

Laura Wiltshire

From: GEORGE SHORT [edwardshort@btinternet.com]
Sent: 03 July 2011 20:29
To: Local Plans (Planning Policy)
Subject: Enfusion Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal

Edward Short, Byeways, Ironwell Lane. Hawkwell, SS5-4JY

To Rochford District Council Planning Department "Core Strategy Review"

I should like to comment on Enfusion's recently commissioned review of Rochford District Council's Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal dated June 2011. I live beside development location 14, "known to the residents as Christmas Tree Farm".

General Development Locations Page 5 of 15. From the 5 alternatives, Enfusion selected only alternative E which says a smaller number of large sites "will deliver the greatest amount of infrastructure improvements". The reasons for selecting E was "it had the greatest concentration of positive effects and the results of "community involvement".

If "community involvement" means the community voicing their opinions about location 14, I haven't heard one resident speak in favour of this development other than the landowners.

Housing Developments Options For Hockley/Hawkwell

There are 18 housing development location options in Rochford District. Six have been grouped to the East, and six to the West. Hullbridge, Canewdon and Great Wakering stand alone but they have grouped the two locations in Hockley with the one in Hawkwell, classing them as Central Rochford District. But they are separate villages with separate identities and parish councils!!

In Enfusion's summary of South Hawkwell "Location 14" on pages 11/12 of 15, it says "South Hawkwell would positively contribute to the balanced strategy as it is well related to Southend Airport, the strategic highway networks, Southend, and would have a positive impact on economy and employment, balanced communities and landscape". For Enfusion's summary of North East Hockley including North Hockley location 15 says this location would have a negative impact on the balanced strategy as it would direct traffic onto the local highway network.

The main local traffic highway of the central area of Rochford District consists of 3 roads. The first from the Spa roundabout runs south west to the roundabout at the bottom of Hall Road, Rochford. The second runs between these 2 roundabouts but going south east via Ashingdon, and the third is the only link road between these two roads Rectory Road. None of these three roads has any stretch of dual carriageway. The only improvement is a filter lane at Nursery Corner. Would the Council, when conducting the core-strategy-review, disagree with Enfusion and concur with the vast majority of residents who say location 14 will also have a negative impact on the local highway network?

"Regarding "greatest number of positive effects", what would be the positive effects for building 175 new homes at location 14? Cars would be in frequent use for residents as location 14 doesn't have a shop, infant, junior or senior school, library or dentist but we have a doctor's surgery in Hawkwell Park Drive which is over subscribed. If you use the railways, location 14 is in the worst position as neither Rochford nor Hockley railway stations are in walking distance. This area of Hawkwell is poorly served by buses compared

to Hockley/East Hawkwell. Yet location 15 in Hockley they concluded would have a negative impact on a balanced strategy despite having shops, doctors, dentists, schools, library, railway station and a far better bus service than location 14.

Each day Monday to Friday location 14 has 11 buses going to Rayleigh. They run between 08.36 and 18.49. Hockley has each day Monday to Friday 35 buses going to Rayleigh. They run between 06.36 and 23.30. To Southend, location 14 has 20 buses running between 06.20 and 18.15. Hockley has 78 buses running between 06.15 and 22.54.

When Council are reviewing their Core-Strategy is it reasonable to ask location 14 is not a sustainable development site when you consider the poor social and road infrastructure of South Hawkwell. Indeed, I suggest the council enquire if Enfusion have accidentally got their negatives and positives the wrong way round on these two locations as I note on page 10 of 15 of the 6 locations grouped in the East they selected locations 5 and 6 because they are located by King Edmund Secondary School and rejected location 4 due to its poor accessibility and distance from services and facilities particularly when compared to other alternatives. If you apply this logic, Miss Graham would be interested to know how locations 13 and 15 West Hockley and Northeast Hockley (incl North Hockley) are earmarked for 50 houses yet location 14 South Hawkwell is earmarked for 175.

I agree with Enfusion that Clement's Hall Leisure Centre is in walking distance to location 14 housing development option, but they fail to include in their summary the impact this centre has on our road infrastructure.

Windfalls And Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment "SHLAA"

In Hawkwell there are at least 3 locations to my knowledge where 30 windfall sites are being developed. The old Jewson factory on Rectory Road, at the bottom of Hawkwell Park Drive/Park Gardens and on the corner of Poplars Avenue/Main Road, where one house was pulled down to be replaced with two houses. As these windfalls, and I'm sure there will be others, all impact on the road infrastructure of Hawkwell, as will the 36 homes earmarked for this area in 2017/18 under SHLAA, will the council when having their Core Strategy review agree with the residents to leave our woodland and wildlife intact, and reject location 14 as due to the lack of social and road infrastructure, it should not be subject to a large housing programme as it can never be a sustainable development.

Yours Faithfully

Edward Short