



Rochford District Council

CORE STRATEGY

KING EDMUND SCHOOL STUDENT
WORKSHOP – COMMENTS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

March 2007



Introduction

Council Officers visited King Edmund School, Rochford, on Friday 17th November 2006 to encourage young people to have their say on the development of the district. After a brief presentation outlining the purpose of the exercises, students were split into groups focusing on different issues affecting the future development of the district. An officer worked with each group to discuss the various options and encourage the students to put forward their own ideas.

Each of the groups completed a sheet showing their opinions and individual students were also encouraged to complete individual worksheets putting forward their personal views on the issue. Maps were available for the students to use, with many using stickers to show areas of interest.

Researchers have found that young people are often significantly underrepresented in participating in the decision-making process. Young people are a diverse social group and the views obtained here are not necessarily representative of *all* young people. It is important that Rochford District Council recognises the opinions of young people in the district in order to ensure that future development meets the needs of the whole community.

The views of each group as a whole, together with the views of individual participants and the proposed direction the district should take as indicated on maps, are stated in the following pages.

HOUSING

Group's views

- Housing should be developed near to railway stations.
- New roads to link new housing to existing ones
- Not in floodplain
- Still use Southend for jobs and shopping
- Demolish Rochford Square. It's really bad – traffic and space
- Improve Doggetts Area
- Make Canewdon bigger
- Put houses around Wakering

Comments by individual students

- An extra road by Warners Bridge
- Houses should be built between Rochford, Rayleigh and Hockley. There are a lot of nature reserves here but there is quite a lot of free land.
- Widen roads
- Houses should be constructed on land that isn't being used for housing and sheltering animals or growing crops
- Settlements such as Saxon King Settlement should not be dug up. The road may get busy but there is major history under that earth.
- In Great Wakering over by Cupids there is a road called Poynters Lane and either side of the road are fields and in these fields nothing ever grows so we could build houses and flats with small gardens on them.
- Between Hockley and Rayleigh there is unused land so you could build houses and flats with big gardens over there.
- New homes should go behind Alexandra Road [Great Wakering] because it is a big field.

Views submitted via maps

- 100 homes to the west of Rawreth Lane with a new road to the north that links Rawreth Lane with an additional 100 dwellings
- 100 homes to the east of Hullbridge Road, halfway between Hullbridge and Rayleigh.
- 200 homes to the south-west of Rayleigh, south of the railway line.
- 100 new homes to the north of Hockley Road, Rayleigh, on the edge of existing residential area
- 100 new homes in Hawkwell, to the south of Mount Bovers Lane
- 500 new homes west of Rochford, north of Hall Road.
- 500 new homes on land between Rochford Garden Way and Oxford Road, with a new road to the east linking to a further 100 new homes
- 500 homes to the south of Rochford, adjacent to the boundary with Southend Borough.
- 100 new homes around Little Stambridge Hall
- 300 new homes to the north of Brays Lane, away from the existing residentially allocated land in Rochford
- 300 new homes to the south of Canewdon in 3 groups of 100 homes, linked to each other and Canewdon by new roads
- 100 new homes around Stambridge sewage works
- 100 new home near Shopland Hall Farm
- 500 new homes to the north-east of Barrow Hall Farm, with a further two groups of 100 new homes connected to these 500 by new roads to the south
- 100 new homes to the south of Star Lane industrial estate

Officer comments / recommendations

The development of new housing near train stations may encourage people to utilise the train and reduce reliance on the private car – this can help avoid increased congestion and pollution in the district. The Core Strategy should promote residential development that is in proximity to the train stations of the district, and / or other public transport links.

Whilst it is important that the requisite infrastructure is provided for new development, with regards to the comment on constructing new roads, it would be more sustainable to direct develop to locations that do not require the construction of new roads.

The group felt that new development should not be undertaken on the floodplain. Recent government guidance promotes a sequential test, whereby sites that are not in the floodplain are considered before sites that are at risk of flooding. Given this, the Core Strategy should direct development away from areas at risk of flooding.

The district has a relationship with surrounding districts: a large proportion of the district's residents commute outside of the district to work, as well as to utilise services and facilities. It is important that Rochford's Core Strategy reflects the links with adjacent areas, and acknowledges that the district does not sit in a vacuum.

The group felt that both Canewdon and Great Wakering could be subject to further residential development. One option that the Council has proposed is to allocate 10% of its housing allocation to the smaller settlements of the district, which include Canewdon, Great Wakering and Hullbridge.

Other comments received at different participation events have raised concerns about the ability of Great Wakering and Canewdon to accommodate additional dwellings. Particular concerns were raised with regards to Canewdon and the possible impact additional dwellings would have on the character of the settlement, with participants noting the lack of public transport links.

If Canewdon were to be allocated a significant number of dwellings it may become the case that the settlement reaches a sufficient size to make viable to providers the provision of additional public transport, facilities and services. This would, however, have the potential to significantly alter the character of the settlement.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Group's views

- Affordable housing needed for young and old, and those just starting jobs
- Separate housing for young and old, but still quite near. Close to jobs and facilities
- All sizes / types needed: big houses, flats, bungalows
- Developers should pay for affordable housing
- Should be mixed in with other housing so people don't feel left out
- Gypsies and Travellers:
 - Own site would need to be near shops / facilities or away from other areas but with other areas but with shops on site.
 - Problems with people not wanting to live near sites

Comments by individual students

- Have a piece of land just for Gypsies and Travellers with shops and toilets on site plus a garage. Signs to direct Gypsies to supermarkets and shops
- Have small and big houses for a range of people i.e. old people, big families and small families
- The developers should pay for it [affordable housing]
- Affordable housing for young and old people
- More bungalows
- Recycling bins in schools
- Affordable houses for people who have just started jobs
- Affordable housing for poor people and old people
- More bungalows
- Could use for people who have children and want to live near a school, shops, parks
- We should have three bits of land that we could use for people who have children and want to live near a school, shops, parks and so on. But we need to think about old people because they would like to live near a quiet area but near shops
- Affordable housing for young and old but young away from old and Gypsies near shops but not near young and old. If Gypsies have land it will cost less for the Council and young people now have start jobs
- Land for Gypsies but away from village but near a few shops
- Affordable houses for younger people
- Small and big houses for small and big families

Views submitted via maps

- Possible Gypsy / Traveller sites:
 - Land to the north of Great Wakering, together with shops and affordable housing for young
 - Land to the north of Brays Lane, together with shops
 - Land to the north of Brays Lane, together with shops
 - Land to the north of Canewdon, together with shops
 - Land to the south-east of Baltic Wharf, together with shops
 - Land to the east of Hockley Woods, with shops to the south east serving the site
 - Land north of Hockley, to the west of Greensward Lane and south of Lower Road
 - Land to the west of Rayleigh, south of Rawreth Lane, together with shops to serve the site
 - Land to the west of Barling Road, adjacent to the border with Southend Borough, together with shops, doctors and affordable housing for young people
 - Land to the west of East End Paglesham, with site served by shops and doctors
- Possible affordable housing for elderly locations:
 - West Hockley
 - East of Ashingdon Road, Ashingdon
 - Canewdon
 - To the west of Purdeys Way Industrial Estate
 - To the south of Rochford
 - Little Wakering
 - Land to the west of East End Paglesham
- Possible affordable housing for young locations:
 - To the north of Great Wakering
 - To the north of East End Paglesham
 - To the north of Rochford Garden Way
 - To the west of Barling Road, adjacent to the border with Southend Borough
 - Existing residential area of Ashingdon
 - Existing residential area of Hockley, along Main Road
 - Existing residential area of Hullbridge, along Lower Road and centrally, off Ferry Road
 - Existing residential area of Rayleigh, on sites in the north, south, east, west and centre of the settlement

Officer comments / recommendations

The groups, as a whole, were in favour of providing affordable housing in a variety of forms to meet the needs of a variety of people.

They were in favour of having segregated housing for old and young people, feeling that these two groups would need different types of housing and different facilities. It is however, important that the Local Planning Authority don not take an overly simplified view of people's needs based on the age, whilst acknowledging that there may still be a need to provide specific forms of accommodation, such as sheltered housing.

The location of affordable housing was considered important. Members of the group felt that it was important to locate affordable housing near facilities such as shops and schools. The Local Planning Authority should direct residential development to locations from which local services are accessible.

The groups were in favour of a specific site allocated to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers, although concerns were expressed as to whether people living near the sites would accept them. The Local Planning Authority is currently looking at the need to provide Gypsy / Traveller sites with other authorities in Essex in order to establish a strategic, countywide approach. The Essex Planning Officers Association commissioned an independent survey and assessment of the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Essex (including Southend-on-Sea and Thurrock). The report, entitled *Looking Back, Moving Forward. Assessing the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers in Essex*, drew a number of conclusions including that there was an under-provision of authorised sites in Essex that should be addressed immediately. Although this is an issue for the region as a whole and one that Rochford District Council should address through the Local Development Framework, the shortfall of authorised sites for Rochford District is not as severe as in other areas of Essex. For example, Basildon, Chelmsford and Epping Forest contain 172, 60, and 51 unauthorised caravans, respectively.

The most recent government guidance of Gypsy / Traveller sites states that they are not normally appropriate in the Green Belt. This is a particular issue for Rochford District as most of the undeveloped land in the district is Green Belt.

A number of the possible locations for Gypsy / Traveller sites are in isolated locations away from shops and services. Although the group suggested that additional shops / services could be developed nearby it is unlikely that there would be sufficient demand to warrant their development. The locations suggested nearer existing settlements are more plausible and, in the event that a countywide assessment found a need for sites in Rochford District, would be preferable to the isolated locations put forward.

Effective consultation with groups representing Gypsies / Travellers would be required to be undertaken by the Local Planning Authority in order to establish appropriate locations. The comments by the affordable housing group with regard to the possible issue of existing local residents opposing the sites is noted and the Local Planning Authority should also undertake public participation with existing communities before allocating sites.

A number of location for residential development were suggested that were spread across the district, but mainly clustered on the edge of, or near to, existing settlements.

A number of satellite developments were suggested by the group. These would, however, not be well served by facilities and services and residents of these would be likely to rely on using the private car – with the ensuing congestion and environmental problems that this would entail. Such development would require the greatest investment in new roads and infrastructure and would also take up the most existing green space. The Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal that was carried out on behalf of the Local Planning Authority found that developing new towns away from existing settlements would be harmful to the environment and would be unsustainable.

Some of the suggested locations are potentially less problematic, being adjacent to established settlements, could link with established communities and infrastructure (as opposed to having to create their own), would not lead to neighbouring towns merging, and represent a limited encroachment into the green belt.

JOBS

Group's views

- Need a new industrial estate and town centre
- Increase size of Canewdon
- More jobs through local shops supplying daily needs
- New roads with easy access to employment areas
- Be careful of wildlife sites when providing new employment areas
- More facilities like doctors, hospital and vets to provide more jobs
- Dormitory settlements are not good as they increase traffic
- Only 2 out of 7 think they will work in the district in the future (as teachers)
- A big facility, e.g. theatre, hospital or university, will provide lots of jobs

Comments by individual students

- Don't move wildlife keep them there
- Make another school in Canewdon because there's only one school there
- Make a new town centre but make it small not big because it would take up more land if we build a big town centre
- Build new shops but make them thin but tall because if they are wide there will be less country land
- I think no.2 [referring to annotation on map that denotes land to the east of Ashingdon, north of Brays Lane] is the best place for an industrial estate
- Put a dentist in Rochford
- Make Canewdon a little bit bigger
- Make a zoo near because we have to go all the way to Colchester and that's around an hour drive
- I will go and work abroad and travel around doing any job I can find
- Build a university near Rochford, Southend, Rayleigh, Canewdon or in Great Wakering
- Build another school in Great Wakering
- Cars not near wildlife
- New roads with easy access
- Pet shops
- Not build near flooding areas
- More local facilities like doctors, dentists, vets and hospitals
- Bigger town centre
- More shops

Views submitted via maps

- Enlarge Canewdon to south and south-east and create a town centre area
- Possible industrial areas:
 - Existing Green Belt land to south-east of Canewdon
 - Land to the north of Brays Lane between Canewdon and Rochford
 - Land between Oxford Road and Rochford Garden Way
- Senior school needed in Great Wakering. Possible location to south of Star Lane industrial estate

Officer comments / recommendations

The majority of the students in the group did not feel that they would work in the district when older – if indicative of young people in general this would continue the current trend in the district which sees 68% of the working population commuting to work outside Rochford district.

The group were for the enlargement of Canewdon, appearing to support the option of expanding one of the smaller settlements in the district. There are, however,

concerns with the impact enlarger Canewdon would have on the character of the village, and whether the infrastructure is in place to accommodate significant growth.

The group noted that providing additional facilities and services such as doctors, dentists and shops would help create more jobs. Such additional services and facilities are likely to be required and made viable when additional housing allocated for the district is developed.

One suggestion was to have one large facility that would provide a substantial number of jobs. Whilst this is one possible solution, the danger with this approach is that the district may become over reliant on this one facility, which would lead to significant employment problems if this one facility every closed or relocated.

In terms of creating a new town centre, this could be interpreted in two different ways. In terms of redeveloping an existing town centre, this would require the Local Planning Authority to compulsory purchase the town centre and then to redevelop it. If a new town centre in a completing new location were to be developed, this would require the development of a new town, with a new community to support such a town centre. Whilst the creation of a new town centre is one possible option for the enabling the district to accommodate the number of new homes it is required to by 2021, the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal that was carried out on behalf of the Local Planning Authority found this option would be harmful to the environment and would be unsustainable.

The group were keen to see that new employment development would not adversely impact upon wildlife in the area. The Local Planning Authority should ensure that development does not harm the biodiversity of the area.

One suggestion was that new shops should be built that were tall and thin, so that they took up less land. It is important that the Local Planning Authority ensure that land is used efficiently. This normally involves specifying minimum densities for development (for example, at least 30 dwellings per hectare on a residential site), which will impact upon design. Rochford District Council is currently working with other authorities in Essex to produce a design guide with the aim of ensuring that development is well designed and enhances the character of places, but also makes efficient use of land available.

Flood risk areas are not an appropriate location for employment development, as the comment from the group notes.

The Local Planning Authority do not decide when a new school is needed themselves, but work in collaboration with Essex County Council to ensure that, if a new school is needed, a suitable location can be found.

The Local Planning Authority has policies in place to ensure that a certain percentage of town centre areas remain as shops (although it cannot control exactly what type of shop) and that existing shops outside of town centre areas are protected. The additional dwellings that have been located to the district may give rise to a demand for more shops in the district. This should be monitored and reviewed by the Local Planning Authority.

The group were opposed to the concept of dormitory settlements. To discourage the towns and villages of the district from becoming dormitory settlements, it will be

necessary to ensure that jobs are available near to where people live. New residential sites could be located near to existing employments areas, or vice versa, to ensure that this is the case.

PROTECTION

Group's views
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The most important areas to protect are community uses, wildlife sites & woods, parks, coast – Wallasea, some farms, and rivers.• Wallasea Island visitor centre was something the group would like• There is lots of green space and it could be used better• Hockley Woods and fishing lakes are important for wildlife• Small scale access to the countryside, bird watching and create better access to Hockley Woods
Comments by individual students
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Schools should be protected
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fishing lakes should be protected
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The wildlife and parks are some of the most important places to protect.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The countryside and villages. They shouldn't build houses around schools and woods such as Hockley.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Green areas are important but there is a lot of it so you could build a few houses there.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wildlife is important for all areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Countryside should be accessible to people and maybe they could build some paths for people
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parts of the countryside should be open to the public but not all of it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The areas of wildlife are important, but there is loads of it. Woodlands, lakes should be kept. But some areas of wildlife could be used for houses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parts of the countryside should be open to the public but not all of it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The local parks, the coastline, the inner countryside are the most important.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There shouldn't be more houses near the schools, in Hockley woods, local community open space and other countryside areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The green areas are important but maybe put a few houses (NOT flats) on the spare green areas, where wildlife isn't very high.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Local fishing lakes, common lands and woods should be saved for the wildlife.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use of countryside: no use land should be used for something, like more parks or open spaces.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Leave the car parks alone because it would increase the amount of parking in front of houses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community uses are one of the most important areas to protect
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Green areas are not really important so houses should be built there
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I think that parks are important but the wildlife and woodland are just as important.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The wildlife and country are places that you should keep because there are public footpaths and parks that are very popular.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There area also animals and different land which you can't cut down because of endangered animals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I like to go to the countryside (strawberry picking) & to go to the park so they shouldn't cut them down.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Half of the land you could build houses on but the other half just stays there.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All of the area is important to woodland.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The countryside should be accessible to people but only by public footpaths otherwise, no because people build land on it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Put a public footpath through it, don't let them go wherever.
Views submitted via maps

- Areas to be protected from housing (but not necessarily from any change):
 - Industrial estates
 - The airport
 - Country Park (West)
 - Wildlife sites
 - Schools
 - Wallasea Island (eastern side)
- Areas to be protected from change:
 - Community facilities
 - Majority of King George V playing field (small area on eastern side could be developed for housing).
 - Hockley train station
 - Car park to rear of Southend Road
 - Wallasea Island (western side)
 - Hockley Woods
 - Public open space
 - Caravan park near Baltic Wharf
 - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) between Hullbridge and South Fambridge, adjacent to River Crouch.
 - Country Park (East)

Officer comments / recommendations

The comments, in general, support protecting wildlife areas, green areas and community facilities. The group as a whole were in favour of making the countryside more accessible to the public, but felt any development should be of a small scale.

The group believed that the Council should develop a visitor centre at Wallasea Island – supporting the option in the draft Core Strategy that advocates some development for tourism in the Green Belt. They also felt that the green space in the district was worthy of protection but could be used better.

Some comments raised concerns about the possible parking problems if car parks were developed – this has implications for the district if it wished to pursue the option of increased development within existing residential areas.

CHARACTER

Group's views
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wakering: More things to do (too cramped) e.g. Skate park / Youth centre.• Wakering + Rochford: Too many pubs.• Like Older Buildings:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Look nice➤ Adds to Rochford's character• Don't change unless dangerous• Rochford Old Garage Site:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Something for kids➤ Old style – Like estate agent next to Blue Bear.• Rochford:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Lots more street lamps to avoid attacks➤ Lots of parks• Sweet shops in Rochford• Magnolia Park – Dodgy
Comments by individual students
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Older buildings = Cute – Should be kept• Keep the bakeries – Good shops• Little houses – Cramped• Re-furbished – No ramps• Paths are too small• BP Site – Something for kids. Modern would be out of place. Estate agent by blue boar – walls that look old• More street lamps in Square – More lights, too dark at night• Don't like loos and pubs in Rochford – More drunk people at night.• Wakering Sport Centre – poor condition• More shops and more stuff for the kids – Netball court, youth centre / skate park• More stuff to do in Rochford – Parks• Wakering – Small Mansions nearby• Old buildings – Made priority, design very important, moved on can learn from it• Airport – international?• Wakering needs more things to do
Views submitted via maps
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good aspects of Rochford:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Magnolia Park➤ Rochford town centre➤ Rochford airport➤ Anne Boleyn pub➤ Airport retail park
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Areas in need of changing:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Area to the east of King Edmund School➤ Parts of Union Lane, Rochford➤ Parts of North Street, Rochford➤ Parts of Old Ship Lane, Rochford➤ Area along Southend Road, near River Roach
Officer comments / recommendations
<p>The group were in favouring of preserving the historic buildings in Rochford, and sited the refurbishment of the listed building next to the Blue Boar on Victoria Avenue, Southend as a positive example to follow. The views of the group suggest</p>

support for the policy of preserving the historic character of the area, and for new development, such as that at the former garage in Rochford, to be in keeping with the surrounding character.

The group expressed concerns on the lack of facilities for young people and the quality of some of the existing facilities. The Local Planning Authority should ensure that the new residential development that is likely to come forward in the district is accompanied by adequate and accessible leisure and recreational facilities that meet the needs of the community.

The group liked the fact that Rochford had an airport, and felt that this was important to retain. The airport is currently looking at expand and the group's comments are noted, although there are still concerns with the surface access to the airport and the Local Planning Authority must consider the amenity of nearby residents and the possible environmental impact when formulating its policies on the airport.

The lack of street lighting in Rochford is something that the group raised as a problem. Rochford Regeneration are currently looking to improve the street lighting in the town. The Local Planning Authority should ensure that, with future development, adequate lighting and other measures to design out crime are incorporated.

Magnolia Park was sited as a positive, although concerns were also expressed about using the space there. Hawkwell Parish Council, who manage Magnolia Park, have formulated a management plan for Magnolia Park. The Local Planning Authority should take note of the comments made by the group in designating areas to be protected.

ENERGY AND WATER

Group's views

- Every new house should have solar panels and water stores
- Developers should get advertising / grants / money for incorporating renewable energy into development
- Wind farms should be located on un-used grassy, hilly open land
- Recycling is important. People should be fined for not recycling and rewarded for doing it
- All homes should have energy meters. The less energy homes use, the more rewards they get
- Insulation and triple glazing should be included in development
- Water butts should be included in new development

Comments by individual students

- I think we should have one place like a field or a piece of land where they can put the wind turbines so it doesn't look horrible all of the turbines dotted all over the place.
- Most streets have solar power on their roof or garden
- Turn lights off in your house to save energy
- Wind farms
- Recycling: fines for not recycling and you get rewards
- Everyone should have a meter for how much energy they can use per week or per month
- Make solar power cheaper
- Encourage more people to recycle by rewarding them with cheaper gas, electricity and water
- Have days of the week where we save energy, for example: Friday, gas savings day; Tuesday, light savings day
- Encourage more people to use less energy by saying if they use 10% less than what they used less year give them vouchers at food shops
- Solar panels on every new house
- Should not use so much energy in your houses
- Put wind turbines in instead of using energy
- Put wind turbines in what bit of land
- Only so much energy a week / month
- Water
- Solar power
- Recycling
- Free triple glazing and insulation in new houses
- Water butts
- Fines for not recycling
- Rewards for recycling
- Survey for solar panels
- Wind turbines
- Posh people to save energy
- Water buckets
- Wind farms
- All houses must have at least solar panel on every new house built
- Quad-glazing to save energy

Views submitted via maps

- Suggested location for wind turbines:

- North of Canewdon
- Wallasea Island
- Near the border with Southend Borough, to the east of Southend Airport
- West of Hullbridge
- West of Rayleigh, south of Rawreth Lane.

Officer comments / recommendations

The group's support for new development to be required to incorporate renewable energy generation is noted.

A number of the suggestions, such as making people recycle, are beyond the scope of the Local Planning Authority but the Local Planning Authority should endeavour to encourage such activities, such as by siting new development so that recycling facilities are accessible.

The group were not opposed to a wind farm in the district, but felt that they should be grouped together rather than spread across the district. This would minimise the encroachment that such development would have on the district, and, in the event that the wind farms were developed in the district, would be the preferable approach.

The points made with regard to grants for renewable energy generation are noted. Such grants are already available nationally and the Local Planning Authority should endeavour to publicise these to developers.

LEISURE, TOURISM AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Group's views

- New houses in west of district
- Great Wakering needs more community facilities – skate park, better community halls, gym, health facilities
- With new housing estates, more facilities, health care and community facilities would be needed
- Tourism: need stuff to attract tourists – hotel by the airport. Why would you go to Rochford for a holiday?
- More restaurants and less pubs in Wakering
- Nowhere to stay

Views submitted via maps

- Facility for elderly / community centre needed in:
 - Eastern end of Great Wakering
 - Hockley
- Facility for children needed in:
 - Public open space in Great Wakering
 - Canewdon
- Hospital / doctors needed in:
 - Canewdon
 - Eastern end of Great Wakering
 - Ashingdon
 - Eastern Rayleigh
- Restaurants needed in:
 - Western end of Great Wakering
 - Rochford
- Police station needed in:
 - Little Wakering Road

Officer comments / recommendations

The group's views suggest that Rochford will face challenges if it wishes to attract tourists to the area. The lack of hotels in the district is noted. Restrictive Green Belt policies currently restrict the possible conversion of rural buildings into hotels or bed and breakfasts.

Rochford District Council works in partnership with agencies such as the South East Essex Primary Care Trust and Essex Police with regards to the location of facilities such as hospitals and police station. The suggested locations are noted.

The Local Planning Authority must ensure that new development is accompanied with the required community facilities and the locations suggested by the group are noted.



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

☎ 01702 318002
E-mail planning.policy@rochford.gov.uk
Website <http://www.rochford.gov.uk>

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