

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 July 2011 10:04
To: Local Plans (Planning Policy)
Subject: Sustainability appraisal of core strategy submission document response

Please acknowledge receipt .

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
10 July 2011

Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy Submission Document.

Public Consultation.

Rochford District Council
Planning Services & Transportation Services
Council Offices
South Street
Rochford
SS4 1Bw

Dear Sirs,

This is my response to the above document , and would wish it to be noted and to be presented to the Inspector as such .

I believe that little or no attention has been directed to improvement of the infrastructure to cope with the proposed numbers of houses in any part of the District .Indeed I cannot see how the developments will be able to provide the necessary funding to improve the existing system let alone the future needs .Wherever housing is proposed it will need to use the east west routes; A127,A129,Rawreth Lane and Beeches Road .All these routes are in excess of capacity ,and lead into the only north south route the A130 .

I will now come to specific concerns as affecting this Parish .

1.I will compare the two options ,7 and 12 as I believe the information contained in the Matrix to be incomplete and erroneous .

2.In Strategic Option 1 .the council decided not to take forward A and B.

i.e. Relaxation of the greenbelt Policy ,and strategic gaps which only fulfilled a token purpose .

In several cases and particularly in location 7 this policy is ignored .Location 12 (Rawreth Village) in contrast adjoins an existing small settlement and is on a disused nursery site with the site covered in concrete and greenhouses .Land was identified attached to this site as green fields and in the existing scheme was to remain as open public space .Other sites adjoining Hambro Nursery were put forward at the same time summarily dismissed,these were Clovelly ,a small industrial area ,Three garage sites on the west side of the A1245 . In total this would have provided an estimated 300 to 350 housing units with potential for further natural expansion without spreading into the open countryside .

3..Isolation and access.

It was stated that communications were poor in location 12.This is patently wrong .All the sites sit alongside the A1245 a main primary route connecting into the A130 avoiding all East west routes as before mentioned . There are two bus routes serving Rawreth and the site is within a short distance of Battlesbridge Station .This has an enhanced service recently and would take pressure off Rayleigh station .

12/07/2011

4. Rawreth has historically been a community of scattered settlements and although there is good community spirit, for example the raising of over £150,000 to build what many recognise as a hall of high standard without any call on taxpayers' pockets, there is a need to find a central focus and this location 12 would achieve that,

making the village viable. In contrast the extension of Rayleigh would achieve an isolation from the centre of Rayleigh and possibly destroy the character of the rural parish of Rawreth.

4. Soil and food production.

Location 7 is situated on an area of high productivity, it is grade 3 and probably 3a, which by law comes under PPS7 and has the same protection as grades 1 and 2. This core strategy has ignored land with high classification in the east of the district therefore seems there is acceptance that the loss of food producing land is not important. We see the continual erosion of productive land in South Essex, we are moving into an era of food poverty as the developing world becomes richer and competes with dwindling resources so that imports will become unaffordable. Location 12 is under glass and concrete and can not be brought back into economic production with escalating fuel costs.

5. Water and drainage;

Location 7 is partly situated in zone three and cannot be fully developed. It also drains through Rawreth brook which combines with runoff from North Benfleet and the developments round Shotgate before it enters the River Crouch above the weir at Battlesbridge this has historically been over capacity and caused floods recently in the Parish as well as devastating floods in 1953, 1958, 1963 and 1968 around Battlesbridge. The incidents of floods will only increase with this development despite any designed flood retention methods which appear to only have limited effectiveness as witnessed in recent developments along Rawreth Lane. Location 12 in contrast would have none of these problems as it sits on a small ridge sloping down northwards directly into the River Crouch below the weir and bridge.

6. Strategic option 7;

This states that accommodation for Travellers and Gypsies should be met by identifying sites adjoining existing residential areas formerly specifying it in the Allocation DPD. All sites identified in the CS were within the greenbelt so ignoring the preferred option in the final CS document.

There appear to be many anomalies when Council decided upon preferred options to use as the framework for the core strategy when deciding on specifics they appear to have ignored them. Over 80% of new commercial and residential developments is scheduled to be on greenbelt. No regard for existing transport problems let alone for future growth, is it sustainable? No risk assessment for flood risk has been carried with regard to effects on the greater drainage system and existing settlements.

We still await the published results and analysis of the DPD which was consulted on over a year ago. This hardly gives the Taxpayer confidence that our democratic views are being given attention. I am concerned that this document appears as an afterthought and a justification for previous decisions made before proper analysis of the public response to previous documents.

In conclusion I would suggest that the Core strategy itself is unsound and events have overtaken some of its findings. With housing targets themselves under review and government proposals for localism unclear no conclusion can be foreseen for this process.

Yours faithfully . [REDACTED] please acknowledge receipt .