr D Batchelor	More protection.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	All existing woodland areas and parks/playing fields should be protected. Upper Roach Valley could be a good area for increasing recreational opportunities by making better use of the river for example. On the question of balance it is important to ensure that where there is development it is of good long term quality.
244	Mr P Raiswell	Sport England supports the possible policy option of relaxing green belt policy (para 4.2), particularly where this allows more development opportunities for leisure and tourism, as outdoor sport and recreation are legitimate land uses within the green belt. With regard to Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country Park (Para 4.3.3) Sport England supports the policy to provide for the protection and enhancement of the area and increased informal countryside recreation opportunities.
245	M J Burpitt	Historically due to existing planning policies the current balance between all the conflicting interests has led to high price, mediocre developments.
246	Miss M Seward	Yes at the moment.

247	Mr & Mrs Addison	We must continue to protect the Upper Roach Valley. There is a need for a well run touring caravan and camping park in this area. This would bring in increased recreational use and extra business income whilst not spoiling the valley.
249	Mr I Hill	The proposed identification of Strategic Gaps to provide enhanced protection to certain sites in addition to the allocation of land as Green Belt will serve no planning purpose and is therefore considered unnecessary. More specifically, the objective of Strategic Gaps is to maintain the strategic settlement pattern of an area and prevent the coalescence of settlements - an objective that is replicated by two of the 'purposes of including land in Green Belt' which are identified at paragraph 1.5 of PPG2: Green Belts (1995) as: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. Accordingly, there is no requirement to introduce another tier of protection to land already identified as Green Belt, given that the areas proposed as Strategic Gap are, subject to continued application of Green Belt policy, no more at risk of development than other sites within the Green Belt. The net result of the proposal would be to undermine the level of protection afforded to land by the Green Belt designation.
250	Ms M Power	The Council at this juncture of LDF preparation and seeking to provide a 'sound' basis for future policies and allocations, must review Green Belt boundaries in the light of RSS14 housing requirements. Given that all of RDC's settlements are surrounded by Green Belt designated land, there is little available previously developed land on which to provide future housing. Many of the existing employment sites for example require continued protection for employment purposes in order to provide a sustainable employment land supply in accordance with regional needs. Housing requirements may provide the justification for Green Belt release on the basis of a sound review of all proposals for Green Belt land release. Such a review must therefore be undertaken at this time based on regional and local needs.
251	Mr B Guyett - Chairman	We agree with the statement in Rochford Matters and the need to ensure communities remain physically distinct. The habitat around river estuaries needs protection to encourage wildlife, some of which is of international importance to wildfowl and wading birds. We believe that the current balance is correct but are concerned that statements in this questionnaire are bias towards further development and do not give a balanced view. The Green Belt boundaries need to be protected.
253	Mr M J Smith	Our estuaries are vitally important and should not be touched.
254	Ms V Stanesby	No I don't think people have got any faith in the Council. With more and more people having plans to improve their houses declined and then allowing another to build houses in their back garden. There really is no consistency it all appears to be down to how the planner is feeling on the day and money.
255	Mr S Chilton	Yes
257	Mr T Dodkins	We agree with identifying coastal protection belt, special landscape areas, and green wedges and protecting those areas of special landscape and ecological interest from development. However, it is clear that there are areas outside of these designations such as my client's land that can be developed without impact on these interests.
258		Upper Roach Valley could be developed into another country park. Balance between development and protection about right.
259	Mr M B Rogers	Having 9/10 Green Belt and most of the land around the towns owned by big insurance companies and estate agents the decisions are mostly driven by these two factors if they want to develop land the Council wants to protect it comes down to money they have millions invested and the Council won't oppose in case they lose.
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	Skateboarding - just think of the kids you keep out of trouble. The best recreation as I see it that you have already created are the skateboard parks as my grandson is a skateboarder. You have the balance about right just one thing they all moan about is the rain stops them from skateboarding Could you not cover them over.

261	S A Skinner	I would like to see a belt of woodland created all around the edges of Rayleigh - the Council should acquire land to plant with trees to gradually link up Wheatley Woods, Grove Woods, Kingley Wood, Sweyne Park, Turret House Farm open space, Ferndale open space etc into as far as possible one great circle of woodland, open glades and walks - an amazing leisure area for the town!
262	Ms L Parish	Rochford gives a lot of protection to the countryside which is welcomed and extending the Cherry Orchard Country Park is a great benefit. Also, better access will be welcomed.
263	Mr P Kneen	Swan Hill recognises the importance of protecting and enhancing the countryside, particularly in area within and close to the existing settlements, as these areas can provide an important element in promoting the quality of life for those in urban environments. However, new developments on the periphery of these settlements can both contribute to and enhance accessibility to the open countryside, through the use of planning contributions and improved access to public footpaths and bridleways. Swan Hill understands that the District has a number of important landscape features, such as the Upper Roach Valley and two internationally recognised Ramsar sites (Foulness and the Crouch and Roach Estuaries), the second of which is also a designated Special Protection Area. Swan Hill considers that these areas should remain protected, with their general locations set out in the Key Diagram, and supported by relevant policy guidance in the Core Strategy.
264	Mr K Coleman	We support protection of the indicative Green Belt gaps. We support protection of indicative Coastal Protection Belt. We support protection of the indicative Special Landscape Areas. We support protection of the indicative Historic Landscapes and Ancient Woodlands.
267	Mr D Pointer	The Upper Roach Valley is a good idea. The Crouch Valley should also be protected. A green corridor should be rigidly maintained between Rochford and Southend and also adjacent to the A130.
268	Mr S Crussell	Hockley Woods has eroded significantly QE2 Park - hard to find and poor parking. Need to advertise the assets, provide more parking to encourage their use.
270		The Rayleigh Mount site in Rayleigh should perhaps be mentioned specifically both as an historical site and an environmental green haven in the middle of a town. No mention is made of the rural landscape features that create the network of fields that give the northern and eastern parts of the district their characteristic look. Since these areas are being expected to attract local and out of district visitors as part of the tourism targets a statement giving intent to protect the hedges/mature trees/drainage ditches and other landscape feature that make up the pattern and provide the environment for maintaining plant and animal biodiversity should be included.
271	Mr & Mrs Jobson	The rural character is the most important to local people, your own online survey shows that local people value the open spaces of the area most of all.
274	Mr S Mckinnon	The balance is good.

		Protection and Enhancement of Special Landscapes, Habitats and Species - We would fully support the protection of the undeveloped coastline, for both biodiversity and flood risk management reasons. Due to the presence of the international nature conservation designations within the district, advice should be sought from Natural England on the possible requirement for the core strategy to be subject to an Appropriate Assessment to consider possible impacts from development on these sites. As you are no doubt aware, we are preparing a Crouch and Roach Estuary Flood Management Strategy, currently due to be launched in the summer of 2007. This has considered options for flood risk management across the estuaries for the next 50 years, and will identify areas where, for example existing flood defences are to be maintained and where managed realignment should or could occur. The core strategy must clearly have regard to this document. Considering the proposed 'probable' options, we would clearly support the protection of designated sites and BAP species and habitats. It should be recognized that these features could be impacted by development directly or indirectly.
276	Mr M Barrell	
277	Ms S A Elkington	Please continue.
278	Mr P Marshall	Local fishing pond should be protected, recreation grounds, better promotion of existing sites.
279	S J Heeney	Where is the Upper Roach Valley?
280	Mrs M A Tyrell	It is most important to keep and protect our existing recreational areas.
285	Mrs B E Dale	At present the Council have got things right and in my opinion Rochford Council is better than most. I do not want to see any more evidence of 'urbanising the countryside'. Please leave natural areas to be natural. Hockley Woods was more enjoyable when it was not as 'regimented' as it is today - don't spoil our natural areas by 'tarting them up too much'.
286	Mr L F Knight	No not while developers can make it so councils parish, districts and counties.
287	Mr R Forster	Protect the green belt from development.
288	Mr & Mrs C Cummins	Countryside at the end of Rayleigh Avenue and Tudor Road which abutts the Country Park should be protected
289	Mrs J Warner	On the whole yes. Extending Cherry Orchard Park is a good idea. Every development, housing or industrial, needs a 'green lung'. Protect and develop recreational opportunities especially open spaces, in all localities.
290	Ms E Davis	Not sure, but protection is important.
292	Mr & Mrs Goring	The Upper Roach Valley seems the obvious place to develop recreational/tourist opportunities, but transport to and from these areas should perhaps be on the water, not building new roads but utilizing the natural route.
298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	Yes, please, please, protect Hockley woods. It is being vandalised in the name of husbandry. Once there were paths, now they are virtually roadways.
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	All parks and areas such as the mill and its adjoining land must be protected. School playing fields must be kept for the development of children's sport and social activities. Green Belt protection provides habitat for our limited wildlife and gives families views of nature on their doorsteps. We must not create a concrete jungle. The balance is fine but we need to look after our green space, we can't afford to waste this precious resource.
300	Mrs Upson	Cannot answer about the Upper Roach Valley

		4.3 Protection and enhancement of the Upper Roach Valley. The RSPB believes green spaces are vital for communities and would support the protection and enhancement of the Upper Roach Valley for biodiversity and informal recreation. Council options - The RSPB would support a policy providing protection and enhancement of the area and increased countryside recreation opportunities. These opportunities should be appropriate to the site in providing sympathetic access. The RSPB supports the extension of country park allocations. 4.4 Protection and enhancement of special landscapes, habitats and species. We are pleased to see recognition of the important landscapes, habitats and species within the District. We support the protection, extension and enhancement of these sites. We are pleased to see that the Council recognises the importance of environmental infrastructure along the coast and we encourage them to ensure its protection and enhancement. We are also pleased to see that the Council is committed to seeking 'throughout the coast and other special landscapes, high standards of development, including the location, siting, design and materials used' (para 4.4.7). W
301	Ms K Kelly	
302	Mr B Short	Yes to Upper Roach Valley. Yes to balance.
303	Mr K Hatfield	Hockley woods and the surrounding area should be protected. Gusted Hall and surrounding area should also be protected. Same for Clements Hall.
304	Mr A Rutter	We must keep what we have but some farmland could be used Stambridge Canewdon way.
305	E L Strangleman	Yes.
306	Mr E C Cook	See comments under 9
307	Mr J Snow	All green areas should be protected from development and more should be made of the undoubted potential that this area has for recreation, be it parks, nature sites or even developing the waterside areas that are currently in my opinion a disgrace.
308	The Occupier	Regret so far inadequate knowledge of the area.
309	Mr J Smith	Priority for protection is the <u>green belt</u> . Rochford area is already intensively developed.
310	Chris Teeder	I like to see all the Green Belt areas being protected from development. It is important that all of our footpaths and woodlands are maintained, I feel that the Council are doing too much development and not enough protection.
314	Mrs C Quennell	No I do not think the council has the balance correct, as you have lifted a part of green belt for large housing and left the other half as green belt, all should be lifted in that area, and only affordable houses for young people should be built on that land.
315	R A Stone	Too much development, too much short term decision making is the tall mark of the Council. Protect the Green belt, protect the environment and defend school playing fields.
316	Ms S Copeman	The lower end of Ironwell Lane should be a bridle/cycleway and not accessible to motore vehicles. The Upper Roach Valley should be further developed as a recreational area.
317	Mr D Harris	While it is worthwhile to protect important areas, considering beauty and special wildlife habitat etc, I don't agree with a policy of nil development of any kind simply because the subject site happens to be classified as 'green belt'
318	Ms W Hatton	We can never get developed land back for countryside - be careful.
319	Mr M Lang	No there is over development in all areas the upper Roach Valley should be left alone as green belt land or a country park.
320	J Feather	Countryside recreation is a good idea but the Cherry Orchard Park does not have enough parking for anyone other than Southend residents to use. If you wish people to use these areas they have to get there.
321	R J Feather	Balance is right. Maintain places like Hockley Woods but green belt has to be used for housing. Nothing special about area to be protected.
323	Mr T Beebee	All ancient woodland to be protected. The Cherry Orchard Country Park to be extended to Hockley Woods.

324	Mrs Doward	In the corner of Hawkwell where I live, we have a wonderful little haven for wildlife, which not many people know exists. In Rectory Road, it starts at Thorpe Road, where I live - a muddy unmade lane ?? Scub land, reaching the to the bottom end - nothing to ? this scrub land reaches across to the Main Road on the left hand side and on the right across as far as the Christmas Tree Farm and the road to Clements Hall, and backs on to Spencers Park the whole area, containing fields, scrub and woodland ? important to the local wildlife as it is a barrier from the busy roads and gives them a safe place to hide in during the day. We have visits in our gardens from badgers and foxes, and squirrels galore and even ? ? deer ? the area. The badgers and foxes criss cross the lane using both sides of the scrubland in complete safety. Horse riders use the road to get away from the main roads and to gain access to the bridle way in Spencers Park, dog walkers, cyclists and children all use the road safely to reach either Spencers or Clements Hall and can continue down the footpath to Windsor Gardens
325	Mr D Elwell	All non developed areas should be retained and comments in 4 agreed.
326	Owner/Occupier	Council should be seeking to protect all areas! Preservation of lower/upper roach valley vital - supports much wildlife. Increasing recreational opportunities can be good but depends on the nature of the opportunities (car parking? Disturbance to wildlife?).
327	Mrs C Taylor	We need to protect more of our old oak trees etc, whether in woodland or not. They are more pleasing to the eye and provide habitat for our birds and wildlife - the same for hedgerows. Yes, the Upper Roach Valley is a good area for recreational opportunities. I would like to see a better network of public bridleways across the Rochford District. Cycle lanes would also be a good outdoor pursuit keeping fit etc. Encourage the councils to provide more open spaces for all users. Cycle ramps and skate board parks provide outdoor facilities for our youth, to get them outdoors too!
329	Mrs M J Snowdon	Every attempt should be made to protect our green spaces. This area is rapidly becoming a concrete jungle. Certainly no-one should even consider ? Any more ancient woodland.
330	P Mansbridge	Steps could be taken to prevent the spread of the mixture of rural/urban landscape where farms etc are taken over and used to store all sorts of redundant equipment, containers etc. Rural businesses such as garden centres should not be allowed to over-develop.
331	Mr A C Cooper	Should protect the riverside areas of Crouch.
332	Mr & Mrs Jones	An area used for recreational purposes is not an ideal wildlife 'flora and fauna' habitat so areas of seclusion from the general public are necessary.
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	Yes, increase recreational opportunities but not in a way that presents 'a blot on the landscape' eg a large complex of buildings. Most important to retain gaps between settlements otherwise we will have just one large sprawling community that loses its identity.
334	Mrs Amey	I thought green belt was protected, obviously from No. 1 about housing is it really protected? You have done a marvellous job of creating new parks in the last few years and you are to be congratulated. As residents of this area we are naturally against big developments and the balance appears about right.
347	Mr C Rooke	I feel RDC has a good approach to protection and need to keep its focus on extending areas eg Crouch Valley. Recreation opportunities must be considered with ? Area - no marine growth ? Gold courses - expand country park type ?
349	Ms C Paine	If we let the gaps between settlements and the green belt go we'll never get it back. We have to think of future generations. Already Rawreth is in danger of being swallowed by Wickford from one side and Rayleigh from the other, and Rayleigh is merging into Southend.
350	Mr A James	I believe on the whole the council is moving in the right direction on this subject.
352	Cllr Joyce Smith	Would agree that we need to protect the green belt between settlements. Not sure that the Upper Roach Valley is suitable for increased recreation as most of it is farmland, poor public transport, lack of facilities that would be needed.



354	Mrs Smith	This side of the river Crouch is already over developed, overcrowded and getting unpleasant to live here, there's one public swimming pool for hundreds of thousands of residents already so yes, build more recreational areas which include swimming, not everyone goes to gyms and play squash, badminton etc, swimming is for cradle to grave ages. Why has the other side of the Crouch hardly been developed, since I moved here in 1968, its lovely there just like this side used to be like.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	The current balance between protection and development opportunities is about right and the URV is probably the most suitable area for recreation. Other possible recreational areas may involve water-based leisure along the Roach, eg Stambridge and Paglesham. A marina in the Stambridge area could provide high-value development but would require significantly improved road infrastructure to allow large vehicles/low-loaders to avoid Rochford Town Centre; large boats are already transported by road to Wallasea and Hullbridge.
357	Ms V O'Malley	Hullbridge Riverside should be protected. More effort should be made for recreational facilities for the very young, teenagers etc.
358	Mr & Mrs England	Protection is vital. There is enough noise and pollution from Southend airport already. Keep the farmland and ancient woodlands and the green belt.
360	Mr A J Eisenhauer	The district is special in its mainly rural aspect, special landscapes, woodlands, greenbelt etc and any further development must enhance and complement the existing character of the area.
362	Ms M Power	The Council at this juncture of LDF preparation and seeking to provide a 'sound' basis for future policies and allocations, must review Green Belt boundaries in the light of RSS14 housing requirements. Given that all of RDC's settlements are surrounded by Green Belt designated land, there is little available previously developed land on which to provide future housing. Many of the existing employment sites for example require continued protection for employment purposes in order to provide a sustainable employment land supply in accordance with regional needs. Housing requirements may provide the justification for Green Belt release on the basis of a sound review of all proposals for Green Belt land release. Such a review must therefore be undertaken at this time based on regional and local needs.
365	Mrs H J Springham	All green belt should be protected. If not possible, houses must be allocated fairly around the district.
366	Mr S J Springham	The existing green belt should be protected around all existing settlements. The areas described should be protected at all costs.
369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	We should be protecting all the green belt areas.
370	Mr G Biner	The most important areas that the Council should be protecting are the greenbelt areas and preventing overdevelopment of these. I personally feel that protection should be given to smallholdings and plot-holders land and encouragement and help should be given to keep these areas as they originated and prevent them being bought up as potential development investments, which is helping to lose this part of our heritage forever.
371	Swanton	I think council do well at providing open spaces.

## **5. CHARACTER**

Have we got this right? Are there areas where design and landscaping are not important? Are there any other issues? Do you support the introduction of a local list and what are your views on the benefits?

Rep No	Contact Name	Character Comments
001	Mr I Haines	Character is not the "be all and end all" of Rochford
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	Right as far as new buildings tend to be more in keeping with their surroundings and landscaping should be used lessen the visual impact even roundabouts these days are less offensive to the eye and most likely the cost is not prohibitive. Not sure of a local list.
003	Mr A Cooper	Design (of buildings) is always very important. Landscaping, around built areas is important. Not so important in open country areas, however, resources must be allocated to manage open areas.
004	Mr M Cubitt	I am sure the Council can manage this
005	Mrs P R Byres	I think a local list is a good idea
007	Ms P Pemberton	Landscaping/design are <u>always</u> relevant
008	Ms S Woolhouse	Yes, encourage building in traditional local styles.
010	Mr A Devlin	Not really sure, I do not fully understand the question
011	R F Wise	Pity no-one thought of this in the 1960's when Rayleigh High Street lost its character.
013	Etchells	Do not understand the question.
014	D Hanrahan	Modernisation has to come but there must be a retention of the here and now. Why have the houses in East Street not been developed. The "new square" is a fine example of sympathetic design, on the other hand Weir Pond Road is not. A list is a good idea especially if we want the right type of owner and to attract those benefits that come with considerate and responsible citizens.
015	F A Robinson	Not sure. Good design and landscaping are of prime importance to the community, as you only get one chance to get it right. A list of what? "A list of politicians who should be disqualified from the list of elections".
016	Mr R Fuller	We should redesign as far as possible to get cars out of the high streets with car parks around, accessible from the outskirts, not by driving through the middle of the town. For example, open Love Lane to 2-way traffic, widen Websters Way and close Crown Hill.
017	Mr L A G Dunford	Yes. Not to my knowledge. No. Very little.
018	Mrs Gaunt	There are <u>NO</u> areas where landscaping is <u>NOT</u> important, everywhere is important as we have to see most of these areas daily.
019	Mrs L Allen	The character of the area is being destroyed as we spread our <u>development</u> .
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	Design and landscaping are always important as long as this is combined with common sense and realism
022	Mobbs	Generally the character is good. Keep up the good work!
023	Ms C J Christopher	Resounding yes. I love the fact that all new property in Rochford reflects the historical feel and diverse style of the old property in the town. Fully support local list. To prevent developers flights of fancy! Design and landscaping always important.
024	Mr P Williams	All landscape is important. Purdeys way needs softening, its untidy, dusty, brazen vertical concrete and steel cladding, with an awful mini roundabout access junction but alongside a pretty farm with a riverhead and ford. It needs a better domestic attitude by its users. Roadsweeping, riverbank tidying and enhancing, better road access, trees to hide steel shutters and cladding and somehow hide car breakers yards skip lorries, car transporters carrying severely damaged wreck and staggering 'knocking of time' so that when the 'works bell' goes at 5pm, the roads don't jam.
025	Mrs P Clifton	Rayleigh Town architecture in the High Street should have been in keeping with old village style. STOP modern shopfronts being put up before it is too late.

026	Mr A Lantaff	Any developments allowed should be of good quality in both design and landscaping.
027	Mr B Fuller	Design and landscaping should always be important. Support local list.
028	Mr J Lickfold	Everything to make the area more attractive is important to residents and tourists alike.
029	Mr White	Too late for local list. Most buildings have already been demolished or (as in Priory Park Museum) left to rot.
030	Mr H May	It is all very well encouraging people to buy historic properties, but the maintenance costs are very high and you must then make the property available to the public. We have a most interesting and historic area and we must preserve it.
031	A R Wetton	The communities such as Rayleigh, Rochford, Hockley etc have an identity. Gradually these places are being urbanised and are losing their character. Landscaping is one of many issues that must be considered for the future. Design of landscaping are important in <u>all</u> areas.
032	J Morley	The character of each town is important. Too much landscaping is spoiling some places.
033	Mr R Balchin	Yes
035	Mr B Deal	No it seems you are intent on destroying whatever is left of Rochford.
036	Mrs P Slade	I am a firm believer on first impressions and good maintenance helps to prevent an area becoming a target for anti-social behaviour. So for me landscaping is very important.
037	Mr A Bawden	I think design and landscaping are very important. You would not want new developments to look like Harlow or Basildon!
038	Mr J Wright	In such a historic area as that which Rochford covers, there is never an area which is unimportant. People will not shop or go to industrial areas which look like a rubbish tip. The look of a place is very important.
039	Ms D Quinn	Character is lost in towns as small shops are losing business to large superstores
040	Mr D Huskisson	I don't see how a local list would benefit the District, unless its purpose was to assist developers with the design of new buildings etc. But what to include and what to exclude? Would it include mistakes of the past that we still have to live with (eg the east side of Rochford Square)? Don't let it stifle innovation. Design and landscaping are more important in public areas than in residential areas. Individuals need the freedom to adapt their properties to their families needs without overburdening them.
041	Mr McGee	Most of the towns in this survey are covered in concrete. There should be a limit on people covering front gardens with blocks etc
043	Mr M Yorke Wade	We should preserve our history and make sure redevelopment keeps in character.
044	Mrs R Beaumont	Design and landscaping are always important.
045	Mr R Abbott	Design and landscaping is vital to the soul! I don't understand the second question.
046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	Local list is a good idea, we need to preserve our heritage (which is even more important in this day and age of changing society).
048	Mr S Reeves	What character? There is no design/landscaping that I am aware of.
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	No design and landscaping are very important. Expansion in the area of designer landscaping can be used to create new jobs particularly for the young.
050	Mrs J Samuels	You have spent considerably on improving Rayleigh's High Street (including hanging baskets) and other areas such as conservation Rochford. I resent the fact that the area of Great Wakering is treated as the poor man of the borough. I tripped on the pavement which is badly broken in front of my daughter's house and banged my head badly. I phoned the council offices but the pavement has still not been relaid. It's a disgrace and would not be tolerated in Rayleigh. How about some improvements for our area which also has historic churches and landmarks?
051	Mrs D Langdon	Design, landscaping and character are essential here, there and everywhere. Please look into parking in local streets near stations.

052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	Too many expensive, land gobbling properties. High proportion of rich, who do not seem to care about working class life. Big membership freemason lodge in Rochford is unfair on the man on the street and is outside acceptable levels. Intimidating and a history of centre of cruelty.
053	E Winn	If you leave areas unscaped, some builder will apply to government to build a block of flats.
054	Mr & Mrs Todman	Landscaping and design is important in all areas to create a pleasant character.
055	Mr V Hawtree	Design and landscaping is important everywhere
056	Mr S Lee	All areas are important
057	Mrs J Williams	Design and landscaping are always important.
058	M J Jackson	The deterioration of West Street, Rochford and Rayleigh High Street highlights. The need for greater architectural consideration to an immediate area. The same comments apply to residential development where design and landscaping need considerable improvement.
059	Garfield	Not sure
060	Mr S J Herbert	Anything that maintains the character of the area is good. A local list is a good idea.
061	Mr G W Slaughter	Leave it as it is
062	Chris Taylor	The concept of a local list is a good one, but more effort could be put into restoration of heritage locations. Derelict buildings in Rochford are an example. Landscaping is desirable but mustn't be used as a way of masking uncontrolled new development. Rayleigh Mill area is a good example of restoring existing sites. The expansion of the west of Rayleigh is becoming extensive to the extent that the town is in danger of losing its character.
063	Mr B A Stammers	You have it about right.
064	Mrs S Smith	We need areas of beauty and the council are doing their best now, alas Rayleigh was destroyed in the latter half of last century. The new urban sprawl west of Rayleigh is characterless, and has no centre for community, not even a new school or pub. It has nothing to commend it. What is the point of a list of buildings unless the Council are prepared to ensure their upkeep?
065	Mr T Bennett	Surely design and landscaping are <u>always</u> of paramount importance to keep such areas attractive and properly used by the public.
066	Mr G Langhorn	Design and landscaping are important but I believe that it is too late in some areas around Rochford.
067	J D Carr	Yes would agree that council needs to list all buildings that demonstrate local character both residential and trade. Some allowance has to be made for modern design and materials ? Consideration of the layout of roads and walkways could make an improvement. ? of ? - ? producing fruit or ? trees would help reduce ?
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	Design and landscaping are of paramount importance. But housing developments are now cloned. An architect designed houses for Downhall Park estate we think he must have photocopied the plans and passed them on and on and on to infinitum. The postage stamp gardens are so restricting people need elbow room and space for privacy.
069	Mrs B Buckland	Recent improvements in Rayleigh eg High Street, Mill, sensory garden are much appreciated. Rochford square - also good. Floral displays - lovely. Good design is so important. The buildings that spoil Rayleigh High Street eg Police Station, Library are disasters of the 1960's we must not let this re-occur.
070	P Robertson	The character in this area I feel is currently correct. You do not explain what you mean by a "local list" so how can I comment on this?
071	P Williams	Insufficient information to comment. Although local lists/comments are always good.
073	Mr S Learmouth	I have no view on this

075	Mr K A Cooke	The scale and pace of development and overcrowding has all but removed any character from Rochford and Rayleigh District Council. Buildings with any historic interest are such a tiny percentage we could be living in suburban London for all the difference there is.
076	Ms G Lunn	Much of the character of the area has already been spoilt by the unsympathetic development of the 1960's and 1970's, we must ensure that our generation does not compound this further by ugly over development.
077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	You may have it about right. All areas are important and should be cared for and landscaped. Keep the character rural, East Anglian - not urban, not London overspill - leave that to Kent, Surrey and Herts which have long been spoilt that way. What is a "local list"?
078	David & Jeanne	More important matters to consider.
079	Mrs S Clark	The list sounds good. Rayleigh lost its weatherboarded cottage it's a true shame they were not valued. Hockley has greatly improved of late, as has Rayleigh.
080	Mr C Hathaway	I can't see any benefits in drawing up a list greater emphasis should be applied to the design and construction of new builds. New housing estates should have to include adequate play areas for children.
082	Mr J Adkin	I think the council has got this balance correct and I do support the local list.
084	Miss M Andrews	Would <u>not</u> be keen to see a site developed for gypsies and travellers.
085	C G Tabar	All areas - design and landscaping <u>are</u> important.
086	Mr M Gorman	Yes, where there is building it must be kept within the character of the area it is being built in . Not sure what good a list would do.
087	Mr I Walker	There are no areas where design and landscaping are not important! I support a local list (within reason).
088	Miss S Thackeray	Local list? Design and landscaping should always be important if it looks appealing it will be used and valued.
091	Ms P Bailey	What is a local list
092	Mrs M Hills	The character of the area is right.
093	Mrs M J Owoo	I feel you have got this right.
094	F A Browne	I consider that design and landscaping are always important and I support the idea of a local list.
095	Mr J Britton	See comments
096	Mr W Roberts	Yes I think this area will never/had never appeared on chocolate box lids! Protect character but don't try to keep the area in a time warp.
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	Our only comment is that the work that is being done to improve the character of Rochford takes too long!
099	Mr & Mrs R G Headley	We should continue to try and keep the character of our towns and villages. Even industrial areas need some design and landscaping. A few trees and flowers make a lot of difference.
100	Mr R Scates	South East Essex is probably one of the most characterless areas of the country. We lack many interesting natural characteristics which have been taken away over time with relentless building programmes. More emphasis needs to be placed on returning character to the area. Southend sea-front is a good example of how 'character' and life has been restored to a feature of the area.
102	Mr T Newton	Are your new parks attracting anybody other than dog walkers? A council produced book on local walks with points and places of interest may be a thought. This could be produced and sold in and around Rochford. Farmers markets at a time when working people can access, with a place to park. Rayleigh seems to be undergoing expansion westwards, and the town centre looks good. Rochford on the other hand is stuck in a time warp, mainly consisting on dingy dark pubs for the boys.
104	B Aspinall	The character of our area has been systematically destroyed this past 10/15 years

106	Ms P Melito	Rochford should always maintain its oldy worldly character.
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	Design and landscaping should be considered for all areas. Even our gardens have a small wild area for nature. If we get it right now then the future should be easier to manage.
112	A J Smythe	We have lived in Rayleigh since 1958, when it was still a small town with character. Over the years, development has been virtually unchecked, and has completely spoilt its old town. I would refer specifically to some instances of bad planning: the old cottages which used to exist at the High Street end of Eastwood Road were demolished and the awful pile of bricks that is Ulfa Court and adjacent buildings built instead. The old library, a building of real character and which lay back from the road, was replaced by the present ugly building. The old police station, while perhaps not of great architectural merit, and which also lay back from the High Road, was replaced by the present monstrosity, overhanging the pavement, which would bid fair to be named the ugliest building in Essex. "New development should be well designed ..." as you mention is more a pious hopethan a eality. There should be no areas where design are not important. As to a local list of buildings, by all means draw one up, but remember that greedy land speculators have clever lawyers who can by-pass anything if they want
116	R S Barton	As "Rochford" has been destroyed over half the town is empty and there is nowhere else that had any real character perhaps you should consider this factor before any consideration for "Tourism".
117	W R H Beehag	Design and landscaping are <u>always</u> important for good development. Anything less if false economy. If the government (any party) wants development, they must help finance it, as must trade and industry.
119	Mr C Gabell	Almost right at present - agree with local list suggestion to benefit the areas history and tourism opportunities.
120	Mr B Poole	In all instances design and landscape needs to be appropriate to the area and <u>must have minimum agreed standards.</u>
121	Mrs S J Attfield	I cannot see any benefits to further development in the aera. The current Governemnt have to be the worst as far as caring for the environment. It seems to be a knee-jeck reaction to solving problems in the short term with little comprehension for the long term overall difficulties they are creating.
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	Design and landscaping are important everywhere. Not only for a visually pleasing efect, but also because of the physical and mental benefits for residents.
126	Mr J Jefferies	Generally the planning department has got this right, especially in recent years. The newer developments in Rochford for example are in keeping with the original character of the old town.
127	Mr G Ware	Those people without affordable housing or a reasonably paid job might think this a waste of time and money. For everyone else quality of life is of course important. Has the Council got the balance right between the two?
129	Mr A Clarke	In all frankness Hockley has no character whatsoever, it is nothing more than part of the South East Essex urban sprawl. Compare it to a rural French village.....alternatively how about Woodbridge and Southwold in Suffolk. I rest my case. The central feature is the Spa Hotel.....it's awful. As for Hockley Woods - you get plastered in dogs mess and the smell on a hot day is horrible - made uneasy by some lowlife with a pitbull/staffordshire terrier. Also it is now increasingly likely you will be confronted by an escaping foreign inmate from Bullwood Hall. At my age you can do without all that.
130	Mrs S Martin	All areas are important. A local list would be a good idea. Would help new buildings to blend in with existing ones in each area.
131	Mel Bennett	I don't understand intent of question. What is a local list?
133	The Occupier	Design, landscaping etc are obviously more important where limited development is allowed in areas of environmentally sensitive nature. An industrial estate should be designed for efficiency, not for aesthetic effect.
134	Ms Innes	(a) No. (b) Yes. (c) Keep a strict control on unauthorised building etc, see the erection of mobile homes and caravans in Goldsmith Drive off Hullbridge Road. (d) Yes. We can see what is happening in our local areas.
135	Mr C Blundell	Design and landscaping are very important. Local list - yes, providing the mood/point of view was positively taken up.

138	The Occupier	Do all our residents know about all the small parks that are in the area, I was here 10 years before coming aware
139	Ms A Clark	Design and landscape are always important - but this does not mean building mock ? Scale, proportion and accessibility to clients/users is what matters.
140	Mrs J Davies	Character is always important. A local list is a good idea but err on 'old charm from the outside' inside can be adapted to efficiency and an economically run modern design.
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	Yes. We support the introduction of a local list. The benefits we see will be to protect the character of this area.
142	D Tilley/R Bhandari	The flats being developed appear to have been planned without any aesthetic values. They will soon appear to be a local discrepancy, out of keeping with village character. We should have learnt to do better by now!
146	A C Barton	There is wastage of land from the past, grass verges which do little to enhance and ? Upkeep.
147	Mr I Randall	Have serious reservations about the "square" development and the impact it will have on Rochford generally, stopping parking etc. Not sure what a "local list" would achieve?
148	L F Wallace	You have not got a clue!
149	Cunningham	No
150	Ms N Saunders	New homes always look new. They are too small and look like they won't last 5 minutes. My home is like a cardboard box!
151	Mr R Roles	The whole area within the confines of Rochford are very important in design and landscaping - the example I have given are not very encouraging. The question, "have we got this right" the answer a very definite NO.
152	Mr S Crowther	I think the idea of a local list is an excellent one. Design/Landscaping and townscaping are what distinguishes Rayleigh/Rochford and area from other settlements in the area.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	Design and landscaping in this area are important, they should always be in keeping with the environment and the character of the area, this has not always been the case. Contractors have been allowed to build large houses out of character with the area and difficult to sell.
156	J W Collins	Good landscaping is just window dressing. It is hard to believe character is important when traditional Essex landmark buildings are torn down to accomodate yet more crammed-in new-build shoe boxes. High Street shopping areas need help to avoid becoming chain store clones. Large supermarkets do not help - we have enough already.
158	Mr & Mrs White	The character of Rayleigh Town centre has largely been destroyed by ugly building work. Future alterations to premises must remedy this. Hockley looks a mess. Rochford must retain its town centre character at all costs.
159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	Too many flats being built. On corner of White House Chase and Eastwood Road is a typical example where once was a nursery and lovely white timered house there is now loads of development, where are these people going to send their children to school, visit doctors, teenagers to let off steam and police to police the Rayleigh area, to get police to call out at present is a joke!
160	Ms S Barnes	Landscaping is very important. You have to be proud of the area you live in. Hullbridge need to look more like a village and less like a housing estate. Its getting better but more needs to be done.
161	Mr S J Binee	The council seems to have got it right so far.
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	Design and landscaping are very important everywhere. Recent developments in Rochford have blended in well. I can't at present see the benefit of a local list. Surely local character is obvious.
163	Mr S T Cardwell	It would be a good idea to draw-up and publish a local list detailing the character of the local area. Then residents will probably have a better idea of the future possibilities.
164	Mr I King	Design is very important in our Villages don't make the mistakes of the 70/80's a modern supermarket in Rochford Square??.



166	G W Fleming	All areas must be maintained to ensure they do not become eyesores - if this is not possible then don't change the natural aspect.
167	Mrs J Marshall	No doubt more expense to us with higher rates.
168	Ms L Young	Design and landscaping are always important, this year the general maintenance of the area has been better verges and roundabouts kept under control. I just wish the grass cuttings could be cleaned, as the area looks so unruly with grass left to die on the verges and on the paths and roads. I'm not sure what a local list does.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	Landscaping is always important including on and around industrial estates/sites. More could be done. Although historic towns like Rochford, once had buildings onto the pavement we think this is a mistake to do this with new buildings which are bigger and modern and not old-fashioned looking. It restricts forever, the possibility of widening roads a little, which is often needed in small towns with increasing traffic. This traffic will make living and working in these buildings unpleasantly noisy and vibrating.
170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	The restriction of development in Rochford to ? In keeping with the conservation area has been important to ? The ? To expand without destroying its historical character. This policy should be used throughout the district to ensure that all development is in keeping with the traditions of Essex. A local list could help.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	A local list is essential not only to highlight places of character and historical interest if they are allowed to be forgotten then we have nothing to attract people to the area in this respect. Landscaping is always important. A well kept area will be respected by people.
174	Mr P Clark	Design and landscaping is always important in protecting the environment, our rivers, coastline and wooded areas should be protected at all costs!
175	Mr H J Rowland	Pie in the sky! Rayleigh was destroyed in the 1960's by rotten building and rotten planning! Poor Mr Mann the grocer had a heart attack because of it. What then it became a series of "nothing shops" which reduced the character of Rayleigh even more.
176	Mr R Abbott	The area around Southend Airport should be reviewed for noise and pollution eg the smell of aviation fuels.
177	Mr J East	In recent years I have been pleased and impressed by the design and landscaping of many new areas in and around Rayleigh. These qualities, I believe, are very important whatever changes or new developments are made. I'd be interested to see a local list.
178	Mr D Livermore	Design and landscaping are always important. Poor design and lack of thoughtful landscaping has led to the intensive building of unhealthy housing estates. People do not want to be living on top of each other. Look at the Rochford hospital debacle. In 10 years it will be a slum - hundreds of houses on a small area of land and then even more on the old Rochford Junior school field.
179	Mrs F M Wilson	Prefer natural landscaping of trees and water - nothing elaborate - just to attract wildlife - preferably where dogs are not allowed.
180	Mr R Swain	I would support the introduction of a local list. New development should be well designed, but much of what we have is a right old mish-mash (mixture of different styles). Restricting the height of new developments just means they spread out, which is much worse.
181	Mrs M R Hutchings	Design and landscaping is not that important, places to live are more important. Landscaping can come later, as for benefits, if you mean moneywise, I don't receive any other than an attendance allowance so I can't respond to that question!

184	Mr T L Ellis	Design and landscaping are always important. Places where people live on top of each other, in drab barrack type buildings is not very satisfying and leads to aggression or depression. People need space and cheerful, well looked after surroundings.
185	Mr J K Mills	Design and appropriate landscaping are always important to maintain the character and history of the area. I support the establishment of a 'local list' rural nature of the area.
186	Mr & Mrs J Halliday	Rayleigh has maintained most of its original character - However there are certain shop fronts and types of shops that are gradually letting its character disappear which is quite sad. Rayleigh station looks very sad.
187	Mrs K Jesty	The character of our areas is important and any new developments and/or improvements to existing buildings should be in keeping with surroundings. A local list could be of benefit to this area, as long as it is consistently adhered to. Historic properties and areas are important when keeping the character of Rochford.
188	Mr A Mackay	Well it's a bit late, Rochford square was decimated by previous councils, so forgive me if I'm not euphoric at your stance. Especially when a council favours 'moving' it's treasured buildings to where it would rather they stood eg St Lawrence Church inconveniently placed for - dare I say it - Airport expansion. A list is only as good as the people who enforce it - a faceless council with no track record - we need a council we can trust.
190	Mr G J Tinsey	Yes I support a local list.
191	Janice & Alex Brining	Design and landscaping can enhance and should enhance any area. A list to keep the right character could be valuable. In the sixties, Hockley lost its character buildings to utility looking buildings and village green had been lost.
192	Ms B Mean	Design and landscape are very important. If housing and landscaping are not considered then whole areas fall into a 'don't care' attitude and this in turn means the council eventually pays to clean up etc.
193	Ms S Swift	Rayleigh lost a lot of its character in the 1960/70's. The market town look should be protected and avoid looking like so many other towns, over supply of fast food outlets and off licences. This would cut down on nuisance behaviour because of drink. King Georges Park looks good now and the skate park has really helped keep skateboards from the High Street.
194	Mr C Hutchinson	No comment
195	Mr B M Gilbert	Design and landscaping are very important! No matter where or what is being developed. Bad design, landscaping and lack of foresight show those responsible what they really are, when in 20/30 years time the true picture of bad forward planning rears its ugly head.
196	Mr A E Hodges	Landscaping should be applied wherever future development is agreed.
197	P McAllister	In any area design and landscaping is important. A local list would be good if people had access and views, which if they had an objection they would be adhered to.
198	Mr J Clamp	The balance at the moment is about right given the increase in population. I am unsure about a local list all design and landscaping should be taken as an individual decision.
200	Mr T O'Shea	All areas should encompass design and landscaping or endeavour to. I have been impressed with the new buildings going up in Rayleigh town I only wish this had been followed in the 50's and 60's. Rayleigh still retains its character.
201	Mr M Thomas	All areas of local concern should have necessary restraints and these should be governed by those people that use this facility and area.
202	K Cardnell	Yes
203	M T Conaty	My views are that they would not be taken into consideration look at the congestion caused by the introduction of two way traffic around Websters Way and the tailbacks this causes right back to Fitzwimarc School (despite not being approved by the majority of residents in the area).

204	Mr R Gould	As before
205	Mrs Whitham	It is important to keep the landscaping correct, be it for industrial or housing.
207	Ms G Yeadell	4.10.2 says appearance of a proposal and relationship to surroundings is important to determining proposals & appeals. You remember the 'doctor's house' @ 1 Southend Road was on the Council's 'Local List' . This listed local buildings of historic, architectural or visual interest. It was informal and did not provide same protection as Grade Listing "...owners encouraged not to demolish", but were advised to apply for Grade Listing as soon as possible. Cynically, the list was omitted from revised District Plan, facilitating demolition ahead of appeal on 1 Southend Road, on grounds that, to quote head of Planning Poilcy, Government "frowned on" Local Lists (though other LPAs kept them). Grounds for refusal of 13 flats at Committee November 2004 omitted mention of the house. Head of Planning Policy commented later on objections: "Just politics, lot of local interest, nothing of character in that area". 4.10.5 - Strategy adds insult to injury: "Council dropped its Local List during preparation fo the new plan, but new guidance suggests reinstating the local list and updating the list to
208	I Gyres	Increase the land per house, stop packing in as many people into small flats just to increase profit for developers.
210	Mrs M A King	Landscaping is an all important feature with any building project trying to keep to original character where possible.
211	Mr B W Williams	Unable to fully reply to this question except to say that both design and types of construction ought to be sympathetic to locations.
212	Master J Richards	I find respect for each town and villages historic character as rather much a joke as Rayleigh's prehistoric settlement history is not recognised and the most historic town is often assumed as Rochford. Design and landscaping are not important in the built up town of Rayleigh and built up villages of Rochfrod and Hockley.
213	Mr M Wheeler	Design and landscaping are important but they should not be a deterrent to development - not sure what is meant by 'a local list' but if this is a list of required features it all depends what is on the list. Planners should be there to assist not to act as a deterrent.
215	Mr T R Thompson	No all areas deserve design and landscaping.
219	Mr J Amey	Design and landscaping is always important. If design/landscaping is poor it will be undesirable to local residents. I'd say character is currently about right. Rayleigh is a pleasant place to live.
220	Mrs S Clarke	I think character is always important. Property could be built to blend with local area.
222	R Luck	I do not think it is right to say any area is unimportant. A local list is a good idea as it could be used to encourage tourism.
224	Mr K S Gee	The area around Bullwood Hall and Turret House (East side of Hockley Road) must be protected (special landscape area).
225	Mr P Court	The requirement for Design and Access Statements should hopefully meet the Council's objective of seeking to preserve or enhance the existing quality of the built environment.
226	Mrs A Hill	I believe design and landscaping is always important - pride in whatever.
227	Mr & Mrs Haskew	I like to see grass verges. I like the landscaping on Ashingdon Road off Meesons Mead. Yes - think you have got this right.
228	Ms A Henderson	Design and landscape are very important everywhere. Who enjoys looking at the plainness or brutality of the ugly flat roofed blocks of flats, and factories put up in the ?
230	V G Crick	Design and landscaping is important in all areas.
231	Mr & Mrs Walker	Keeping the local character is very important, a good job has been done on the housing and refurbishment of Rochford and Rayleigh. Rochford town could be much improved by rebuilding the east end of the market square to get rid of the ugly buildings where the spa supermarket is.

233	Mr G Congram	I do not have a copy, but developments like those in Rawreth Lane do not demonstrate any such consideration. There is a distinct lack of landscaping with houses on top of houses. No tree lined avenues. No hedging. No green spaces.
235	L W Lewis	All landscaping is important. Landscaping around the district would be improved with the removal of general clutter eg old posts, old unnecessary signs etc. Although landscaping seems to be a major part of the councils planning policies it seems to be the developers last priority. The council should follow these up to ensure they are implemented and maintained this would enhance the general character of the district.
236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Properties should be in character with their surroundings. Design landscape is always important. Local list for properties should be backed up with 'zones' around those properties which must be under special control.
239	Ms S Martin	Existing development is just about right, with the exception of the larger new mansions being allowed which are not in keeping with the area. Flats should not be more than two storeys high. What is a 'local list?'.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	The character of new houses should fit the area (eg 'traditional' in heart of Rochford) and the surroundings. Design/landscape should always be important it's not just the house, but the location and surroundings should fit. We should restrict 'big' extensions making a property look out of place with others around. A local list sounds a good idea, and allows control and guidelines.
242	Mr D Batchelor	Do you ever get it right some one always moans.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	I agree that it is important to ensure that any new building or development is in keeping with existing local housing/architecture and attractive in the long term. A local list may be a useful measure of buildings that demonstrate good local character. New buildings should also try and include energy saving features and measures for water conservation.
245	M J Burpitt	Design and landscaping is always important. Generally speaking the phrase 'quality of design' does not apply to properties in Essex. With a preponderance of bungalows with ill conceived windows poking out of the roof and the so called 'chalet style dwelling' may be by design but, it's far from style! The planning rules should be changed to outlaw these bodged up buildings in favour of proper two storey housing.
246	Miss M Saward	Do not modernise too much as it spoils the countryside of Essex. Leisure centre's should be designed to fit it with the countryside ie Rawreth Lane, rather than a 70's looking building.
247	Mr & Mrs Addison	Yes design and landscape are vital to this part of Essex. Well done on protecting Rochford. A local list will be a good idea.
250	Ms M Power	The Council on the basis of soundness principles should not introduce local designations in order to resist development proposals. Where landscape and built form characteristics are worthy of nationally recognised designations, these should form the basis of continued landscape protection or historic building protection. Other criteria/sequentially based policies also provide a sound basis against which to resist built development in sensitive locations. The Council is aware that Design and Access Statements are now a requirement of the P&CPA 2004 for major development proposals and therefore there is no separate requirement for such statements to be specifically advocated as part of the application process. Landscaping is important to development and good design however, it is not always appropriate to seek to agree all details of a scheme as part of a current planning application and the use of appropriately worded conditions to be discharged prior to implementation can address the necessary detail and agreement with the Council.

251	Mr B Guyett - Chairman	No, you have NOT got this right. RDC have repeatedly failed to support the community in safeguarding buildings of interest eg 1 Southend Road; conversion of farms into industrial estates; not supporting requests for a rural conservation area (or legal equivalent) around St Peter Pauls church. RDC is clearly not listening to its residents. The landscape and the layout and design of its settlements give Rochford District its distinct character, as opposed to the neighbouring urban conurbations and must be protected.
253	Mr M J Smith	Landscaping is always important. As one drives through Essex especially South, we look like the poor side of the family.
257	Mr T Dodkins	The draft Core Strategy identifies that Rochford has a specific local character, with which we agree, with a number of conservation areas where there is a need to build seamlessly. However, there is a risk of a contradiction if there is a precedence given to reflecting local character and the need to ensure energy efficiency. There needs to be a recognition that the use of new energy efficiency materials with low embodied and low CO2 'footprints', together with the use of micro-generation such as solar panels, will require a degree of flexibility whilst maintaining high quality. A particular example is the size of windows in traditional buildings which tend to be small and do not permit solar gain to be best utilised. The challenge for the Council is to marry these competing objectives, and in this context site responsive design will be important. In the context of para 4.13.1, new housing development can produce greater energy efficiencies than other uses and development, and it is important that such measures can be incorporated within the design of new buildings. The best
258		Points of character in Rayleigh appear to be under publicised and signposted.
259	Mr M B Rogers	"Onwards and upwards" seems to be the Council's motto getting rid of the character in our towns and building more flats knocking down two bungalows building flats that possible 3 cars to possible 14. Thus creating congestion within the confines of that town. All areas are important. If they are allowed to decay the area becomes bigger. If you take the Poets Estate where I live you will see roads where weeds are growing in the gutters some 2 feet high the grassed areas are not being trimmed so the pavements are getting narrower. Bring back road sweepers.
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	Landscaping is always important. I live at 12 Bedloes Avenue in a cul-de-sac and the landscape from the my front lounge window is not nice, a roundabout being a local point could do as we all live here agree could do with a lovely sycamore tree. The horrible hege opposite wasting time and money being cut every so often "yuck". Please get rid of these unsightly hedges and save your money which would pay for better things like the tree asked for above.
261	S A Skinner	The Council is setting a bad example by shoving up ugly buildings itself. The shed-like eyesore new leisure centre in Rawreth Lane is an example of architecture at its worst. There should be a policy of high quality visual appearance for Council buildings. A local list to give protection to buildings that do not have national listing is desperately needed, otherwise we will lose old buildings of character to modern flat developments everywhere.
262	Ms L Parish	I support the introduction of a list of acceptable character features for building to avoid 'eyesores' being built within a particular period type of property.
263	Mr P Kneen	It is considered that the Councils approach towards character and design is too prescriptive and unnecessarily repeats existing legislation. The requirement to submit Design and Access Statements with the majority of planning applications has now come into force and requires developers to take into account the character and appearance of the existing area when considering development. Landscape forms an important component of the Design and Access Statement and as such it is not considered necessary for the Core Strategy to include a specific policy relating to landscaping. It is considered that a single generic policy relating to design (incorporating the various components of scale, mass, landscaping etc) could be included within the Core Strategy and that the detailed guidance is reserved for the SPD on "Design, Landscaping and Access Statements", which Swan Hill has already responded to. This approach would limit any potential repetition of existing legislation and avoid unnecessary levels of detail within the Core Strategy.

267	Mr D Pointer	I think the current character is about right and should be maintained. Design and landscaping are extremely important. High density developments should generally be discouraged.
268	Mr S Crussell	Most development I've seen has been fine (even if I don't think it should have been permitted in the first place).
269	Mr R Scadding	No comments
270		The Essex Wildlife Trust supports the probable options stated in Section four in this area.
274	Mr S Mckinnon	Architectural consideration should be more important when planning applications are considered. In certain circumstances materials should be used to blend in to local/historical features.
276	Mr M Barrell	Good Design and Design Statements We feel that it is important to outline at an early stage what will be expected of development in the district, with high standards required. It should be made clear that compliance with sustainable construction targets will be sought in all developments. You should consider utilizing the BRE EcoHomes/BREEAM ratings standards, and seek development that meets, for example, the 'excellent' standard. Sustainable construction should form an intrinsic part of the development. It should influence the layout of the development, allowing for appropriate orientation to maximise passive solar gain and provide space for habitat creation or amenity space. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be the first option for site drainage. Such systems also provide for habitat creation/amenity space, and a specific allowance within the layout of the site will need to be made for SuDS. Developers will clearly need to be aware of all these requirements prior to submitting an application. <b>Landscaping</b> Landscaping proposals should ensure that existing r
278	Mr P Marshall	Yes, I support local list, so people get to know their area better.
285	Mrs B E Dale	Since I moved to Rayleigh 46 years ago the character has changed totally but in the last couple of years it is improving greatly and the Council are to be congratulated. Design and landscaping are important in all areas where people live and work but not in the open spaces to the same extent.
286	Mr L F Knight	Don't know
287	Mr R Forster	Character is important, again to make people want to live there and respect the area.
288	Mr & Mrs C Cummins	Design and landscaping are always important.
289	Mrs J Warner	Every locality must have a list of buildings/areas to be listed/protected. Landscaping and design are imperative in an area such as Rochford District. Need to liase with all interested parties ie Town Council/Parish Council/Civic Society etc.
290	Ms E Davis	No, they are always important. Don't know about a list.
292	Mr & Mrs Goring	Yes. Etaining local character is essential when building - it ensures that new developments merge seamlessly with the local environment, that new residents cuold feel part of, not separate to the local community. A local list is a good idea because planners from areas outside of the district may have a different impression of the community.
297	Mr S Marshall	CYCLING! The area is jammed solid with cars and yet there is virtually no provision for cycling especially in the Rayleigh area.
298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	All area are important. Too many flat roofed buildings have been allowed. Too many old/picturesque properties have been allowed to be demolished, thus destroying 'character'.
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	I feel the character of Rayleigh and its surrounding area is slowly being erroded; not all old buildings are bad or new ones good. Attention also needs to be paid to the road way system which is becoming increasingly conjested.
300	Mrs Upson	Every piece of land is important to someone. The soldier in the last war hoping to see his home again. The soldier of today also. Someone has to say NO think again to those responsible for our by-laws and English laws.

		4.9 Good design and design statements. We are pleased to see the Council recognises the need for sustainable development. Where appropriate, all developers should be encouraged to use locally sourced, reused, recycled and environmentally sustainable materials during the construction process. Rigorous site and methodology assessment should ensure pollution does not occur as a result of the construction or functioning of any development. By designing technologies such as water saving devices, micro-renewables and facilities for recycling into development, increased efficiency is achieved and environmental impacts are minimised. Council options - The RSPB would support a policy that requires planning application to comply with minimum standards, as set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes. Further to this, we would recommend that the Council positively support proposals that go over and above minimum requirements. Development proposals should also be assessed against their ability to meet BREEAM 'excellent' standards. The RSPB would support the development of a guidance document which avoids being prescriptive but sets out best practice ideas and
301	Ms K Kelly	
302	Mr B Short	Keeping the landscape natural is important. Not sure about local list?
304	Mr A Rutter	Rochford must keep its old world charm. The new building behind the market square look good so far. The new building on Wier Pond Road look cheap and are too tightly packed.
306	Mr E C Cook	yes, about correct, yes to local list retain character.
307	Mr J Snow	"Toytown" developments lack character, well designed and layed out properties of a pleasing design work better than say, Betts Farm type developments. A local list - meaning held by local town councils or parish councils will be better than a Rochford District Council list. This will allow those that know their town to advise on development etc.
308	The Occupier	Design and landscaping always important not simply to maintain the history but also to develop surroundings tastefully and appropriately for benefit of all and steer through traffic away from built up areas, (esp Lorries!).
309	Mr J Smith	Design and landscaping are of the utmost importance in this area.
310	Chris Teeder	Unfortunately a lot of the character of this area is being destroyed by developers. Old character buildings seem to be getting demolished rather than renovated only to be replaced by another standard designed house or flats. Soon the whole area will look like a new town. A local list is important only if it is going to be adhered to.
311	Mrs P A Watson Jones	Design and landscaping is always important.
314	Mrs C Quennell	The areas I have already mentioned land top and Rayleigh Avenue top of Eastwood Rise, Disraeli Road off Rayleigh Avenue, A127 Arterial Road but only for affordable housing. I was born in Eastwood, and never moved, so I feel these younger generation need help to achieve that ambition to just have a chance of owning their own home.
315	R A Stone	The environment history and character should be protected at every point. It defines our area, where we live! A local list would be helpful as benchmark but planning decisions need to reflect the overall objective.
316	Ms S Copeman	The historic buildings of Rayleigh/Rochford are well worth preserving and a local list would be a good idea.
317	Mr D Harris	I agree that all new development should be of a good enough quality to enhance and not spoil an area.
318	Ms W Hatton	Character brings people to a district. You don't have contemporary Christmas Eves that draw in crowds business money its Victorian Eves look at Halstead.
319	Mr M Lang	Don't know on this one.
320	J Feather	You certainly did not follow this idea with the Park School site! You should allow more room for landscaping and less houses per area.
321	R J Feather	You've got to be joking! How can an Asda store be considered to respect the existing character of Rawreth Lane. Do these rules already exist - if so I don't understand how this works.
323	Mr T Beebee	All buildings of historic nature or architectural merit to be saved.

324	Mrs Doward	No development should be allowed that would spoil the character of an existing town or village. If building a new town/village then that would be given a character of its own.
325	Mr D Elwell	Agreed - no further comments
326	Owner/Occupier	Build environment does have a special character and everything (within the council's power) should be done to preserve this character design and landscaping is important in all areas.
327	Mrs C Taylor	Most sites can benefit from a well designed layout and where possible provide facilities as well as access for all including wheel-chairs. I remember trying to push my friend up high kerbs in her wheel chair - if possible some outdoor walks via footpaths (public) do benefit disabled people to still appreciate landscaping and access to the countryside. I do support publication of a local list so anyone may have their say and put forward their views/comments.
329	Mrs M J Snowdon	The character of the area should be preserved but this policy is rather too late for much of Rayleigh High Street. Design and landscaping is always important in the hopes that a pleasing environment may reduce the current trend of vandalism.
330	P Mansbridge	Design and landscaping is always important. Areas such as the A127 and Websters Way are examples of poor design etc. Industrial estates often exhibit poor design. People must be encouraged to maintain buildings and the land around them. Much more should be done to encourage careful disposal and control of business and commercial waste eg Websters Way shops.
331	Mr A C Cooper	Design and landscaping is always very important. This makes or breaks a community or area. The improvement to Rayleigh High Street after the disasters of the 60's and 70's are a good example, although almost too late as many buildings have already gone. Design does not have to reproduce 'olde worlde' styles but must be top quality with good materials which will age well. Landscaping needs to be low maintenance.
332	Mr & Mrs Jones	This area is seen by many outsiders as desirable so the character is to be maintained or improved to stop it deteriorating into an inner-city slum or close to.
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	Design and good landscaping are important in all areas. We believe a local list could help to ensure the individuality and character of the area.
334	Mrs Amey	The extra trees and shrubs planted in Hockley have added to the character as it would on any new developments
347	Mr C Rooke	Character must be kept in planning practice - the need for the area to be visually appealing. A list would need to include the best examples ? ? Paper - not architects - think have appeal. RDC needs to look at all areas and see what ? Character can be brought in.
349	Ms C Paine	Local list is a good idea. Developers must be made to fit the character of the area and if they have a list to consult there is no excuse.
350	Mr A James	Too many interesting buildings are being replaced with inferior looking developments. I think the council could do a lot more in this area.
352	Cllr Joyce Smith	I hope that Parish Councils will be consulted regarding a local list. It will only be of use if it is linked to planning issues so that enforcement action can be taken if needed.
354	Mrs Smith	Sympathetic design and landscaping are vitally important in every development, if ghettos of the future are to be avoided. A local list should be put to the local residents and approved by them before any development starts, new or updated. This list should be given maximum publicity.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	Design and landscaping is important ion all parts of the area to maintain the histroci character of the district. A local list would be a good idea and all developers required to use these as good examples of suitable design. However, this should not be a straitjacket and allowance should be made for progress in design.
358	Mr & Mrs England	Design and landscaping is important. New development at Rawreth would not spoil Rochford or existing historic villages.



359	Mr New	The district is short of large park areas, long distance walks and open spaces. New development should blend
		The Council on the basis of soundness principles should not introduce local designations in order to resist development proposals. Where landscape and built form characteristics are worthy of nationally recognised designations, these should form the basis of continued landscape protection or historic protection. Other criteria/sequentially based policies also provide a sound basis against which to resist built development in sensitive locations. The Council is aware that Design and Access Statements are now a requirement of the P&CPA 2004 for major development proposals and therefore there is no separate requirement for such statements to be specifically advocated as part of the application process. Landscaping is important to development and good design however, it is not always appropriate to seek to agree all details of a scheme as part of a current planning application and the use of appropriately worded conditions to be discharged prior to implementation can address the necessary detail and agreement with the Council. Policies for lifetime home standards should be based upon particular site circumstances and requirements to provide an element of such homes. Percentages sh
362	Ms M Power	
365	Mrs H J Springham	The district does have a special character. The new housing required needs to be spread around the district so that no one area is totally ruined.
366	Mr S J Springham	Yes the local area does have a special character. The proposed additional building will help to ruin this. Lobby the Government to build in less heavily populated areas of the country.
369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	Sorry but the characters of Rochford and Ashingdon have already been spoilt by too much development.
		Design and landscaping is always important and so is the consideration of existing residents. Has the option of underground or partially underground buildings been investigated. It may be more expensive but should be more environmentally friendly. Maybe developers should contribute a percentage of profits towards such projects, for every conventional build they should build and environmentally friendly house.
370	Mr G Biner	

## **6. ENERGY AND WATER**

Should we do more? Is a requirement too stringent, should we simply encourage? Are there other things we could do?

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Contact Name</b>	<b>Energy &amp; Water Comments</b>
001	Mr I Haines	Encourage and educate
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	Encouragement is good, most would respond, water for example should not go down drains unless it is not usable, educate how to divert rainwater from roof gutters onto gardens and so back to the water table via soak aways and again perhaps help finance such efforts or when front gardens are concreted over make sure surface water again is not allowed just to go down the drain (could also help guard against property subsidence)
003	Mr A Cooper	I don't know where our water supply comes from. So far as I'm aware, the only reservoir built in South East Essex is Hanningfield in the fifties (I would guess). Must be realistic about electricity supply. It will keep growing with more houses and more gadgets. Therefore must have more power stations.
004	Mr M Cubitt	Yes we should retain and rework materials.
005	Mrs P R Byres	Maybe some incentive could be set up to encourage residents to have solar panels installed. Perhaps the Council could set up something for the supply of these panels in much the same way as the compost and water tubs. Sorry just noticed you already do this - I will be contacting them soon. Great idea - very forward thinking.
007	Ms P Pemberton	We should do more. Too much wastage and complacency. Water meters should be mandatory and electricity/heating (especially in shops should be more controlled).
008	Ms S Woolhouse	Any new buildings should be as self sufficient in energy as possible and should also be aswell insulated as possible. Water conservation is important and I am in favour of legislation to enforce it.
010	Mr A Devlin	Stronger encouragement is required for less energy and water use
011	R F Wise	Get your planners more energy conscious - wind power electricity from solar power, etc and encourage inhabitants to install such appliances.
013	Etchells	We save all we can, the Council should be planning for a drier future; more resevoirs, more sewage facilities.
014	D Hanrahan	We could always do more and encourage we should come down hard on polluters and waste. Global warming again
015	F A Robinson	More can always be done. However, all things affect others; some things may not be obvious eye saws. I for one would like some solar power or solar heating, but do not know what to get or what laws there are, or even how to go about getting permission for solar sells or even a wind turbine on my roof. As more companies persuade householders to by these things, perhaps it might be wise for the planning department and council think of this before it is too late.
016	Mr R Fuller	Remove requirement for planning permission for silent wind turbines. Put a cap on the decibel rating that is allowed without planning permission. Could fields near homes be allocated for wind farms ie local power supporting local houses.
017	Mr L A G Dunford	Encourage water companies to fit metres as compulsory - far too much water is wasted.
018	Mrs Gaunt	I think present arrangements are adequate.
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	Help people with solar panels. Stop building where the water and sewage companies tell you they can't cope with any more
022	Mobbs	We could do more to help. We could be less stringent and people would react more to save water if not being ordered to. Also less building would help energy and water (more houses more water needed).
023	Ms C J Christopher	Agreement on anything to assist with protecting energy and water resources should be encouraged.
		Requirement by Government is the only way to get firms to build in renewable energy provision. Eg put solar panels on all new buildings - into building regs. I believe Sweden already does so.

024	Mr P Williams	Offshor or on-masrsh windfarms are more acceptable than nuclear energy and are not that noisy or ugly if 3 or more miles away from housing. The very, very tidal Crouch and Roach would be ideal for hydro electricity providing suitable lockgates were built for the thousands of yachtsmen and women and the Baltic shipping to Wallasea. Such a system would keep a much higher low water level at Hullbridge and Battlesbridge which <u>Will</u> please yachtsmen and may have other benefits.
026	Mr A Lantaff	The Council is right to impose strict requirements - particularly with regard to water conservation and storage. Could all new developments include solar panelling in the roof?
027	Mr B Fuller	Encourage
028	Mr J Lickfold	Every house should be on a water meter to save water.
029	Mr White	Yes. All new building should be made self sufficient for energy - solar panels etc. All households charged for rubbish collection and when households recycle they get a refund. Extra parking enforecments in town centres for people who park illegally.
030	Mr H May	We are all surely, well aware of the need to conserve energy and water and anything which is directed to this end, must be good.
031	A R Wetton	This item should be given top priority. A watchdog type group should be set up to encourage better use of these resources and avoid waste. Effective and efficient management is key to the success of eliminating waste. I feel strongly about this subject as it will be of greater concern in the future as population continues to grow.
032	J Morley	You could perhaps help people to save energy and water by giving them information on how this is done.
033	Mr R Balchin	More solar panels and in new property
034	Mr Hart	Introduce water meters compulsory for swimming private pool and fish ponds.
035	Mr B Deal	Although short have you noticed how many power curts there are shortly the whole infrastructure is simply overloaded.
036	Mrs P Slade	Householders would benefit from being made aware of simple solutions to save water (ie turning off taps when brushing teeth). Again can our area cope with more housing etc. We already have drainage problems, are they being cleaned out often enough?
037	Mr A Bawden	Water and energy are very important! The water companies waste the most water with under ground leaks! Why is more not done to make them repair their services?
038	Mr J Wright	You cannot force people to recycle, most people do or would like to. However, it must be made simpler and easier for people to do. Rain water butts are a good idea. As are energy saving bulbs.
039	Ms D Quinn	Turn off some street lights between 12pm and 6am compel businesses to turn off signs and lights outside. Have solar panels installed in new housing - or similar energy savers.
040	Mr D Huskisson	If Rochford goes the way I read some other Council's are going, by restrictingthe amount and frequency of refuse collection, you'd better stipulate mini-incinerataras in all new homes too! I don't know what kind of "renewable energy provision" you are referring to. I don't think more encouragement is going to get people to invest in solar panels, wind turbines etc. of their own volition. It will take planning law over time to deliver the changes required. I believe it is right to do this.
041	Mr McGee	O.K.
043	Mr M Yorke Wade	Opportunity to set up a wind farm in the English Channel
044	Mrs R Beaumont	Rain water for gardens should be an issue, we have 2 large barrels and never use tap water
045	Mr R Abbott	Yes - pump it in from the sea and de-salinate it - the land is flat enough. Act as a watchdog over supplier prices, particularly for the old and infirm

046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	See 1.0 - why create an increased load on something we already struggle to combat/cater for? It is so basic, we despair with the way the world is heading.
047	Ms J Colbourne	Energy conservation is vital to the continuation of this planet. An example of how RDC could do more is that there is a street light outside my neighbours home (26 Riverview Gardens) that has been on continuously for the past 4 years (all day and all night) I have tried to report this on several occasions - this is light pollution and a waste of energy.
048	Mr S Reeves	Yes. There should be penalties for not complying, eg why does my neighbour at No. 24 have 2 bins, and why do the dustmen take them?
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	Yes. New things that can be done should be to include more resevoirs that can have the dual purpose of storing water while providing facilities for increased leisure activities plus wildlife conservation.
050	Mrs J Samuels	Enforce water meters. Electricity and gas is so expensive particularly with added VAT people probably do their best to conserve energy. The Council should continue its policy of helping poorer residents to put in loft insulation etc.
051	Mrs D Langdon	Water - ensure water bursts are attended immediately renew old watermain pipes. Ask for details from water co's and make sure carried out maintenance and renewal. Offer subsidies on solar panels etc.
052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	Water/sewerage rates are very high. Cost could be brought down and the public shown how to be more conscious about overuse, emissions, windfarms and how to save all round.
053	E Winn	Make the water companies do more from their vast profits.
054	Mr & Mrs Todman	Just encourage
055	Mr V Hawtree	Windfarms on Foulness Island and Maplin Sands
056	Mr S Lee	Collection of plastic for recycling. Perhaps the Council could make its own compost from garden waste to be sold to make a profit for the cultivation of the area.
057	Mrs J Williams	All new buildigns should have renewable energy provision as a requirement. I welcome the idea of rainwater storage. However, there are two further issues. Firstly, the recycling scheme should be expanded and improved - too much of our waste is going into landfill sites. In addition, if we have new housing we must ensure that there is an adequate energy supply - power cuts are already frequent in the area in which I live.
058	M J Jackson	Solar heating should be installed in all new housing.
059	Garfield	No need if population stays the same.
060	Mr S J Herbert	Encouragement is the best policy
061	Mr G W Slaughter	Leave it as it is
062	Chris Taylor	<u>Many of the questions asked assume that the population of the area is to expand. The area is overcrowded, and it's this that puts demands on energy and water. Generally the support for energy efficiency is a good one. Power could be generated by the tidal power from the Roach and Croach using possibly Bradwell as a centre after closure of its nuclear role.</u>
063	Mr B A Stammers	Not too stringent to keep the cost of new homes at a level that people can support.
064	Mrs S Smith	The requirement is not too stringent. Are all new builds adequately insulated? Water will be a problem if there are many years of low rainfall. Construction of another resevoir.
065	Mr T Bennett	The saving of energy in all its forms is a modern and absolute requirement. The new "housing department" building, which will be required in the hope for "yes" verdict on Rochford housing association should be an opportunity to demonstrate the advantages currently available.
066	Mr G Langhorn	If further development is carried out then there will be shortages of water, drainage systems, and energy supplies. Even more congestion on already crowded roads, greater pollution levels.

067	J D Carr	You ? ? We have a couple of national advantages already, one of which is of course wind ? ? Of the river estuaries and the other is water particularly the ? Which has one of the fastest tidal flows and with ? ? Some use of this could be considered. All ? should be encouraged to store ? and so should trade and industrial premises.
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	The majority of council tax paying public are really quite intelligent requirements are unnecessary
069	Mrs B Buckland	Ways to produce renewable energy in existing homes should be encouraged by more information (not everyone has the internet or time to browse it). Rainwater storage - encourage this as you have the garden composting. Re-instate the 'green' bins free of charge. Re-cycling - curbside collection of card and plastic would be a help.
072	Mr & Mrs S J Painter	Rainwater storage. Tanks to be built in new housing developments.
074	Mr & Mrs Raddon	Every new home should be fitted with solar panels. Shortage of water - pipe water from where there is plenty. Wales, Scotland etc. Gas can be piped across continents why not water. We are an island surrounded by water. Do what the continent does, extract the salt from the sea water.
075	Mr K A Cooke	As we live in the driest part of the Country any rainwater storage system will have to be very large to cope with the levels of rainfall we currently endure.
076	Ms G Lunn	With current water shortages, it is surprising that development has even been considered without first thinking about such issues. Any new <u>small</u> and <u>limited</u> developments no more than 20-50 homes should be built in an energy efficient way with wind power sources and solar power. Water must be considered first.
077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	You have to keep your fingers on the pulse to be sure that energy and water are sufficient, planned and grow to meet sustainable demands. Other utilities and services need similar attention. Sewerage, waste disposal, telecommunications, roads, schools, etc also need to keep pace.
078	David & Jeanne	On water - our supply is low. Following the ? Project
079	Mrs S Clark	Essex gets so little rain, rainwater storage is futile at times - as we find with our rainwater butts. Obviously renewable materials are a good idea any encouragement is always better than the iron fist. Technology needs to improve before sunlight is viable.
080	Mr C Hathaway	All new houses should be built with a solar heating capability, the cost of which can be incorporated into the sale price.
081	T S Papworth	Negotiate with other countries outside of EU to recycle white goods.
082	Mr J Adkin	I think the word 'encourage' is just about right.
084	Miss M Andrews	Energy conservation incorporated in building plans. Not sure whether Hanningfield reservoir will cater for the additional requirement of water.
085	C G Tabar	If more development is provided, energy and water supplies will be a major issue. Wind farm on Thames Estuary should be considered - energy.
086	Mr M Gorman	No, the council must do more. All homes to have water butts. Water must be saved when it rains, so we do not have droughts. Sustainable homes are a must.
087	Mr I Walker	Requirement is correct. Improving existing homes should be a priority. Incentives would be useful.
089	J Weddell	9 months ago a big leak from Essex water which ran all day, after I notified them the road suffered but I did not see any road repairs from this matter moneyed to this is something which you could look into. If I done this I would be held liable for the damage.
090	Mr B Everett	We should encourage to save energy and water. Better use of waste water required for gardens
091	Ms P Bailey	All properties should have a water meter we should promote different sources or energy solar - wind etc. Can Rochford Council provide information about this - how about Clements Hall with solar power?
092	Mrs M Hills	Keep to encouragement.

093	Mrs M J Owoo	I think you are doing all you can and I think energy and water is fine.
094	F A Browne	Can existing services cope! Not only water. More other services are required. Doctors surgeries, hospitals, for example, and general health care. I agree with current proposals. Have heat pumps been considered as an energy source?
095	Mr J Britton	See comments
096	Mr W Roberts	We can't do enough to protect precious supplies of water. Insist on proper insulation being built into any new building approved.
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	Recycle plastic as we used to. Encourage water conservation before putting pressure on individuals eg cheaper water butts etc.
098	Mrs N London	Where will the water come from! The last new reservoir built in Essex, Hanningfield resevoir, was built over 50 years ago.
099	Mr & Mrs R G Headley	Encouragement is better than trict rules because people are more likely to join in if they are not forced. But we do need to conserve energy and water where possible. More recycling support units especially for people who cannot get to the local tip.
100	Mr R Scates	I have no problems with water and energy supply except the cost.
102	Mr T Newton	What happened to the recycling scheme? Too much stop, start, and changes. Why not compost all garden and public space waste, and sell it back to local public but cheaper than DIY store compost. Why no information and detail on whre and what is done with all our cans and bottles etc. Encouragement is the key to success. Water shortages are dependent on the weather and population growth.
104	B Aspinall	Everyone has to do more for the environment.
105	Mr R J Aldridge	Electricity, water, gas should only be allowed increases inline with inflation.
106	Ms P Melito	Education - let people know what Rochford's Council stance on wind turbines, solar etc. Who is recommended as suppliers etc.
107	Mr P S Reid	We will need more energy in the future and could have more wind turbines in areas.
109	Mr C Fantides	Wind turbines should be made compulsory on all newly built domestic buildings and encouraged on older dwellings.
110	Mr P Nippard	Too stringent - recycling should be a personal choice not a mandatory requirement.
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	I would like to be advised on things such as alternative energy (not by a company, by independent persons) also help to be available for people to encourage such as composters - green bins. We have blue bins and red bags but nothing for cardboard/shredded paper/plasic. Some energy could be made for council offices, old peoples homes by using wind and solar. Many road signs have solar power, is it possible to use such things for public lighting etc.
112	A J Smythe	Rainwater storage seems to make good sense. The benefits of solar panels and in particular Windmill generators are much more problematic. Windmills in particular are a chimera, being almost wholly useless and not cost effective. Developers should be made to substantially contribute towards the infrastructure, although I have no great hopes of this policy succeeding.
116	R S Barton	Before <u>ANY</u> further development the whole infrastructure needs overhaul and updating. Roads - try travelling on the Ashingdon Road around 8-15 to 9-15 am. Water supply and sewage disposal also require attention.
117	W R H Beehag	In line with development, as required.
119	Mr C Gabell	More than encouragement needed - new homes should have rainwater storage and solar panels as well as existing requirements - more the better.
121	Mrs S J Attfield	Yes we should conserve our water supplies by keeping the population at a sustainable level; other than that the Government should pay for adequate water to be piped from the North to meet the needs of the population. Curtailing the use of water by making it unaffordable will cause the rise of diseases such as TB.

122	F E Wells	Great Wakering, a renowned UK dry spot, surely is not a suitable area for development. Its road structure is poor anyway.
123	Mr K Walcer	Yes to encourage, solar and wind energy so less depend on nuclear power, don't have to worry about import of gas and oil. Builders etc like Wimpy and Barrett etc should have already have designs for solar and wind for their new houses. Water can be used for energy as well. Fresh water be drained from salt water.
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	You could encourage local initiatives for green energy schemes.
126	Mr J Jefferies	Energy conservation should be the priority, energy saving strategies should be a requirement. Renewable sources such as solar panels should be installed whenever possible on new developments and encouraged (financially) on all existing properties. All water should be metered. This should be achieved without a cost to the householder.
127	Mr G Ware	If this question refers to environmental considerations there are numerous: In new built housing there should be solar panels, wind turbines, (roof or garden) 100% insulation, double glazing, condensing boilers, rainwater retention facility, greywater retention, dual water systems, grey water flushing of toilets, radiators with individual thermostats. In future years some of these things may have to be statutory. For now, a degree of subsidisation may be enough. Certainly, encouragement and planning permission is essential.
128	Mr H Snell	We should actively encourage energy and water saving.
129	Mr A Clarke	In order to save more energy consumption per household I would float the idea that high household use beyond a permitted allowance should be reflected in the Council tax paid for the band of the property. Yes higher charge for some based on the premise 'the user pays'. The South East faces a hydrological crisis and all properties should be metered. In addition all properties should restrict the amount of hard surfacing within the boundary to allow what rainfall there is penetrates deep into the soil. I believe this approach is applied in Portugal due to recent droughts in that country. With another 3700 additional dwellings plus the accompanying infrastructure will only exacerbate the looming crisis.
130	Mrs S Martin	Make sure all existing bottle banks etc are emptied regularly perhaps another council rubbish site.
131	Mel Bennett	Demand on services will continue to increase, but what can council do about this - they are commercial operations outside local control.
133	The Occupier	Any measures which improve the existing levels of any energy and water efficiency must be statutory to succeed. Even then, does the political and legal will to enforce any new initiatives exist?
134	Ms Innes	(a) Yes. (b) No - strict care needs to be taken of our natural resources.
135	Mr C Blundell	Yes, see "housing" we increase the need for energy and water, but we see no provision for the facility of increasing energy - water.
136	Mrs G E Chase	Put everyone on a water meter. Use solar power for some street lighting.
137	Mr & Mrs Acres	Water is a very precious commodity and everything should be done to encourage people to save as much as possible. We have 2 water butts in our garden.
138	The Occupier	The village has electricity which is supplied by overhead wire very vulnerable to windy weather have suffered over the years frequent interruption to supply.
139	Ms A Clark	Encourage schools, hospitals and other public buildings to use renewables and restrain consumption. Have show houses available for domestic consumer to see what can be done.



140	Mrs J Davies	If you are refering to the individual then if encouraging isn't working then maybe incentives are needed. le keeping the boundaries around the house free of litter could save on council money. They could be given a small rebate for reducing their energy usage and recycling water usage. This would also lower their bills and those on a water meter but not those who are not on a meter. They the individual would need to apply for these rebates. This may be difficult to police however.
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	We think it should be a requirement and also consideration should be given to grants being made available to retro fit environmental solutions that would have a positive impact eg rainwater storage, solar panels etc.
142	D Tilley/R Bhandari	Conservation should be publicised and made into a central policy issue.
143	J E Burfield	People are not stupid. Talk to them and they will do the right thing.
145	Mr A Lysons	Doesn't the South East have less water per head than Afganistan? Too many people or not enough water? People watering grass in August are selfish idiots water should be more expensive in the summer. Motion sensors on street lights anyone!
146	A C Barton	Encourage dawn to dusk lights, private and authorities. Cashback if water metering does not reduce the bills?
147	Mr I Randall	Yes we should do more, encouragement like recycling doesn't work, people are too lazy! The requirement is not too stringent, at the very least houses should have storm water soak-aways and not be connected to the drainage system.
148	L F Wallace	Too late
150	Ms N Saunders	How can you build new homes when we already suffer the threat of water shortages?
152	Mr S Crowther	If the area is to expand to accommodate more people/jobs it should be incumbent on the developers to make provision for an expansion of necessary services/infrastructure to accommodate them.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	Conservation of our energy and water should be encouraged. Contractors/builders/water and energy providers should all play their part in the conservation of resources. It should not be left to the general public alone to make savings.
156	J W Collins	A wind farm is 100% essential. Could it not be built on part of Shoebury New Ranges? Tidal power could be difficult to implement, however, requiring new homes to be water efficient is sidestepping the real issue. Too many houses chasing too little water. Already we have hosepipe bans/water shortage. Why voluntarily make the problem worse?
158	Mr & Mrs White	ALL householders should be required to have water meters. Many appear to waste huge amounts of water, even in drought conditions. Leaks in roadways must be repaired more quickly - if not this encourages householders not to take care of the resource.
159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	Yes, get water from the North of England where there is an abundance. Yes there are other things that can be done and it doesn't take a degree in science to work out, <u>more housing</u> , <u>more water usage</u> or does our Council agree with the idiot woman councillor in Basildon who stated a couple of months ago in the Evening Echo, houses/businesses do not use water, people do!
161	Mr S J Binee	This should be an issue which is on going and encouraged both locally and national level.
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	Solar panels, small wind turbines, rainwater for toilet systems. Encouragement will not be enough.
163	Mr S T Cardwell	At the moment we seem to be ok with the water situation, but of course this may well not be the case if thousands of new homes are allowed to be built. Long term energy supply may also be a problem. Would it not be feasible to up-date and modernise Bradwell Power Station to ease energy supply to the district?
164	Mr I King	This will be controlled by Central Government.
165	Mr G Searles	Why don't you fine large buildings that are lit up all night and put everyone on the water meter?
166	G W Fleming	Encourage with yearly reminders, new proposals and/or offers.

168	Ms L Young	We must do all we can to conserve energy and water. No-one likes being told what to do, especially with water rationing, when there are so many leaks, wasting water. A national grid for water could be great, piping it from the wet North to the dry South.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	Encourage: Advertise ways to save energy and make it worthwhile for people to invest in solar panels and small wind generators. Promote energy saving bulbs particularly in large shops/offices which often have lights on all night. Give incentives. Encourage/insist that new homes are energy efficient when built (we are to have 4000 of them after all!)
170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	The requirements should be as stringent as accessible especially with regard to water conservation. Renewable sources of energy such as wind and solar power should be encouraged to reduce reliance on both nuclear and imported sources of energy.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	Households should be encouraged more, to save rainwater and recycle (eg Basildon collects all paper/card/wrapping). The council should supply water butts and compost bins - additional can be purchased, people would buy one if they got one free too!
173	Mr & Mrs Cripps	Yes a requirement is too stringent and counters proposals for affordable housing. To equip a 4 bed house with solar panels and wind generation would cost between £12000 and £15000 at this time. The financial return could be up to 10 years at present energy prices. This would have to be paid for by the buyers who presently do not demand such facilities. Developers could be required to offer a renewable option to buyers who could afford and want such facilities. Only mass production of renewable generators will bridge price down. This will happen over time and is the way forward. Rain water over flow to soakaways not storm drains in suitable soils.
174	Mr P Clark	Absolutely. Much more could be done to encourage recycling and energy efficiency. Facilities for recycling plastic bottles, paper and cardboard should be encouraged ( to kerbside collections if possible or atleast more places for bins etc)
175	Mr H J Rowland	New buildings containing solar panels, wind turbines and facilities for water storage, can easily destroy what "character" exists. Also if these became new requirements, by law, they should be paid for by the owners not subsidised except by tax incentives.
176	Mr R Abbott	You need to advise all housholders/businesses what is available to them free of charge from the council. What is the strategy for energy saving in homes? How can energy/water be saved? Lighting, plugs left in, television on standby etc. Is it possible to extract methane from local tips?
177	Mr J East	Your statement in Rochford matters under Energy and Water is excellent. The energy and water saving ideas proposed should not make houses more expensive. The Government needs to encourage this with cash.
178	Mr D Livermore	While we build and build encouraging people into the area problems such as water shortages and the requirement for additional generation of energy will grow and grow.
179	Mrs F M Wilson	Water supply should be on a national grid ie pumped from the north (lake district) to dry areas like ours. Wind farms - out to sea - are a good idea for energy.
180	Mr R Swain	The requirement that all new buildings should be constructed to include renewable energy provision is right, simply encouraging will not work. Developers will take the cheapest short term option in order to maximise profit. What would be the exceptions? These cannot be constructed with renewable energy provision, then this should be constructed elsewhere (eg the equivalent on an existing building. Yes you could do a lot more. What about existing buildings? Solar and wind energy generator are too expensive for individual households even with grants. You need a differentt funding model.

181	Mrs M R Hutchings	What do you mean by "encourage"? Of course energy and water are important. Water is the wine of life, you should do more to save water, build another reservoir or two.
182	Mrs V Wisbey	Water meters, the repair of underground pipes. Offer people incentives.
183	Tomassi	The balance is correct.
184	Mr T L Ellis	Requirements and bans may become necessary. Maybe supplying cut price rain water barrels, similar to the compost bin scheme, could be useful. Collecting water this way can be useful for gardens, car washing and in some cases toilet flushing.
185	Mr J K Mills	I agree that energy should be produced green renewable means and that a requirement is necessary for new housing
186	Mr & Mrs J Halliday	Stop sewage being used to top up the drinking water supply
187	Mrs K Jesty	Yes, we should do more. New developments should be energy efficient. Public places should be given grants so they can improve their energy efficiency. Householders should be encouraged to make their places more energy efficient by providing clear information and grants where applicable. Recycling should be encouraged at all levels - households, schools, businesses and industry far too much is wasted.
188	Mr A Mackay	If you are serious about conserving energy and water in any county in this or any other country you do not increase water and energy demand by developing housing and industry. I think this council and the government should enter the strange world of reality here - look up the moaning of the words conservation - and development. Once the two are fully understood maybe we can stop this madness.
189	Mr G Gooding	Reducing energy consumption is a priority which could be achieved by more "green" initiatives.
190	Mr G J Tinsey	I concur, all new homes should be to the Government's code for sustainable homes. More kerb-side recycling.
191	Janice & Alex Brining	Should have requirements and encouragements. Education via schools. Incentives for homes and businesses.
192	Ms B Mean	Energy and water issues are so widely discussed on the media and pointed out by the water/energy providers that money could be better spent elsewhere.
194	Mr C Hutchinson	This is the most pertinent issue of all in view of global warming - NO planning permission should be given on any new housing or other developments unless they incorporate suitable provision for - Solar heating panels and under ground water storage tanks, from roof rainwater duly filtered for use on toilets! See 8.
195	Mr B M Gilbert	Encourage where necessary. There are too many new laws being introduced in this country. General public are beginning to ridicule the law in general as a result. Requirement is another term for law. Remember, "the law is there to serve the people not the people serves the law"!
196	Mr A E Hodges	Infrastructure is of vital importance to any future developments, thermal efficiency and water saving measures must be part of future housing specs. Encouragement to install water butts and rainsaver devices is important.
197	P McAllister	If we are to help protect our planet we must do more and not waste. Industry is a major factor in creating green house gases, they should be required to tow the line and if they don't fine them. Give people big grants to have solar panels and the more energy efficient they become take money off their council tax.
198	Mr J Clamp	The district council can not do enough to encourage saving on energy (reduce lighting in offices when not in use). Possible use of long term (unused) farming, areas for a new reservoir.
199	Mr & Mrs Crockford	We need more reservoirs for the extra population that's alerady here.
200	Mr T O'Shea	Unfortunately I do not think encouragement will work. Requirements are needed but they should not become too 'big brother' but if we all move to a wetter place and allow no further development down the 'Thames Causeway' we won't have a problem.

201	Mr M Thomas	Local water networks are old and archaic. New development has increased demands to area and water pressure has dropped in many regions of Hockley and Hawkwell. This compounded cost saving treatment reduction resulting in harder water scaling up our networks and appliances. Improvement required.
202	K Cardnell	Should be a requirement
203	M T Conaty	No. Pressure should be placed on the people that now own these utility co. to improve the standards and cap wages paid ie M.D's/share holders. Local authority should be addressing the sewerage system locally in view of the increase in housing and infill where on property demolished and most property built.
205	Mrs Whitham	We are the driest corner of England. How can we supply water to all the houses, buildings that are going up.
206	Mrs G Harper	Energy conservation is important. Why do we have this feeble attitude towards the possibilities, that offers advice on warming water to those whose houses have hot water tanks, but no surveys and advice to those who have large areas of roof facing the right way to catch all the sunlight our warming climate can offer, but have direct, on demand hot water systems. So far, I have not been able to find a company in Essex that offers the advice, installation and servicing of suitable systems, so I cannot consider them. When it comes to water conservancy, why are such valuable watersupplies as those provided by natural springs still being voided into storm drains when the land above them is crying our for irrigation? This area is full of natural springs. What has happened to them all? Schemes to use our local resources better could do a lot.
207	Ms G Yeadell	Encourage use of water butts. Discourage wasteful car washes, ornamental garden fountains. Discourage all night domestic outside lighting. Street lights to be angled downwards to light road, pavement, crossing, not bedrooms. Eg new crossing Hockley Southend Road needed one light at each end - not one light present in 1999 with sad result - but now has 12 huge lights, few used, but apparently complained of result by 2 residents. Better ones - those attached to posts in Main Road Hawkwell.
208	I Gyres	Less population growth would ease the consumption of these resources
210	Mrs M A King	We do not have enough reservoirs as it is - and gas pressure at peak times reaches an all time low, especially during the winter months.
211	Mr B W Williams	More effort should be put into using renewable types of constructable developments, solar panels, good insulation, yes provision for rain water storage. Even considering individual energy wind turbines or larger to serve a number of properties. Clearly conservation is a high priority.
212	Master J Richards	I find that if more power and energy is needed more power stations are also needed before there are concerns on where to put it. I would probably position it between Canewdon and the coast of Foulness Iland. This is an urgent call for power in Rochford District or neighbouring boroughs and districts.
213	Mr M Wheeler	Should encourage but have in place minimum requirements which are reasonable and sensible. Far too often planners use requirements such as energy efficiency to act as a deterrent rather than assist and help.
215	Mr T R Thompson	Do not know, we have to conserve energy, water is a problem if most of water companies are owned by overseas countries who do not spend enough on maintaining areas.
219	Mr J Amey	Encourage and offer incentives to switch to energy saving devices or to use part solar in residential/industrial units.
220	Mrs S Clarke	I believe we should encourage solar panels and wind turbines. I also think that infill where infrastructure is in place should be foremost in planning for the future.
222	R Luck	Encouragement is the key. Requirements only serve to annoy people.
223	C Morris	Help people to use solar power financially. Enforce water meters use in all areas.

224	Mr K S Gee	Water - there are several things that builders can be requested to do to save water. 1) Fit w.c's with economy valves. 2) Fit showers instead of bathtubs as a first option. Energy - lay 240mm thick insulation in loft areas.
225	Mr P Court	Local Authorities can only do so much by imposing requirements upon developers. This main objective should be to constantly educate the public on the benefits of efficiency in respect of water, fuel and energy consumption. Whilst a developer can install efficient systems, they will not serve their purpose unless used in an efficient way by the occupants of the buildings. Hence the Council needs to target residents and employers, rather than developers.
226	Mrs A Hill	We should encourage water companies to maintain pipes!
227	Mr & Mrs Haskew	It is good to have this requirement. For instance the requirement for new houses to have a water meter led to me accepting one when I had the chance as I had a friend in a new house who had lower water bills. It gave me confidence to switch. I think the same will happen with renewable energy.
228	Ms A Henderson	I think requirements are necessary. I think a majority of public couldn't be bothered to conserve energy and water.
229	Mr J Robinson	We know that the South East is a 'dry' area and that more housing will only worsen the situation.
230	V G Crick	Simply encourage
231	Mr & Mrs Walker	New housing should be energy efficient. The idea of storing rain water and grey water is a good one. Flushing the toilet with perfectly good drinking water has always seemed wrong to me.
232	Mrs A Robinson	I would like to see future housing developments (and possibly industrial) use more environmentally friendly heating/water and such as collections rainwater to flush loo's - recycling washing water for flushing loos, solar panels etc. Apparently Japan uses a lot of these types of systems on their homes. I would like to see recycling become a way of life - though this is probably a long way off.
233	Mr G Congram	Yes, solar and wind power at both household and industrial should be supported
234	Mr J T Dorrell	In this area we should be making more use of solar energy. All future buildings should be made to incorporate solar panels. All rainwater should be directed into storage tanks for use during the dry season.
235	L W Lewis	The infrastructure in the district should be soundly based water supply being a government issue these should be addressed first before governments demands for more housing.
236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Lets make builders put water butts and compost bins in/on all properties. More recycling required with collection going to all roads. Impose penalties on those who cannot be bothered to recycle.
237	Mr Sanders	This isn't an area local councils should be involved in.
238	Gill Tilson	Priority must be given to correcting the water shortage first.
239	Ms S Martin	This is a very sensitive subject. Most people are intelligent enough to understand the consequences. Enforcement with financial penalties only causes resentment. A wider view must be taken with businesses and industry taking a leading role.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Yes. Renewable energy provision sounds a good idea and all new houses should be fitted with water-butts. We think a requirement is good and better than 'encouragement', which works for some, but not all. Encourage people to be 'energy efficient' by roadshows.
242	Mr D Batchelor	Build wind generators.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	All new buildings should include features to save rainwater and conserve energy. A formal requirement is needed as few developers will voluntarily install such features, they are in general entirely profit driven and build everything they can down to a price rather than to a standard which is what is needed.
245	M J Burpitt	Heat loss calculations etc, when applied to new builds is a good idea. But why not add rainwater recovery systems both to new builds and alterations?

246	Miss M Saward	We need to publisize a lot more about recycling. At the moment we can only kerbside recycle unless you have a car to get to anywhere. Do more kerbside recycling. Also paper why can we only recycle paper (not shredded paper and envelopes). What about cardboard, plastic bottles and certainly green waste look at how busy the tip is. If we do not encourage more kerbside people will fly tip and dump.
247	Mr & Mrs Addison	We need to do as much as is possible to reserve water and produce renewable energy sources locally. We also support nuclear energy. A new Bradwell Power Station would be acceptable.
251	Mr B Guyett - Chairman	It is axiomatic that with the lowest rainfall in the country, the need for water conservation and provision is esential. Water authorities need to be consulted to ensure adequacy of supply. New developments should encompass the latest conservation measures as a requirement.
253	Mr M J Smith	It is always important to do more. Windpower and solar power are grossly under used.
254	Ms V Stanesby	Yes. Definitely - this is definitely the future our children are being educated this way and yet we appear to do nothing. Our recycling was excellend and then they reduced that and started charging to take our green bin - a service we had for free. People who were starting to recycle because it was easy stopped as you were making it harder. Charging for a service we had got used to having angered people and they simply don't bother. I will always recycle and take everything to my recycling centre but we need to encourage the majority to do the same. A shame we did have a much better service but for some reason you stopped it.
257	Mr T Dodkins	As a consequence of both Local Agenda 21 and the growing concern over water resources and carbon emissions, we support the suggestion that a policy should require at least compliance with minimum energy efficiency standards, but in order for such a policy not to simply duplicate current standards which could be reviewed within the lifetime of the Core Strategy, an enhancement of standards to attempt to achieve carbon neutrality should be enshrined in policy.
258		National TV and press have this item covered. All we could do is repeat / copy.
259	Mr M B Rogers	I think that after 12 o'clock streets should only have every other light on. Anybody with any sense is indoors by then. Those that are not are probably in a car. Where I live its like daylight all night. Not good for natural animals and not saving electricity.
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	Energy: I live in an area where there are not many street lights and manage quite well so why is it there are so many lights along the A127. Could they not do away with every other one it seems an awful waste of energy. Water: why is it that you are doing away with reservoirs which we need and then build more houses which means more water needed (cut off your nose to spite your face)
261	S A Skinner	I agree with the Councils's strategy to require new buildings to have renewable energy provision. There should not be any exceptions. The Council should set an example by installing renewable energy provision in its own buildings wherever possible. Think of the amount of energy somewhere like Clements Hall leisure centre uses. Could hot air from the Council chamber be used to power the civic suite?
262	Ms L Parish	Education is the answer to persuade people to conserve energy. In the 80's we saw stickers on light switches 'to switch off when not in use'. Office blocks and shops do not need to be lit up all night. Larger grants (say 75%) towards installation of solar panels to a property would help. Liaise with manufacturers of electrical appliances to make units not being used, switch off automatically after a certain length of time and not just be put permanently on standby.

263	Mr P Kneen	Whilst Swan Hill acknowledges the need to consider issues of climate change within developments, it is considered that setting a stringent requirement that all developments must meet a certain target does not provide a sufficiently flexible manner in which to promote more sustainable forms of development. Swan Hill recognises the Government's commitment set out in its Energy White Paper for reducing carbon dioxide emissions. In this regard, it is widely considered by other Local Planning Authorities that new developments should generate an element of electricity required by the development from renewable energy. Swan Hill has no objection in principle to the inclusion of such technologies within developments provided that their inclusion, along with other requirements, does not result in an unviable development. It is considered that the 'probable' option of requiring all new housing and employment development to include renewable energy provision is inflexible and does not allow sufficient flexibility to consider site specific considerations which may not allow the inclusion
265	Mr R Pomery	We fully support measures to conserve energy and water and the principles of sustainable construction. In particular the benefits of hemp, some of which is used in the insulation of buildings.
267	Mr D Pointer	Planning for new developments, both housing and other, should have a requirement for some renewable energy (solar panels or wind turbines) and should have rain water storage. Improved recycling facilities should be provided.
268	Mr S Crussell	A firm policy is needed as anything else will be met with typical apathy. Better recycling facilities essential (eg it takes me an hour on a Sunday to recycle at Rayleigh - and often bins are full!).
270		EWT considers that the council should be playing a lead role here. Water conservation is a major interest, standards for collection of water from hard surfaces ie roofs and surface runoff should be developed and all housing developments should have plans for recycling of grey water. We would encourage RDC to adopt the highest standards of home insulation possible for new properties in the interest both of the environment and also the future homeowners.
271	Mr & Mrs Jobson	You need to be leading the debate on this area, for once RDC can preempt future government guidelines these issues are only going to become more not less important over the next 15 years.
274	Mr S Mckinnon	Environmental energy and water issues should be supported by RDC. However, only when they can be demonstrable in having a positive effect.
276	Mr M Barrell	Energy and Water Conservation Water resources are a key issue for south Essex, which imports the majority of its water. Our representations to the East of England Plan highlighted the need for all new development to incorporate water efficiency measures. A saving of approximately 25% can be achieved through the use of relatively simple measures such as: sprays taps, efficient appliances and low flush toilets. We would recommend the inclusion of a specific target for this key issue. Further guidance on possible techniques is available from myself or on our website <a href="http://www.environmentagency.gov.uk">www.environmentagency.gov.uk</a> . Waste is a further key issue for south Essex, with landfill space rapidly decreasing. This section could be broadened to 'Resource Efficiency', which should include waste reduction. Site waste management plans should be required to limit construction waste, while space for the storage of recyclable materials should be provided within developments. <b>Renewable Energy We support the identification of this issue, but feel that the 'probable' options should be broadened. There are a range of renewable energy options, from ground source heat pumps to biomass</b>
277	Ms S A Elkington	Offer energy/water advice in home/work place free of charge.
278	Mr P Marshall	Quite satisfactory at the moment. Not sure if there's a lot more extra building.
279	S J Heeney	Do not understand the question.
280	Mrs M A Tyrell	Whatever buildings take place - our roads, all our utilities, schools, hospital, doctors and dentists must be in place first. So much is already overstretched.

285	Mrs B E Dale	Everything possible should be done to increase the use of energy from wind and solar power. All new council buildings should have solar energy and where viable existing ones converted to solar. Applications from private residents and businesses should have wind power approved whenever this would not spoil outlooks for residents nearby. A requirement for developers to provide renewable energy should be a must.
286	Mr L F Knight	Encourage wind save cancel planning give grants to all forms of energy except nuclear and fossil fuels.
287	Mr R Forster	New homes need to have there facilities, but rain water should be collected and used everywhere not just lost down the drains and out to sea.
288	Mr & Mrs C Cummins	Do not know about this.
289	Mrs J Warner	Educate, encourage - give incentives for the more conscientious.
291	Maydo Pitt	We are pleased to see a section in the document relating to renewable energy. You will be aware of the Minister for Housing and Planning's (Yvette Cooper) statement of 8 June 2006 regarding the review of emerging plans and full incorporation of PPS22 guidance. In particular she stated that it is essential that all planning authorities take account fully of the positive approach to renewables set out in PPS22 at the earliest opportunity in their plan-making. In particular the Government expects all planning authorities to include policies in their development plans that require a percentage of the energy in new developments to come from on-site renewables, where it is viable. Such policies have a vital role to play in reducing emissions, through the use of carbon-neutral energy sources. Local authorities who are now updating their plans through new local development frameworks should take the opportunity to update their policies in this area. In light of this we suggest that the Authority includes such a policy in their preferred options document.
292	Mr & Mrs Goring	New housing should be required to incorporate environmentally friendly features what is wrong with recognising climate change and trying to address the issues in a practical way?
297	Mr S Marshall	Should be greater support for people to install solar panels etc. People should be encouraged to leave their cars behind and walk or cycle, into town. WHERE ARE THE SAFE CYCLE ROUTES INTO RAYLEIGH?
298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	Yes, perhaps subsidies to households to instal solar heating. Requirements coupled with encouragement
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	With a growing population the reservoir situation needs to be reviewed and monitored. A council scheme to provide water butts and other rain collecting systems would help. Environmental education programmes in all schools.
300	Mrs Upson	People who use water etc should be all encouraged to have water meters
301	Ms K Kelly	4.12 Energy and water conservation. The RSPB recommends that the Council sets out guidance in planning policy defining how water and energy efficiency measures should be incorporated into building design. Building Regulations set out a minimum acceptable standard and the RSPB feels that all councils should be seeking to increase the targets of water and energy efficiency in their policy documents. Setting a target for developments to have water and energy efficiencies 10% higher than the Building Regulation Standards and providing encouragement and information for developers could achieve this. Council options - The RSPB would support a policy that requires planning applications to comply with minimum standards, as set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes. Further to this, we would recommend that the Council positively support proposals that go over and above minimum requirements. The RSPB would support the development of a guidance document that encourages developers to move towards delivering carbon neutral developments. The RSPB would support the development of a policy to reduce the travelling distances between housing, employment and amenities at
303	Mr K Hatfield	Encourage more recycling by providing "green" wheely bins free of charge in addition to the current grey bins. Empty paper bottle and clothing banks more regularly.
305	E L Strangleman	Regarding water, how do we cope with all this extra housing.
306	Mr E C Cook	See comments under 9



307	Mr J Snow	Extra development means more demand for the utilities, only if extra provisions are made for the above should any major development be approved. Maybe any future housing developments are made to contribute a set percentage of costs to providing energy needs.
309	Mr J Smith	Conservation of resources and non waste of energy are of prime concern.
310	Chris Teeder	Anything which can save energy, water and the environment should be encouraged.
311	Mrs P A Watson Jones	Important factor and should not be overlooked.
314	Mrs C Quennell	Everyone should be fitted with a water meter, all should be encouraged to use low energy light bulbs.
315	R A Stone	Recycling could be improved. The development of more wind turbines could be considered. Greater exploitation of solar energy in public buildings at least should be made.
316	Ms S Copeman	Rainwater collection and insulation should be essential as they are relatively in expensive other more expensive methods should be merely encouraged because of the cost implications.
317	Mr D Harris	Expert advice will no doubt have been sought by the government, and therefore, if they have produced a 'code for sustainable homes' it would seem prudent to follow this code.
318	Ms W Hatton	Yes we have a new home 4 years old but were very surprised we did not have time to negotiate solar panels had to divert our own water pipes to butts. We need wind turbines in the Estury.
319	Mr M Lang	More should be done to save energy and water by the council and residents
321	R J Feather	Very laudable objective but must not ask for requirements which makes homes unaffordable.
323	Mr T Beebee	All new housing to be environmentally friendly and be powered by solar energy or wind power.
324	Mrs Doward	All new homes should have water meters and I like the idea of rain water storage. I also think the provision for renewable energy is a must.
325	Mr D Elwell	If all new homes are provided with rainwater storage, some subsidy should be provided to allow existing residents to also enjoy the facility of rainwater storage.
326	Owner/Occupier	Should be as much as possible in this area - need to enforce requirements as encouraging does not always work. Maybe provide heavily subsidised help to install energy saving devices (eg rainwater storage, solar heating, energy saving light bulbs).
327	Mrs C Taylor	Encourage the public to save water as much as possible - especially in the garden - using water butts and also buckets old bowls indeed anything can be used to save rain water - free of charge. Do people really need to wash their cars every week, its not necessary, when water is in such demand during a drought. Educate our children from a very young age eg primary school not to waste our water - I teach mine to do this and we recycle where ever possible. Encourage more youngsters to take up fishing. Use our resources for sailing if possible. All new Council buildings should be fitted with solar panels.
329	Mrs M J Snowdon	I do not consider "requirement" is too stringent. We regularly seem to be in either a drought or flood situation and action should be taken to ensure the situation does not get any worse.
330	P Mansbridge	More people might install more energy and water saving devices if the price was reduced by bulk purchase such as with compost bins. This could include solar panels and wind turbines. More re-cycling could be encouraged by 'pay as you tip'. Cardboard could be collected kerbside - as this makes up a large amount of the rubbish and used to be collected. People could be encouraged not to throw bottles, cans etc in the street as there must be a vast amount being lost to re-cycling. Are the contents of street bins sorted?

331	Mr A C Cooper	Has a secondary water system been considered for irrigation purposes. I believe this is used in some parts of the world to reduce use of purified drinking water. Where does Rochford get its water supplies? To my knowledge, the only reservoir that has been built in the last 50 years in this area is Hanningfield? What does 'renewable energy provision' mean? I know of nothing that is commercially viable yet to replace coal, oil or gas.
332	Mr & Mrs Jones	Being energy efficient is very important but more could be done by Government and local councils. Wind farms always seem to be sited where they stick out like a sore thumb why not site them around and ontop of industrial areas Tilbury Docks etc. Turbines could be mounted under Southend Pier and similar positions. Solar panels on the roofs of factories etc.
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	You could also include solar panels for all new buildings.
334	Mrs Amey	It would be good if there was development and grants for rainwater, or bathwater saving for the older houses also. I suppose water metering is going to become compulsory.
347	Mr C Rooke	I am all for encouraging renewable energy. All development should be compatible with such policies.
349	Ms C Paine	Individual wind turbine/solar panels on all new buildings.
352	Cllr Joyce Smith	Not sure about this one - needs a lot of research and fact finding first.
354	Mrs Smith	With all the present new developments already putting extra strain on utilities and creating pollution and wear and tear strain by their numbers to date, it makes sense to do everything reasonable to cut down on damage to the locality now and in the future. Solar and wind harnessing make sense, using common sense.
355	Mr K Vingoe	The Parish Council and its residents clearly favour and expansion of the kirb-side collection for recyclable materials. Historically, the civic amenity behind the library, has performed well in the collection of recyclable material.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	Good idea, but we are concerned that the additional costs will just be passed on to property buyers and make housing less affordable.
358	Mr & Mrs England	Some should be stringent ie rainwater storage, some areas encourage
362	Ms M Power	All renewable energy/sustainable development policies should relate to the site's circumstances, viability and a realistic assessment of what is achievable on each individual site. The application of set targets at unrealistically high levels can stymie development proposals. A target of 10% is being applied at various locations across the country and in line with this encouragement policy all policies should be drafted on the basis of seeking to achieve a target rather than refusing applications that do not meet rigid policy requirements.
366	Mr S J Springham	The existing building regulations should be followed by the Council. The council should only impose additional requirement when these are made a government requirement.
369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	Encouragement is enough. Most people are willing to conserve energy and water.
370	Mr G Biner	The profits of developing our greenbelt areas should be put towards an environmentally friendly solution to solve our energy and water problems. Rather than lining the pockets of big companies, the money should be used as a financial contribution to make existing properties more enviornmentally friendly.

## **7. LEISURE, TOURISM & COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

What facilities do we need? What extra leisure and tourism facilities are we short of? Is the development of tourism right? What else could we do?

<b>Rep No</b>	<b>Contact Name</b>	<b>Leisure, etc. comments</b>
001	Mr I Haines	Accept and develop with Southend the country side that we have and they have not
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	I think that we have quite a few "visitors" and I have yet to see one helpful signpost in any other language, ok most don't need it but at least it would show we welcome them
003	Mr A Cooper	Growth of boating is enormous. Need to develop another large marina facility on south bank of Crouch. Also more "off road" horseriding areas.
004	Mr M Cubitt	B&B's in Rayleigh, Hockley - near rail stations. More focus on land marks, eg Dutch Cottage and Rayleigh Mount.
005	Mrs P R Byres	I think there could be more leisure facilities for young people, especially. There is nowhere for them to skate since the closure of Roller City and the nearest ice skating rink is Chelmsford. More could be made of the history of Rochford, especially the connection with Anne Boleyn and Rochford Hall. The character of Rochford is being upkept by the style of buildings but traditional events such as May Day celebrations have dropped off.
007	Ms P Pemberton	Additional swimming pools and playing fields, cinema! Nothing (as far as I am aware) for youth to do. Leisure centres are overcrowded and too expensive. Personally, I no longer swim due to overcrowding in pool at Clements Hall - the only one available.
008	Ms S Woolhouse	Leisure facilities need to be accessible by public transport including in the evening. As a keen walker, I consider that footpaths should be kept clear of obstructions and should be clearly marked.
010	Mr A Devlin	Happy with current levels
011	R F Wise	You have the balance right - we have not got the infrastructure to increase further (roads, sewage, transport).
013	Etchells	Facilities are already good
014	D Hanrahan	These around the only problem is access. No bus route to the new nature reserve of Hall Road or the wetlands at Wallasea. After Autumn watch people are interested provide a service be it 1 or 2 an hour see how it works.
015	F A Robinson	My only comment on this is; It would be nice to have a large flower garden to sit and walk about in.
016	Mr R Fuller	Rochford has no entertainment centre for bowling, cinemas, out of town shopping centres, relying on Southend and Basildon instead - this should be addressed.
017	Mr L A G Dunford	In Rayleigh we need an affordable community hall. Rayleigh Mill is being priced out of local organization budgets.
018	Mrs Gaunt	Why didn't Rayleigh get a swimming pool - No we get houses. This side of Rayleigh has no community centre - pub even.
019	Mrs L Allen	More facilities for youngsters. There are far too many of them hanging around and creating problems.
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	Facilities we need are for young people with nowhere to go, nothing to do, we need meeting places and social places for the young. We don't need tourists we need to look after our young people and our elderly people.
021	Mr P Jermyn	If you build more houses/industrial units who is going to want to come as a tourist
022	Mr R Hockett & Ms C Mobbs	Leisure? Community facilities are very important, as quite often the benefits are not apparent until the facility closed. Area is generally well served on leisure, which is important for our youth.
024	Mr P Williams	Traffic volume has increased beyond all belief along the Low Road between Rochford and Battlesbridge as commuters and trades vehicles use this route to take advantage of the new A130 from Battlesbridge to Chelmsford and beyond whilst trying to avoid the overcrowded A127 to reach the A130. More people are owrking away from their homes in the Southend area and working in Chelmsford as an alternative to east of central London. Watery Lane, Rawreth between 17.00 and 18.30 eastbound each weekday is madness.
026	Mr A Lantaff	Current facilities are ok - so just enlarge to cator for the extra users.

027	Mr B Fuller	Leisure facilities ok, although it would have been nice to have a pool in Rayleigh.
028	Mr J Lickfold	More skate board places floodlite of an evening also more places to keep youngsters occupied and off of the streets, instead of trashing the parks.
029	Mr White	More should be made of the rivers in the area. (Not building housing along riverbanks) - ie more made of sea.
030	Mr H May	We cannot attract tourists if access is limited and it has been proven that public transport is not used to its full extent. It really does boil down to providing good access first.
031	A R Wetton	Tourism brings its own problems. However, the airport has potential for job creation. I suggest hotels/exhibition halls/restaurants/taxi's etc can all gain from increased passenger traffic.
032	J Morley	We need a lot of entertainment facilities where people can go perhaps a small hotel so that tourists can stay and explore around this area, also interesting shops
033	Mr R Balchin	The Holmes Place sports centre at Rawreth Lane should have a swimming pool then ? Would rocket.
035	Mr B Deal	Stop destroying Rochford. Look at Saffron Walden or other towns that fight hard to keep their character as opposed to trying to make another failed South Woodham Ferres
036	Mrs P Slade	We really do need to offer facilities to accommodate our youths during the evenings. It would be more cost effective than carrying out repairs and peace of mind for local residents effected by bored youths is priceless to a nice community.
037	Mr A Bawden	Leisure and community facilities should be funded by the people who use them not from tax payers as a whole for 20% of the population to benefit from!
038	Mr J Wright	We don't sign post our areas of interest. Very few people know of our town cycling event. Why don't we have a carnival. Why not a Victorian night like Maldon has.
039	Ms D Quinn	Small cinema required in Rayleigh
040	Mr D Huskisson	"Tourism" implies attracting people from other parts of the world to visit the Rochford District. No, I do not think Rochford should set its sights beyond its own residents. Invest in facilities for local people. Don't try to compete with London or Southend. Informal leisure facilities are important to develop and protect (parks, open spaces, children's play facilities). Fitness suites are probably worth promoting too, where not adequately provided by private sector. I do not see a need for hotel or conference facilities in the Rochford District, unless closely associated with the airport.
041	Mr McGee	I would not visit this district as a tourist. There is not enough for them to do.
043	Mr M Yorke Wade	Encourage investors in marine activities on the Crouch. Encourage projects to do with woodlands.
044	Mrs R Beaumont	The character of the area is vital to tourism, a few more places to eat like cafes would be nice especially at Hockley Woods and Ashingdon Memorial Park
045	Mr R Abbott	More theatres would be nice, if not profitable. Country walks and signage. A good cinema this side (Rayleigh) of Southend. Develop the upper Roach Valley as a conservation area.
046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	We certainly <u>do not</u> need to be providing facilities for "Travellers" (as suggested in your article) - this sends the wrong message (to our children/grandchildren). Southend Airport is currently a "virtual facility", there is clearing a customer base for a local Airport (European business/holidays) - the cartel of Airports needs to be broken.
047	Ms J Colbourne	A swimming pool in the Rayleigh area is very much needed.
048	Mr S Reeves	Many more, aimed at evening, to pursue outdoor lifestyles, off road cycle areas, tennis courts, parks, lakes etc.
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	Provide more facilities for outdoor leisure pursuits.
050	Mrs J Samuels	Yes the development of tourism is right if we are to retain the character and charm of our district.
051	Mrs D Langdon	Not applicable in Rayleigh etc.

052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	The local people's needs should come first, and outside visitors second. Local community facilities could be improved; reducing the cost for families on benefits is important. Cable TV (eg telewest) would save money for some people. Why is Rochford exempt?
053	E Winn	More and cheaper facilities for the younger people, cheaper travel for tourists.
054	Mr & Mrs Todman	The Dutch Cottage in Rayleigh and the National Trust at the Rayleigh Mount should be put together to form a tourist attraction in Rayleigh.
055	Mr V Hawtree	Cherry Orchard Country Park is superb. We need more of the same, Foulness perhaps?
056	Mr S Lee	Locating a suitable area to create a large Sunday bootsale as these have become very popular and are sadly lacking in our area. I visited one in Ardleigh yesterday which had a good atmosphere, places to eat and a good way to spend a Sunday morning.
057	Mrs J Williams	As well as leisure/tourism facilities (a large public swimming pool nearer to Rayleigh would be nice), public transport <u>must</u> be improved. The train service is not bad but it is expensive. The bus service needs improving - timetables are not easily accessible and buses rarely seem to run on time.
058	M J Jackson	I cannot see the demand for tourism in this area. Leisure should be encouraged by charging local clubs rents they <u>can</u> afford.
059	Garfield	Essex lacks entertainment not all want to play at the casino (most can't afford to). Good old fashion dance halls, would entice the older generation out and about.
061	Mr G W Slaughter	Leave it as it is
062	Chris Taylor	Tourism could be developed in the open spaces in the area. Walking, boating and heritage activities could be developed further. Perhaps a "country hotel" in the Hockley/South Fambridge area with a golf-course and leisure homes 'Spanish style" could bring good quality tourism into the area. A good fair-sized heritage centre with auditorium exhibition spaces etc would be desirable. Rayleigh Mill Hall lacks an educational aspect.
063	Mr B A Stammers	The river is the only tourism possibility in the area.
064	Mrs S Smith	More access to places of interest for disabled people. That means more paths suitable for wheelchairs in parks and woods. More public transport that is disability accessible eg low platform buses to places of interest. How about a Rochford Heritage trail that can be reached by car? Something must be done soon to provide more NHS services locally. The Council should work with NHS to provide them.
065	Mr T Bennett	These provisions need to be <u>very</u> carefully scrutinised and surveyed, lest their introduction costs some of the serenity now generally available in the area. Leave the crowds to Southend-on-Sea!
066	Mr G Langhorn	Young people complain about lack of facilities, perhaps skateboard ramps, walls devoted to graffiti could be added to existing sports fields. There is not a lot to attract tourists and the historic quaintness of the Rochford area is being over shadowed by overdevelopment and traffic problems.
067	J D Carr	I am of the opinion that tourism will ? On a ? Scale not local as we do not currently ? The ? Of Hotels, ? And the like we ? Have 3 gold courses for example and another could make a ? Green belt situation if a developer could be ? The 2012 Olympics will provide the area with the chance to make the area more well known and that facilities we have could be made available to ? ? ? will be ? ? travel through the ? will also help. ? have regular visitors from the Lake District who always enjoy their stays here but are ? that we do not ? our local facilities more in their area.
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	We have recently had the old Park School handed over for leisure, adding yet another to the many already in existence. Tourism? Whoever would be a tourist here!

069	Mrs B Buckland	A <u>swimming pool</u> in Rayleigh - easy to get to on foot/bike/bus. Holmes Place is out of the way. Why not be bold and build a 'super' pool like the one in Maldon (Blackwater Leisure). This I'm sure, would be a money spinner for the whole district. Not even Southend has one, this would be fantastic for people of ALL ages.
070	P Robertson	Any leisure and tourism needs to be in keeping with the community (existing). An influx of noise, alcohol, gambling etc with all its bad social effects should be avoided.
071	P Williams	Restrict building up the area to much so that tourism has something to see other than housing and business parks maintain green belt to help leisure and community feel good factor
072	Mr & Mrs S J Painter	With loss of Renouf's no quality hotel in area. More and less expensive facilities in Rayleigh - swimming pool for example.
073	Mr S Learmouth	Unable to answer
074	Mr & Mrs Raddon	Shortage of facilities for teenagers.
075	Mr K A Cooke	Tourists. I cannot imagine anyone in their right mind coming to our area with all its traffic congestion, lack of scenic beauty and minimal historic buildings. If a tourist came to stay with me I could show them Rayleigh Mill after that I would struggle to find anything intersting to show them, apart from vast amounts of houses less than 25 years old. Tourists are not a problem in South East Essex! ps I congratulate you on your picutre above of our swans at Hullbridge. However, I do not feel it will attract tourists from far and wide.
076	Ms G Lunn	It is important that we have some facilities, particularly for young people. However, we must protect the natural areas and keep the landscape as it is for future farming, the miles of footpaths in the area which I live are both peaceful and beautiful and should be preserved for future generations.
077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	As a rural county and district we have much to offer; cycling, riding, walking, peace and quiet, food, shooting, wild animals and birds in abundance. As a coastal county and district we have more to offer; sailing, boating, fishing, skiing, swimming, paddling and strolling by the water's edge. We can also offer sea-food, fish, shellfish, marine salt, etc. We need more access to the coast through the countryside; footpaths, bridleways, cycle-paths. Marinas and moorings for boats must be encouraged. We must urge and assist to get a marina for Southend which will benefit us too.
078	David & Jeanne	We need more adequate doctors facilities.
079	Mrs S Clark	The area is crowded enough without tourists. Healthcare in the area is sadly lacking. It is nearly impossible to get an appointment at the doctors in Hockley even in emergency. Queing from 7.30 am is ridiculous.
080	Mr C Hathaway	The current provision is fairly good but maybe we could make more use of facilities like Mill Hall and The Freight House or publicise local events better either on local radio or through advertising.
081	T S Papworth	I am ashamed of the condition of the local parks. The children of 3-5 do not have adequate apparatus in local parks. Can we have CCTV in parks to protect children.
082	Mr J Adkin	I think the council should do more in encouraging local residents to use the facilities for leisure we already have.
084	Miss M Andrews	Will need sports and leisure facilities for youth. Opportunities for wild life conservation eg protection fo birds. Parks and open spaces for families.
085	C G Tabar	Use must be made of existing facilities - advertising in council publications.
086	Mr M Gorman	The word sports centre in Rawreth Lane should have had a swimming pool. I see no evidence of the Council promoting Rayleigh where tourism is concerned. No tourist centre, there are no hotels.
087	Mr I Walker	Theatre, multipurpose events venue. Mill Hall and Freight House and community centres are inadequate to local needs, see 4 re tourism. If residents enjoy facilities so will tourists. Improve pedestrian (cycle) access.

088	Miss S Thackeray	Tourism is vital it brings money into an area. More for our youth - what happened to youth centres and workers. Bring the community together, fundays, open and exploit the windmill, the bowls club to open its doors more. Encourage and embrace all the community - cemeteries and burial sites are not a priority.
089	J Weddell	Bring some of it back from Rayleigh.
090	Mr B Everett	We are short of hotel space in the area.
091	Ms P Bailey	For size of population Rayleigh could do with a swimming pool or cinema. Rochford could do more to advertise historical sites and places of interest. Make historical site more interesting - How about Rochford coach tours in high summer to visit many places with tour guide etc (must be well publicised for all people local and visitors etc).
092	Mrs M Hills	Definitely need leisure facilities other than those provided by the current commercial enterprises we need a local swimming pool. Southend pool is derelict and the others are too ? Provide area out of town complex like the festival leisure park would be good in between Southend and Rayleigh.
093	Mrs M J Owoo	Possibly cinema's, youth centres.
094	F A Browne	Facilities for teenagers are important. I suggest that we leave tourism facilities as they are though.
095	Mr J Britton	See comments
096	Mr W Roberts	Walking areas, footpaths. Tourism is about right. Stop noise pollution from a few boats/ski jets spoiling the day for thousands by the shores.
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	Development of tourism is right as it helps local economy, but should be for country pursuits and not so as to encourage too much vehicular traffic.
098	Mrs N London	Extra houses need extra leisure facilities, the converse applies.
099	Mr & Mrs R G Headley	It would be good to have a park in this location similar to Prittlewell where there were facilities for picnics and play areas ie putting greens, and other outdoor sports. These to be for the public and not where you have to belong to a club. We can only develop tourism if we have the right things to offer.
100	Mr R Scates	South East Essex lacks way behind most other areas of the UK as a tourist area. There simply is too little of interest to see and do for a tourist. The only exception is the Southend/Shoebury sea-front area, but inland, there is little on offer. More cycleways please. Especially along the riverside where families could cycle on their bicycles.
101	Mrs S Parsons	Swimming pool in Rayleigh would be very good
102	Mr T Newton	Southend Airport future expansion could encourage European tourists, but we need to give them a reason to spend their money here, before going off to London. Rochford has too little to offer as it is. Southend is the only possibility at this time.
104	B Aspinall	Leisure facilities - adequate. Tourism - don't want it.
105	Mr R J Aldridge	Tidy up Rochford Town square.
106	Ms P Melito	Perhaps in the riverside areas, we should encourage caravan/tower vans to bring customers into the villages. Norfolk and Suffolk take this approach. We have splendid park areas and Southend to hand.
107	Mr P S Reid	Leisure needs to be improved and be affordable.
109	Mr C Fantides	More should be invested to attract people to enjoy the countryside, ie walks, conservation sites, archaeological etc.
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	Is there enough day centres for the old. I don't know the answers to these questions as I have no knowledge of these facilities. I cannot comment.



112	A J Smythe	Green Burial sites - excellent idea. Incinerator - unfortunately, will probably be an inevitable consequence of new recycling laws, etc. Could be no problem if the right system were adopted. I believe that on the Continent there are modern incinerators which produce very little pollution. The Green Lobby will try to frustrate any proposal. Prison - NIMBY!
113	Mr & Mrs Rowland	Leisure - teenagers need somewhere to go - coffee houses - modern version with music? (Rayleigh's Mill Hall is getting there, but transport is a problem for those who are not local). Joint venture with Southend - open up Maybrooke for something?
117	W R H Beehag	Not really a tourist area or likely to be, which doesn't matter at all!
119	Mr C Gabell	Water based tourism along the Crouch etc a possibility without ruining the rural nature of many of the villages - develop say one of these for water based tourism.
121	Mrs S J Attfield	Can we afford luxuries when the basic needs of the elderly, disabled and people on low incomes are not being met. Who is able to actually afford leisure activities only those on the higher wage bracket. We are becoming increasingly a two tier society.
123	Mr K Walcer	Southend Pier should be rebuilt and use as a River Boat service to London, instead jamming up the A13 & A127 roads and less road accidents. Tourism use river taxi to visit Southend etc. Venice do it, why can't we?
124	Mrs Slater	Facilities for the young.
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	More leisure facilities are needed for youngsters. Spray art project in Hullbridge or Hockley was an excellent idea. Similar scheme for Wakering would be ideal, along with a prominent display area. Encourage children to contribute to their surroundings and hence develop a sense of pride. Rochford area will never be a tourist area!
126	Mr J Jefferies	Facilities for teenagers need to be improved. This I know is always a thorny question to which no-one really has an adequate answer, myself included.
127	Mr G Ware	Do local councils actually provide tourist facilities? Most would seem to be the preserve of private enterprise. Differences in the upkeep of public open space certainly deteriorates as you move away from the sea-front (granted, that is Southend's responsibility). Under the present allocation of resources to local councils there would seem to be very little councils can do.
128	Mr H Snell	Tourism should be actively developed.
129	Mr A Clarke	One persons 'fun centre' is another's nuisance. The vast majority of today's so called leisure activities are based on maximum alcohol consumption, the highest noise pollution possible therefore if that is what you propose....no thanks. Also I would object to adventure parks, rock venues etc on the basis that with so much development some stress free peaceful locations offering wide open landscapes, fresh air and quiet country lanes for walking not being involved in a R.T.A. by a clown driving a 4x4 (S.U.V.) Here's a thought, how about setting some land aside in Hockley for allotments....growing in popularity in some parts of Britain and we may need them in the not too distant future.
130	Mrs S Martin	More leisure facilities in existing towns not just bars and pubs. Smaller cinemas or bowling alleys eg Rayleigh is quite a large town with no facilities. Existing leisure centres are hard to get to using public transport.
131	Mel Bennett	More use of leisure/dining/drinking venues are fact of life. They have impact on attractiveness or otherwise of the area as a whole - but largely dominated by commercial suppliers. Certainly more support to theatre, airport, firework spectacles and carnival type events would draw more people as tourists - but this is not because we have too many world class attractions.

133	The Occupier	The District is evidently well served with sport leisure facilities, but many of the facilities available are unaffordable to about 50% of the population. Local tourism development depends on local entrepreneurs being brought on board from the onset.
134	Ms Innes	A decent shopping centre in southend. (b) More transport. (c) No. (d) Clean up the areas tourists are likely to visit.
135	Mr C Blundell	Development of tourism is right, but with the development we have already planned and continually new development under the heading of tourism, for what reason should they be interested in Rochford.
136	Mrs G E Chase	Somewhere for the youngsters to meet. The state of Southend at present is the last place anyone would visit for pleasure.
137	Mr & Mrs Acres	I believe you have leisure, tourism and community facilities right.
138	The Occupier	No swimming pool that is accessible by public transport. Why not a swimming pool in Rayleigh. New sports centre in Rawreth Lane - served by 1 bus that runs half hourly.
139	Ms A Clark	Purpose built facilities for teenagers - small scale, local to housing areas, supervised and safe.
140	Mrs J Davies	Again more for the younger teenager - youth centres with people who can advise on problems they are having - counselling etc. I think the rest is quite good.
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	We agree with the idea of developing green tourism throughout the district. We see there is a lack of appropriate facilities for local youth in Hockley, Ashingdon and Hawkwell - which leads to other community problems. Has anyone asked the local young people what facilities they would like to have in their area? Improved local shopping areas in Hockley, Hawkwell and Ashingdon - to create a 'core'.
142	D Tilley/R Bhandari	A good supermarket in Rochford. Better bus services. Decent hotel(s). More chain restaurants - eg Pizza Express - rather than always having to go to Southend. A more upmarket Tuesday market to reflect local produce and market town history of Rochford. Move Rochford upmarket in terms of businesses present.
143	J E Burfield	How about a set of stocks in every village, then anyone causing acts of vandalism, paint spraying and other crimes could spend 2 hours in there and we could all throw rotten veg and fruit at them. This should cure them and people would come to watch. Two birds with one stone.
145	Mr A Lysons	There is lots to do here, don't forget wildlife, it needs somewhere too. Places for kids to play and burn off all the blubber.
146	A C Barton	To find alternatives for evening meeting for young people, not costing a lot, in town centre, preferably.
147	Mr I Randall	Airport extension sounds exciting and will bring new jobs and opportunities. With the exception of our Tudor history I cannot see how tourism can be generated unless "tacky" attractions are put in place! Sorry to say "we are not the Cotswolds" etc.
150	Ms N Saunders	Leisure etc facilities are fine. Need to make sure there is plenty of public transport so people can use them!
152	Mr S Crowther	I don't think Tourism is an issue but I do think it is necessary for local people to have country parks and leisure facilities (eg sports/water centres) I would be in favour of using Green belt land for these and similar social purposes.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	Facilities needed in the area should include the promotion of local shops, and local products. There appear to be enough leisure facilities for the area. Development for green tourism should make use of the green belt areas for walking and studying nature (nature reserves etc) any development needed for this should be in keeping with the environment.
155	Ms A Boulter	Rochford is labelled as a "historic" town - we need a heritage centre with informatino for vistors. We have perhaps the most important ship on our doorstep (ie H.M.S. Beagle) - scientifically of great interest around the world. Why not make use of this - it would bring tourists and money into the area. An excellent example of a small heritage centre is at Witham, in the High Street.

156	J W Collins	Rochford does not need more tourist facilities - it is unlikely to be a major tourist destination anyway. Emphasis must be on leisure facilities for all ages. Shopping facilities need improving already Rayleigh is becoming one big collection of charity shops and Estate agents. A wider variety of retailers is needed in order to fight back against lakeside and so on. Shops must be for local needs, and parking cheaper or free.
158	Mr & Mrs White	If we increase our protected countryside areas, this will encourage folk into these places. Thereby benefitting health - channelling children's energies positively and providing income for pubs and local shops. Get advice and participation from Essex Wildlife, RSPB and RHS.
159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	Somewhere for the 11-18 year olds to go, doing what interests them. Music, computer games, bowling, café's where they can meet friends and chat. This would also get them off the streets, out of King George's Park, hence less policing of the area. They (the police) could then concentrate on doing something useful, catching criminals.
160	Ms S Barnes	The River Crouch could become a much better tourist attraction. If you look at the waterway around Papermill lock - the crouch could be this good.
161	Mr S J Bence	At this present time I think these issues are well catered for - there are more important issues as discussed in this document.
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	Community facilities are all important. Do we have a local museum? How many tourists come to Rochford District.
163	Mr S T Cardwell	In my opinion we definitely need a new swimming pool in the Rayleigh area. I feel Park School site would have been ideal, but unfortunately I believe that this was a golden opportunity missed. Not only the local residents but also local schools could benefit from a quality swimming pool.
164	Mr I King	More facilities are required in central <u>Rayleigh (the highest populated area)</u> .
165	Mr G Searles	Who would want to tour round here? Every town has it's quotes of foul-mouthed yobs, and we hear constant complaints from visitors regarding no toilets.
166	G W Fleming	Leisure good, by other areas. Tourism? Comm - streets etc could be cleaner.
167	Mrs J Marshall	What tourism exists in Rochford? What leisure exists in Rochford.
168	Ms L Young	We have the facilities we need, I don't think we are short of any leisure facilities and as we are not a tourist area, we do not need anything extra. What is needed is the facilities we have being looked after and reasonably priced. The Mill Hall is a disgrace and expensive. Clements Hall changing area is also disgusting.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	Make more of our water fronts. It would be nice to see some leisure provision at the old Stambridge Mill site. Encourage some house owners to provide good B& B facilities - don't tie them up in red tape. More facilities are needed for teenagers - facilities that they want and would use. Make more of Rochford Reservoir site - some nice gates would improve it. Encourage local art/music/historic groups. There seem to be many restrictions that make it difficult for them to prosper. Cost of any exhibition site/hall is too high for any amateur groups. Facilities for storage for them would also help eg unused garages.
170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	We could do with more accommodation for visitors such as B&B/Holiday cottages to ? Visitors for activities such as those at 4. Above. We must also market Southend, Leigh and Rochford as a where to provide a variety of activities to encourage different types of visitors on short term breaks. Essex County Council could promote Rochford area - not just the 'Old House' which is open for only half a day a week.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	Developing the airport for tourism not only creates jobs but will reduce the traffic that uses the roads at present eg holiday ? Will not need to get to other London airports. Business travel - like ? See 3 re Hotels water based recreation such as bird sanctuary would suit the riverside areas.

173	Mr & Mrs Cripps	Leisure: Young people need centres for sport or just chillout and chay venues. Ask them what they want. The fear of feral young people roaming the streets is real. They need facilities to provide something for them to do.
174	Mr P Clark	Southend has all the clubs, beaches, amusements etc. Rochford should concentrate on its countryside creating cycle routes and footpaths and nature reserves for outdoor pursuits etc.
175	Mr H J Rowland	The Council's commitment in this area is laudable, but doomed to failure. We do not have the necessary infrastructure in place. The destruction of the Rayleigh one-way system, cut visitors drastically and reduced shop takings. Tourism? To see our clock?
176	Mr R Abbott	Advise where the facilities are and where to park to access them. What footpaths are available? Map? Is parking free? What are costs of family membership to leisure facilities etc. All this could be on one map.
177	Mr J East	Walking and cycling should be encouraged for all ages. Dedicated routes and paths should be available on leaflet, well signposted and with points of interest indicated. Cherry Orchard Jubilee area should become a must for all ages, car parking well designed and not obtrusive. Do all our market towns/villages have an info leaflet with map and points of interest. I think the district has made great improvements in recent years - quality and high standards make so much difference.
178	Mr D Livermore	If you go into Rayleigh town or Hockley town in the evening you will see kids with attitude terrorising the areas. This never used to be the case. Help existing sports clubs such as Rochford Hundred Ruby, Football club, Rayleigh Wyverns etc. They are giving kids an interest, keeping them healthy and giving them some values. Rayleigh needs more parks and parkland with one in the middle all the kids congregate in that one and spill out onto the high street.
179	Mrs F M Wilson	We need a decent olympic size swimming pool to encourage youngsters to swim well and train for the olympics. We need somewhere in Rayleigh for youths to go and socialize - instead of vandalising everything.
180	Mr R Swain	I would like to see more cycling facilities. In Holland you can hire bicycles to cycle through woods down cycle paths. You see all age groups out, from mothers and toddlers to grey-haired couples. It's too dangerous in this country on the roads. In Holland its very pleasant. I recently registered for a city car club. The nearest one was 32 miles away in London. My sister-in-law in Bristol has 5 within a short walk. You could promote car clubs.
181	Mrs M R Hutchings	No idea.
182	Mrs V Wisbey	More smaller busses. There are enough fitness centres. Development of tourism on a small scale is good.
183	Tomassi	None
184	Mr T L Ellis	Do not provide leisure facilities without adequate parking. Parking cars in my own road and many others is an aggravation when the local sports club has events. What else could you do? - Make up my road to a good standard. Better, water, footpaths and lighting are also required.
185	Mr J K Mills	I believe further leisure facilities are required in Rayleigh West.
186	Mr & Mrs J Halliday	A swimming pool in Rayleigh would be a great bonus for the area.
187	Mrs K Jesty	More facilities are needed for teenagers, within walking distance of main towns. A club that would be large enough for bands to play and people to dance in could be provided in Rayleigh. The Pink toothbrush is not really suitable for middle aged residents. There is very little for tourists in our areas. If there is, then its not publicised very well.
188	Mr A Mackay	Here we go again. The council is developing 'green tourism' what the hell does that mean? We are not short of any leisure and tourism? Facilities. No, the development of tourism is not right. Who on earth does the council think wants to come to our area as a tourist. Listen councillors - the real world is calling - again!
189	Mr G Gooding	There are comparatively few features or facilities to attract people to the area.

190	Mr G J Tinsey	New facilities should be constructed close to new homes, so car use is not needed. Any leisure buildings, play-grounds and so on must be CCTV protected and closed at night, if for use by only young children. Youth facilities are required.
191	Janice & Alex Brining	Expand existing airport. Improve and develop bike paths (not just a line on already narrow roads). Arts house cinema - much needed. More clubs young people to avoid delinquency, local bike/skate boarding etc within communities - not out of towns. River Crouch - develop paths for walking and cycling between South Woodham Ferrers to Hullbridge and Paglesham.
192	Ms B Mean	Southend is ripe for more tourism/leisure facilities. Any money spent promoting this will pay back dividends both for the existing local people and for tourists.
193	Ms S Swift	Swimming pool (see 4)
195	Mr B M Gilbert	I can see tourism within Southend-on-sea, but what would a tourist want to visit Rochford. We have nothing to attract them. Maybe a few more hotels or the like to satisfy a dormitory need for the Southend airport when it develops.
196	Mr A E Hodges	Visitor centre for Hockley Woods showing woodland management/flora and fauna - tearooms?
197	P McAllister	Would not want tourism developed in these areas not suitable sites for it. Too much road congestion. No to incinerators.
198	Mr J Clamp	To encourage tourism - council areas would need to work closer together to avoid duplication - a small office in town centres would make the facility more accessible.
199	Mr & Mrs Crockford	Tourism is not really a good idea, with the two roads we have into this corner congestion would be worse than it already is.
200	Mr T O'Shea	Not sure why we need tourism - we have little to offer? Leisure - most if not all privately owned and expensive community - not impressed. Is the new pavillion in St Georges just for the bowling club - are the toilets to be opened to the public. If not why was it built? Can more be done for the teenagers? Where can they go?
201	Mr M Thomas	More swimming pools for local people and not out of area clubs which consume most of pools and pool areas during times when normal working people are able to utilise these facilities. Clubs and out of area clubs consume our local facilities. This is a major deterrent to get fit.
203	M T Conaty	More local youth clubs should be provided in local areas ie the centre of town/village etc. Not the expensive members only health centre we already have sufficient within the area.
204	Mr R Gould	The facilities are adequate albeit more should be done for teenagers - Rochford.
205	Mrs Whitham	Why not a swimming pool, being elderly it is the only sport I am capable of doing, not just me but others also. You have catered for youngsters, middle aged but not us. I rest my case.
206	Mrs G Harper	More leisure facilities would go under used and be a drain on resources. Tourism is unlikely to make our district a large income. Many of our skilled residents work in London.
208	I Gyres	Swimming pool in Rayleigh
210	Mrs M A King	Don't you think we have enough traffic problems and parking problems in Rayleigh without encouraging more tourism!
211	Mr B W Williams	Clearly the Southend Seafront is the main area for tourism. However, the existing leisure facilities the arcades are in excess. There ought to be seafront cafes, and bars to encourage more families to use them as opposed to the many pubs which do not encourage the tourism family clientele. The pier must be reinstated in full, and also the land slipped area west of the pier, again to include a bandstand, which could also be used as an open arena for use by stage acting.
212	Master J Richards	I think the first thing we need in Rochford District is a country park which would be a nice day out for families and would be a pleasant place in the area. It should be positioned in the North of the district near Hullbridge. I think a hotel is also needed as the only local ones are the Chichester and Renouf. These are only small hotels and to boost tourism we need larger ones.
213	Mr M Wheeler	We need a swimming pool in the Rayleigh/Hullbridge area.

214	Mrs M Doherty	I would like to see more transport services to the Rochford Sutton Road Cemeteries, a lot of services have been stopped. Would be nice to have a bus service on a Sunday too. May be a small bus.
215	Mr T R Thompson	Have a balance, if new housing you need additional leisure facilities.
219	Mr J Amey	The only problem I can see here is leisure facilities for teenagers. Just within the last 5 years there has been a large rise in groups of youths congregating in town at night.
220	Mrs S Clarke	I think the council might like to consider reopening community centres and using existing buildings for community activities.
221	Mr G Hoy	Hullbridge hasn't seen much development in any of these areas for years. A number of years ago a small park was taken away. This means that the only remaining park is at one corner of the village making it top inaccessible for many youths.
222	R Luck	Another swimming pool. As far as I know Clements Hall is the only one in the Rochford area, which because of its position isn't easy to get to by public transport which means more cars on the roads, hence more pollution.
223	C Morris	We have enough.
224	Mr K S Gee	Development of tourism is important and information about the district probably needs to be increased. Leisure facilities are probably about right.
225	Mr P Court	It is surely incumbent upon the Council to provide a reasonable range of facilities for residents and visitors alike. If this means that development needs to take place within the green belt, then the Council should accept that.
226	Mrs A Hill	We need park keepers to help make the parks safe for us all to enjoy. We would like a swimming pool in Rayleigh. Plus a rugby pitch somewhere! Rayleigh has a lovely high street. Well done very pretty!
227	Mr & Mrs Haskew	As stated before we need local leisure facilities - ones we can get to on foot or easily on bus - Clements Hall is a nightmare without a car and kids can't get there on their own - easier to use Southend facilities.
228	Ms A Henderson	Rayleigh really needs a swimming pool for the locality. I would love to take my grandchildren to swim, by walking, instead of driving to Clements Hall or Runnymede pools. And the buses are often unreliable, who wants to wait at a bus stop for twenty minutes! Is the little park opposite Fitzwimarc School still used by this public? It could be a suitable venue.
230	V G Crick	Theatre with tier seating.
231	Mr & Mrs Walker	Something needs to be done for teenagers to try and stop them hanging around the streets, I'm not sure exactly what though! With the development of all the extra housing, more primary schools and a senior school will probably be needed, doctors surgeries and play areas. The Rochford police station should be open 24 hours police should be seen on the streets.
232	Mrs A Robinson	I would like to see more reasonably priced facilities both for locals and tourists. As a mother I had to always check prices when taking my children to activities, and holidays. As a Grandmother, I find even taking my grandsons for a swim at Clements Hall is too expensive. I visit Leicester frequently and can take my other grandchildren swimming a lot more cheaply there.
233	Mr G Congram	I believe the council has got this right. Too much tourism in the country cause erosion and requires maintenance, at present the balance is about right. I would like to see our river banks tidied up with stiff penalties for dumping waste.
234	Mr J T Dorrell	More leisure facilities at affordable rates is required for the youth of the area.

235	L W Lewis	There are not enough adequate footpaths/bridleways around the Crouch Valley for people to easily access and enjoy the river scenery, without walking or riding along dangerous roads and there is only two poor quality slip ways to access the river. These should be improved. Caravans should be licensed so that their movements and placements can be monitored as many are used for storage and never properly disposed of.
236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	More cycle paths in and around Rayleigh, Rochford and especially Eastwood Road into Rayleigh. Parks and green spaces with wardens to keep out gangs of kids.
237	Mr Sanders	Current council strategy is fine.
239	Ms S Martin	Facilities are perfectly adequate for a seaside area. Countryside is accessible to all as long as the land is not over-developed. We are an island and not in the USA where casinos etc are the norm.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	See comments under question 6. Shopping facilities should encourage local shops and the more traditional shops rather than one-stop supermarkets. We should be wary of providing more tourism, protection is more important. More/bigger libraries would be good. Green burial sites/incinerators all important.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	Upper Rayleigh and Eastwood would benefit from a leisure centre including a local swimming pool. A small local theatre/cinema serving the area would also be of value. I question the need for tourism, where is it envisaged the tourists would be from? What is the draw? Southend? If it is going to be in the Upper Roach Valley a visitor centre with educational facilities would be highly beneficial.
244	Mr P Raiswell	Sport England believes that it is important to define what is meant by 'leisure' as this term can be misinterpreted and it is not clear whether indoor/outdoor sports facilities or informal recreation opportunities are covered by this section. However, Sport England do believe that policies are required to ensure that adequate indoor/outdoor sports facilities are provided as part of new developments, and that existing facilities are adequately protected.
245	M J Burpitt	More note should be taken about using what is already available such as the rivers and woods
246	Miss M Saward	Why waste money on pretty block paving which is so expensive. Maybe a few hanging baskets perhaps, what happened to good old fashioned tarmac or similar. Surely it is safer to have a level pavement rather than risk of a loose block which people can trip on. (Bring our tax bill down).
247	Mr & Mrs Addison	We need to do more for tourism. As stated earlier a touring caravan park is essential. Promote hiking and rambling. More country area bed and breakfast needed.
250	Ms M Power	Community, leisure and tourism facilities may in very special circumstances be appropriate in Green Belt locations particularly new facilities which may significantly improve/enhance better community facilities particularly if these are provided at the expense of the private sector. Additionally, sustainable development criteria may outweigh site specific designations and provide a justified rationale for limited release of Green Belt land for community, leisure and tourist development. A suitable policy could propose sustainability criteria such as proximity to the local population/community, need for the facility, proximity to public transport and other leisure/sports/tourist facilities, relationship with other facilities which may be just outside of the boundaries of the District. For example, an application has been submitted by Southend United Football Club (SUFC) for training grounds including an Artificial Turf Pitch (ATP) on land to the north of Smithers Farm in association with the development of a new 22,000 seater stadium for the Club on land to the south falling within
251	Mr B Guyett - Chairman	Additional facilities and support for the young are essential and we should encourage increased use and enjoyment of the natural environment. We would not support an incinerator, with potential health hazards and need to import waste. It also discourages recycling. If Healthcare centres are the chosen way forward by the PCT, Hockley needs a dedicated centre located in the town and land is available in a central location with excellent transport links.

252	F Harrison	There is plenty available in South East Essex, some expansion may be desirable, people should realise they must travel to such centres and not expect to have them on their doorsteps.
253	Mr M J Smith	We have a good selection of leisure activities at the present.
254	Ms V Stanesby	Improve what we have already. I really believe things that exist, businesses/facilities should be given help and ideas to improve and tidy up our area. It is nice to see the work in Southend with the pier bridge and Palace Hotel - people are so pleased that things are looking nicer.
255	Mr S Chilton	Desperate need of a family club where parents can have a drink and children can play in a family club environment.
257	Mr T Dodkins	An important issue will be the integration of new development with existing development, services and community facilities, particularly by cycling and walking. You will be aware that my client has for some time had a positive dialogue with Sustrans, who are a charity that works on practical projects to encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport. A project that being formulated is the Prittle Brook Greenway Scheme, the main aim of which is to provide a sustainable transport route through Southend. The objection site has the potential of expanding on this to create a sustainable link between Rochford and Southend. Sustrans are keen to include a route through the objection site as part of any development, which they feel is an important part of the proposed Greenway, improving sustainable transport in the area. This will engender links between Rochford and the higher level leisure services of Southend, as well as encouraging residents of Southend to visit the more rural character of Rochford, without using the car.
258		We have sufficient leisure facilities. Erect road signs indicating Rayleigh on the new A130 and A127
259	Mr M B Rogers	When the old cinema was closed for development we were promised a new one. This has not appeared. For years the swimming pools was promised. Once again zilch. Rayleigh has at last count 31,000 people, South Woodham Ferrers 18,000. They have a pool and a cinema. I was amazed last week driving through Rayleigh on a weekday evening about 9 o'clock to see hundreds of youngsters just milling around. They have no where to go and as the old saying goes idle hands work for the devil. Damage and graffiti.
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	Community facilities sometimes out of the price range of the poorer class. Swimming pool at Park School grounds did not appear as was spoke of. Buses that leave the old folk of Rochford stranded because the bus company decide to limit every now and then. What about in the freezing cold its just not right that we should suffer this.
261	S A Skinner	I would like to see Rayleigh Windmill become the visitor centre for the Rochford District. It is an iconic building that can attract visitors in its own right, and should play a key role in promoting the leisure, cultural and tourism opportunities in the district. The Council seems to lack a coherent strategy for promoting visitor attractions at present - such a strategy should be built around the windmill.
262	Ms L Parish	Rochford is a positive council regarding leisure facilities and encourages people to walk by arranging 30 mins walk in Hockley Woods. However, for those wishing to walk further additional longer walks would be welcomed. The Ramblers do welcome members but their pace is too fast for us!
263	Mr P Kneen	In general terms, countryside policies should make provision for the allowance of leisure, recreation and tourism in the countryside, where a countryside location is essential. Swan Hill would support this approach. Further, it is considered appropriate to provide policy provisions for financial contributions in the Core Strategy towards leisure and community facilities, where appropriate. This policy approach should be flexible and the Council should seek to consider each application on its own merits, and how it would impact on existing leisure and community facilities.
267	Mr D Pointer	Current facilities seem about right given the proximity of other facilities at Southend and Basildon. Future tourism should be centred on the rural aspect of the district.



268	Mr S Crussell	We don't really have anything in the district that is a significant draw for tourism. Do we want that when our roads are overcrowded already.
270		In country areas there should be good public access to green spaces and walking trails. RDC should consider entering agreements with local landowners to increase the variety and number of walking and cycling trails. Any sites used for expansion of sporting activities ie golf courses should be expected to show no loss of character or biodiversity of an area after development. As the Thames Gateway itself becomes more developed the rural character and outstanding wildlife sites eg the Crouch Ramsar sites within the district will stand out more strongly and should be promoted by the RDC.
271	Mr & Mrs Jobson	Leisure and tourism in this area is built on the enjoyment of the countryside, therefore the effect on the environment local wildlife should be a consideration of all developments.
274	Mr S Mckinnon	There appears to be a distinct lack of facilities for the 12-16 year old group. Facilities for this age group should be a priority. I am not convinced that Rochford is a viable tourist location. Funds should not be 'wasted' on unviable options.
277	Ms S A Elkington	Trained staff to deal with teenagers who have no activities to attend - staff out on street corners etc.
278	Mr P Marshall	For a very long time I have been requesting the Council to find an investor for a dry ski slope in this area, it would suite so many age groups, senior school always offer ski trips when children start, it would have been nice if the working class children have an opportunity to see a pair of skis.
279	S J Heeney	I like many other residents do not like the idea of extra tourism facilities. There are plenty of leisure facilities in the area.
280	Mrs M A Tyrell	Leisure in the area and surroundings is I think already catered for. I don't see it as a tourism area anyway.
285	Mrs B E Dale	One thing which is desperately needed in Rayleigh at least is a swimming pool. It would dramatically cut the number of car journeys if we had one which would be very beneficial for everyone. The leisure programme is not advertised as well as it could be. The cinema at Rayleigh was a very well kept secret - just a banner outside the Mill Hall and a few notices around the town could have saved it from closure. How about starting it again?
286	Mr L F Knight	About right.
288	Mr & Mrs C Cummins	Provision of youth centres and facilities to keep the young occupied are a high priority.
289	Mrs J Warner	A good local guide book. Tourist information and signs in easily accesible location.
290	Ms E Davis	Another swimming pool
292	Mr & Mrs Goring	We need to be able to access and enjoy the natural areas around the district. I think most people feel the need to 'escape' to the country or to the water - these are the areas that need development. Idea - a large development incorporating indoor and outdoor leisure facilities in and on our local waterways. An area where old and young people could visit and enjoy accessible from near the 'Factory Shop' by boat? Rochford Roach or Hullbridge Crouch.
296	Miss S Rom	Improved vehicular access to our coastline. Hotel and B&B accommodation in the Green Belt. Leisure and recreation facilities along our coastline. More flexibility for garden centres to use existing buildings for tea rooms.
297	Mr S Marshall	Cycling! More safe cycle routes please, please, please.
298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	Leisure and community facilities - yes. This is a rural area, tourism doesn't come into it. There are natural amenities to enjoy.
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	We need to get the kids off the high street and into other activities. Tourism is not very strong, we do not provide much of interest and we lack hotels and evening entertainment. The police are rarely to be seen in the town centre at night which stops families from coming into town after the shops close. A tour bus of historic/interesting sites could be a good way of getting people to know more about the town and its history.
300	Mrs Upson	It was wrong to double fees for the older person at evening classes and mostly at keep fit. I wonder how many people of that age group are going to doctors now with small aches and pains.

		4.15 Community, leisure and tourism facilities. The RSPB recognises the importance of tourism initiatives in providing for communities socially and economically. We would stress to the Council that these initiatives also need to be environmentally sensitive and sustainable. Tourism initiatives should seek to provide environmental education, biodiversity protection and enhancement as well as economic gain. Caution should be taken to ensure the initiatives are sustainable and remain environmentally rather than economically focussed. Increasing tourist numbers can also mean increasing car usage; therefore, all tourism initiatives should be accessible by public transport. Council options - The RSPB believes that promotion of community, leisure and tourism facilities can occur without compromising the current greenbelt allocations. As such, RSPB would be likely to object to reduced protection of the greenbelt, to allow for community, tourism and leisure facilities. Rather, we would prefer to see the development of a policy, which provides guidance as to what developments
301	Ms K Kelly	
302	Mr B Short	No to development of tourism. More bike/skateboard facilities for children to play in.
303	Mr K Hatfield	Leisure facilities are generally very good. A ski slope at Clements Hall would be very popular.
304	Mr A Rutter	Rochford was one of the "old towns". Now its almost slipped off the map. We need something like Leigh High Street has to attract people.
305	E L Strangleman	We have plenty of leisure centres. Regarding tourism, this is a dormitory suburb and hardly a centre of tourism.
306	Mr E C Cook	See comments under 9
307	Mr J Snow	Enough in this area to suit most tastes - although membership and monthly fees are rather extortionate for what is on offer in them....for a great centre look at the 'David Lloyd' in Eastwood/Leigh, although this is still rather expensive but has excellent facilities.
308	The Occupier	Basildon Council collect pink sacks of combined re-cycle materials, 1 sack takes paper, cardboard, tins, foil, bottles and jars both glass and plastic. Why are we so limited? We have very small premises so it's difficult to store everything to take to recycle centre. Also un-economic and environmentally unfriendly to use car to drive to tip without substantial recycle contents. Why pollute more to recycle little? We can't store it so need help to cooperate in getting rid of it. They also have big degradable sacks for green garden clippings, leaves etc. Why can't we have the same. They are all collected every 2 weeks in season March to October.
309	Mr J Smith	Feel development of tourism is right. In this area there are beautiful countryside features, Hockley Woods, the River Crouch, and Beckney Woods etc.
310	Chris Teeder	We need more facilities for teenage kids to help keep them off the streets. Attention needs to be made to keeping woodlands and open areas clean and safe. If property and business development carry on at the rate they are tourists will not be attracted to the area.
311	Mrs P A Watson Jones	More leisure facilities for the family - country parks, walks, cycle paths needed.
312	Mr D Foyle	Rayleigh would benefit from having its own swimming pool. I cannot believe a sports centre has been built and no swimming facilities are available. I also believe that Rayleigh would benefit from some upper class wine bar/bistro type places as you are very restricted where to eat in Rayleigh unless you want a take away!! There are also too many charity shops and other small businesses should be encouraged.
314	Mrs C Quennell	We need more community control for young people.
315	R A Stone	The environment is the greatest leisure, tourist and community attraction - protect it! Avoid the superstore mentality, protect the local enterprises.
316	Ms S Copeman	Make sports centres more affordable to local teenagers to encourage positive activities. Tourist information centres to give info and encourage use of existing facilities. Health centres rather than doctors surgeries. Traffic calming measures through populated areas.

317	Mr D Harris	Having attended a 'planning for tourism' meeting at Ballards Gore Golf Club, I was impressed with the efforts currently being made by the councils team. Ultimately, the inflow of revenue through tourism must help to enhance existing facilities and to develop new attractions.
318	Ms W Hatton	Activity centres like Belchamps. Use the river more for activity marine centres. We need doctors, dentists and hospitals with parking in the district. Use the brickworks site for a community asset.
319	Mr M Lang	No building a leisure centre when there are others near by was a big waste of money it should have been a shute water park for the young and familier (like the one in Poole, Dorset called I think shutes). It would bring lots of people into the area, nothing like it around here instead we got a leisure centre that the well off can afford!
320	J Feather	Healthcare is imporatant. Doctors and dentists are more important than large shops.
321	R J Feather	The new Rawreth Lane sports centre answers local residents needs but why was the centre at Park School destroyed first? A community facility instead of an Asda store would help. How is that green when shopping facilities already exist.
323	Mr T Beebee	Leisure facilities adequate and infrastructure cannot cope with further development.
324	Mrs Doward	There seems to be a lack of facilities for the young to encourage them off the streets. I don't suppose many of them can afford to visit Leisure Centres, but they might enjoy their own Club House where they can sit in the warm and indulge in things like table-tennis, snooker and basket ball, even scrubable walls where they can practice their graffitti and wash it off when they feel like a change! Perhaps this could be in conjunction with an area for younger children as they grow older, will have learnt that there are other things to do rather than hang around the streets.
325	Mr D Elwell	Agreed - no comment
326	Owner/Occupier	Should improve existing facilities (eg libraries) rather than providing new facilities.
327	Mrs C Taylor	Try to get more tourist facilities on the pier - café just selling coffee, tea and ice creams and cakes, decent restaurant on the end of the pier, more toilets along the seafront. Keep the Palace Theatre please a lovely building. More activities for teenagers. Our family likes to take rides on the steam train in Sutton. Train along the seafront in summer at a reasonable price. Bring back a department store into Southend like Keddies. Attract more shops into Rochford square, reduce the rates for shops. Encourage the farmers in the district to open for bed and breakfast for horse and rides - encourage them to open-up their land for public bridelways/cycle off road bikes network.
329	Mrs M J Snowdon	What is required is a better bus service to get to the few facilities that do exist. As a non-driver I now find it impossible to get to Clements Hall unless I take 3 buses. Chelmsford (the only decent shopping area in the reasonable locality) will no longer be available when the 35 bus is taken off. There are no evening busses where I live to enable trips to the cinema and theatre. Without a car Rayleigh is virtually a cultural desert unless you are a driver - I thought the current policy was to encourage use of public transport.
330	P Mansbridge	Essex does have some interesting places to visit but has a poor image which is to a large extent shown to be true when you drive along any of the major roads eg A127, A13, A130, A12 etc by the poor state of maintenance of the central reservation, verges and lay-bys. Where does all this rubbish come from? Overall the county suffers from a lazy approach to control such as unoffical signs, people using land for all sorts of purposes - sorting rubbish which then blows all over the place etc.
331	Mr A C Cooper	I believe we now have plenty of open spaces and sports facilities certainly in Hockley/Hawkwell areas. We should develop the riverside opportunities offered by Crouch and Roach. Improve toe paths to enable more use as footpaths/cycling/horse riding. Boating is very popular but there are very limited public slipway access onto the rivers. Mostly private clubs.

332	Mr & Mrs Jones	Imagine you live in another part of England and think, is there anything in Essex that as a tourist I would want to visit' and you answer your own question. As for leisure, I do not think more nightclubs open 24 hours a day or keep fit centres open only to those who can afford to use them would be any use to me or the vast number of 40 somethings in this area.
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	Provide facilities along the River Crouch area to encourage tourists and locals to enjoy our open spaces, particularly along the river areas.
334	Mrs Amey	Living where I do the leisure facilities aer fine.
347	Mr C Rooke	I do not really see Rochford as a tourist area. Leisure facilities are important though and I would like to see more use made of our water based facilities - not just for the 'well to do'.
349	Ms C Paine	1. Why was the new leisure centre in Rawreth Lane built without a swimming pool - one is needed in this area. 2. Take some Green Belt out of agricultural use and do a rare breeds centre/woodland. 3. In Rawreth we need more G.P's.
350	Mr A James	I believe the council is doing enough in this area.
352	Clr Joyce Smith	Similar comments to 4. If you increase facilities you will spoil the countryside that you want people to visit.
353	Mr R J Saward	Facilities should be made for leisure and tourism. On the river front at Hullbridge we have no access for use for pleasure. I would like to suggest making a prominard on river front on Pooles Lane playing field. By making a road in forming a prominard or park for leisure. The slipway at the end Ferry Road should be made good and longer and a charge should be made for boats and parking boat trailers by way of pay and display machine in car park and trailer to be attached to the towing vehicle at all times suggest fee of £10.00 for five hours to cost of maintenance of slipway. Kendle Park is badly in need of a rebuild.
354	Mrs Smith	What reason would enough people have to want to visit this area, to look at all our car sales plots, to see all the traffic jams, or tour the toytown estates. Hunt out Rayleigh Windmill or Dutch Cottage. We don't need any more superstores, car lots, or huge housing estates, or industrial estates, we need leisure that suits all ages, groups and pockets, even Hockley Woods one has to walk through piles of dog poo, maybe a large area to just walk our thousands of dogs in the area in would be good.
355	Mr K Vingoe	The Parish Council has worked hard and successfully in conjunction with the County Council to improve access to the footpath network. Our open spaces similarly have been enhanced (not without some local difficilty) to encourage greater enjoyment and healthy exercise for our community. The river networks throughout the district could provide more leisure opportunities. The Jubilee Countrypark and the upper reaches of the Roach Valley could continue to provide a benefit for tourism and leisure and the development of an environmental centre would be seen as assisting this.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	Over-reliance on tourism can spoil the very nature of the area that tourism can attract. Various pockets of the area are already tourist centres, eg the reputation of Battlesbridge attracts antiques collectors, but it would not be right for, say, Rochford town centre to become an 'antiques and tea shop' centre. In addition, there is a shortage of hotel and B&B accommodation; what there is is mainly on the corridors to Southend, so any facilities would need to be of significant interest to divert people into the Rochford Council area. A significant investment in publicity would need to go hand-in-hand with developing the facilities.
357	Ms V O'Malley	By developing shopping malls and out of town areas you are killing off the independent traders, who give good service. Soon we will have no choice. It will soon be all big stores like ASDA, TESCO, SAINSBURYS, nowhere where you can buy 1 screw or specialist clothes etc and get advice at the same time. Make parking free in town centres so the independents can compete.
358	Mr & Mrs England	New town at Rawreth could have healthcare, leisure and shopping facilities. Nature reserves down the Crouch could attract tourists via A12/A130.

359	Mr New	I do not see this as a tourist area, it is too built up with large housing developments along the railway corridor. We lack ancient large houses etc and good coastal areas except Southend.
360	Mr A J Eisenhauer	Clearly leisure is important with expanded and protected country park land, public open space, visitor centre/tourist attractions and even greatly expanded water-based recreation. This district has a long unused coast line and this could be a big money-spinner for the whole area. Enhanced shopping areas are needed - particularly the rather pathetic Rochford Town Centre - but only on existing brownfield sites not on new green belt land.
362	Ms M Power	Community, leisure and tourism facilities may in very special circumstances be appropriate in Green Belt locations particularly new facilities which may significantly improve/enhance better community facilities particularly if these are provided at the expense of the private sector. Additionally, sustainable development criteria may outweigh site specific designations and provide a justified rationale for limited release of Green Belt land for community, leisure and tourist development. A suitable policy could propose sustainability criteria such as proximity to the local population/community, need for the facility, proximity to public transport and other leisure/sports/tourist facilities, relationship with other facilities which may be just outside of the boundaries of the District. For example, land adjacent to Southview Close on redevelopment for residential could support the need to develop a tennis club providing an enhanced sport and community facility. Such a scheme may or may not fall within PPG2 acceptable development criteria but more often than not the
365	Mrs H J Springham	High quality healthcare is not provided throughout the district. Swimming pool is needed in Rayleigh - as has been said many times before. Lack of public transport to Clements Hall and Rayleigh Leisure Centre.
366	Mr S J Springham	Better tourism should be promoted by the improvement of existing infrastructure. The existing roads, healthcare, public transport systems etc are inadequate for existing inhabitants let alone any increase in population.
369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	Existing facilities are sufficient.
370	Mr G Biner	One of the main problems with the leisure facilities in the Rayleigh area is that over the years the ones that could have been beneficial to the town today have been demolished and "developed", ie Crown Bingo Hall, Rayleigh's cinema and Rayleigh's speedway track.
371	Swanton	A cinema in Rayleigh? More land for allotments. None in Hockley.

## **8. COMPULSORY PURCHASE & PLANNING OBLIGATIONS**

Is this a reasonable approach? What else could we do? Do you have a view on the financial contributions that developers should be asked to make?

Rep No	Contact Name	CPO and Planning Obligations Comments
001	Mr I Haines	Encourage development that enhances existing buildings and services ie allow development in green belt if low cost housing and roads and infrastructure are included at developers cost
002	Mr & Mrs Hawes	Logic dictates the more money development involve the higher the cost of the end product, yes, involve them in the cost of shall we say, any additional expenses put upon the Council, and making sure the right infrastructures around large sites are provided by them
003	Mr A Cooper	Developers must contribute more to infrastructure roads, schools, doctors surgeries, schools. Also local employers should contribute eg Tesco's billion pounds profits should be spread around to local needs a bit more.
004	Mr M Cubitt	Developer SHOULD be forced to contribute to environment and residents since they only want the money
005	Mrs P R Byres	I suppose realistically compulsory purchase may sometimes be necessary but I think a <u>fair market price</u> should be paid.
007	Ms P Pemberton	Not sure of the legal angle but the fact that the 'doctor's house' in Hawkwell was allowed to be razed was unforgiveable, a beautiful landmark desecrated - council should have held out!
009	Ms S Nicholls	No - but developers should be prepared to pay as moving households completely and starting afresh is a very expensive task and not necessarily the right one for the area or occupants.
010	Mr A Devlin	I have no experience, but I feel developers should be responseable for all aspects from start to finish of any projects.
011	R F Wise	See answers to question 1 and 7
014	D Hanrahan	What, where and why, surely not in this age we are not making drastic alterations unless there is something we know nothing about. Planning obligations - a must if we are to maintain and sustain the area and its heritage. One thing developers must do, provide off street parking.
015	F A Robinson	Developers should not be asked, but told what the Community wants.
016	Mr R Fuller	Developers should contribute to the building of the necessary infrastructure to support the developments - power, water, shops, roads, surgeries and parkland.
017	Mr L A G Dunford	Yes. Make sure that there are proper facilities for new tenants, ie doctors surgeries and school places. Road wide enough for parked cars and emergancy vehicle access.
018	Mrs Gaunt	Make developers provide facilities first not last.
019	Mrs L Allen	Yes if it is a definite benefit for the community however, more than adequate compensation must be paid.
020	Mr & Mrs Appleton	No this is not reasonable to compulsory purchase somebodys home or land and it certainly is not reasonable to expect people to leave loved houses and areas, there are plenty of people who would sell homes and land without purchasing by order.
021	Mr P Jermyn	Developers make enough money they should be made to spend it.
022	Mr R Hockett & Ms C Mobbs	Compulsory purchase and planning law should be used with our <u>local community in mind</u> rather than the interest of an outside prive developer whose untillmate aim is profit in £££££.
023	Ms C J Christopher	No! No! No! to compulsory purchase, it is totally against individual freedom and rights. Yes to developers making financial contribution.
024	Mr P Williams	It needs compulsory purchasing of a few acres of cheap agricultural land in Rawreth to widen and straighten half mile of Watery Lane and strengthening 2 culverts. Speed limiting with cameras and a modest rework with traffic lights of the accident prone junction of Lower Road with Ashingdon Road and then sorting out the Anne Boleyn junction as previously said and phasing the school morning and afternoon times to ease Ashingdon Road.

026	Mr A Lantaff	I am not a supporter of compulsory purchase orders. Developers will have to make financial contributions towards improvements as they are bound to be making large profits from these developments that are being forced on the area.
027	Mr B Fuller	We should not allow too many properties to be crammed into small space.
029	Mr White	Developers should make more contribution to landscaping and also after care. More thought for parking, and ensuring enough parking as what is opint of building new estates where car owners end up parking on pavement? Compulsory purchase and planning obligations I do not know enough about to comments.
030	Mr H May	I do feel that the cost of road improvements to new development is a cost which can only be pased on to the purchasers of new property. This is not right, but I see no real alternative.
031	A R Wetton	Developers should make a contribution depending on size and type of development. If part of a larger development plan then yes a contribution should be made.
032	J Morley	Depends on where it is compulsory purchase? Every developer should be asked to make a financial contribution if they want to buy land for development.
034	Mr Hart	Building by property speculators should carry maximum financial penalty.
035	Mr B Deal	Use it wisely and save unlike the destruction of the Doctor's house in Hawkwell.
036	Mrs P Slade	Should not be allowed.
037	Mr A Bawden	Compulsory purchase is criminal, it cannot be right to take land and homes from people if they are not willing to give it up!
038	Mr J Wright	Compulsory purchase is not nice but sometimes required. Where a building or land ha been left to deteriorate then I would say the Council would be right to purchase. If a builder puts two houses where there was one before then he should pay a levy of say 50% which would offset the Councils extra work in supplying waste, policing etc.
040	Mr D Huskisson	<u>Developers should make a proportionate contribution to infrastructure improvements (road, car parking, education, cultural facilities etc) but they should not be "taxed" beyond the legitimate additional demand their development will place on existing facilities. Also, I am suspicious of the government's proposed to replace Section 106 agreements, negotiated locally, with a 'planning gain supplement' redistributed on a regional basis. The present system should be retained, any abuse by local authorities prevented, and the obligations of developers enforced.</u>
043	Mr M Yorke Wade	Preserve woodlands. Not to grant high rise flats over 5 stories
045	Mr R Abbott	Yes. Developers should be asked to contribute a lot more or reduce house prices which bear no relation to the cost of construction!
046	Mr & Mrs J Cripps	Proves the point (compulsory purchase) - we do not have the room for mass build/development, why should hard-working/tax paying people be penalized for an incompetent decision to develop an over-crowded area?
048	Mr S Reeves	No it's not. It's not necessary to compulsory purchase, go elsewhere
049	Mr & Mrs Kitchen	Yes. It is a reasonable approach but developers should make a conspicuous contribution
051	Mrs D Langdon	No. Planning people, should ensure that no business is carried out on residential property. Clear eyesores from (above) such as large lorries, caravans etc from front gardens and local streets. Ensure all new estates have plenty of off road parking.
052	Mr & Mrs D Lench	Previously, in other areas, bribery and corruption have been found with regard to building plots/sites. We must ensure fair play, and a fair balance in the type of dwellings.
053	E Winn	Get developers to work in unison with the public
054	Mr & Mrs Todman	Compulsory purchase should only be used as a last resort - rely on market forces. Any burden put on developers will only be passed onto the purchasers to fill an increase in home prices.
055	Mr V Hawtree	Compulsory purchase Foulness and build a wind farm and Country Park.



057	Mrs J Williams	Developers should make a contribution to the local infrastructure.
058	M J Jackson	C.P.O's essential in extreme case. Whilst the old development land tax was a good scheme, planning gain is still covered by capital gains tax.
059	Garfield	No. New council houses would help youngsters, but it doesn't help them get a foot on the property ladder
060	Mr S J Herbert	Unless absolutely necessary compulsory purchase should only be a last resort. Developers should be paying more I cite the Park School sale as an example.
061	Mr G W Slaughter	Leave it as it is
062	Chris Taylor	Where there are derelict sites/unused sites etc compulsory purchase is a good way of avoiding wasted space. Developers should be encouraged to take these on with planning incentives. Requiring infrastructure improvements to be provided by developers is logical. Big developers should require developers to finance road widening and repairs if access could be an issue once in operation. The maintenance of existing buildings should be obligatory to avoid unsightly areas. Council tax premium could be charged for failure to maintain standards of maintenance.
063	Mr B A Stammers	Compulsory purchase would work ok if it was value and 20% it would save time and money in the long run.
064	Mrs S Smith	Yes developers should make contributions to local amenities and the infrastructure. All new estates should have provision for schools, surgeries and a focal point and meeting place for the new local population.
065	Mr T Bennett	All considerations and approaches should be examined from the point of view of <u>general</u> advantage rather than the individual. The <u>basic</u> responsibility of authority is to provide and sanction what is obviously best for the majority!
066	Mr G Langhorn	Compulsory purchase should be a last resort measure and developers should be asked to contribute and be restricted into building like for like.
067	J D Carr	The possible main problem here to national government rules which has led local councils to delay decisions. I am sure it is right to obtain all ? Land financial contributions from developers and not easily at the initial stage of any development but on a continuing basis to upkeep of roads and property. All on site requirements, roads, sewers, paths, lighting should be installed prior to any building being commenced.
068	Mr & Mrs McDermott	Compulsory purchase to move someone out of their home for a developer or road is obscene. Developers have done very nicely over the years by making very token payments.
069	Mrs B Buckland	Difficult to have a hard and fast rule as there are always so many points to consider when planning if a compulsory purchase is involved. Long term needs/effects should possibly be the deciding factor. Developers must make substantial financial contributions but this should <u>never</u> be the deciding factor in a planning decision.
070	P Robertson	Developers exist to make money and do not regard the feelings or objections of local people as important. Therefore, developers do need to be effectively controlled.
071	P Williams	No. Indepth investigation on developemnt against it effect on the local community should be carried out first.
072	Mr & Mrs S J Painter	Yes in the right situation. Developers should contribute towards infrastructure - roads etc. Estate development to include community centre/shops. Rawreth Lane is bereft.
073	Mr S Learmouth	Unable to answer
074	Mr & Mrs Raddon	Don't believe in compulsory purchase. My daughter lives in Gardiners Lane (that has now had a stop on it).
075	Mr K A Cooke	Compulsory purchase should only be used for infrastructure benefits for the community with affected persons being <u>fully</u> compensated. Of course developers should have to pay for any resultant effects from their developments.
076	Ms G Lunn	Any developers should have to provide energy efficient homes, considering, sewage, water, power and roads. Large builders should not be able to strain our resources and infrastructure further leaving local residents to foot the bill and suffer the aftermath.

077	Cllr Glen Dryhurst	Compulsory purchase is a last resort - it is a state land grab and must be done seldom. Planning obligations are good, right and proper and so must be (seen to be) fair and equal for all. Contributions or free infrastructure given by developers needs to be fair, proper and beneficial to the whole community.
078	David & Jeanne	No. No further development in the area. No.
079	Mrs S Clark	I do not regard compulsory purchase reasonable. It causes problems. Development has meant increased traffic in the area. There are too many hold ups. The new road which Tesco helped build and which benefited them greatly has made Hockley roads congested.
080	Mr C Hathaway	Developers should have to fund 25% of their profits to the infrastructure improvements.
081	T S Papworth	Build character properties on plots that remain affordable. Please develop derelict properties first before bulding on any Green Belt site.
082	Mr J Adkin	All developers do 'it' for the profit. Of course they should contribute more.
084	Miss M Andrews	A difficult area. Perhaps to purchase delapidated premises or real problem sites, unless land is available for sale.
085	C G Tabar	Developers <u>must</u> contribute to infrastructure required. Prefere for land to be acquired by NRG station.
086	Mr M Gorman	You always worry if it is the financial contributions from the developers that swings the housing deal, gets it passed and rubber stamped by the Planning Department.
087	Mr I Walker	Developers should be asked what benefit will accrue to existing residents? Will a development improve local amenities/infrastructure/tourism?
088	Miss S Thackeray	Yes. Building developments must include affordable housing.
089	J Weddell	Romney marsh still stinks I understood it was a play area for children.
090	Mr B Everett	This is a reasonable approach. We should make developers finance roads and paths near new building areas
091	Ms P Bailey	We should not compulsory purchase unless all other avenues have been explored - rather than build bigger roads why don't we increase public transport to make it more appealing and easier to use.
092	Mrs M Hills	Compulsory purchase only as last resort. Developers should contribute as they benefit from the general desirability of this area.
093	Mrs M J Owoo	I think it is a reasonable approach
094	F A Browne	Gypsy and travellor sites must be discouraged, totally impossible.
095	Mr J Britton	See comments
096	Mr W Roberts	Yes but developers could and should contribute more.
097	Mr & Mrs Newman	Yes . But we should not place such a high burden on developers so that they are driven away from worthwhile developments.
098	Mrs N London	Compulsory purchase should only be used as a last resort. Developers should be made to make financial contributions to the infrastructure, out of their profits, not by bumping up the cost of housing.
099	Mr & Mrs R G Headley	Imposing compulsory purchase on people can lead to a lot of upset and is not always the right way. Planning I feel is often very difficult to understand. Things which should be stopped are not and sometimes reasonable requests are not allowed. More thought should be given to the people affected by the planning and the impact on their lives. Developers should be made to restore roads where their lorries have caused damage ie Plumberow Avenue.
100	Mr R Scates	Planning obligations is a reasonable approach, although the costs will invariably be 'passed on' in some way or another. This is where it needs to be ensured that this is not the case and that developers meet some of the infrastructure costs.

102	Mr T Newton	Compulsory purchase is inevitable if roads are to be expanded, to stop polluting traffic janes becoming even worse. Do a months survey on Ashingdon and Southend, Sutton Road. Planning obligations should prevent over crowding of building plots with large energy wasting housing. Large developers should contribute to road development, and infrastructure. The council should consult on how people could get to and from developments without always using cars ie cycling or public transport.
104	B Aspinall	Unfortunately compulsory purchase occassionally necessary - ok where proper compensation paid
105	Mr R J Aldridge	Do not let the developers in the Rochford area. Is bigger already we do not need a new library for flats and houses building houses in Rochford hospital land was not good enough no more building to be allowed. Enough is enough.
107	Mr P S Reid	Developers particularly "Barrats" have made millions out of Rochford and have given nothing back, when agreeing developments planners need to gain positive benefits for the area eg fund local charities etc.
109	Mr C Fantides	In these days of global warming land should be given over to the environment NOT developers!
110	Mr P Nippard	Why should anyone be subject to compulsory purchase when this whole initiative is flawed!
111	Mr & Mrs Curtis	There is always room for improvement. No one wants industrial units at the end of there garden with the increase in traffic etc.
113	Mr & Mrs Rowland	Use empty properties. Build council houses and flats. Strict rules for tenants and enforced evictions for those who do not take reasonable care. Developers should be made to think about schooling, etc and pay towards these (especially large scale developments).
116	R S Barton	Compulsory purchase should be used where property is left empty and land becomes derelict. Planning should apply equally to all and not be unfairly biased towards developers or travellers.
117	W R H Beehag	As and when necessary for progress
119	Mr C Gabell	Reasonable - especially for new roads!
120	Mr B Poole	At a local level I don't believe compulsory purchase is appropriate. It is an infringement of individual rights and should only come from central government level.
121	Mrs S J Attfield	No definitely not, why should anyone have the right to compulsory purchase another persons homes, at the end of the day it is taking away the rights of the individual. The developers should look at the overall plan of who they are targetting their houses to, certainly not the local population, at the unaffordable prices currently advertised. I wonder how many of the properties at the present time are actually not sold due to the current over inflation of house prices.
122	F E Wells	In view of the profits generated in the building industry, am amazed that the cost of compulsory purchase is not already borne by developer.
123	Mr K Walcer	Yes for empty houses and waste ground, unused Industrial Estates, developers should design houses better, not for a cheap quick buck planning obligations should include solar and wind.
125	Mr D Brown & Mrs J Kirk	Developers should contribute to local transport plans eg subsidise loss making bus routes to outlying communities. Landscaping around new build areas should benefit the residents and not be a case of just throwing down a few trees and bushes.
126	Mr J Jefferies	It is obvious that the developer should make a substantial financial contribution importantly when there is a costly planning enquiry, during the initial stages. Substantial contributions towards the provision of new infrastructure is essential. As to the amount I could not say.
127	Mr G Ware	Compulsory purchase should only be used as the very last resort when it is clear that the benefit of the majority is being disrupted by an individual. Unless local council or the government is going to pay for community-based projects on a large scale (pits might also fly) private developers will have to fund the vast majority of projects.

128	Mr H Snell	Only if necessary.
129	Mr A Clarke	From a land management perspective compulsory purchase may be a necessary tool whereas from a recipients standpoint it must be very heartbreaking. If such action should become necessary it should be dealt with sensitively and the developer should pay....to the hilt, full compensation.
130	Mrs S Martin	All developers should be made to develop infrastructure as part of planning permission they seem to make big enough profits.
131	Mel Bennett	Has to occur in certain circumstances for specific needs to the public at large eg new roads. If developers are making excessive gains, yes they should contribute (as major stores do), however be careful not to pass burden onto public via developer.
133	The Occupier	Compulsory purchase should be seen as a last resort due to the social implications - C.P. for profits sake should most definitely be avoided. Any financial contributions will be factored into contract values, developmers need to make profits, so they will need to be extensively vetted by independant auditors.
134	Ms Innes	(a) Yes in the main. (b) Keep a tight rein on applications. (c) Yes they should contribute more.
135	Mr C Blundell	Compulsory purchase is agreeable if in the general public interest - not commercial. With developers, the end gain is financial reward, positevely no consideration for those who live in the area.
136	Mrs G E Chase	Disagree with compulsory purchasing. The price offered is usually awful.
138	The Occupier	Yes. Developers should be made to contribute to cost of roads and linking those roads into the existing structure too often is seen within a year of building estate, charges are made to connecting roads which are not met by developers.
140	Mrs J Davies	Compulsory purchase is horrible but if it needs to be done then a good price should be paid for the dwelling as well as the land even though the dwelling is pulled down.
141	Mr & Mrs Sarchet	Compulsory purchasing is a difficult area to comment on - this principle we do not agree with, but on very rare occassions it may be necessary. We do believe large financial contributions should be made to the community, by the developers.
145	Mr A Lysons	You could cap the amount of profit developers make or make them build houses that non lottery winners, footballers, millionaire or criminals can actually afford.
146	A C Barton	Have a more consistent policy for development and house extensions. Why has a 5m high side extension passed next door, yet a less obtrusive change refused in Spring Gardens? Both extended to the boundary fence at the side.
147	Mr I Randall	Core strategy sounds about right. Developers MUST be prepared to fully compensate in compulsory purchase situations. It is every home owners right to expect nothing less.
148	L F Wallace	More strict controls on developers.
149	Cunningham	Yes
150	Ms N Saunders	Developers should finance all road networks.
151	Mr R Roles	For many years the old brickworks in Cherry Orchard Lane has been derelict. What an eyesore. What a waste. Acres of land that could have been put to good use. Instead of showing cars in the site being developed why not on the old brickworks. Why hasn't this site been put into use.
152	Mr S Crowther	Not in favour of compulsory purchase in general but I recognise that this may be the only option in a minority of situations. To be used only as a last resort.
153	Mrs S Bradshaw	Compulsory purchase and planning obligations should perhaps only be used to protect the area from continuing development. Developers should only be allowed to do any development within rigorous boundaries and only if the development is needed for local people, particularly the young people.
157	F I Curnow	Yes

158	Mr & Mrs White	Some compulsory purchase must become necessary. Builders have economised enormously on construction methods - but retained high prices. They should contribute to local amenities and improvements to roads etc...
159	Mr & Mrs J Collins	There should be no compulsory purchases, only in dire circumstances. Councillors should put themselves in their constituents place, (how would they like it?) Developers who wish to compulsory purchase should pay a substantial amount in compensation, over and above the price of the property/business they wish to compulsory purchase. This might make them think twice and come up with an alternative idea.
160	Ms S Barnes	No one should have the right to <u>take</u> land away from an owner - this is, and always will be stealing. The land should be purchased at the going rate.
161	Mr S J Bence	Compulsory purchase of neglected or empty properties is acceptable. The compulsory purchase of land undeveloped and owned by developers or individuals would seem to be too much Big Brother.
162	Mr & Mrs Livens	All financial contribution based on the profits for the developer is fair.
163	Mr S T Cardwell	It seems to me that developers only have to submit their applications until they have been granted even though they have been turned down on numerous occasions.
164	Mr I King	Major developers should help with the infrastructure.
165	Mr G Searles	I was told that Countryside properties (Rawreth Lane) offered to provide a bus stop. How unbelievably exciting! How on earth would Alan Cherry be able to afford it. It's a joke.
166	G W Fleming	Compulsory purchase should only be considered as a last resort
167	Mrs J Marshall	Pay full market value and compensation where applicable. Put yourself in their position before deciding.
168	Ms L Young	I do not like compulsory purchase and if it is unavoidable the main financial beneficiaries should be made to pay.
169	Mr & Mrs Garlick	Compulsory purchase is reasonable if land is required for the good of everyone so this would generally be for improved transport, road, rail or perhaps a hospital. We do not feel people should be evicted from their homes and property just because a developer/the council can make money by putting several houses in place of one.
170	Mr & Mrs Gibson	Developers must contribute to the local infrastructure by way of roads, rail investment (eg Wickford to Chelmsford) and must also build homes that are energy efficient and designed for life. They should also contribute to the development of community facilities such as libraries, schools and local NHS.
171	Ms K Meiklejohn	This is reasonable for derelict buildings - most are dangerous anyway and this brownfield is needed so we don't give up green belt. Unused agricultural land must be utilised for allotments or people's gardens in new developments are too small.
173	Mr & Mrs Cripps	CPO's are a measure of last resort. Full compensation should be made to those affected. It is wrong to burden developers with planning gains. This simply increases the price of property for the buyers and is negative towards affordable housing. Infrastructure improvements should come from government when forcing development on communities.
175	Mr H J Rowland	Before even considering compulsory purchase, let alone agreeing to it, I would wish to see the "problems" highlighted, with all the reasons why such action could be necessary. Financial contributions from developers merely leads to more out of town shopping Tesco/Sainsbury and further ? of the original community and shops etc.
176	Mr R Abbott	Compulsory purchase should always be at the market rate agreed by a third party. Any planning must be in character with local buildings, for frontage, height etc, with parking available for a minimum of 3 cars per house/dwelling - each car must be able to get on/off the plot without shuffling cars. Take more care over the shape of driveways.

177	Mr J East	Yes - very reasonable. A developer who is as much interested in his surroundings as his profits is to be admired. As shops in our district are there to serve the public, where there are absentee landlords, rent should be reasonable to encourage a greater diversity of shopkeepers. There are developments where gardens and lawns etc have been made but the ground has not been properly prepared - a very short sighted approach.
178	Mr D Livermore	Developers should only be given planning permission to develop brownfield sites and only then with a good deal of thought.
179	Mrs F M Wilson	Developers should definitely contribute more to the surrounding areas of their developments.
180	Mr R Swain	Land is a scarce resource, it is important it is protected. Too much is being used for car parking, and commerce. Companies which use land should have the obligation to use it responsibly and use as little as possible as efficiently as possible for their needs. Residents are also obligated - too many are paving over their front gardens for car parking - if this is a course of flooding then they should be obligated to provide soakaways with these
181	Mrs M R Hutchings	There again, I've no idea about compulsory purchases, never having to deal with anything like that.
182	Mrs V Wisbey	The planning obligation are over the top. Developers use cheap materials which in turn leaves developments looking scruffy within 5 years. A tighter review on materials are necessary.
183	Tomassi	Completely unreasonable. Compulsory purchase should never be used.
185	Mr J K Mills	Regretably yes, but needs to take account of local issues and facilities currently available. Developers should be required to make a financial contribution.
186	Mr & Mrs J Halliday	Compulsory purchase should be market value and 10% for disruption.
187	Mrs K Jesty	Compulsory purchase should only be implemented when there really is no other option and not if it destroys a wildlife environment or domestic area. Planning obligations are essential but must be for the good of the area and not the property developers. Property developers should make financial contributions to ensure the character of the area is maintained and benefits the people of Rochford.
188	Mr A Mackay	I'm a householder in this district, not a landowner but I feel strongly that no-one not you the government or anyone else should have the power (and that is what this strategy is all about) to compulsory purchase. What else could you do? How about acting with humility instead of oppression?
189	Mr G Gooding	A greater ban on economic profit from development should be made.
190	Mr G J Tinsey	Yes, this is a reasonable approach. On financial contributions from developers, there should be more monies from the promoter for public transport.
191	Janice & Alex Brining	Yes, for widening existing roads/pavements/bike tracks for safety of everyone. Developers should enhance the developed area and not make unnecessary obstruction/noise on local neighbours.
192	Ms B Mean	Compulsory purchase depends on the overall importance of the desired outcome and should only be considered when all other possibilities have been dismissed. There is however, an obligation by the council to provide housing.
193	Ms S Swift	Planning permission should be very strict and if a property is derelict they should be bought by the council ie the exgarage site on the corner of Eastwood Road and Queens Road. These sites really bring the area down and absent landowners should be held to account.
194	Mr C Hutchinson	I do not approve of compulsory purchases. There must be an alternative - this is only in my opinion a chance for developers to make more profits and could be open for corrupt practice!?
195	Mr B M Gilbert	No to compulsory purchases! Yes to planning obligations and yes to high financial obligations that developers are asked to make. After all they are only in it for the money they make, forget the idea that they are there to help the people of Rochford et al.

196	Mr A E Hodges	The voluntary approach for purchase or sale of development land should be tried first.
197	P McAllister	Compulsory purchase in my opinion of past experience brings the area down and it never regains its original charm. People are made to move out and they never come back to the area.
198	Mr J Clamp	Private development of the area should be more transparent. Any such development should be encouraged to show that their development is putting something into the area that will improve it not just line the pockets of the developer.
199	Mr & Mrs Crockford	Don't agree with compulsory purchase, planning on developers should be controlled too many houses knocked down and apartments put on the same piece of land.
200	Mr T O'Shea	If compulsory purchase means that the developer will make excessive profit the owners should be paid well above the market price. If it is because of a new road etc. they must be paid the market price plus an amount to cover all relocation costs and upheaval.
201	Mr M Thomas	Compulsory purchase is not a fair means of acquiring land/property. If a fair market value price was provided in exchange this would provide 90% of the solution.
202	K Cardnell	Yes
203	M T Conaty	No. Developers to ensure all the existing infrastructure is adequate for what they are going to develop in an area.
204	Mr R Gould	None
205	Mrs Whitham	No I do not agree at compulsory purchase. Why should people be deprived of their homes because someone says so
206	Mrs G Harper	If local authorities were allowed to use housing funds as a revolving fund, compulsory purchases if property held dominant might be applicable, but as things are I would say 'no' to it.
207	Ms G Yeadell	"set framework to ensure residential enhancements can be brought forward using compulsory purchase power" has a sinister ring. In the past this was solely for public schemes: road, airports etc, not private development. However, the Planning Policy office was unable to assure that such acquisition of owner occupied homes for house redevelopment wouldn't occur in future.
208	I Gyres	If people want to make profit out of developing then they should be forced to pay towards the infrastructure they are overloading.
210	Mrs M A King	No to compulsory purchase - developers could be more sympathetic to surrounding neighbours and the landscaping thereafter.
211	Mr B W Williams	Developers are in it to make money and therefore must contribute to enable others to benefit. Such as referred in my answer 7. There should be more effort by developers and local authorities for both the younger and more mature generations such as say an ice or roller skating facilities for the young with say locations for dancing by the middle and mature public which could include bars and other leisure facilities.
213	Mr M Wheeler	Compulsory purchase should only be used when establishing a public amenity such as a road. Developers should be asked to contribute to public amenities where it is obvious that the new house holder would be using that amenity.
215	Mr T R Thompson	No I do not believe in compulsory purchase, if developers develop they should finance all of the schooling, hospitals, new roads etc. Tesco at Southend re routed the whole 127 and what was gained other than local shops closing?
220	Mrs S Clarke	I suggest that buildings should be in keeping with affordable property.
221	Mr G Hoy	Can our roads, schools and emergency services withstand more major development?
222	R Luck	I have never agreed with compulsory purchase and I strongly disagree with developers offering financial contributions to schemes. This always sounds like a type of blackmail.
223	C Morris	Let developers make their money elsewhere.

224	Mr K S Gee	Yes, but only after negotiation has reached deadlock! Financial contributions are most important and should be required from all developers where the development is five dwellings or more or land commercial development.
225	Mr P Court	The Council needs to accept the fact that landowners are not prepared to accept development of their land at any price. They are subject to income and capital gains tax, and the cost of planning gain/section 106 packages are additional to this. There thus comes a point at which some landowners will withdraw their land from the market if they find the overall tax burden unacceptable. Planning obligations thus need to be in accordance with Circular 05/2005, and freely and fairly negotiated with landowners rather than imposed on the basis of the Council's own objectives.
226	Mrs A Hill	I think the community/sports centre on the new housing estate in Rawreth Lane is an absolute eyesore! The builders should have been made to build it to match the area - not the cheapest possible. When you view it from a higher point in Rayleigh it is awful!
228	Ms A Henderson	Compulsory purchase of homes must be heart breaking to residents and they should be paid above market values as recompense and helped if they are elderly. It is expected that developers make a good profit, but they should improve the area also.
230	V G Crick	Against compulsory purchase if for private development or council housing. Restrict development.
231	Mr & Mrs Walker	Developers should most definitely be obliged to contribute some of their profit into developing the infrastructure, such as building park areas etc.
233	Mr G Congram	Only of industrial or derelict sites. There should be no compulsory purchases for road development.
234	Mr J T Dorrell	More notice should be taken of Parish Councils views on planning permission. After all they represent the interested parties.
235	L W Lewis	Compulsory purchase should be used for housing, industrial sites, bridleways and footpaths where necessary. Financial contributions should be a main part in larger developments and part of the planning procedure which should be made public.
236	Mr & Mrs Beattie	The words 'compulsory purchase' are scary. Get developers to do things mentioned in question no. 6. Plus building requirements regarding insulation and security.
237	Mr Sanders	Any developer should have to provide all the required infrastructure before planning permission is granted.
239	Ms S Martin	Compulsory purchase is not an option. 50% of developers profits should be handed to the councils for the land released. No developer should be allowed to have planning permission in return for 'favours' ie small road improvements.
240	Mr & Mrs Beattie	Sounds reasonable. Need to get the amount right so that we don't deter smaller local builders. How about tiered? Allow smaller firms to pay less.
242	Mr D Batchelor	No, you do what you think is right.
243	Adrean Lansdowne	It is absolutely necessary to ensure that developers are involved with and make financial contributions towards infrastructure improvements. In particular any development that will draw additional traffic and/or consumption of resources. Any/all new supermarkets and retail parks should be discouraged as what exists is more than adequate and local high street trader is increasingly vulnerable.
244	Mr P Raiswell	Sport England believes that developers should contribute towards the provision of community indoor and outdoor sports facilities if they are not to be provided on site. We have developed the 'sports facility calculator' to help local authorities assess the demand for, and cost of providing new built sports facilities. For larger developments on-site indoor/outdoor sports facilities should be provided, with financial contributions to cover on going management and maintenance.
245	M J Burpitt	If a CPO is used for the common good and benefit of the community so be it. I think the current guide lines for developers contributions to the local area are adequate, although a little more imagination could be used.



246	Miss M Saward	No this is not fair unless you are willing to pay top money for them. Keep planning strict.
247	Mr & Mrs Addison	Planning obligations are a good idea provided they are followed through. Where we used to live, on one new development a park was promised but it never became a reality and is now a housing area. On another site a community centre was promised and 10 years later nothing has been built.
250	Ms M Power	Circular 05/2005 provides clear and consistent advice that has been upheld by the Courts in seeking to provide realistic requirements and S106 obligations associated with proposed developments. The Council should therefore not seek to introduce S106 obligations which move away from these established principles.
251	Mr B Guyett - Chairman	Compulsory purchase should be available but only as a last resort and for demonstrable community benefit. We have great concerns regarding Planning Obligations which RDC have failed to pursue in the past (eg Etheldore Avenue). Stronger measures to ensure developers contribute appropriately and follow agreed working practices should be introduced and enforced.
254	Ms V Stanesby	I don't believe in compulsory purchase.
257	Mr T Dodkins	The use of cpo powers, whilst usually the last resort, could be used positively as a tool to unlock sites for development that may otherwise be held to ransom by those who may not have the best interests of the District at heart, particularly where it can ensure that the maximum amount of development profit can be plowed into community benefits, and not private pockets.
259	Mr M B Rogers	In the past houses and land were bought at knock down prices by Councils for development. Sometimes nothing was done with it and it was later sold to developers at a huge profit. Developers should pay a penalty.
260	Mr & Mrs Willey	It is unfair to compulsory purchase as the right value of the property is never given. As I recall developers should make a contribution as they must be making vast profits prices ranging from £200 thousand to £240 thousand for what I would terms as shells as the rest is all stud walls of framewor and plasterboard. Give me a pre-war house of which I live in any day. May as well build pre-fabs a lot cheaper and quicker to erect deep foundations just as strong.
261	S A Skinner	Small developments should make a contribution to infrastructure provision, not just large development, otherwise in-fill sites will contribute nothing while still putting a burden on local facilities. Even tiny amounts of planning gain from small developments could add up to a significant benefit overall if a way could be found to make it work. Perhaps there should be an infrastructure levy on all development.
263	Mr P Kneen	Swan Hill accpets that developments can have a potential impact upon existing infrastructure and as such developments should contribute towards improvements to, or contribution towards new infrastructure, commensurate with the level of development. Any form of planning contribution resultant from a planning application should be based on a site-by-site basis, and allow for a degree of flexibility so that contributions sought are achieved through negotiations between the developer and the District Council. All contributions should be based on an up-to-date assessment of existing services and facilities, in order to ensure developments do not result in a surplus or defciency of provision or contribution.
267	Mr D Pointer	Some compulsory purchase is reasonable but only as a last resort. I disagree with 'planning gain' as it tends to allow developers to ignore controls.
268	Mr S Crussell	Developers should make provision for a proper infrastructure within their development, and something towards the wider area (shops, parking etc).
271	Mr & Mrs Jobson	Would suggest that Woodlands such as the scrubs at Gusted Hall and Primrose Wood be considered for inclusion in the Cherry Orchard Country Park Area. These have already been used for public enjoyment and this would retain them for future generations.

274	Mr S Mckinnon	CPO should be a last resort. Alternative locations should be investigated. Where financial contributions from developers are made via S106 these should be used to 'directly' improve immediate areas close to the development.
276	Mr M Barrell	Planning Obligations These should including the facilitation of environmental enhancements and habitat maintenance. SuDS also require ongoing maintenance, so sums should be sought to contribute to this.
277	Ms S A Elkington	Full market price should be offered and compensation.
278	Mr P Marshall	I think it is reasonable to ask developers to contribute to local social activities. Many to help the local youth like the ski slope.
279	S J Heeney	Not qualified to answer, and lack of information.
280	Mrs M A Tyrell	Compulsory purchase is a last resort. No view.
285	Mrs B E Dale	Developers should be expected to make financial contributions to infrastructure but the Council must be aware that developers are in business to make a profit - set the costs too high and they will go elsewhere. If a site is left un-occupied for a very long time then certainly a compulsory purchase should be made and affordable housing built asap.
286	Mr L F Knight	Yes, developers should pay for parking for every dwelling (off the road) and infrastructure extra costs.
287	Mr R Forster	Derelict areas should only be considered.
288	Mr & Mrs C Cummins	Compulsory purchase is reasonable if it benefits the community as a whole, but should not be an opportunity for developers to make huge profits.
289	Mrs J Warner	Developers, large and small must make green spaces part of their plans. Replace any trees lost and ensure adequate infrastructure. Compulsory purchase should be a last resort, but useful for buildings left to deteriorate.
292	Mr & Mrs Goring	Developers should be asked to contribute financially if they are to benefit from any schemes.
293	Wai-Kit Cheung	Planning contributions Fairview require that the use of planning contributions for purposes set out in the document (page 39) should conform to the guidance issued in ODPM Circular 05/2005. The need for such provision should be applied on a site-by-site basis and planning obligations should adhere to the tests that they should be: i) relevant to planning; ii) necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms; iii) directly related to the proposed development; iv) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and v) reasonable in all other respects. Fairview request that the document recognises the impact that planning obligations can have on the viability of development. As such, the following text should be included in Section Four of the document: <b>"The Council will have regard to the impact of planning contributions on the viability of development and will ensure that they are necessary to allow consent to be given for a particular development and that they are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and reasonable in all other respects"</b> .
298	Mr & Mrs Hewitt	Developers are there to make money. For them to make contributions is an illusion. Then they put up their prices to compensate.
299	Mr & Mrs Tuson	We do not agree with compulsory purchase; the amount paid is never the going rates and it is seen as getting land/buildings on the cheap. Better planning is needed within policy that is not detrimental to the town. We need the council to fight our corner and not allow us to be driven down paths that will cause us problems and damage our environment both now and in the future. Views sought from residents are important; we put the government in and we can also take it away.
300	Mrs Upson	Planning on curb issues plus damage to adjoining property should be considered before builders are given permission to continue.
302	Mr B Short	Compulsory etc yes. Do not know about developers contributions.
303	Mr K Hatfield	Developers should be made to pay more in contributing to infrastructure of the area.

306	Mr E C Cook	See comments under 9
307	Mr J Snow	Planning needs to be on a more local parish level. The latest debacle involving 'Pond Chase Nursery' site being a good point. No resident (local) wished for this to be approved and had no say in the matter if this was a local decision then it would not have been approved.
309	Mr J Smith	I am not in favour of compulsory purchase. Unable to comment on developer's contributions as I am not versed on subject.
310	Chris Teeder	I disagree with any form of compulsory purchase. I would like to see a bigger financial input from developers towards any infrastructure changes that have to be made as a result of their developments. Also they should be made to pay fines on breaches of any regulations which they have not adhered to. It seems to me that most developers are out to make vast sums of easy money at the expense of local residents. This must be stopped as it is getting out of hand and destroying the area.
311	Mrs P A Watson Jones	If a property is compulsory purchased then 1. A fair price be paid. 2. Land gets used, and is not abandoned as I have seen to happen in past.
314	Mrs C Quennell	I do not support compulsory purchase, Council could look into there planning applications to see if these are reasonable and not a decision made by a smaller planning board.
315	R A Stone	The financial contributions from developers should be higher. The requirement to provide education, leisure and/or health facilities should be made more extensive. The local authority needs to ensure that health and education providers come to use the facilities. Developers need to contribute significantly more.
316	Ms S Copeman	Developers should be providers of walking access to schools and shops
317	Mr D Harris	I think it is fair to ask developers to contribute to infrastructure improvements.
318	Ms W Hatton	Compulsory purchase (look at Victoria Avenue Southend now). 35 years on it's a mess. Think hard, think ahead.
319	Mr M Lang	Only if above value price is given for the use of that land. Developers should give more to the community.
321	R J Feather	Compulsory purchase for what? From my view of Rochford District Councils planning officers they support big business rather than residents without knowing what compulsory purchased land or imposed planning obligation will impact the question is impossible to answer - but look after residents first.
323	Mr T Beebee	No compulsory purchase
324	Mrs Doward	I think developers should be more responsible and certainly be made to contribute towards road improvements. I also agree with the idea that they should pay towards the policing of new developments. I don't see why other council tax payers should be expected to pay for what they are creating!
325	Mr D Elwell	It is all very well developers contributing to infrastructure in the immediate area of development but roads and other feeding areas of development will not be sustainable in this forced development is allowed.
326	Owner/Occupier	Not in favour of compulsory purchase. Development should not be allowed if infrastructure cannot support this - not in favour of financial contributions from developers as this tends to mean that more development takes place.
327	Mrs C Taylor	If a new road has to be constructed, thus land is compulsory purchased - It should be bought for the current valuable rate, not an excuse to under cut and not give the land owners the correct price - maybe the developers or Government should refund the landowners - they shouldn't be out of pocket because the council boroughs decide to use their land for a road. The developers should also provide hedges and trees thus encouraging wildlife/birds back into the area and pleasing to the eye.
329	Mrs M J Snowdon	I think it only fair that developers should make financial contributions towards infrastructure. I understand that Tesco's contributed to the new road layout from the A127. What a pity no one in Rayleigh can get there by bus now!

330	P Mansbridge	This has to be considered by the fact that sometimes a few people suffer for the benefit of more people but overall each case has to be taken on merit. Developers should be asked where possible to contribute to road improvements, landscaping etc.
331	Mr A C Cooper	I understand the financial constraints which drive planning but fully agree developers should contribute to infrastructure improvements.
332	Mr & Mrs Jones	Developers should be made totally responsible for contributions toward infrastructure that their development 'for which they make a handsome profit' necessitates if their development puts strain on present services let them correct the problem. Compulsory purchase should be an absolute final resort.
333	Mr & Mrs Hopkins	Yes all developers should contribute considerably towards infrastructure improvements - particularly with regard to roads and access. The approaches to and from the western parts of our area are already highly congested and can not take anymore traffic on the current road system.
334	Mrs Amey	I do not like the idea of compulsory purchasing. Financial contributions towards infrastructure improvements sounds okay but I don't know enough about it to comment any further.
347	Mr C Rooke	I have misgivings about too much use of compulsory purchasing. Yes, developer should be made to improve the infrastructure in return for permission to build.
349	Ms C Paine	Developers should pay for all of the associated infrastructure. Existing residents should never have to pay via council tax.
350	Mr A James	This should only be used as a final solution. Developers make a lot of money and should definitely pay for any related local issues.
352	Cllr Joyce Smith	Would agree that this is necessary to ensure infrastructure is put in place before developments start.
354	Mrs Smith	Seeing as developers make massive financial rewards, yes they should also put massive input to improving the area they build in. Compulsory purchase should be more flexible on the side of the property owners not wishing to be compulsory purchased.
356	Mr & Mrs D Dobbin	The approach suggested is not only reasonable, it is essential. The infrastructure must be in place so that prospective or new residents and businesses do not have to use environmental resources in making avoidable journeys. Developers too often appear to have avoided obligations in including these concerns in their developments; they should expect to provide suitable contributions towards setting up the facilities their incoming residents are likely to need. Although they should be obliged to make this financial contribution or commitment, care needs to be taken lest the additional expense is passed on to purchasers/lessees of premises to make housing (for example) less affordable.
357	Ms V O'Malley	Developers must be made to pay for road improvements, desalination plants for water (we are an island surrounded by water). Solar panels (if we are getting a warmer climate) would be a source of energy.
358	Mr & Mrs England	Developers waste a lot of money and should contribute a percentage of profit towards infrastructure.
359	Mr New	Infrastructure should be an essential part of any development, not after.
360	Mr A J Eisenhower	The former should only be used where there is a clear and overwhelming need for redevelopment of an area. Developers must not be allowed to hold existing owners or occupiers to ransom by claiming that their needs to make profit from a development of any descriptions avoid the needs of the existing community. Also developers must not be allowed to 'bribe' council planning decisions by offering so-called infrastructure improvements that otherwise wouldn't take place - particularly with the airport expansion expected. This includes the spectre of the unwanted outer Southend relief road that rears its ugly head from time to time.

362	Ms M Power	Circular 1/97 provides clear and consistent advice that has been upheld by the Courts in seeking to provide realistic requirements and S106 obligations associated with proposed developments. The Council should therefore not seek to introduce S106 obligations which move away from these established principles.
366	Mr S J Springham	Lobby the Government to provide satisfactory infrastructure improvements. Give a better return to the area which at present is only providing money to investment projects elsewhere.
369	Mr & Mrs Gauden	In view of previous comments there should not be a need for compulsory purchasing.
370	Mr G Biner	Why should a family be forced to sell it's heritage and land that generations have worked so hard to protect and use so that the Council can keep the Government and it's controversial policies happy and so that developers can make huge profits. Even if the landowners are prepared to sell out their forefathers for the ludicrous sums of money on offer, what about the residents who don't want to sell or do not have the option. Developers should be responsible for the financial outlay incurred as a result of these developments, ie the costs of expansion of school facilities, libraries, doctors, dentists, hospitals etc, all of which will be impacted on.



**PREPARED BY THE ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING POLICY TEAM**

**☎ 01702 318002**  
**E-mail [planning.policy@rochford.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@rochford.gov.uk)**  
**Website <http://www.rochford.gov.uk>**

**Rochford District Council, Council Offices,  
South Street, Rochford, Essex SS4 1BW**