

<p>Item 1  11/00315/OUT  Land East of  Spencer  Gardens,  Brays Lane,  Rochford</p>	<p><b>Contents:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Ecology Issues</b></li> <li><b>2. Essex County Council Schools, Children and Families Directorate</b></li> <li><b>3. Further Neighbour Representations</b></li> <li><b>4. Petition</b></li> </ol> <p><b>1. Ecology Issues</b></p> <p>Paragraph 1.146 page 33 of the officer report refers to a matter of clarification recommended by English Nature that reptiles are present on the site in the field margins.</p> <p>The applicant's consultant ecologist has made the following comments in response to this matter.</p> <p>The reptile survey submitted included a survey of the field north of Brays Lane that was part of the initial proposals but was later removed. Reptiles were found at the northern end of this field, but this field is no longer part of the proposals plan.</p> <p>As stated in paragraphs 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 of the 2010 report, the field where there are houses to be built is primarily horse grazing and was therefore considered unlikely to support reptiles due to the lack of foraging habitat and hibernation/shelter opportunities and the disturbance caused by an intensely grazed paddock and a busy stable yard. The boundaries of the arable field within the additional area of land were considered suitable for reptiles, however these boundaries should not be impacted by the proposals.</p> <p>In view of these comments officers are satisfied the recommendation for a watching brief will ensure protection of reptiles during the construction period.</p> <p><b>2. Essex County Council Schools, Children and Families Directorate</b></p> <p>This proposal delivers a new access and additional land to facilitate the expansion of the King Edmund School, as identified in policy CLT 3 of Rochford's Core Strategy submission DPD. As such, the proposal is supported by Essex County Council.</p> <p>Since this is an outline application, the precise design of the school facilities to be constructed on the land must be left to future negotiation but the applicant should be bound by a section 106 agreement to provide the access road; bus turning circle; foot/</p>
---	--

	<p>cycle ways; car parking; surface water drainage; lighting; gates/fencing and landscaping. The applicant must also be obligated to guarantee that the land is free from contamination, has 30cm of clean topsoil; is flat / level land suitable for use by the school in all reasonable respects.</p> <p>On the assumption that the above onerous duties are agreed, it is not reasonable to request additional monetary contributions towards the construction of other education facilities in the area as would normally be the case. Suggest the trigger for completion of the works and free transfer of the land to the school is prior to the occupation of more than 25 open market dwellings.</p> <p>An option for additional land for sports pitches has also been verbally agreed, between the developer and The King Edmund School, in exchange for an easement over part of the school site. Believe it is also intended that these obligations are included in a section 106 Agreement. This is supported.</p> <p><b>3. Further Neighbour Representations</b></p> <p>One further letter has been received from a resident in Brays Lane and which makes the following comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns about the long boundary of the site with the property I own and have to maintain if the plans succeed. Would like provision of a Section 106 included to make sure that the developer builds a boundary to my satisfaction at their cost.</li> <li>○ After all, I haven't asked the applicants to build on what is totally Green Belt land.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Petition</b></p> <p>Two days prior to the meeting officers understand Members received electronically a copy of a petition against the development. The petition contains 500 signatures.</p> <p>The petition is generally signed by residents from roads near to the site and states that as the Government is championing local people having a far greater say in what happens in their own area, there is a strong message that residents do not want the development to go ahead.</p> <p>The petition supports the objections raised by local residents at various stages of the process and sets out the following concerns:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The lack of publicity to the application and the Core Strategy regarding information on proposals to develop housing across many Rochford areas.</li> </ul>
--	---

- Lacking detail on how sites were chosen, whether alternatives were considered (brown field/ empty properties) and the effect of windfall sites on numbers.
- Loss of Green Belt, which cannot be replaced and effect on wildlife, trees, opens spaces and loss of the semi rural aspect of the area people chose to live in.
- Heavily congested Ashingdon Road and this development will bring 200 cars.
- Extra traffic movements and creation of “rat runs.”
- What consultation, review and analysis had been undertaken to arrive at the decision that the proposed school access in this application was an improvement over the current access or that an alternative access could be more easily created from Oxford Road. This application appears to just move the problem and doesn't seem to consider the addition of traffic from the new housing development.
- 100 houses will bring even more children than local primary and secondary schools could cope with.
- The hazard of significantly adding to the number of pedestrians using Brays Lane used also by heavy industry and farm vehicles.

**Officer Comment:-**

The petition refers to development north and south of Brays Lane. The dates of the signatures range between July and October last year when the larger proposal for 150 houses and to the site both sides of Brays Lane was being considered. Officers consider that whilst there is common ground between the two applications over the principle of the development, this petition was prepared in relation to the earlier scheme and should be given limited weight. The current application now before Members was not submitted at the time this petition was signed.