

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 July 2011 16:05
To: Local Plans (Planning Policy)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Further Representations - Strategic Environmental Assessment - Addendum Report - June 2011 - Fairview New Homes Ltd
Attachments: 2010-10-29-Preliminary Report on Highways Transport (updated) 10-052.pdf; Fairview Reps - SEA Addendum - July 2011.pdf

Dear Sir / Madam,

Please find attached further representations on behalf of our client, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

We would be pleased if you would acknowledge receipt.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

If you are not the intended recipient of this email you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Scanned for Spam and Viruses by Instanton.it and Websense

Planning Policy
Rochford District Council
Council Offices
South Street
Rochford
Essex
SS4 1BW

11th July 2011

Our Ref: 10/1024

Dear Sir/Madam,

**FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS ON THE REVIEW OF THE PUBLISHED
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL ADDENDUM DATED JUNE 2011 -**

The above matter has reference.

We note that this review has been undertaken as a result of recent case law on Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) and has been prepared on behalf of Rochford District Council, and specifically provides further commentary on the summary of the alternatives considered and the reasons for selecting or rejecting those alternatives in taking forward the Core Strategy.

We act on behalf of [REDACTED] who have been actively involved in the emerging Local Development Framework, and specifically, with regards to the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations Development Plan Document. Our

client participated in the early hearings for the examination into the soundness of the Core Strategy, and has continued to provide further comments and representations on: topic papers; evidence base; matters of process and responding to matters raised by the Inspector.

We therefore take this opportunity to specifically respond to the consideration of the options for the identification of Strategic Locations for future Housing Development in the District. Our representation specifically focuses on Rayleigh, given our clients interest in the land off Poyntens Road, described as land to the "South West of Rayleigh".

Before articulating our specific concerns with the published Addendum Report, we note the District Council has acknowledged that the Regional Spatial Strategy, being the East of England Plan, remains part of the Development Plan and therefore the Core Strategy (having regard to both PPS3 and PPS12) must be in general conformity with it. Additionally given the length of time over the examination of the Core Strategy further amendments will be required to address the 'period' of the plan and overall housing numbers (rolling the plan out beyond the current plan period). Whilst this is not an issue that is directly dealt with in the SEA Addendum Report, we note that the District Council has indicated that further consultation is likely to take place during August of this year on these and other matters. We would reserve our client's right to make further representations at such later stage.

Turning to the SEA Addendum Report, my client continues to provide support and agrees with the statement in paragraph 3.1 that the general location for housing should be allocated to the top and second tier settlements (which includes Rayleigh), this has been described through Option E. My clients concern lies in the preferred locations taken forward through the Core Strategy, as is addressed more fully in the subsequent paragraphs of this representation.

Housing Development Options for Rayleigh

Under the consideration for the locations for housing for Rayleigh, we note that the Council considered six general locations. These are described as;

- Location 7: West Rayleigh (North of London Road, Rayleigh)
- Location 8: East Rayleigh
- Location 9: South West Rayleigh
- Location 10: North Rayleigh
- Location 11: South/Southeast Rayleigh
- Location 12: Rawreth Village

Under these general locations, the following text is provided on page 10 and 11 of the SEA Addendum Report.

"Location 7 was selected as the preferred location for housing development in Rayleigh, as the location provides opportunities for the co-location of development with the adjacent proposed employment area. Due to its location on the west side of Rayleigh it will also result in less air pollution and congestion in Rayleigh Town Centre, as traffic will not need to travel through the centre. It corresponds well to the proposed balanced strategy in the Core Strategy, and relates well to Chelmsford and Basildon, avoiding generating traffic on local networks for non-local reasons."

Going further, in rejecting Locations 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, the report (on page 11) considered that Locations 8, 9, and 11 are likely to have an impact on air pollution and transport in the town centre, Locations 10 and 11 could lead to coalescence with Hullbridge and Southend-on-Sea, Locations 8, 10 and 11 would perform less well in terms of the proposed balanced strategy, Location 8 would have negative effects on landscape, and, Location 12 was considered too isolated and poorly served by services and facilities.

Quite clearly from consideration of this commentary, of the five rejected locations, Location 9 (of which our client has an interest in) has only been rejected due to impact on air pollution and transport in the town centre. By comparison, and with the exception of Location 12 which is considered to be too detached from Rayleigh, the remaining Locations 8, 10 and 11 were all discounted for an additional number of reasons. Through the assessment, quite clearly, Location 9 can be considered to fall in "second place" to the preferred option.

Taking matters further, the detailed assessment of each of the locations is considered in Appendix 1 to the SEA Addendum Report. Having reviewed this, our client is of the view that the subjective or qualified assessment is not supported by robust evidence and is not considered to produce realistic assumptions.

For the purposes of articulating our concerns, we have replicated the detailed appraisal matrix using the same structure and scoring. What we have also done, is we have assigned a numerical value to each of the sustainability effects, and totalled this using the District Council's Analysis. This is shown in Table 1 and 2 below.

Table 1:

Categories of sustainability effects		
Colour	Impact	Numerical Points
Dark Green	Major Positive	+3
Light Green	Positive	+2
White	No Impact	+1
Grey	Uncertain	0
Orange	Negative	-1
Dark Brown	Major Negative	-2

Table 2:

SA Objective	Commentary – Location 7 (West Rayleigh – North of London Road)	Score Location 7	Commentary- Location 9 (South West Rayleigh)	Score Location 9	
1. Balanced communities	The quantum of development that can be delivered in this location provides sufficient economies of scale to fund/develop facilities required by the community, including a primary school, public open space and other community facilities.	++	The quantum of development that can be delivered in this location provides sufficient economies of scale to fund/develop facilities required by the community.	++	
2. Healthy and safe communities	Location has potential for good links to Thames Gateway Greenway proposal 13, providing opportunities for recreation, also the potential for inclusion of a significant public park, creating a buffer to the A1245.	+	The location has access to open space areas to the South of Rayleigh. Potential health effects from increased air and noise pollution, if significant traffic routed through Rayleigh town centre.	+	?
3. Housing				+2	0
4. Economy & employment	Location is within close proximity to Imperial Park Industrial Estate and the proposed employment area (office development) west of Rayleigh. There are potential opportunities to encourage mixed-use development at this location and to relocate businesses from Rawreth industrial estate. Well located to Basildon and Chelmsford for employment opportunities.	+	Location within proximity of Rayleigh town centre for employment opportunities and opportunities to contribute to the regeneration of the town centre.	++	
5. Accessibility	Site is a significant distance from Rayleigh Train Station and town centre, although the land area/development quantum is of sufficient size to encourage the enhancement of bus services (when combined with the proposed west Rayleigh employment area). A potential highway link between Rawreth Lane and London Road may provide more public transport opportunities.	+	Location is within good proximity to Rayleigh Train Station and the services, employment and facilities available in Rayleigh Town centre. It is noted that there are Highways concerns around connecting the location to the A127.	++	?
6. Biodiversity	No significant effects identified.	0	No significant effects identified.	0	
7. Cultural Heritage	No significant effects identified.	+1	Development at this location will increase traffic flows through Rayleigh Conservation Area, with potential negative effects through increased pollution and noise disturbance.	+1	
8. Landscape & townscape	Within South Essex Coastal Towns Landscape Character Area. A development of the scale envisaged may be more prominent in this location due to the obvious extension into the green belt (and lack of defensible green belt boundaries). However it is noted that the Core Strategy is proposing a new green buffer to the west of this	+1	Development at this location is likely to have less of an effect on landscape than at other locations in Rayleigh as it is bound by the existing urban area, railway line and the A127.	0	

	development.	-1		+1
9. Climate change & energy				
10. Water	Some areas within this location are within flood zone 3, however it is likely that development can be accommodated outside of the flood prone area.	?	No significant impact identified.	0
		0		+1
11. Land & Soil	Located on Grade 3 Agriculture land-no significant impact identified.	0	Located on grade 3 agricultural land. The site's steep topography may present difficulties.	-1
		+1		
12. Air Quality	Development on this scale could exacerbate air quality in Rayleigh through increasing traffic (it is noted that Council is in the process of declaring an Air Quality Management Area (ASMA) at Eastwood Road and High Street Rayleigh). However, due to the relationship of Rayleigh to Basildon/Chelmsford, this location to the west will have less of an effect on air quality than sites located to the east and south (all traffic from the east and south will route through Rayleigh centre). Location also near Rawreth industrial estate AQMA, however this site is proposed for redevelopment (to less polluting employment land uses than present), so this is unlikely to be a concern.	?	Development at this location has the potential to exacerbate poor Air Quality (An AQMA is proposed for Rayleigh). No access to the A127 from this site, therefore traffic would be directed to the town centre.	-1
		0		
13. Sustainable Design & construction				
	Total	13		12

Based on the above, for analysis purposes, the preferred location (Location 7) scores 13 and the "second place" location (Location 9) scores 12.

For the purposes of 'our' scoring, the "uncertain" category is considered to be the mid-point (or negligible category), and thus is assigned the numeric value of zero (given that the assessment should not prejudice an uncertainty). Positive impacts are numbered up, and negative impacts numbered down.

From first glance, we note that the assessment undertaken on behalf of the District Council plays down the impact of Flood Zone 3 impacts on Location 7, and penalises Location 9 for its topography. Clearly this is an imbalance. The fact that the topography of the land at South West Rayleigh is actually a design consideration, mean that Location 9 would actually gain back at least 1 point, and possibly even 2 points, making it equal or indeed scoring higher than the preferred location. Similarly, Location 7 should be penalised a point on the flood impact.

Additionally, we would also add that given Location 7 is further away from Rayleigh Town Centre than Location 9, it is considered that the preferred location would have a greater negative impact on air quality, than a location that is closer to the Town Centre and less likely to trigger vehicular movements. We also disagree with the statement that Location 9 has no access to the A127, without traffic going through the Town Centre. This is factually incorrect. To this end, we attach my clients initial Transport Report, which demonstrates this point.

Interestingly, my client has discussed the "alluded" highway concerns with the Highway Authority (Essex County Council) who have confirmed that there are no highway objections to the delivery of housing South West of Rayleigh (Location 9). On this basis we would contend that assessment category 12 should assign a '-1' to Location 7, and assign '+2' to Location 9.

Overall this would result in Location 9 scoring at least 15, and Location 7, scoring 11. Clearly, Location 9 scores better – yet it has been discounted.

Another point that we believe has been overlooked is the fact that Location 9 is significantly closer to the railway station and the town centre/convenience/leisure. It is a significantly better and more sustainable location, and would not result in the incongruous encroachment into the green belt that would occur at Location 7.

My client has also undertaken a feasibility sketch scheme concept, which demonstrates a design solution can overcome any possible concerns over the sites topography, and this is therefore not a constraint. From an analysis of capacity, the site can comfortably accommodate 30-40 homes, making best use of the site topography, meeting the Councils own area requirements, garden sizes and other design standards, and accommodates the existing mature boundary vegetation on site.

In summary, we do not accept that proper consideration has been given to Location 9, and that the SEA and Core Strategy are considered to be unsound.

My client maintains its ongoing position, that the land at South West Rayleigh, should at the very least, be considered an additional location (strategically) to provide the required housing numbers in the District over the plan period. We note that paragraph 5.5 of the East of England Plan states that the housing targets should be regarded as a minimum, with Policy H1 clearly stating these ARE NOT ceilings.

We would kindly request that this representation, in combination with others submitted to date, are given due consideration and that Location 9, Land South West of Rayleigh is identified as a location for future housing provision in the District over the plan period.

I would be pleased if you would acknowledge receipt of this representation, and keep us directly informed of any further consultations.

Yours sincerely,

Enc: Preliminary Report on Highways & Transport Matters, October 2010-
Milestone Transport Planning



Poyntens Site, Rayleigh

Preliminary Report on Highways & Transport Matters

prepared on behalf [REDACTED]

October 2010

Introduction

The purpose of this preliminary report is to explore the highways and transport implications of the potential redevelopment of land to the north-west of Poyntens in Rayleigh, Essex for residential development under Use Class C3 with capacity for around 50 dwellings.

From a highways and transport perspective there are no perceived constraints to the potential redevelopment of the subject site. Indeed the opportunity exists to develop the site in accordance with planning policy and current design guidance / best practice.

In planning policy terms in so far as it relates to transport matters, the subject site is well located in terms of proximity and access to local amenities, the town centre and public transport services by means of travel other than the private car. Indeed its locational relationship to the town centre and other amenities, as shown in plan 052/01 and outlined below, would place it considerably higher than many other sites in terms of accessibility criteria:

Town Centre (heart) - 650 metres (walk time - 8 minutes approx.)

Nearest bus stop - 320 metres (walk time – 4 minutes approx.)

Rayleigh rail station - 800 metres (walk time – 10 minutes approx.)

As can be seen from plan 052/01 the subject site also enjoys multiple points of vehicular access to the local and strategic road network. These multiple access points enable any additional development-related traffic to be distributed more evenly such that any potential impact is dissipated.

The principal access towards the A127 Southend Arterial Road (for onward routes to Southend, Basildon, the A130, A13 and M25 road corridors) is via Burrows Way and Ridgeway to the A129 High Road. The junction of the A129 High Road with Ridgeway is of a good standard in terms of road safety characteristics and geometric design. Love Lane also connects with the A129 High Street for access towards the town centre and with the A129 Crown Hill for connections towards the railway station, Hullbridge and Wickford.

Poyntens is constructed in accordance with the guiding principles of the Essex Design Guide in terms of carriageway width, street lighting and footway provision. A turning head to adoptable standards is provided at the southern end of Poyntens from which it is envisaged that vehicular access would be provided to the subject site.

It is understood that the subject site was considered by Rochford District Council as having the potential for allocation within the emerging LDF for residential purposes but that as a result of perceived access difficulties it has been discounted.

In preparing this preliminary report discussions have been held with Mr Dennis Everard, Development Control Officer for the Rochford District area at Essex County Council (Highway Authority). Mr Everard confirmed that further to discussions with a colleague, Mr Mark Lawrence (also of Essex County Council) who was directly involved in the LDF sites allocation process that there were no highway issues and was not aware of any reasons from a highways perspective as to why the site could not continue to be considered for residential allocation..

Within this preliminary report a brief summary is provided in respect of the opportunities to access the subject site at Poyntens by a choice of means of travel including, foot, cycle, public transport and private vehicle.

The preliminary report also considers the surrounding road infrastructure in the context of published standards and the potential travel demand associated with the potential future uses on the subject site.

Pedestrian & Cycle Permeability

As noted in the introduction the subject site at Poyntens is well located in terms of access distances / times to key local amenities, the town centre, bus stops and the rail station making both pedestrian and cycle access a realistic choice in terms of mode of travel.

The subject site is surrounded by a network of local residential roads to the west, north and east that provide direct access to these facilities including Spring Gardens, Burrows Way, High Mead, Love Lane and Ridgeway. Love Lane incorporates traffic calming features in the form of vertical speed bumps to regulate vehicle speeds.

These local residential roads are, in general terms, lightly trafficked and provided with footways on both sides of the carriageway. A signed public footpath links Burrows Way with the A129 High Street that extends eastwards from the junction of Burrows Way with Spring Gardens.

Where pedestrian access to local amenities and public transport services cross busier trafficked routes such as the A129 High Street and the A129 Crown Hill either zebra or pelican crossings are provided at regular intervals, positioned to reflect key desire lines of movement. There are no signed, designated cycle routes in the vicinity of the subject site.

Public Transport Connections

The subject site at Poyntens is provided with excellent access to the existing public transport network.

The nearest bus stops are located on the A129 High Street within 320 metres walk distance or 4 minutes walk time of the subject site. Rayleigh rail station also provides stops for additional bus services that are within 800 metres or 10 minutes walk time of the site. A summary of local bus services is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 Summary of Bus Services – A129 High Street

Route No.	Operator	Frequency				Route
		Monday-Saturday		Sunday		
		Day	Eves.	Day	Eves.	
1	Arriva	6	2	1	1	Rayleigh – Leigh – Southend – North Shoebury
3/3A	Regal	Every 2 hrs (M-F)	-	-	-	Chelmsford – Rayleigh – Hadleigh - Southend
24	First	1	-	-	-	Rayleigh – Hadleigh – Leigh – Southend - Southchurch

Table 2 Summary of Bus Services – A129 Crown Hill (Rayleigh Rail Sta.)

Route No.	Operator	Frequency				Route
		Monday-Saturday		Sunday		
		Day	Eves.	Day	Eves.	
7/8	Arriva	2	2	2	1	Rayleigh – Hockley – Southend – North Shoebury
9	Arriva	5	2	2	-	Rayleigh – Prittlewell – Southend – Shoeburyness
11A	Regal	-	-	Every 2 hrs	-	Chelmsford – Rayleigh - Southend
20	First	4	1	2	1	Hullbridge – Rayleigh – Eastwood – Southend
25	First	2	-	1	-	Basildon – Wickford – Rayleigh – S'thend
X30	First	1	1	1	1	Stansted Airport – Chelmsford – Rayleigh – Leigh – Southend
251	NIBS	-	-	1	-	Warley – Brentwood – Billericay – Wickford – Rayleigh - Southend

Rayleigh rail station is managed and operated by National Express East Anglia and is located some 800 metres, or around 10 minutes walk time, north-west of the subject site. From Rayleigh rail station direct train services are provided to London Liverpool Street via Wickford, Billericay, Shenfield and Stratford as well as Southend Victoria via Rochford.

During daytime hours Monday to Saturday Rayleigh station is served by 3 no. trains per hour in both directions with a half-hourly service provided during evenings and on Sundays as well as additional services during weekday peak hours. Journey times to key destinations are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3 Journey Times to Key Destinations - Rail

Destination	Journey Time	Destination	Journey Time
Southend Victoria	15 mins.	Shenfield	18 mins.
Wickford	5 mins.	Stratford	32 mins.
Billericay	11 mins.	London Liverpool St	43 mins.
Rochford	8 mins.		

Vehicular Access

The subject site at Poyntens is well connected to the local and regional highway network through multiple points of access, the advantage of which is that any traffic associated with the proposed development would be dispersed thereby reducing the overall impact on the operation of key local junctions. The prevailing speed limit on all roads within the locality of the subject site is 30mph.

Poyntens is a single carriageway two-way cul-de-sac of some 68 metres in length that serves 6 no. existing townhouses, all of which have their own private driveways. Poyntens also provides rear access to the driveway / garage associated with the corner property on Spring Gardens.

The existing road infrastructure on Poyntens is constructed in accordance with the guiding principles of the Essex Design Guide. It has a carriageway width of some 5.5 metres with street lighting and footways provided on both sides of the road. A turning head is provided at the southern end of Poyntens from which it is envisaged that vehicular access would be provided to the subject site.

Single yellow line parking restrictions are in place along the entire length of the carriageway that is enforced between 11am and 12pm, Monday to Friday and is common practice in this area. It is understood from discussions with Mr Everard at the County Council that these restrictions are in place to protect Poyntens from town centre and commuter parking.

Poyntens connects with the local residential road network via Spring Gardens which in turn leads into Burrows Way / Ridgeway and Love Lane. Both Love Lane at the Ridgeway form all movements, give-way controlled junctions with the A129 High Street to the east of the subject site.

The A129 High Street in turn leads northwards towards the town centre and southwards towards the A127 Southend Arterial Road and Hadleigh. It is anticipated that the majority of traffic to / from the subject site would use the route via Burrows Way and Ridgeway to the A129 High Street as this is constructed to a higher standard.

Spring Gardens, Love Lane and Burrows Way (in part) are all two-way single carriageway roads with footways and street lighting provided on both sides of the carriageway.

All three residential roads are characterised by a carriageway width of no more than 4.8 metres which is less than the 5.5 metres or 6.0 metres that would be required under the Essex Design Guide requirements for a new development serving the number of dwellings that exist.

All three residential roads are however provided with single yellow parking restrictions generally enforced between 11am and 12pm, Monday to Friday (as with Poyntens) and the existing residential properties are generally provided with private driveways. However, that section of Spring Gardens between Love Lane and Burrows Way has a parking restriction between 8am and 6pm.

It is understood to be the view of local councillors based on their experience that parking issues create difficulties for commercial vehicles in accessing local roads. However we believe this to be only at isolated times of the day and generally only occurs in the vicinity of the School.

When asked, Mr Everard at the County Council did not perceive that there was a highway link capacity or parking issue on these local roads and that any commercial vehicle movements are generally restricted to off-peak periods only.

The Ridgeway and the southern section of Burrows Way are also single carriageway two-way roads provided to a higher standard carriageway width of around 5.5 metres with footways and street lighting on both sides. Parking restrictions as noted above are enforced on Burrows Way.

The junction of Ridgeway with the A129 High Street is constructed to a good standard with generous carriageway widths, standard corner radii and good visibility in both directions along the main carriageway. There is a vehicular access to the Paul Pry PH immediately west of the junction.

The junction of Love Lane with the A129 High Street is more constrained in terms of its geometry with narrower carriageway widths and tighter corner radii. Visibility to the left out of Love Lane is partially restricted by the existing pedestrian barrier.

On Love Lane itself the Rayleigh Primary School is located immediately west of the junction. 'Keep Clear' markings are provided outside the school however it is likely that this area becomes congested at the start and finish of the school day.

The junction of Love Lane and Spring Gardens is particularly constrained. Both carriageway widths and corner radii are below current highway design standards and visibility in both directions out of Spring Gardens onto Love Lane is restricted by the fence lines of adjoining residential properties.

There is no prospect of undertaking highway improvement measures at this junction without acquisition of 3rd party land however it was observed that vehicle speeds on Love Lane itself are low given the presence of speed humps on both sides of the junction.

To the north-west of the site Spring Gardens leads into High Mead that in turn connects with Love Lane. The road construction characteristics of High Mead are similar to that of Spring Gardens and Love Lane in that the carriageway width is no more than 4.8 metres and parking restrictions are enforced. High Mead has footways and street lighting on both sides of the carriageway. Visibility standards relative to the prevailing speed of vehicles are met at the junctions of High Mead with Spring Gardens and Love Lane.

From its junction with High Mead, Love Lane proceeds north-westwards to connect with the A129 Crown Hill, immediately east of the rail station. From here the A129 Crown Hill continues westwards towards Wickford and Billericay connecting with the A130 towards Chelmsford.

The junction of the Love Lane with the A129 Crown Hill has restricted movements with 'No Entry' off Crown Hill into Love Lane. Visibility in both directions for traffic turning out of Love Lane onto Crown Hill is satisfactory.

Trip Generation

Using trip rates derived from the TRICS database, Table 4 summarises the predicted weekday person trip generation by mode of travel over a daily period.

Table 4 Weekday Daily Person Trips by Mode of Travel

Mode	Arrivals		Departures		Total Movements		% Split
	Trip Rate	No. Vehs.	Trip Rate	No. Vehs.	Trip Rate	No. Vehs.	
Car Driver	2.121	106	2.214	111	4.335	217	69.5%
Car Passenger	0.413	21	0.374	19	0.787	40	12.8%
Public Transport Users	0.091	4	0.087	4	0.178	8	2.6%
Pedestrians	0.456	23	0.410	21	0.866	44	14.1%
Cyclists	0.034	2	0.027	1	0.061	3	1.0%
TOTALS	3.115	156	3.112	156	6.227	312	

n.b. trip rate is expressed per dwelling

From Table 4 it can be seen that a development of around 50 dwellings on the subject site at Poyntens has the potential to generate around 312 total person trip movements over a daily period. Of these around 70% will be vehicular movements and around 18% will be by non-car modes of travel.

Using the TRICS database, Table 5 summarises the predicted level of traffic generation associated with a development of circa. 50 dwellings on the subject site during the weekday AM and PM peak hourly periods.

Table 5 Weekday Peak Hourly Traffic Generation

Time Period	Arrivals		Departures		Total Movements	
	Trip Rate	No. Vehs.	Trip Rate	No. Vehs.	Trip Rate	No. Vehs.
AM Peak (0800-0900 hrs)	0.143	7	0.425	21	0.568	28
PM Peak (1700-1800 hrs)	0.335	17	0.124	6	0.459	23

n.b. trip rate is expressed per dwelling

From Table 5 it can be seen that a development of circa. 50 dwellings on the subject site will generate no more than 28 vehicle movements during any given hourly period which is the equivalent of less than one vehicle every two minutes. Given that the subject site is provided with multiple points of access onto the wider highway network the effect of development-related traffic on the operation of surrounding roads will be minimal.

Summary & Conclusions

This preliminary report has considered the highways and transport implications of the potential redevelopment of land to the north-west of Poyntens in Rayleigh, Essex for residential development under Use Class C3 with capacity for around 50 dwellings.

From the results of the study the following can be concluded:

- The subject site is well located in terms of proximity and access to local amenities, the town centre and public transport services by means of travel other than the private car. Indeed its locational relationship to the town centre and other amenities would place it considerably higher than many other sites in terms of accessibility criteria;
- Local residential roads are conducive to safe walking and cycling and where there is a conflict with busier roads safe crossing facilities are provided. Pedestrians are presented with multiple access routes to the town centre, railway station and other local amenities by a choice of both on-street footways and signed, lit off-street footpaths;
- The site is provided with excellent access to the surrounding public transport network.

From the A129 High Street and the railway station there is a combined total of 10 no. regular bus routes providing a combined frequency of 21-22 buses per hour in both directions during daytime hours, Monday to Saturday, 10-11 buses per hour on Sundays and 4-8 buses per hour during evenings to a wide range of local and regional destinations.

Rayleigh rail station provides 3 no. trains per hour in both directions during daytime hours, Monday to Saturday and a half-hourly service on Sundays and during evening as well as additional peak hourly services on weekdays. Train services from Rayleigh provide direct connections to London Liverpool Street via Wickford, Billericay, Shenfield and Stratford as well as to Southend Victoria via Rochford;

- Poyntens is constructed to current highway design standards in terms of carriageway width, footway, lighting and turning provision. At present it serves only a limited number of existing properties and would have capacity to accommodate the additional development without modification;

-
- The surrounding residential roads are constructed to a standard less than what would be required in terms of meeting current design standards for new development in terms of carriageway width however there is good provision for footways and street lighting. All local residential roads are characterised by generous driveway accesses to adjoining properties and there are parking restrictions in place to prevent town centre and commuter parking;
 - The site benefits from multiple points of access to the wider highway network that will assist in dispersing development-related traffic thereby reducing potential impact.

Burrows Way, the Ridgeway and the junction of Ridgeway with the A129 High Street are constructed to a good standard in terms of road geometry and visibility splays. Along the majority of this route a carriageway width of 5.5 metres and footways on both sides are provided, more than sufficient for two-way traffic. On the remainder of the route, i.e. the northern section of Burrows Way and along Spring Gardens there is less than 40 dwellings served off existing roads of less than 5.5 metres.

This route is therefore considered to be the principal route for vehicular access to and from the subject site.

The junctions of Love Lane with Spring Gardens and the A129 High Street are more constrained in terms of geometry and visibility splays however this is an access corridor more likely to be used by pedestrians accessing the town centre from the subject site

There are restricted movements at the junction of Love Lane and the A129 Crown Hill. Again this is a route more likely to be used by those residents on foot and by cycle accessing the railway station;

- Based upon trip rates derived from the TRICS database, a development of circa. 50 dwellings at Poyntens would generate in the region of 312 total person trip movements over a weekday daily period of which around 70% would be vehicular trips and around 18% would be by non-car modes of travel. During the weekday AM and PM peak hourly periods a development of circa. 50 dwellings would generate no more than 28 vehicle movements, equivalent to less than one vehicle every two minutes.

On the basis of the findings within this report, there are no highway and transportation reasons why this site should not be considered for residential development.