

---

## REPORTS FROM THE EXECUTIVE, COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES TO COUNCIL

### 1 REPORT OF THE PLANNING POLICY SUB-COMMITTEE

#### **New Local Plan – Early Engagement Workshops and Survey**

- 1.1 This item of business was referred by the Planning Policy Sub-Committee on 28 November 2016 to Full Council with a recommendation in relation to the content of the early engagement programme consultation statement, detailed in Appendix A to the officer's report to the Sub-Committee. An extract of the key elements of the report of the Assistant Director, Planning and Regeneration Services to the Sub-Committee is appended (see Appendix 1), together with a copy of Appendix A.
- 1.2 The Sub-Committee had discussed whether or not the consultation was compliant with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. It was perceived that low take up from Town and Parish Councillors and local communities to the consultation could be attributable to the consultation being non statutory and open-ended in its questions.
- 1.3 Reference was also made to the fact that further consideration should be given to the most appropriate way to monitor the consultation process, where appropriate.
- 1.4 Although it was recognised that the Council favoured electronic consultation methods, the point was made that at informal meetings during the summer Sub-Committee members had supported the option of leafleting residents and it was understood that provision of £20k had been requested in the Council budget for public consultation; leafleting could, potentially, be achieved via such budget provision.
- 1.5 It was also noted that the inclusion of garden communities within the issues and options document would be positive.
- 1.6 During discussion of techniques employed in respect of the consultation, it was noted that all those on the workshop mailing list were directly notified about the engagement events. There had been some difficulty engaging with some of the parishes, which resulted in less forward notice of the events being given in these areas than would have been preferred. It was also possible that attendance may have been low because of the nature of the consultation, which was not focused on any specific proposals. However, this approach did give residents an opportunity online to add any additional comments they wanted to include, and an opportunity also to be included on the Council's mailing list for future consultations. It was not currently possible to track the online responses given to the survey, however, it was anticipated that the new IT contract would allow residents to register online to confirm their interest. It was noted that Ward Councillors had also publicised the consultation via different media, including email, website/s and social

networking sites. The point was also made that some residents would be reticent about coming forward at workshops attended by groups of Councillors. It was also observed that the timing of the public engagement event in Great Wakering may have been a contributing factor for low turnout, as potentially an evening event would have been easier for working residents to attend, rather than a morning event. It was, however, emphasised that ideal timing was difficult to predict across the district and it was very difficult to time such events to satisfy everyone.

- 1.7 It was noted that low attendance at such events was not considered unusual; unless events specifically targeted issues of interest to residents, attendance tended to be low. The start of the consultation process was usually more open-ended in terms of focus, but consultation later on in the process would be more tightly focused. It was usual to receive most representations at the end of the consultation period deadline, and this had also been the case for this particular consultation exercise.
- 1.8 Particular reference was made that documents for consultation could be quite technical in nature, which could be difficult for residents to engage with and that an executive summary, with links to the necessary sections within the technical document could be more accessible to residents. It was noted that it would be possible to do something along these lines, provided that there was a link from the executive summary to the full consultation document and that it was made clear that the summary was for guidance only and responses must be to the draft Plan.
- 1.9 It was noted that population data from the 2011 Census had been used within the document, together with data from the last Essex County Council 5-year school plan in respect of school places. The County Council was now releasing 10-year plans in respect of school places; when the Council started consulting on the actual issues and options document the most up to date data would be included.
- 1.10 It was noted that officers would forward concerns raised in the Consultation Statement to relevant teams/organisations, where appropriate.
- 1.11 Reference was made to the importance of using different media for different age groups, where appropriate, and the need to liaise with the Council's Communications officers in this respect. It was stressed that the Council would have to provide robust evidence to the Planning Inspector relating to the soundness of the new Local Plan. To this end the Council would seek to engage as widely as possible with all stakeholders to the best of its ability.
- 1.12 The Sub-Committee did not agree with some of the responses to document listed in the appendix to the officer's report and felt it was more appropriate therefore to note the content.
- 1.13 It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES** that the content of the early engagement programme consultation statement, as set out in Appendix A to

the officer's report, be noted.

## **2 REPORT OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

### **Treasury Management 2016/17 Mid Year Review**

- 2.1 This item of business was referred by the Review Committee on 29 November 2016 to Full Council with a recommendation on the Mid Year Treasury Management Report. An extract of the key elements of the report of the Section 151 Officer is appended (see Appendix 2).
- 2.2 The strategy was scrutinised by the Review Committee in line with the requirements of the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities.
- 2.3 In response to questions officers advised that the biggest issue the Council would face would be if negative interest rates were to come into effect. The Council's Treasury Management strategy is for low risk investments, which means that the Council's finances are heavily dependent on the level of interest rates. Unless the strategy is changed, investment returns will not be likely to increase to any large extent.
- 2.4 In response to a Member question on the impact on the borrowing cost/cash flow forecast for the coming years for three projects the Council is considering, the Section 151 Officer advised that no forecasts were currently available as the projects were in the very early planning stages. Future borrowing requirements would be dependent on Government funding, including the New Homes Bonus. In future there may be opportunity for Revenue budgets to be added to the reserves in the Medium Term Financial Strategy to offset the need for borrowing.
- 2.5 It was confirmed that the statement in the report that a strategy to seek to maximise return on investment would be considered later in the year was not suggesting a higher risk portfolio of investments. Discussions would be restricted to how to maximise return on investments within the constraints of the Council's Treasury Management strategy. The Council recognises CIPFA guidance that states that investments firstly must be secure and suitably liquid before yield can be factored in. The S151 Officer confirmed that there are no proposals to change the parameters of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy at present. This would be restricted to looking for the best deposit rates with banks within the safer investment portfolio the Council has chosen.
- 2.6 Although the Council has considered investing in property funds and other non-tradable products, these investments are not as liquid as term deposits with banks; in addition, the property market is prone to fluctuation. Although this would not be an appropriate risk at the moment bearing in mind the Council's low-risk approach to investments, it is something that could be looked at in the future.

- 2.7 It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES** that the Treasury Management 2016/17 Mid Year Report be noted.

### 3 REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE

#### PUBLIC TOILET STRATEGY

- 3.1 This item of business was referred by the Executive on 30 November 2016 to Full Council with recommendations in relation to the future of public toilets within the District. An extract of the key elements of the report of the Assistant Director, Environmental Services to the Executive is appended (see Appendix 3) together with the Options Document (see Appendix 4).
- 3.2 It was noted that various options had been identified for the service delivery of public toilets within the district from 2017/18, with the aim of reducing expenditure, while also providing better facilities than currently exist. The preferred option was to work with the Town and Parish Councils to transfer the facilities by means of long-term leases and to develop a business case for the installation of replacement public toilets. It was, however, stressed that closure would be a last resort option, if it did not prove possible for the facilities to be taken on by the Town and Parish Councils. It was emphasised that the public toilets were not of a high standard and not financially viable and that the usage of some of the facilities, and notably Great Wakering public toilets, was low.
- 3.3 Reference was made of the need to forward plan some of the savings needed within the Council's 2017/18 budget and to the requirement of Town and Parish Councils to set their precepts in January. Investigation of options to date had not incurred any costs; if the Council did determine to look at the option of long-term leases with the construction of replacement facilities, a procurement exercise would need to be undertaken, which could result in further savings. It was also noted that the Town and Parish Councils were more likely to be able to access funding support from, e.g., local businesses, than this Council.
- 3.4 It was noted that replacement modular toilet units would be more flexible to operate, with a range of different options available for lighting, levels of charges, opening/locking and needle facilities, as well as the ability to extend the size of units, if wanted.

It is proposed that Council **RESOLVES**

- (1) That all public toilets, with the exception of those at Hockley Woods, are disposed of either by closure and sale, or through transfer of the asset upon a long-term lease to the relevant Town/Parish Council. The disposal of these assets to be completed by April 2018.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Environmental Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and

the Portfolio Holder for Enterprise, to oversee the closure and sale of public toilets, as above (1), subject to appropriate public consultation.

- (3) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director, Environmental Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and the Portfolio Holder for Enterprise, to negotiate suitable lease arrangements with the relevant Town/Parish Councils.
- (4) That should the negotiations in (3) above have been successful, the Investment Board be asked to present a business case in line with the budgetary principles set out in the appended Options Document for the installation of replacement public toilets.

---

## **NEW LOCAL PLAN – EARLY ENGAGEMENT WORKSHOPS AND SURVEY**

### **1 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the Consultation Statement that has been produced as a summary for the early engagement programme that the Council has undertaken to better inform the new Local Plan. The early engagement programme gave an opportunity for residents and businesses to express their views on the issues and opportunities for meeting the future needs of the district. The ideas raised at this stage will be used, where appropriate, to inform the next stages of the new Local Plan process. The programme of consultation took place between 24 May and 24 October 2016.

### **2 INTRODUCTION**

- 2.1 Rochford District Council is at the early stages of reviewing its current local development plan. As part of this review the Council has undertaken a programme of engagement at the pre-Issues and Options stage, prior to statutory requirements for consultation. The aim of this programme was to inform residents and businesses of the role both they and their local Parish/Town Council can have in the plan-making process, as well as to gain insight into their ideas about the issues and opportunities affecting future development and infrastructure delivery across the district. Workshops were held at the parish level, which helped to ensure that all local communities were given an opportunity to express their views.
- 2.2 The Council also held a survey to complement the programme of workshops and to provide those who were unaware or unable to attend the workshops with an opportunity to express their ideas. The structure of the workshops and survey were designed to reach out to as wide an audience as possible, ensuring that local communities have greater ownership over the plan-making process, and are more able to shape the places where they live.

### **3 EARLY ENGAGEMENT ON NEW LOCAL PLAN**

- 3.1 The programme of early engagement has provided the Council with a more up-to-date knowledge base of the planning-related issues affecting residents of the district. The ideas gathered from this exercise will help to ensure that the issues and opportunities brought forward in the next stages of the new Local Plan process are greater attuned to residents' needs, wherever possible. It is important to note, however, that this programme of early engagement is not a statutory requirement and has been undertaken to help inform the next stages of the new Local Plan process. Community engagement within the plan-making process is one of the core aims of the Statement of Community Involvement (2016), which was adopted in July 2016.

- 3.2 The programme of early engagement with local communities commenced on 24 May 2016 with 12 work shops being held across the district until 19 October 2016. The survey (available both online and in hard copy) was open between 10 September and 24 October 2016 to enable those who were unable to attend the later workshops time to comment.
- 3.3 Opportunities for engagement have been publicised in various ways, including written notification letters and emails to those on the Council's mailing list. In addition, newspaper adverts and notices on the Council's website and social media accounts helped to publicise the opportunities available for residents to get involved. The Council produced a poster to notify residents of the survey, and these were put up in strategic locations across the district (including leisure centres, libraries, train stations and doctors' practices). In addition, an article was published in school newsletters, on social media, in local newspapers and rolling banners were utilised in the Council reception areas. The poster directed residents to either pick up a paper copy from their local library or Council office, or to complete the form online at [www.rochford.gov.uk/cee](http://www.rochford.gov.uk/cee).
- 3.4 The responses received from both forms of engagement are included as an appendix to this report (Appendix A, which will be circulated to Members under separate cover). These have been given an initial response by a planning officer and, where appropriate, will be used to inform the forthcoming Issues and Options Document.

## **4 CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 The programme of early engagement has provided the Council with valuable information about how residents and businesses view the issues and opportunities for meeting future needs across the district.

## **5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 Costs incurred during the consultation process have been incorporated into existing budgets.

## **6 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The programme of early engagement with local communities was undertaken in addition to formal statutory stages required by the national legislation. The Council has no statutory requirement to carry out consultation at this stage.

## **7 PARISH IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 Consultation at the parish level has led to a more community-led and local approach. This has allowed residents and businesses to express ideas at both the local and more strategic, district-wide level.

Rochford District Council

November 2016

# Rochford District New Local Plan

# Early Engagement Consultation Statement





**If you would like this information in large print, Braille or another language, please contact 01702 318111.**

**Contents**

1 Introduction.....3

2 Early Event Programme.....4

3 Main Issues Raised at the Consultation Stage.....11

Appendix 1 – Issues raised during community engagement events.....13

Appendix 2 – Issues raised from Issues and Options Survey.....39

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Rochford District Council is at the early stages of reviewing its current local development plan – these are the policies which planning applications are determined against. As part of this wider policy review, the Council has been undertaking a programme of community engagement at the pre-Issues and Options stage, in order to gain valuable insight into the planning-related issues affecting local residents and businesses, as well as gathering ideas on opportunities for meeting future needs. The comments that have been made will then be considered and fed into the next stage of the plan-making process, called the Issues and Options Document, where appropriate.
- 1.2 The Issues and Options Document is planned to be published and publicly consulted on in Spring 2017, in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (2016).
- 1.3 This Consultation Statement sets out the ways in which the Council has sought to engage with local communities – including residents and businesses – the methods undertaken to notify local communities of the early engagement programme, the main issues that have been raised, and an initial response to these issues.

## **2 Early Engagement Programme**

2.1 A programme of early community engagement to help inform the Issues and Options Document was considered and taken forward in April 2016. This programme took place between 24 May and 24 October 2016. The Council engaged the local community through the actions set out in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 – Early Engagement Programme**

<b>Engagement Method</b>	<b>Details</b>
Community Engagement Workshops	<p>A programme of workshops has been held across the local parishes, with the exception of Foulness Island which is under the authority of the Ministry of Defence.</p> <p>The purpose of the workshops was to help explain the role of the Parish/Town Councils in the plan-making process, as well to discuss the issues and opportunities for meeting future needs within in each Parish/Town. All issues and ideas have been welcome throughout these interactive workshops.</p> <p>The typical structure of a workshop was as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A short presentation introducing attendees to their parish/town and the aims of the workshop, followed by a look at the key statistics to highlight possible issues and opportunities</li> <li>• Two-way discussions between attendees and planning officers / Councillors</li> <li>• An opportunity for a walkabout of the surrounding area to allow communities to show planning officers and Councillors issues in their parish/town first-hand</li> <li>• A mapping session designed to allow communities to comment and draw their ideas onto a map of the parish/town</li> </ul>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey 2016: Consultation Statement**

Engagement Method	Details
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A visioning session to bring together ideas from the whole workshop and talk about the way forward</li> </ul> <p>The structure of each workshop was flexible however, with conversation and focus led mostly by attendees.</p> <p>The workshops were publicised on a parish by parish basis using the following methods of notification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on the Rochford District Council Website</li> <li>• Emails and letters to individuals on the Council’s mailing list</li> <li>• Emails and letters to businesses on the Council’s mailing list</li> <li>• Notices on the Council’s social media pages               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rochford District Council Twitter account – 3426 followers</li> <li>○ Rochford District Council Business Twitter account – 477 followers</li> <li>○ Rochford District Council Facebook page – 912 followers</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Articles in the local newspaper, the Echo</li> <li>• Parish Council websites and noticeboards</li> <li>• Via Ward Councillors and Parish/Town Councillors</li> </ul> <p>In total, 12 workshops were held between 24 May and 19 October 2016. Some evening sessions</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey 2016: Consultation Statement**

Engagement Method	Details
	were held where appropriate or requested.
Issues and Options Survey	<p>The Issues and Options Survey was a district-wide survey held to complement the programme of workshops. The aim of the survey was to provide an opportunity for those residents and businesses that may have been unaware or unable to attend one of the workshops to make their views known.</p> <p>The survey ran from 5 September until 24 October 2016, and was available both as an online form on the Council’s website, and a paper form available at the Council offices in Rochford and Rayleigh and the five local libraries, during normal opening hours. The survey period was extended from 10 October 2016, to take account of the last few workshops that were arranged later than expected.</p> <p>Posters were produced to publicise the survey and these were put up in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All five local libraries*</li> <li>• Five local GP surgeries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Great Wakering Medical Centre</li> <li>○ Riverside Medical Practice</li> <li>○ Ashingdon Surgery</li> <li>○ Greensward Surgery</li> <li>○ The Practice, Hawkwell</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All four railway stations within the district</li> </ul>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

Engagement Method	Details
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three leisure centres and/or gyms               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clements Hall Leisure Centre</li> <li>○ Rayleigh Leisure Centre</li> <li>○ Eldon Way Gym</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Childrens’ play centre, Rochford</li> <li>• Rolling banners on the noticeboard in Council reception areas</li> <li>• Sweyne Park and Greensward Academy school newsletters</li> <li>• A number of shop windows across the district</li> <li>• Parish/Town noticeboards</li> </ul> <p>The details of the survey were also directly sent to all those on the Council’s mailing list (totalling 1,232 individuals and 417 businesses). The survey was also advertised on the Council website, on Council social media pages and as an article in the local newspaper, the Echo.</p> <p>*In order to provide assistance to those filling out paper surveys, note packs were available to read at local libraries and Council offices. These note packs provided a concise record of the information discussed at the previous workshops. Those filling out the survey online had access to these notes on the same webpage as the survey.</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey 2016: Consultation Statement**

---

2.2 Table 2 provides a list of the specific numbers of emails and letters sent notifying residents and businesses of the programme of engagement. It must be noted that various other non-specific methods of notification were used including the Council website, social media and newspaper articles.

**Table 2** – Breakdown of publicity and attendance by workshop.

<b>Workshop</b>	<b>Date held</b>	<b>Direct Methods used to Publicise (including figures)</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Canewdon	24 May	Email: 219 Letters: 115	30
Rochford	10 June	Email: 398 Letters: 336	32
Ashingdon	3 August	Email: 50 Letters: 87	14
Hullbridge	4 August	Email: 268 Letters: 603	47
Hockley (evening)	16 August	Email: 976 Letters: 512	40
Great Wakering	24 August	Email: 50 Letters: 17	15



**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey 2016: Consultation Statement**

---

<b>Workshop</b>	<b>Date held</b>	<b>Direct Methods used to Publicise (including figures)</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Hawkwell (evening)	30 August	Email: 140 Letters: 151	32
Rayleigh	12 September	Email: 887 Letters: 408	18
Rayleigh (evening)	4 October	Email: 887 Letters: 406	12
Stambridge/ Paglesham (evening)	6 October	Email: 14 Letters: 7	4
Barling/ Sutton (evening)	11 October	Email: 12 Letters: 5	25
Rawreth (evening)	19 October	Email: 37 Letters: 28 Leaflets: 400	24

2.3 A total of 7013 direct forms of notification were sent out publicising the workshops, with a total of 293 residents and businesses attending.

## **Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey 2016: Consultation Statement**

---

2.4 The dedicated Community Engagement Programme webpage received a total of 732 unique visits over the period that the survey was open – 24 May to 24 October. In total, the Issues and Options Survey received 178 responses (22 paper forms), of which 94 responses were returned with issues. The remaining 84 submissions used the survey as a means to be put on our mailing list, so as to be included in all future correspondence.

### **3 Main Issues Raised at the Consultation Stage**

- 3.1 The list below compiles those issues raised from the workshops and surveys identified as the main, or recurring, issues and opportunities.
- 3.2 Some residents raised concerns surrounding the resilience of the road network across the district. Specific areas of concern include;
- Ashingdon Road;
  - Rawreth Lane;
  - Rayleigh Town Centre (Including Websters Way, Eastwood Road, Crown Hill)
  - Railway bridges
  - Carpenters Arms roundabout to Fairglens
- 3.3 Some residents raised concerns surrounding school capacity across the district and in particular the impact of future housing developments on school capacities and performances. Secondary Schools are of the most concern.
- 3.4 Some Great Wakering residents have expressed an interest in a secondary school in the village, so as to reduce/eliminate the need for buses to the King Edmund School in Rochford.
- 3.5 Some residents raised concerns surrounding the composition of house sizes being delivered in the district. Some residents would like to see new developments providing more, smaller 1 to 2 bedroomed housing.
- 3.6 Furthermore, some residents have expressed a wish to ‘protect’ bungalows to prevent them from being enlarged, extended or demolished, possibly through the implementation of an appropriate policy.
- 3.7 Air pollution levels are a common concern amongst residents of Rayleigh, Rochford and Rawreth. Identified areas of concern are:
- Ashingdon Road
  - Rawreth Lane
  - London Road
  - Eastwood Road
- 3.8 Some residents want to explore the opportunities for greater tourism in areas including Ashingdon, Canewdon and Wallasea, including greater harnessing the ‘pull factor’ of Rochford’s historic and natural heritage. Hand-in-hand growth with local economy, cafes, b&bs etc.

## **Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey 2016: Consultation Statement**

---

- 3.9 Possible opportunities for 'eco-tourism' raised in areas including Hullbridge and Ashingdon
- 3.10 Some residents want to explore the opportunities for greater sustainable transport and eco-leisure provision across the district, including a desire for greater and improved cycle routes, footpaths and open spaces.
- 3.11 Many residents believe that the Council should prioritise the preservation of the district's historic and natural assets through the plan-making process.

## **Appendix 1 – Comments received during Community Engagement Workshops 2016**

N.b.: where similar or identical comments or issues have been raised, these have been grouped together in the interests of conciseness and clarity.

	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Initial Officer Comments</b>
<b>Infrastructure (Transport)</b>			
1	Rochford	Ashingdon Road cycle path is dangerous, could be moved onto grass.	Comment noted for consideration in Issues and Options Document.
2	Rochford/ Great Wakering	School buses to King Edmunds from Wakerings are an issue for both Rochford and Wakering.	Essex County Council is the education authority for the district, and as such would be the determining authority on this issue. However, Rochford District Council will continue to discuss the issues of school provision with Essex County Council to work up options for future improvements to education provision.
3	Rochford	Amend bus routes 7/8 and include a new bus stop along Station Approach.	Essex County Council as the Highway Authority for the district works closely with private bus companies in the area. Suggestion will be made to appropriate parties for consideration.
4	Rochford	Need greater capacity for heavy vehicles in the Baltic Wharf area.	Comment noted for consideration in the Issues and Options Document. The current local development plan seeks to support improved east to west road network improvements, and improvements to the highways serving Baltic Wharf.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
5	Rochford	<p>Parking within Rochford needs to be altered. Short-stay parking within the square needs to be reduced to half an hour with 1 hour only for disabled persons.</p> <p>More parking is needed; potential options for underground parking should be explored.</p>	<p>The <a href="#">Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan</a> looked at the provision of parking in Rochford Town Centre, including the Market Square.</p> <p>Wider parking options across the district will be considered in future stages of the new Local Plan.</p>
6	Rochford	<p>The possibility for a new Park and Ride on Cherry Orchard Way should be explored</p>	<p>Parking options will be considered in future stages of the New Local Plan. The potential for a Park and Ride system within the district can be discussed with Essex County Council.</p>
7	Rochford	<p>Suggested a new cycle path along Ironwell Lane</p>	<p>Essex County Council has recently published a County-wide <a href="#">Cycling Strategy</a>, and are now looking to produce Cycling Action Plans at a District-level. The current local development plan includes an aspiration to deliver a new National Cycle Network route through the district, which would run along Ironwell Lane.</p>
8	Rochford	<p>The streetlights in Rochford town centre are lacking or ineffective</p>	<p>Comment noted. Essex County Council are responsible for streetlights in the district and feedback/complaints should be reported to them.</p>
9	Rochford/ Hawkwell	<p>Hall Road/Ashingdon Road junction needs improving – bottleneck and dangerous at times.</p> <p>Discussions need to be held with Network Rail to solve this issue as the current railway bridge is far</p>	<p>Congestion at this location is known. Recent improvements have been implemented to help reduce the problems at this junction. The efficiency and safety of the road network will continue to be a key consideration throughout the</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		too narrow.	new Local Plan process.  The Council is aware that the railway bridge limits opportunities for substantial improvements to this junction at present. Discussion with Network Rail about the existing rail bridges is being pursued.
10	Rochford	Need to deter ugly shop fronts within Conservation Areas.	The Council currently has policies on appropriate design within Conservation Areas and these are considered when determining planning applications. However, relevant policies will be reviewed and updated within the new Local Plan where appropriate or necessary.
11	Ashingdon	Issues on Ashingdon Road, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution levels need monitoring;</li> <li>• Too much noise pollution;</li> <li>• Footpaths too narrow at points;</li> <li>• Emergency services have a difficult task navigating congestion</li> </ul>	Specific issues with noise and air pollution are dealt with by the Council's Environmental Health team. However, the comments raised will be looked at when considering the potential for future road improvements, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council.
12	Ashingdon	Drains along Ashingdon Road cannot cope with and are damaged by HGVs, they need more maintenance.	Essex County Council has a maintenance schedule ( <a href="#">Essex Highways Maintenance Strategy 2008</a> ) for all aspects of the road infrastructure, in which drainage falls under routine maintenance for clearing and repair (unless maintenance is needed for safety reasons).  Any issues with drains along the highway can be brought to the attention of Essex County Council

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			for consideration.
13	Ashingdon/ Hullbridge	Restore coastal footpath and extend to Wallasea, homeowners along the path could be made duty bound to report issues to the managing body.	The government has commissioned Natural England to form a footpath around England's coastline by 2020. Rochford District Council has also formed the partnership of the River Crouch Coastal Communities Team which is looking at ways to improve access to the river.
14	Ashingdon/ Hullbridge	Rochford District Council is yet to approve the opening of a Fambridge Ferry, which is stated to be approved by Essex County Council, Maldon District Council, North Fambridge Parish Council and Ashingdon Parish Council.	The Council is currently considering a planning application for a crossing in the South Fambridge area. The planning application has the reference 15/00505/FUL and can be viewed on the <a href="#">Council's website</a> .
15	Ashingdon/ Rochford/ Hawkwell	An 'Rochford Outer Bypass' should be explored, and considered before new housing developments become a barrier.	Improvements to the wider road network will be looked at throughout the new Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council.
16	Hullbridge	Pooles Lane needs a signposted 'give way system', and the footpaths are in need of improvements.	Comment noted. Small-scale projects like these could be funded by the Parish Council, or could be Parish Council led, in conjunction with the Local Highways Panel.
17	Hullbridge	Buses along Lower Road need laybys in order to maintain traffic flow.	Comment noted. This option could be explored with Essex County Council as the Highways Authority. The potential to deliver laybys however is constrained by land availability in the right locations.



**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Initial Officer Comments</b>
18	Hullbridge	Improvements to Watery Lane are desperately needed as it is 'unsafe' and receives increased use due to Rawreth Lane becoming gridlocked.	Comment noted. Both Rochford District Council and Essex County Council are aware of the issues along Watery Lane, and will consider the potential for improvements on the wider road network through the next stages of the new Local Plan process.
19	Hullbridge	The potential for a railway to service Hullbridge/ Battlesbridge should be explored.	Battlesbridge currently has a railway station on the Crouch Valley Line. The potential for an additional spur to Hullbridge can be put to Network Rail, but is unlikely to be economically justifiable or viable.
20	Hullbridge	Extend the X30 to reach Hullbridge, or a new route to Chelmsford.	Bus routes are run by the private sector, therefore any new route or route extension has to be deemed viable by the company before any amendment will take place and subsequently approved by Essex County Council. It is noted that buses are available from Hullbridge to Rayleigh rail station from which passengers can board the X30.
21	Hullbridge	Improvements needed to the junction of Lower Road/Ferry Road.	Improvements to the wider road network will be looked at throughout the new Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council.
22	Hullbridge/ Ashingdon/ Rochford/ Hockley/ Rawreth/ Rayleigh	Overall concerns shown about the resilience of the road network.	We will be publishing a baseline position on the district's road network alongside the forthcoming Issues and Options document. From this, highway modelling will be developed and potential mitigation measures explored.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
23	Hullbridge/ Hawkwell	Highways review studies are inaccurate and therefore lead to development based on false information. Assessments should be carried out at both peak and off-peak times.  Examples include: Ashingdon Road and Southend Airport Business Park.	Comment noted. Specific queries about methods used can be discussed with Essex County Council.
24	Hullbridge/ Great Wakering	Roadside footpaths are in need of resurfacing and are currently too narrow.	Comment noted. Some areas of narrow footpath cannot be improved without encroaching on the highway. Resurfacing can sometimes be a Parish Council led project, or in conjunction with the Local Highways Panel.
25	Hullbridge	20 mph zone suggested throughout residential roads, with pedestrian crossing opposite the Medical centre.	Comment noted. Issue can be put to Essex County Council or Local Highways Panel for consideration outside the plan-making process.
26	Great Wakering	Crossing island opposite Co-Op needs replacing with zebra crossing so as to not be dangerous to traffic by narrowing the highway.	Comment noted. Issue can be put to Essex County Council or Local Highways Panel for consideration outside the plan-making process.
27	Great Wakering	Slow down sign near Morley's sharp bend on Southend Road.	Comment noted. Small-scale projects can be Parish Council led, or in conjunction with the Local Highways Panel.
28	Great Wakering	Fixed bins outside estate agents along footpaths cause mobility scooters to not be able to pass.	Comment noted. Small-scale projects can be Parish Council led, or in conjunction with the Local Highways Panel.
29	Hockley	Spa Road roundabout is in need of enlarging or a slip road.	This roundabout is a known congestion area and has been identified in the <a href="#">Hockley Area Action Plan</a> as in need of improvement. Opportunities for improvements on the road network will be

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			considered through the new Local Plan process.
30	Hockley	<p>The Council needs to set aside some money from council tax income for infrastructure improvements, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New zebra crossing opposite 'Bobbins'</li> <li>2. Remove traffic lights on Greensward Lane railway crossing</li> <li>3. Create more railway crossing points</li> <li>4. More cycle paths needed</li> </ol>	<p>Issues noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A new zebra crossing can be put to Essex County Council or the Local Highways Panel for consideration outside the planning process</li> <li>2/3. Options for the rail bridges will be discussed with Network Rail</li> <li>4. Essex County Council have recently published a County-wide <a href="#">Cycling Strategy</a> and are now looking to produce Cycling Action Plans at the District-level.</li> </ol>
31	Hockley/ Hawkwell/ Barling	<p>Consult the Parish Council and engage with local leisure cyclists about new cycle routes to Wallasea Island.</p> <p>New cycle paths wanted along Shopland Road and for cycling clubs to use, instead of creating unnecessary congestion on the highways.</p>	<p>Essex County Council have recently published a County-wide <a href="#">Cycling Strategy</a>, and are now looking to produce Cycling Action Plans at a District-level.</p> <p>Cycle routes involving Wallasea Island are a Council aspiration; the Parish Councils and local cyclists will be updated when more information is available.</p>
32	Hockley	<p>New connecting roads proposed between Southview Road to Greensward Lane; Chestnut Close to White Hart Lane; Broad Walk to White Hart Lane in order to ease congestion along with a new crossing over/under the railway.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The railway bridges are known congestion areas and improvements to the wider road network will be considered through the next stages of the new Local Plan process.</p>
33	Hockley	<p>More disabled parking bays are needed within Hockley centre.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The <a href="#">Hockley Area Action Plan</a> identifies a need for additional parking within the centre, some of this additional capacity is likely to</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			be provided as disabled bays.
34	Hawkwell	Number 8 bus is a poor service – facing review due to no use, however it would be used if it were a reliable, frequent service.	Comment noted. Complaints over reliability and frequency can be put to the route operator as the bus route mentioned is privately-run.
35	Hawkwell	A new policy is wanted to restrict development under infrastructure constraints. At present almost all aspects of the infrastructure are under pressure.	The ability for infrastructure to support proposed development is a fundamental consideration in the plan-making and planning application processes. Infrastructure providers are consulted with regard to the capacity of their existing infrastructure, and where necessary, they advise on what improvements would be necessary to support the proposed development. These improvements are often funded through monies from a Section 106 agreement and in the future, potentially from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
36	Hawkwell	Street lights should be kept on throughout the night as safety is more important than cost.	Most streetlights in the district are under the authority of Essex County Council. Any streetlights that residents or businesses feel should be exempt from Essex County Council's "part-night" scheme should be put to them.
37	Hawkwell	Traffic lights at pelican crossing change from amber to red far too quickly making it unsafe for drivers and pedestrians.	The issue can be passed on to Essex County Council as Highway Authority for consideration.
38	Hawkwell	Some mini-roundabouts/roundabouts need replacing with traffic lights as drivers do not give way to minor roads, these roundabouts are collision prone.	Comment noted. These comments can be passed onto Essex Highways.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
39	Hawkwell	<p>Hockley Station is ‘spilling out’ onto residential roads as drivers take advantage of free parking. What options are there for expanding or improving the parking provision at the station?</p> <p>Similar point was also made relating to other stations in the district.</p>	<p>The <a href="#">South Essex Parking Partnership</a> is responsible for parking restrictions and enforcement in the district. Issues and options relating to on-street parking can be put to them.</p> <p>This issue is noted, however it should be noted that constraints on land availability cause an obvious issue with providing additional parking at Hockley Station.</p>
40	Hawkwell	Cherry Orchard Way/ Hall Road roundabout should have traffic lights.	Improvements to the wider road network will be looked at throughout the new Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council.
41	Rayleigh	<p>Concerns that the future west Hullbridge development will cause traffic. All construction traffic should be kept out of Rayleigh. A full size roundabout should be installed prior to development at the site of the mini-roundabout linking Rawreth Lane and Hullbridge Road.</p> <p>This development west of Hullbridge will have a major impact on Rayleigh. Plans should be looked at as a wider area, not Parish by Parish.</p>	<p>A traffic management scheme may be entered into to mitigate the impact of construction traffic to the surrounding area.</p> <p>The roundabout is a separate planning application to the development and will be delivered subject to the terms of a Section 106 agreement, yet to be finalised at the time of writing.</p> <p>Whilst the workshops were delivered at the parish-level to greater engage with residents and businesses, the new Local Plan will consider a wider and more strategic view of the district.</p>
42	Rayleigh	Concerns over the future development to the north of London Road and the link between Rawreth Lane and London Road.	Comments noted. The outline planning application for this site has been approved, however the Council is yet to receive the application for reserved matters.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>All construction traffic should only turn left into and out of the site, so as not to affect traffic flow and to stop construction traffic from every entering Rayleigh.</p> <p>Suggestions of a temporary road to the west of the site so that construction traffic never has to enter Rawreth Lane.</p>	<p>Where possible and appropriate, route restrictions can be discussed with the developer/sub-contractors to mitigate traffic issues.</p>
43	Rayleigh	Traffic lights in the High Street need a camera to enforce them properly.	Comment noted and can be passed on to Essex County Council to consider.
44	Rayleigh	Rayleigh High Street should be pedestrian access but only during daytime and other off-peak hours.	The potential for pedestrianisation of Rayleigh High Street was considered within the <a href="#">Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan</a> (2015) and earlier studies. This may be reconsidered in the next stages of the new Local Plan.
45	Barling	<p>Existing roads in Barling need improvement, especially prior to any future development.</p> <p>The roads are too narrow and already congested.</p>	Essex County Council, as Highway Authority, are consulted on planning applications and advise on the ability of existing infrastructure to support future development. In cases where it is felt the existing network cannot adequately support future development, Essex County Council would advise on what improvements are needed to address this. Without satisfactory improvements to mitigate the impact of the development, a proposal would not proceed.
46	Barling	What are the development thresholds which trigger the requirement for road improvements?	Individual cases can be put to Essex County Council for a response.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
47	Barling	Drivers site lines are not maintained along Barling Road and Barrow Hall Road, combined with dangerous turns results in this road being accident prone.	Comment noted. Small-scale road improvements can be picked up by local Parish Councils or Ward Councillors, and brought forward in partnership with the Local Highways Panel.
48	Rawreth	Buses into Rawreth village are often once a week and unreliable (11A service).  A better, improved bus service would be desirable.	Bus route operators are, in most cases, private companies and decisions on routes are made on a viability basis. Essex County Council do work with bus operators on routes and ideas can be put to them.
49	Rawreth	Essex County Council needs to update their traffic models, accurately taking into account peak time traffic. An accurate model is crucial as developments and applications are being decided on using false information. Statistical information produced by Essex County Council needs to be challenged.  The levels of traffic along this road are causing large volumes of air pollution.  Possible solution for Rawreth Lane – Remove the traffic lights.	We will be publishing a baseline position on the district's road network alongside the forthcoming Issues and Options document. From this, highway modelling will be developed by Essex County Council and potential mitigation measures explores.  Improvements to the wider road network will be looked at throughout the new Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council.
50	Rawreth	Carpenters Arms to Fairglen – The traffic lights need to be phased by roughly 15 seconds in order to allow traffic to clear from previous set of lights.  The yellow boxes on the road cause more issues than they solve.	We will be publishing a baseline position on the district's road network alongside the forthcoming Issues and Options document. From this, highway modelling will be developed by Essex County Council and potential mitigation measures explored.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
51	Rawreth	<p>Speed reductions to 30mph in the following places;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• London Road between Old London Road and Carpenters Arms</li> <li>• Old London Road</li> <li>• Between Old Chelmsford Road and Hawk Hill</li> </ul>	<p>Comment can be passed on to Essex Highways. Proposed speed reductions can also be brought to the attention of your local Councillor, who can liaise with the Local Highways Panel.</p> <p>Improvements to the wider road network will be looked at throughout the new Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council</p>
52	Rawreth	A new road is needed crossing the River Crouch financed by central Government linking A132 with Hullbridge, North Fambridge and originating near Southend Airport.	Improvements to the wider road network will be looked at throughout the new Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council.
53	Stambridge	Better local transport links are desired (i.e. parish community bus)	Opportunities for local transport links will be considered moving forward through the new Local Plan process. The idea of a 'Parish Community Bus' could be pursued at an individual Parish Council level with parish/grant funding.
54	Stambridge	There are inconsistent highway signs between Stambridge Road and Apton Hall Road, e.g. National Speed Limit to 30mph to National Speed Limit then to 20mph, all in the space of a few hundred metres. This signage leads to confusion resulting in inappropriate speeds.	Comment noted. Individual issues can be put to the Local Highways Panel or Essex County Council for consideration.
<b>Infrastructure (Schools, GP's, Services, Utilities, Broadband)</b>			



**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
55	Canewdon / Great Wakering / Hawkwell / Ashingdon	Broadband in rural areas is poor; this has a negative impact on tourism (guests want Wi-Fi in their hotels/b&bs) as well as local businesses who need a reliable internet service. Local businesses and residents have confirmed this.  Some areas even still on dial-up.	Comment noted. <a href="#">SuperFast Essex</a> – Part of the Superfast Britain Programme coordinated by Essex County Council. The programme is funded and delivered by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK), BT, Gigaclear, Essex County Council and some Local authorities. The programme is looking to upgrade and deliver new fibre capacity in areas identified as lacking. Areas identified as not needing an upgrade can apply to the scheme for an upgrade. Estimated delivery date is between June 2017 and July 2018.
56	Canewdon	The old post office could be redeveloped into a co-op or community run business.	Comment noted. This opportunity could be pursued at community or parish-level with help from Ward Councillors.
57	Canewdon / Barling	Concerns over the ability of sewerage to cope with new development.	Anglian Water manages the sewerage capacity in the district. They are consulted on proposals within the plan-making process, as well as larger proposals for development. Where necessary, they will advise that improvements are needed to support a proposal and incorporate this into their asset management/investment strategies. They may also receive monies from a Section 106 agreement to fund the necessary capacity improvements.
58	Canewdon	Paramount to maintain the local school.	The viability of schools is very much dependent on future intake and population structures in the area. The future educational needs of the district, as well as opportunities to improve or sustain existing provision, will be a key consideration in the next stages of the new Local Plan process.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Initial Officer Comments</b>
59	Rochford / Ashingdon / Hullbridge	Concerns over the ability of existing NHS and other services being able to cope with further housing.	The Castle Point and Rochford Clinical Commissioning Group and the NHS are consulted on large planning applications and policy documents. They give advice on the capacity for existing services to support new development and, where necessary, advise on what improvements are needed to support future development. These improvements may be funded through a Section 106 agreement with a developer.
60	Rochford	King Edmunds is at capacity despite what the Essex County Council statistics suggest.	Comment noted and will be queried.
61	Rochford	Incentives are needed to encourage businesses to locate in empty units.	Comment noted.
62	Rochford	Business opening and closing times should be staggered in order to reduce congestion at peak times.	Comment noted. For certain business-types, this issue can be discussed with the Council's licensing department to see if implementation is justified and reasonable.
63	Rochford	Adult Community College could be a useful community centre.	Comment noted.
64	Rochford	Relocate Rochford Primary School to Hall Road site	Future education provision will be considered through the new Local Plan process in partnership with the local education authority, Essex County Council.
65	Ashingdon	King George's Field is underutilised; new toilets needed and green gym idea needs to be considered.	Comment noted. Such proposals can be considered outside this plan-making process.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Initial Officer Comments</b>
66	Ashingdon	Modernise Ashingdon Hall, to have a café and locking car park.	Comment noted. Such proposals can be considered outside the plan-making process.
67	Hullbridge	Electrical supply can be unpredictable, increasing issue with ageing population.	Comment noted. The Council will be liaising with infrastructure and service providers throughout the plan-making process.
68	Hullbridge	Bring back the infrequent Doctors Practice at The Dome to relieve some of the pressure on Riverside Medical Centre.	Comment noted. Options can be explored with the local CCG as well as privately-run practices, however any additional medical services would ultimately need to be viable.
69	Hullbridge	There is a divide within the village over the eligibility for free school travel to the nearest secondary school.	Comment noted. This issue can be raised with Essex County Council as the education authority within the district.
70	Great Wakering	<p>Issues with school places for certain year groups.</p> <p>Primary school was built as a secondary school, making it unsuitable for young pupils.</p> <p>S106 from Star Lane – concerns over the lack of contribution towards education and that the 600 houses on Hall Road equates to a primary school yet 420 in Great Wakering over multiple sites results in no school.</p> <p>There is potential land to expand the school or even add a second storey to existing single storey.</p>	<p>Having previously discussed the issue of secondary school provision in the east of the district with Essex County Council, it was indicated that several thousand additional homes would be needed to justify and sustain a new secondary school. Decisions on the need for a new school will not only depend on the projected additional students as a result of the development, but also on the excess capacity of existing schools and the ability for existing schools to expand.</p> <p>Essex County Council are the education authority for the district and as such, advise us on what improvements to school provision are needed to support new developments. We will continue to liaise with Essex County Council over the course</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			of the new Local Plan process, on the issue of school provision across the district. Where possible, we will discuss options for improvements to capacity and accessibility.
71	Great Wakering	Some rural areas east of St. Nicholas' Church do not have access to sewerage and gas networks.	Comment noted. The relevant utility providers will be consulted throughout the new Local Plan process to discuss opportunities for improved coverage and quality of service.
72	Great Wakering	Green gym and more youth facilities needed. Additional sports facilities such as BMX facilities.  Potential to pay for these using money from new developments.	Comment noted. The provision of green open space is a consideration at the planning application stage. Any facilities within these green spaces may be funded by Section 106 agreements which require the developer to fund improvements to the local area.
73	Great Wakering	Residents feel the village has a lack of police presence.	Comment noted. Essex Police manage their own resources and any issues should be put to them directly.
74	Hockley/ Hawkwell	Residents would like more assurances that S106 monies are spent on infrastructure.	Comment noted. Details of signed Section 106 agreements are in the public domain and can be viewed on the Council's website.
75	Hawkwell	Doctors' practices are oversubscribed, monies from future developments should be spent on new GP capacity.	The Castle Point and Rochford Clinical Commissioning Group and the NHS are consulted on large planning applications and policy documents. They give advice on the capacity for existing services to support new development and, where necessary, advise on what improvements are needed to support future development. These improvements may be funded through a Section 106 agreement with a developer.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
76	Rayleigh	<p>Concerns over the future development to the north of London Road and where children will go to secondary school.</p> <p>Concerns over how utilities and the railway will cope with extra demand from an extra 550 households. There should be better communications with utility providers to manage capacity and identify the need for additional capacity.</p>	<p>Essex County Council, as the education authority, advise on secondary school capacities at both the plan-making and planning application stages. Where applicable, they will advise on the improvements necessary to support the new development. As a result, the Section 106 agreement for this development may reflect any monetary contributions deemed necessary to increase capacity at the secondary schools in the area. It is also of significance to note that this development is to have a primary school built on the site.</p> <p>Utility providers manage their own capacity, and are consulted throughout the plan-making process as well as on larger planning applications. They will incorporate such proposals into their own strategies, and where appropriate, receive monies from Section 106 agreements to fund improvements to capacity.</p>
77	Rayleigh	There is a lack of facilities in Rayleigh such as a cinema and a swimming pool.	Comment noted. Where there is an evidenced need, the provision of leisure facilities will be considered in the next stages of the new Local Plan.
78	Rayleigh	Rayleigh High Street is in need of tight controls on change of use of shopping units to maintain a healthy balance of shops.	Comment noted. Section 4.2 of the <a href="#">Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan</a> details the Council's specific policies on uses within Rayleigh town centre. These include avoiding clusters of non-retail uses, as well as a preference away from uses which negatively impact the amenity of the

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			<p>town centre. Furthermore, the policy states a preference towards a healthy balance of uses. These policies are considered on any Change of Use applications the Council receives within Rayleigh town centre.</p> <p>Whilst the Council can exercise these controls on planning applications, some changes of use can be carried out without planning permission. These use what are known as Permitted Development rights. A comprehensive guide to those changes not requiring planning permission is available on the <a href="#">Planning Portal website</a>.</p>
79	Barling	Services would not need improvements if there were to be no further housing developments	Comment noted. The Council is required by government to develop a Local Plan which delivers various facets of development in the district, including housing. Improvements to services can be delivered alongside development, where a need is identified by the relevant authorities.
80	Barling	<p>Rochford District Council need to make sure that Section 106 money is spent on what it is intended to provide. Ideally money should be spent prior to development.</p> <p>The total number of new houses built including future allocation, must be approaching the levels to secure new services.</p>	Comment noted.
81	Barling	More employment development is wanted within	Comment noted. Opportunities for employment

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		Sutton, in order to provide those residents with jobs.	growth will be considered in the next stages of the new Local Plan.
82	Rawreth	Concerns over the secondary school provision due to projections of deficit of places and the already overdeveloped existing secondary school sites.	Comment noted. Essex County Council, as the education authority, advise on secondary school capacities at both the plan-making and planning application stages. Where applicable, they will advise on the improvements necessary to support the new development. Hypothetically, these improvements could include greater utilisation of existing school resources, expansions to existing schools or the provision of a new school.
83	Stambridge	A more comprehensive look at school statistics is needed as children come from other parishes, lots of people travel further than their nearest school.	Comment noted. We will be working with Essex County Council throughout the plan-making process to determine the need and scope for improvements to education provision.
84	Stambridge	79% of residents state they would like to have a local convenience store/post office.  Potential for a Farm Shop should be explored.	Comment noted. This opportunity could be led by the Parish Council or local community. Any store or post office would ultimately need to be commercially viable and subject to a planning application. Rural diversification – including farm shops – is supported in the current local development plan.
85	Stambridge	Stambridge has fibre cables to the junction box, however this has not been ‘fed through’ any further. Faster speeds would also be appreciated in Paglesham. Low internet speeds deter businesses and tourists.	<a href="#">SuperFast Essex</a> – Part of the Superfast Britain Programme coordinated by Essex County Council (ECC). The programme is funded and delivered by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK), BT, Gigaclear, ECC and some Local authorities. The programme is looking to upgrade and deliver new fibre capacity in areas identified as lacking (Some of

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			which are in the Stambridge and Paglesham areas). Areas identified as not needing an upgrade can apply to the scheme for an upgrade. Estimated delivery date is between June 2017 and July 2018.
86	Stambridge	Businesses need to be made more aware of the support and funding available to them.	Information about the support available to local businesses from the Council, including a link to join the Rochford Business Network, is available on the <a href="#">Council website</a> .
<b>Housing</b>			
87	Canewdon/ Ashingdon/ Hullbridge/ Hockley/ Hawkwell/ Rayleigh	Residents need varying types of housing in order to stay in the area (bungalows, housing for young people). A lack of 1/2-bed housing has been identified. A policy should be introduced to protect bungalows.  Where undeveloped land is used, developers should be made to be clever about how they use the land, i.e building town houses etc.	Comment noted. The issue of house types and site density will be considered in the next stages of the new Local Plan process.
88	Canewdon	Redundant garage courts could be used as an infill housing site.	Brownfield sites are prioritised for development wherever possible – and could be delivered outside the plan-making process.
89	Hullbridge	Malyons Lane site – concerns for existing residents which will have their views taken away from them.  Noise pollution during development needs to be restricted to certain times.  Drainage needs to be improved so as not to	Comments noted and would be considered at the planning application stage.  The Council has a drainage policy, ENV4, which requires larger applications for development, such as the Maylons Lane site, to implement Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in order to



**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		worsen the situation of poor drainage.	mitigate any negative impacts the new development may have on the natural rate of drainage.
90	Hullbridge	Brownfield sites should be utilised in order to stop them becoming fly tipping hotspots	Comment noted. Brownfield sites are prioritised for development wherever possible – and could be delivered outside the plan-making process.
91	Hullbridge	No gypsy sites wanted in the area – Caravans currently on junction of Watery Lane.	National policy requires the Council to make provision for Gypsy and Travellers in plan-making. Any unauthorised sites are dealt with through the planning enforcement/application process as appropriate.
92	Hockley	Key that affordable housing remains affordable.	Comment noted.
93	Hockley/ Hawkwell	Concerns over the use of Brownfield infill sites due to the already dense nature of the Parish.  However it is also suggested that small brownfield infill sites are favoured over large developments.	Comment noted. Brownfield sites are prioritised for development wherever possible – and could be delivered outside the plan-making process.
94	Rayleigh	Concerns have been raised over the allocation of affordable housing, especially social housing for local people.  There should be more intermediate housing in Rayleigh.	Comment noted. Policy H4 of the Council's <a href="#">Core Strategy</a> states that 'developments larger than 15 dwellings or 0.5 hectares have to provide 35% of their housing allocation as affordable housing.' Currently there is an allocated site which will provide affordable housing to the north of London Road in Rayleigh.
95	Rayleigh	Rayleigh should be protected from further development and instead have more provision of open spaces. It has been stated that Rayleigh residents feel there is more space for development	Comment noted. Development land allocation is based on a multitude of criteria, making sure the allocated land is suitable for development. This will be considered in the next stages of the new

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		in areas such as Barling.	Local Plan.
96	Rayleigh	Housing in Rayleigh is not wanted unless for the local people. Concerns that new homes bring in more people from nearby cities which add to the already congested roads and trains.	Comment noted.
97	Barling	There are flooding concerns in Kimberley Road and Little Wakering Road. Residents would like for the flood zones to be reassessed by the Environment Agency.	Comment noted. The Environment Agency is responsible for fluvial and tidal flooding from water courses and defines the flood zones for those areas at risk. Essex County Council is the lead local flood authority for surface water flooding. Issues relating to flooding can be raised with these authorities.
98	Barling	Little Wakering housing development is not wanted. Barling would like to stay a village.	This site is allocated in the current local development plan. Comments can be made on the relevant planning applications.
99	Rawreth	In order to mitigate any further housing developments in Rochford (and other areas) a 2 mile wide ring of agricultural land around London should be released for development.	Comment noted.
100	Rawreth	Rawreth has many brown field sites which could provide land for up to 300 homes.	Comment noted. Any brownfield sites put forward for development will be looked at through the plan-making process, and specific types of allocation can be considered with regards to the Council's housing strategy.
101	Rawreth	The land surrounding the village hall should be used for affordable/ social housing.	Comment noted. Any sites put forward for development will be looked at through the plan-making process, and specific types of allocation

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			can be considered with regards to the Council's housing strategy.
<b>Tourism</b>			
102	Canewdon	Tourism needs to grow using varying types of advertising (paper and electronic).  St Nicholas Church needs to have more 'brown' signage and advertising, particularly the stocks. Also a better web presence would be of great use.	Comment noted. Opportunities for tourism will be considered in the next stages of the new Local Plan process.  Individual tasks such as these can be brought to the attention of local Councillors and Parish Councils. Signage could be funded at the Parish Council/community level, however will need to secure permissions from the relevant authorities including Essex County Council.
103	Canewdon	An increase in tourist advertising/attractions should go arm-in-arm with more tourist accommodation.	Comment noted. The current local development plan supports suitable types of accommodation in rural areas.
104	Ashingdon	Anniversary of King Canute's Assandun conquest and St Andrew's Church is reaching its 1000 <sup>th</sup> year – both potential tourist attractions.	Events such as this can be considered outside of this plan-making process.
105	Hullbridge	Any options for ecotourism – walkers/ramblers holidays.	Comment noted. The current local development plan supports certain types of green tourism.
<b>Other</b>			
106	Canewdon	Residents would appreciate a new Village hall.	Comment noted. Options for improvements to community facilities may be considered in the next stages of the new Local Plan.
107	Canewdon	Village green could be a possible site to hold fetes or events.	Events such as this can be considered out of this plan-making process.
108	Rochford	Shops on the east side of the square need to have their facades changed.	Comment noted. The design of shop facades in this area are ordinarily guided by the Council's policies on design within Conservation Areas, as

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			well as the policies within the <a href="#">Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan</a> (RTCAAP). However, some shop fronts in this area were identified within the RTCAAP as opportunity sites for improvements.
109	Ashingdon/ Hawkwell	New Towns – Instead of clusters of developments alongside existing towns and villages, a new town should be built with its own infrastructure and services so that the existing areas retain their identity.  An area to the West of Rayleigh was identified	This idea is a major infrastructure project which would require extensive consultation and research with many stakeholders. The broad concept of a ‘new town’ is an option which can be considered in the next stages of our new Local Plan, with regard to the Council’s wider housing strategy.
110	Hullbridge	Health concerns over Malyons Lane site being too close to a telecommunications mast.	Comment noted.
111	Hockley	Some residents would like Hockley to remain the same and prioritise it maintaining its village status.	Comment noted.
112	Hockley	Greenery, especially mature trees should be preserved, new developments seem to have a lack of soft landscaping.	Comment noted. Some trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders, and any development would need to take into account of the impact on the tree(s). Some areas of woodland are also protected under other land designations such as Local Wildlife Sites or Ancient Woodlands. Soft landscaping is also considered through the planning application process.
113	Hockley	Hockley Area Action Plan should be more closely followed.	Comment noted. The Hockley Area Action Plan is an adopted document within the local development plan and is used to advise the determination of planning applications in the Hockley area.
114	Hawkwell	Hawkwell Parish Plan should be utilised as a	Comment noted.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Parish	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		resource.	
115	Hawkwell	Drainage needs to be improved, especially where new development is proposed.	<a href="#">Policy ENV4 of the Core Strategy</a> states that all residential development over 10 units will be required to incorporate runoff control via a Sustainable Drainage System, to ensure runoff and infiltration rates do not increase the likelihood of flooding. Multiple authorities, including Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and Essex County Council, are also consulted on larger planning applications with respect to possible drainage, sewerage and flooding issues.
116	Rayleigh	Planning should adopt a bottom-up style.	Comment noted. There are provisions recently brought into the planning system with regards to neighbourhood planning.
117	Rayleigh	Eastwood Road and The Chase junction should be monitored for air quality.	Air quality is an issue that the Council's Environmental Health team monitors and where necessary, addresses. Individual areas of concern can be forwarded to them to be considered.
118	Barling	Where possible, issues and comments should be considered and dealt with prior to 2025.	Where appropriate, some opportunities may be implemented sooner than the period covered by the new Local Plan.
119	Rawreth	Drainage is insufficient near the ASDA superstore and along Laburnum Way. Flooding is also a recurring issue along Church Road, which floods on an annual basis. Additional housing will only worsen the issue.	The issue of flooding is a key consideration in the plan-making and planning application processes, and statutory authorities are consulted on these. Essex County Council is the lead local flood authority.
120	Rawreth	The football pitches in Rawreth need to be made permeable.	Comment noted. This issue is not within the scope of the new Local Plan.
121	Rawreth	Residents feel as though they have been ignored on planning matters previously.	Comment noted. The <a href="#">Statement of Community Involvement</a> (2016) sets out the ways in which the

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	<b>Parish</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Initial Officer Comments</b>
			Council consults residents on planning matters.
122	Rawreth / Rayleigh	Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) ought to be set up along Rawreth Lane and London Road. Buses are said to be a major polluter.	Issues of air quality are the responsibility of the Council's Environmental Health team and particular areas of concern can be put to them to be considered / monitored.
123	Rawreth	The Tide Mill Dam stops flood waters from draining away.	Comment noted. This issue can be discussed with the relevant flood authorities, the Environment Agency and Essex County Council.
124	Rawreth	Drains along Watery Lane need regular clearing.	Comment noted. Drains on main sewerage systems are maintained by Anglian Water. Clearing drains on private land is ordinarily the responsibility of the landowner.
125	Rawreth	Raise the sea wall along the River Crouch by 2 foot on the southern side to match the level of flood defence as the northern side.	Comment noted. Options can be put to the relevant flood authority, the Environment Agency.
126	Rawreth	Where does all the water pumped out of Fairglens underpass end up and how quickly?	Comment noted and can be queried with Essex County Council.

#### 4 Appendix 2 – Issues Raised by the Issues and Options Survey

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<b>Infrastructure (Transport)</b>			
1	Eastwood/ Hockley	Proposed business parks are an excellent opportunity to encourage walking and cycling by improving and extending existing networks.	Essex County Council have recently published a County-wide <a href="#">Cycling Strategy</a> , and are now looking to produce Cycling Action Plans at a District-level. The <a href="#">Joint Area Action Plan (JAAP)</a> identifies the excellent location of the proposed Airport Business Park. It states that residents living within a 5km radius around the business park, could all cycle to work if safe, practical infrastructure was in place.
2	Great Wakering	Junction of Poynters Lane and Wakering Avenue needs sight lines restored by maintaining hedgerows. Additional road signage is also needed due to drivers often unaware of the speed limit.	Small scale improvement projects may be able to be funded and performed by the local community or Parish Council. The issue of installing additional road signage can also be brought to the attention of local Councillors who can liaise with the Local Highways Panel over possible options.
3	Hawkwell	Disagree strongly with suggestions about installing traffic lights at roundabouts. This would only add to the peak time congestion.	Comment noted.
4	Hawkwell	All bus stops should have cutaways to pull into so that traffic flow can be maintained. Traffic flow is crucial especially for our emergency services and those part time workers arriving to serve at the emergency services.	Comment noted. This option could be explored with Essex County Council as the Highways Authority. The potential to deliver cutaways however is constrained by land availability in the right locations.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
5	Hawkwell/ Rochford	Rochford District Council should pass a bylaw to enable cyclists to responsibly use the pavement so as to not slow down the traffic flow but still promoting the health benefits of cycling.  Where possible cycle paths could be provided such as, along Southend Road.	Comment noted. Essex County Council have recently published a County-wide <a href="#">Cycling Strategy</a> , and are now looking to produce Cycling Action Plans at a District-level.
6	Hawkwell/ Rochford/ Rayleigh/ Hockley	Roads need to be sorted before any more big developments are proposed. Also medical facilities need to be upgraded.  Rochford, Rayleigh and Hockley are a nightmare on the roads with it taking 40 minutes to leave Rayleigh. Roads cannot cope with more houses.	Throughout the planning process, Essex County Council as highway authority, and the local CCG are consulted on the capacity for road and health services to support future developments. Where necessary, they will advise on the improvements needed to support new development and these will often be implemented alongside any works.
7	Hockley	On street parking along the shopping parade should be reserved for disabled users, with a new car park made in Eldon Way.	Comment noted. The current <a href="#">Hockley Area Action Plan</a> has previously identified the need for additional parking within the centre, which may be included within any redevelopment of Eldon Way.
8	Hockley	The Spa Road roundabout should be replaced by traffic lights as it is currently dangerous.	This roundabout is a known congestion area and has been identified in the <a href="#">Hockley Area Action Plan</a> as in need of improvement. Opportunities for improvements to the wider road network will also be considered through the new Local Plan process.
9	Hockley	Improvement of public paths – many are hard to follow and overgrown.	Hockley is a member of the Parish Paths Partnership Scheme, which is an initiative introduced by Essex County Council in



**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			conjunction with the Countryside Agency to assist Parish Councils to maintain, develop and promote their local footpath network. Any issues can be put to Hockley Parish Council.
10	Hockley	Timed parking bays are being abused as there is nobody to enforce these. Especially near stations and schools.	Comment noted.
11	Hockley/ Hawkwell/ Rayleigh	<p>Traffic levels on the B1013 have noticeably increased since the houses built on the Christmas Tree Farm. They will only get worse from the 1200 extra cars possible from the 600 new homes along Hall Road.</p> <p>After the future allocated sites are built out, Rayleigh will be at a standstill all day every day.</p> <p>Ashingdon Road cannot handle any more traffic. The additional 600 homes on Hall Road and 500 on Doggett's will only add to the congestion. Rochford district is in need of a ring road, not just minor road improvements.</p>	Comment noted. Essex County Council are the Highway Authority in the district and are consulted on the capacity of the road network in the context of future development. Where necessary, they will advise on the improvements needed to support new development and these will often be implemented alongside any works.
12	Hockley	<p>Southend Airport station should be made commuter friendly so as to reduce the number of cars travelling to a commuter friendly station (Rochford/Prittlewell).</p> <p>The proposed removal of some car parking at Hockley station will just force more people into using their cars.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>It has been identified within the <a href="#">Hockley Area Action Plan</a> that there is some open land that can provide potential for the reorganisation of car parking arrangements and the road layout.</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
13	Hockley/ Rayleigh	<p>Trains on the Southend Victoria line should have airport friendly carriages with room for luggage. The train operator ignores the plane timetables as there are too few trains at off-peak times.</p> <p>Additional residents from the new homes in Rayleigh, Rochford and even Wickford will all impact on the train line with the increase in the numbers of commuters, yet there are no mentions of any upgrade in the numbers of trains which will run on this line.</p>	Comment noted. As part of the new Local Plan process, discussions over service improvements shall be held with the franchise operator.
14	Rayleigh	<p>Rayleigh is becoming gridlocked and cannot cope with further houses to the west of Hullbridge and North of London Road.</p> <p>For example, having one lane shut at Fairglen has caused gridlock.</p> <p>Gridlock leads to unnecessary air pollution.</p>	<p>Essex County Council are the Highway Authority in the district and are consulted on the capacity of the road network in the context of future development. Where necessary, they will advise on the improvements needed to support new development and these will often be implemented alongside any works.</p> <p>Issues of congestion and pollution on the existing road network will also be looked at in the next stages of the new Local Plan.</p>
15	Rayleigh	There is an issue surrounding the volume and speed of traffic using Roach Avenue and Weir Gardens as a cut through.	Comment noted.
16	Rayleigh	No individual developer or authority has modelled/assessed the impact of the construction traffic during the next 10-15 years. There is bound to	Comment noted. A traffic management scheme may be entered into to mitigate the impact of construction traffic to the surrounding area.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>be a cumulative impact from the multiple sites allocated to be built out over the same period.</p> <p>All of the sites allocated for the next 10-15 year period are adjacent and therefore will all be using the same over crowded roads.</p>	<p>Air quality is an issue that the Council's Environmental Health team monitor, and where necessary, steps will be taken to address unacceptable levels of pollutants.</p>
17	Rayleigh	<p>Roads are congested, there are too many parked cars on the roads with some residential roads needed resident permits. The car parks should provide more spaces but also be cheaper.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Issues of parking and congestion will be considered in the next stages of the new Local Plan.</p>
18	Rayleigh	<p>Fairglens intersection is constantly congested directly increasing pollution at this location.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Essex County Council as the Highway Authority is looking into the options for this key junction at both the short term and long term to address the issues identified.</p>
19	Rayleigh	<p>Residents need parking permits to park outside their property. Bull Lane needs clearing of parked cars to help with congestion especially as this is a bus route.</p> <p>A parked cars survey and assessment should be held. Identify who owns the cars and then what can be done to move as many as possible off the street.</p>	<p>The <a href="#">South Essex Parking Partnership</a> is responsible for parking restrictions and enforcement in the district. Issues and options relating to on-street parking can be put to them.</p>
20	Rayleigh	<p>The biggest issue is traffic through the west side of Rayleigh. The A1245 towards the A127 junction is terrible. It frequently takes over 30 minutes to go from the Carpenter's Arms roundabout to the A127</p>	<p>Comments noted. Certain junctions are identified for improvement within the <a href="#">Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan</a>. Improvements to the wider road network will also be looked at throughout the new</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>roundabout. Then there's the traffic going through Rayleigh itself. This is always worse when there's a problem on the A127. The junction with Down Hall Road is particularly frustrating not to mention the slow crawl up Crown Hill.</p> <p>This really needs to be improved before anymore housing is considered in Rayleigh.</p>	<p>Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council</p>
21	Rayleigh	<p>Move pedestrian crossing at the top of Crown hill down or change to a pelican crossing to alleviate traffic flow.</p> <p>Install 'Sleeping Policemen' bumps to slow traffic in residential area.</p> <p>More parking restrictions are needed along residential roads.</p> <p>Roundabouts outside M&amp;S and Lynx nightclub have obstructed views to the right, these ought to be relocated to give drivers better view of the oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Rayleigh High Street, Eastwood Road and London Road are all congested. Even at off peak times traffic is often queueing from Rayleigh Station to access the High Street.</p> <p>High volumes of traffic are killing off our high street.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The <a href="#">Rayleigh Centre Area Action Plan</a> (RAAP) identifies the crossing at the top of Crown Hill as needing improvement to help ease traffic flow.</p> <p>The RAAP also identifies the need for improvement to many of the mini-roundabouts in the centre.</p> <p>Issues such as these can be brought to the attention of your local Councillor and raised with the Local Highways Panel.</p> <p>We will be publishing a baseline position on the district's road network alongside the forthcoming Issues and Options document. From this, highway modelling will be developed by Essex County Council and potential traffic mitigation measures explored.</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>Websters Way traffic management issues;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entry/exit of Websters Way car park is a major issue.</li> <li>• Crossing lights at this location change too often.</li> <li>• The junction of Websters Way and Eastwood Road is dangerous with drivers having to look for cars and pedestrians. The zebra crossing should be replaced with lights.</li> <li>• At the top (north) of Rayleigh High Street, opposite Holy Trinity Church, drivers often drive through red lights. Red light cameras should be placed at this junction.</li> </ul> <p>In order to solve some of these issues a survey should take place in the school term during the week.</p>	
22	Rayleigh	<p>Rayleigh station car park – Should be one way in, one out. The expanse of pavement could be used to create an entrance/exit that is easy to access.</p> <p>The location of a car wash here makes the system worse.</p> <p>Roundabout outside of Edward Francis is dangerous with drivers speeding up on approach rather than</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Specific improvements to the wider road network will be investigated in the next stages of the new Local Plan, alongside the highway authority, Essex County Council.</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		slowing down. Some form of speed ramp needs to be in place to slow drivers down.	
23	Rayleigh	The traffic lights and lights at pedestrian crossings along Rayleigh High Street need to be synchronized as they currently work against each other.	As part of the next stages of the new Local Plan, we shall be publishing a baseline position on the district's road network alongside the forthcoming Issues and Options document. From this, highway modelling will be developed by Essex County Council and potential mitigation issues explored.
24	Rayleigh	<p>The junction of London Road, Down Hall Road and Creswick Avenue is extremely dangerous, especially for cars attempting to exit Creswick Avenue. The traffic lights on the pedestrian crossing at this location stay green too long, causing issues at this junction.</p> <p>The dedicated turns provided from London Road to Down Hall create an impossible to navigate obstacle when exiting Creswick Avenue.</p>	<p>As part of the next stages of the new Local Plan, we shall be publishing a baseline position on the district's road network alongside the forthcoming Issues and Options document. From this, highway modelling will be developed by Essex County Council and potential mitigation issues explored.</p> <p>Specific improvements to the wider road network will be investigated in the next stages of the new Local Plan.</p>
25	Rayleigh	<p>Rayleigh has far too many bottlenecks which cause traffic to an extreme extent, with no other alternative routes. This happens multiple times a day.</p> <p>Rawreth Lane is already congested, further housing will cause the road to become a car park.</p>	As part of the next stages of the new Local Plan, we shall be publishing a baseline position on the district's road network alongside the forthcoming Issues and Options document. From this, highway modelling will be developed by Essex County Council and potential mitigation issues explored. Such issues as a problematic junction or road causing a bottleneck will be identified within the modelling.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	<b>Area</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Initial Officer Comments</b>
26	Rayleigh	Every road into the town centre is blocked at school pick up times, what are the possibilities of staggering school finish times to ease congestion?	Options to reduce congestion across the district will be discussed with Essex County Council through the next stages of the new Local Plan.
27	Rayleigh	<p>Can the following infrastructure improvements be included in the new Local Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By pass to the north of Rayleigh and Hullbridge incorporating Watery Lane, Lower Road to Ashingdon with road straightening and widening to facilitate traffic flow</li> <li>• Improvements to the Junctions at both ends of Rawreth Lane, with consideration to feeder lanes and/or the creation of roundabouts</li> <li>• Improvements to the Junction of Down Hall Road/Hambro Hill maybe with the installation of traffic lights</li> <li>• Improvements to the Junctions on the A129 (London Road/Crown Hill) at Down Hall Road/London Hill</li> <li>• A change to traffic priorities at the top of Crown Hill and High street on to Eastwood Road, with the replacement of the zebra crossing with a Pelican Crossing. The mini roundabouts should be replaced with synchronized traffic lights.</li> </ul>	As part of the next stages of the new Local Plan, we shall be publishing a baseline position on the district's road network alongside the forthcoming Issues and Options document. From this, highway modelling will be developed by Essex County Council and potential mitigation issues explored.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A change to traffic priorities at the top of London Hill and the High Street onto Hockley Road and Websters way with the replacement of the zebra crossing with a Pelican Crossing and lights that are synchronised</li> <li>• Allow access into Love lane from Crown Hill to allow a traffic flow to Spring Gardens Ridgeway and onto the High Road</li> <li>• Creation of new road off the carpenter arms roundabout into the new countryside development (north of London Road)</li> </ul>	
28	Rayleigh	Liaise with Network Rail and the Bus Companies to remodel Rayleigh Station to get all buses especially the X30 to call into a purpose built bus / train station transport hub, also sorting out the car park and taxi ranks.	Comment noted and can be discussed with the relevant operators.
29	Rayleigh	Potholes in Rayleigh roads are not being fixed and are getting bigger and causing cars damage.	Comment noted. Specific road surfacing issues can be brought to the attention of Essex County Council by submitting the relevant information on their <a href="#">highways website</a> .
30	Rayleigh/ Hockley/ Hullbridge	<p>Install a roundabout at the junction of Beeches Road and Chelmsford Road.</p> <p>Build a bypass across open countryside to the end of Watery Lane.</p> <p>Continue widening Lower Road and bypass the</p>	Improvements to the wider road network will be looked at throughout the new Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council.



**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		garden centres by crossing the fields (in as straight a line as possible) to the junction with Greensward Lane – Allowing traffic to bypass Rayleigh and Hockley, freeing up the roads allowing the current infrastructure to take more homes.	
31	Rayleigh/ Hullbridge	<p>The roads can not be improved much, the volume of traffic is the issue. The volume of the traffic on the roads in turn sparks concern about air pollution.</p> <p>Instead of looking for road improvements, public transport should be improved, made cheaper and run more efficiently.</p> <p>Some roads in Hullbridge have not been maintained since they were laid decades ago.</p>	<p>Air pollution is an issue that the Council's Environmental Health team monitor and where necessary, mitigation measures will be implemented.</p> <p>Improvements to public and sustainable transport will be investigated in the future stages of the New Local Plan.</p> <p>Specific cases of poor road surfacing can be brought to the attention of Essex County Council by submitting the relevant information on their <a href="#">highways website</a>.</p>
32	Rochford	Rail bridges are narrow and often add to congestion, and also collect surface water.	Comment noted. The railway bridges are known congestion hotspots and improvements to the wider road network will be considered through the next stages of the new Local Plan process.
33	Rochford	Hall Road roundabout is inadequate, why was it not made bigger so that cars have to go round it. The extra lane will just add to the peak time congestion.	Comment noted. The design and layout of the roundabout was approved by the relevant Highway Authority, Essex County Council.
34	Rochford	The quality of the surfacing along roads and footpaths in the area around Somerset Avenue, The Drive, Percy Cottis Road and Rochford Garden Way	Specific road surfacing issues be brought to the attention of Essex County Council by submitting

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		is appalling. The potholes and defects cause issue for cyclists, mobility scooter users and wheelchairs.	the information on their <a href="#">highways website</a> .
35	Rochford	Development to the east of Ashingdon Road will cause congestion.  New development to the east of Ashingdon Road will place far too much pressure on existing services and the sewers. When are these to be improved? And where are new doctors going to come from?	Comment noted. The ability for infrastructure to support proposed development is a fundamental consideration in the plan-making and planning application processes. Infrastructure providers are consulted with regard to the capacity of their existing infrastructure, and where necessary, they advise on what improvements would be necessary to support the proposed development. These improvements are often delivered alongside development but may also be considered in more strategic investment strategies.
36	Rochford	Sutton Court Drive often gets used as a racetrack all times of the day. Heavy haulage vehicles use the road as a shortcut and have to use the pavement to get down the road.	Comment noted. Incidents of road traffic offences should be noted to Essex Police. Improvements to the road network will be examined in the future stages of the new Local Plan process.
37	Rochford	Suggested road between Stambridge Road to Sutton Road to bypass Rochford. This would allow additional housing capacity in Canewdon/Stambridge and also an enlarged school, doctors surgery and improved bus timetable should come along with this housing.	Improvements to the wider road network will be looked at throughout the new Local Plan process, alongside the Highway Authority, Essex County Council.
38	Rochford	Problem with buses at junction of South Street and West Street is caused by cars waiting in "Keep	Comment noted. Road traffic offences should be reported to the police.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>Clear" area better enforcement of traffic regulations needed.</p> <p>Continued problem of cars parking on pavements (e.g. particularly West Street). Better enforcement of traffic regulations needed.</p>	<p>The <a href="#">South Essex Parking Partnership</a> is responsible for parking restrictions and enforcement in the district. Issues and options relating to on-street parking can be put to them.</p>
39	Rochford/ Hawkwell/ Hockley	There is a lack of road/traffic capacity and a need for new access roads.	Comment noted. Improvements to the road network will be examined in the future stages of the new Local Plan process.
40	South Fambridge	There is no public transport provision.	Comments noted. The vast majority of the bus routes in the area are privately run, therefore areas in which a potentially viable route could operate, may be brought to the attention of a bus operator.
41	South Fambridge	The footpath gets so overgrown in summer that it becomes unusable.	Issues such as unusable footpaths can be raised with Local Councillors or Parish Councils, who are often tasked with their maintenance.
42	South Fambridge	Traffic does not stick to the speed limit in this village.	Incidents of road traffic offences should be noted to Essex Police.
<b>Infrastructure (Schools, Healthcare, Services, Utilities, Broadband)</b>			
43	Other (Theatres Trust)	Important to recognise the benefits of cultural development. Community infrastructure and cultural facilities are an essential element of a sustainable community as they help to promote wellbeing and improve quality of life.	Comments noted and will be considered moving forward through the new Local Plan process.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	<b>Area</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Initial Officer Comments</b>
44	Great Wakering	A secondary school in Wakering is really needed, especially after the additional pressure that will be put on King Edmunds after the 600 homes along Hall Road are complete and after the homes in Star Lane and Barrow Hall Road.	<p>Having previously discussed the issue of secondary school provision in the east of the district with Essex County Council, it was indicated that several thousand additional homes would be needed to justify and sustain a new secondary school. Decisions on the need for a new school will not only depend on the projected additional students as a result of the development, but also on the excess capacity of existing schools and the ability for existing schools to expand.</p> <p>Essex County Council are the education authority for the district and as such, advise us on what improvements to school provision are needed to support new developments. We will continue to liaise with Essex County Council over the course of the new Local Plan process, on the issue of school provision across the district. Where possible, we will discuss options for improvements to capacity and accessibility.</p>
45	Great Wakering	<p>Police presence in Great Wakering is non-existent.</p> <p>The school suits its purpose as a primary school, despite comments from other residents.</p> <p>Castle Road tip is far too far, our rubbish collection has been downgraded to just one truck.</p>	<p>Essex Police manage their resources and issues about presence should be raised to them.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Issues relating to waste collection can be forwarded to the appropriate teams for consideration.</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
46	Hockley	Hockley is in need of a wider range of businesses, with a redesigned more aesthetically pleasing look.	<p>Business and employment growth will be a key focus of the new Local Plan process moving forward.</p> <p>The <a href="#">Hockley Area Action Plan</a> supports the view that very few of the retail units along Spa road make a positive contribution to the character of the area. It is suggested that green landscaping should take place to enhance the visual amenity.</p> <p>The proposed use of the Eldon Way site may result in a wider range of businesses in the area.</p>
47	Rayleigh	Air pollution from the increase in traffic is putting a strain on Southend Hospital.	Air pollution is an issue that the Council's Environmental Health team monitor and where necessary, mitigation measures will be implemented.
48	Rayleigh	Rayleigh should have a swimming pool, which should have been provided with the Rayleigh leisure centre.	Such leisure facilities, provided there is an evidenced need, and are viable, can be considered through the new Local Plan process.
49	Rayleigh	<p>New houses should not be built as the area is overcrowded and the services and utilities are stretched and exhausted.</p> <p>Minimal consideration is given to the existing community.</p>	The Council consults various bodies including utility providers and the relevant authorities on services throughout the plan-making and planning application process. Their advice provides an understanding on the sustainability of services in the context of new development. Where necessary, improvements to services will be achieved during the application process.
50	Rayleigh	There is a lack of doctors, schools (primary and secondary), community facilities and dentists due to overdevelopment. Significantly reducing quality of	Throughout the plan-making and planning application stage, Rochford District Council shall liaise with the relevant providers in order to

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		life.	monitor and keep demand on these services sustainable.
51	Rayleigh	Hullbridge is in need of a better police force so the older generation can safely travel on foot.	Comments noted. Essex Police manage their resources and issues about police presence should be raised to them.
52	Rayleigh	Less room also should be given to gift, charity and beauty shops so as to allow food establishments to generate more income.	Comment noted.
53	Rayleigh	Doctors are all full and can take nearly a week to get an appointment for a child.  I would like to have the details of GP surgeries and their capacities.  The NHS seems to be bursting at the seams both in hospital and the community.	Comment noted. RDC will continue to consult with the local CCG on the capacity of health services and consider measures for improvement.  The Castle Point and Rochford Clinical Commissioning Group are routinely consulted on the ability for health services to sustain further development.
54	Rayleigh	Provide WiFi, or sponsor a partner to create a Rayleigh hub in the High street area to give free WiFi to shoppers.	Comment noted.
55	Rochford	Schools are full to capacity, although I believe there are plans for a new primary school in the new developments.	The Hall Road development site includes plans for a new primary school
56	Rochford	Do not combine the new school on the Hall road site	Comment noted.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		with Rochford Primary.	
57	Rochford	We need more clubs and play areas, such as a skate park - so children have places to go in the school holidays where they won't get bored and this would hopefully reduce vandalism.	Comment noted. The opportunity for improved leisure and open space provision will be considered throughout the new Local Plan process.
58	South Fambridge	Internet speeds in our village are appalling. Home run businesses are almost impossible to manage with such poor speeds. Fibre Optic is needed.	Comment noted. <a href="#">SuperFast Essex</a> – Part of the Superfast Britain Programme coordinated by Essex County Council (ECC). The programme is funded and delivered by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK), BT, Gigaclear, ECC and some Local authorities. The programme is looking to upgrade and deliver new fibre capacity in areas identified as lacking. South Fambridge is an area identified by SuperFast Essex as due for an upgrade to Fibre broadband. Areas identified as not needing an upgrade can apply to the scheme for an upgrade. Estimated delivery date is between June 2017 and July 2018.
59	South Fambridge	There is no access to mains gas or shops within the village.	Comment noted.
<b>Housing</b>			
61	Great Wakering	Too many houses being built in the Wakering area and no additional infrastructure to accommodate the numbers coming into the area.	The ability for infrastructure to support proposed development is a fundamental consideration in the plan-making and planning application processes. Infrastructure providers were consulted with regard to the capacity of their existing infrastructure, and where necessary, they

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			advised on what improvements would be necessary to support the proposed development.
62	Hockley	More affordable housing provision is needed. Where 4-5 bedroomed houses are built, it needs to be made sure that adequate off-street parking is provided.	Comment noted. <a href="#">Policy H4 of the Core Strategy</a> requires any site larger than 15 dwellings or 0.5 hectare to provide 35% affordable housing allocation, subject to viability. Parking is a key consideration at the planning application stage and the Council has policies on minimum parking provision dependent on the works being proposed. Such policies may be refined or rewritten as necessary.
63	Hockley	Developments that have a detrimental impact to the openness of the green belt such as Hall Road should be avoided.	Comment noted. Rochford District Council seeks to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and any decisions to release land from Green Belt are scrutinised in line with national policy guidance. Objective 2 of the Green Belt within the Core Strategy, ensures the minimum amount of Green Belt is allocated to meet the District's housing and employment needs, and that extensions to the residential envelope are in sustainable locations, which retain the individual identities of settlements and prevent coalescence.
64	Hockley/ Hullbridge	Why are RDC allowing house building on the flood plains in Rayleigh and Hullbridge?	The Council considers the potential for flooding through consultation with the statutory flooding authorities. The Council would not approve the building of houses on land deemed unsafe. The sites mentioned are not within the Environment Agency's designated flood zones, where any section of the site may overlap the boundaries of the flood zone, this land may be used for the



**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		There is not the infrastructure capacity for the proposed additional 500 houses to the west of Hullbridge. If these houses are to be built, additional utility, school, road and shop capacity will need to be provided.	<p>provision of green space for example. Any potential surface water flooding is a separate issue away from flood zones which shall be addressed by a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS).</p> <p>The capacity of existing infrastructure is a key consideration at the planning application stage, and the relevant statutory authorities are consulted on any major proposals. Where necessary, they will advise on the improvements needed to sustain the development being proposed. The potential for future infrastructure improvements will be looked at through the next stages of the New Local Plan.</p>
65	Rayleigh	I understand we need more housing, however Rayleigh is not in a position to accommodate new homes. Sites such as the luxury housing on Bullwood Hall should instead have been located elsewhere and provide more affordable housing.	Comments noted.
66	Rayleigh	<p>One of the purposes of the Green Belt is to prevent towns and villages from merging together. This should be stopped from happening between Rayleigh and Rawreth – West Rayleigh/Rawreth has already taken far more than its fair share of development.</p> <p>Rawreth needs its own neighbourhood plan to</p>	<p>The Council seeks to preserve the Green Belt in line with the nationally defined Green Belt purposes, including preventing the merging of towns and villages. Any decisions to release Green Belt land are scrutinised in line with national policy guidance.</p> <p>Rawreth Parish Council is entitled to begin creating a neighbourhood plan, which will be</p>

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>ensure a sustainable future for the village.</p> <p>Protecting the Green Belt across the district should be a priority and the minimum amount of development as possible should occur – Brownfield sites should have priority over greenfield.</p>	<p>supported by Rochford District Council.</p> <p>Comments noted. Current Green Belt policy supports this approach. Purpose 2 of the Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.</p>
67	Rayleigh	RDC should encourage smaller builders by releasing smaller sites on the edge of Rayleigh. Smaller sites integrate into the existing urbanised are better.	Comment noted. The Council’s future housing delivery spatial strategy methods will be considered within the new Local Plan.
68	Rayleigh	<p>Less housing should be permitted for sale via buy-to-rent. Priority and help to buy should be given to younger local buyers.</p> <p>The needs of local people should be prioritised</p>	Comment noted.
69	Rayleigh	Residents have not been consulted about the change of use of Francs Cottee Lodge, Eastwood Road being turned into housing for homeless. What assurances are there about the value of our properties and the people who shall be living there?	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This issue is not within the scope of this consultation.</p>
70	Rayleigh	No major development should take place on the green field land. No major development should take place anywhere without the funds for improvement to infrastructure committed by ECC, and even then, all infrastructure should be delivered before any house	Comment noted. Rochford District Council has a housing need to be met. The Council seeks to preserve the greenfield land, especially Green Belt, as far as practically and reasonably possible. The Council’s housing delivery strategy for meeting its needs over the longer term will be

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		building can commence.	considered through the new Local Plan process.  Infrastructure improvements, where on-site or monetary contributions are determined by the need – as identified by Essex County Council as the highway and education authority, and other relevant providers. If a need is identified then money for improvement will be secured via Section 106 agreements. The timings of these infrastructure improvements will be agreed prior to the development being started.
71	Rochford	Infilling will not meet the needs of our community, it is already too dense.  Where infilling however does occur, these houses need to contribute to house building targets.	Comment noted.  Infill (windfall) housing does currently play a part in house building targets.
72	Rochford	Doggetts farm development is not taking into consideration for the people living near the site currently or the pressures it will put on all aspects of the infrastructure.  It is also to be noted of the impact this development will have on surface water flooding.	Within the planning application process, the Council consults with neighbours to development sites and asks for their views on the proposed development. These will then help to inform the planning officer's decision on whether the development is acceptable (or unacceptable) with regards to its effect on neighbourhood amenity. The Council also consults the relevant infrastructure authorities with regards to the ability for services to support the new development, and if necessary what improvements are needed to support the new development. This would include consultation with the relevant flood authorities.

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
			The Council also has a policy, ENV4, which requires larger applications for development to implement Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)
<b>Other</b>			
73	Other	How are Council Taxes spent?	This is not within the scope of the new Local Plan process.
74	Hockley	Street cleaning needs improving. Spa Road suffers from bad littering.	Comment noted. This can be put to the relevant team for consideration.
75	Hockley	No attention seems to have been made to the local Area Action Plans produced previously. Concerns highlighted within the plans are still relevant but no action has been taken. Residents will have no confidence in the new Local Plan until results are evident.	Comment noted.  The local Area Action Plans are adopted policy documents and are considered in the determination of planning applications.
76	Rayleigh	Vandalism is present in parks along with dog fouling. More police presence is desired.	Comment noted.
77	Rayleigh	Excessive congestion is leading to air pollution along London Road.  There is also increased flash flooding due to poorly designed roads, housing and drainage.	Comments noted. Air pollution is an issue which is monitored by the Council's Environmental Health team and where necessary, mitigation measures will be implemented.  Issues regarding increased surface water runoff can be brought to the attention of the Rochford Flood Action Group, or Essex County Council as the local lead food authority.
78	Rayleigh	A new West Rayleigh / Rawreth Country Park, linking recreation ground in the north through to	Comment noted. Options for improved open spaces and/or tourism opportunities will be

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		Wheatley wood in the south  The Rawreth recreation ground should however be extended and improved to create a Country Park as part of the district Council's 'green tourism' strategy. There are also good road links to make this feasible.	considered in the next stages of the New Local Plan.
79	Rayleigh	Castle Road Tip is in a poor location as skip changeovers take a long time and cause massive queues.	Comment noted. The current local development plan has allocated land to relocate this facility.
80	Rayleigh	I would like more interactive debate, discussion and dissemination of factual information. Difficult to find any transparent and open list of the good work being done on the cumbersome RDC website.	Comment noted.
81	Rochford	Surface water drainage is becoming a problem more regularly.	Comment noted. Surface water flooding issues are considered at the plan-making and planning application stage. The Council has specific policies on the implementation of Sustainable Drainage Systems on larger developments.
82	Rochford	It is a priority to preserve the rural setting of the District.	Comment noted. The district's rural areas are mostly designated as Green Belt. The Council seeks to preserve the openness and setting of its Green Belt land as far as practically possible.
83	Rochford	More dog waste bins are needed in the area around Somerset Avenue, The Drive, Percy Cottis Road and Rochford Garden Way.	Comment noted and shall be forwarded to the Recycling team for comment.
84	Rochford	The Market square is underutilised. More events could be held than just the Tuesday market. Some	Comments noted. The introduction or creation of new events falls outside of the plan making

**Rochford District Council – New Local Plan – Community Engagement Workshops and Issues and Options Survey  
2016: Consultation Statement**

	Area	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		variety on market stalls. New events could encourage or favour small start ups and healthy food stalls. Rochford should be innovative and model the next big idea. The mood around the square needs to be improved in the evenings too. The square is wasted as a car park. There are plenty of other places to park nearby.	process, however plans can be made in order to facilitate new events.
85	Rochford	Concerns over the loss of countryside. The gradual urbanisation is impacting on the natural environment and the district's character as a farming area.  Farmland should be protected from development.	Comment noted. The Council seeks to preserve the openness and setting of its Green Belt land, as far as practically possible, in line with the five purposes of the Green Belt.
86	Rochford/ Great Wakering	Street lights should be on all night again to improve safety.	Most streetlights in the District are under the authority of Essex County Council. Any streetlights that you believe should be exempt from Essex County Council's "part-night" scheme should be put to them.

---

## TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2016 /17 MID YEAR REVIEW

### 1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to provide an update of the Council's Treasury Management activity for the period 1 April 2016 to 30 September 2016 in accordance with the Council's Treasury Management Policy and good practice in treasury management.
- 1.2 It is recommended that the Review Committee notes the Council's treasury activities for the period ending 30 September 2016 and provide comments on the information presented in this report, before it is presented for approval by Full Council on 13 December 2016.

### 2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The Council has adopted the Code of Practice on Treasury Management and a requirement of this is to produce a mid year review looking at the Authority's performance in line with the strategy considered by this Committee in April 2016.
- 2.2 The Council operates a balanced budget, which broadly means cash raised during the year will meet its cash expenditure. Part of the treasury management operation is to ensure this cash flow is adequately planned, with surplus monies being invested in low risk counterparties, providing adequate liquidity initially before considering optimising investment return.
- 2.3 The second main function of the treasury management service is the funding of the Council's capital plans. These capital plans provide a guide to the borrowing need of the Council, essentially the longer term cash flow planning to ensure the Council can meet its capital spending liabilities.

Accordingly, treasury management is defined as: 'The management of the local authority's investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks'.

- 2.4 This mid-year report has been prepared in compliance with CIPFA's Code of Practice on Treasury Management, and covers the following:
  - An economic update for the 2016/17 financial year to 30 September 2016;
  - A review of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy;

- The Council's capital expenditure (prudential indicators);
- A review of the Council's investment portfolio for 2016/17;
- A review of the Council's borrowing strategy for 2016/17;
- A review of compliance with Treasury and Prudential Limits for 2016/17.

2.5 The Council employs treasury advisors, Capita Treasury Services Ltd (Capita), formerly known as Sector Treasury Services Ltd, to provide advice on its treasury management strategy and analysis of the economy and expectations for interest rates.

### 3 KEY MOVEMENT / CHANGES TO THE CAPITAL AND TREASURY STRATEGIES

3.1 There are no changes to the Treasury Management Strategy (TMS) to report. However, with some institutions starting to re-establish themselves and credit rates starting to improve, it is felt useful to clarify part of the TMS to Members.

3.2 The credit worthiness policy in the TMS provides limits and duration of investments dependent on the colour status of an institution. The limits increase with the strength of the counterparty either in duration or the amount to be placed. For counterparty in one of the higher colour bandings, any limit in the colour bandings below it can also be applied. The limits and durations are as follows:-

Capita Colour Coding	Maximum Duration	Maximum Investment
No Colour	Not to be used	-
Green	100 days	£6m
Red	6 months 100 days	£3m £6m
Orange	1 year 6 months 100 days	£1m £3m £6m
Blue	1 year	£4m
Purple	2 years 100 days	£3m £6m

#### Prudential Indicator for Capital Expenditure

3.3 This table shows the forecasted outturn for capital expenditure as at 30 September 2016 and the changes since the Capital Programme was agreed in February 2016, as well as the indicative financing for the programme.



3.4 The major change to the Capital programme was the carry forward of 2015/16 schemes, mainly the Depot works.

<b>Capital Expenditure</b>	<b>2016/17 Original Estimate £'000s</b>	<b>2016/17 Revised Estimate £'000s</b>	<b>2016/17 Latest &amp; End of Year Forecast £'000s</b>
Total	474	927	927
<b>Financed by:</b>			
Prudential Borrowing	0	0	0
Funded Internally	150	150	150
Capital Receipts	74	527	527
Grants	250	250	250

### **Changes to the Prudential Indicators for the Capital Financing Requirement and the Operational Boundary**

3.5 Net external borrowing should not, except in the short term, exceed the total of Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) in the preceding year plus the estimates of any additional CFR for 2016/17 and next two financial years. The Council currently has no external borrowing.

<b>£000s</b>	<b>2015/16 Actual</b>	<b>2016/17 Estimate</b>	<b>2017/18 Estimate</b>	<b>2018/19 Estimate</b>
<b>CFR</b>	687	687	687	687
<b>Movement in CFR</b>	-	-	-*	-*

\* There are a few projects that Members and Officers are working on that could impact the Capital Financing Requirement over the coming years. If agreed and progressed the following projects may have a borrowing cost attached to them. They are:

- Project Wyvern – A major investment opportunity in Rochford Town. To date, Members have agreed that the project can go forward with phase 1, that is, to seek Planning consent for property numbers 19 and 57 South Street.
- Public Conveniences – Members and Officers are considering all options with the ageing Public Conveniences: some of these options will require external borrowing.
- Leisure Premises – Officers are in discussions with Fusion, the leisure contractor, with a view to improve one of the ageing assets, Clements Hall. If agreed, this will require capital investment.

- 
- 3.6 The anticipated borrowing position as indicated above will mean that a Minimum Revenue Provision charge (MRP) will be made to repay the borrowing and interest costs to the respected service areas.
- 3.7 There are no changes to the authorised and operational limits (upper limit beyond which external debt is prohibited) which is outlined in the Treasury Management Strategy and can only be revised by Full Council.

**Economic performance to date**

- 3.8 UK economic growth had already slowed from around 3% in 2014 to around 2% before the European Union (EU) referendum, due to slower global growth, but the vote to leave the EU is likely to lead to a significant further slow down.
- 3.9 UK growth is now projected to slow to around 1.6% in 2016 and 0.6% in 2017, largely due to the increased political and economic uncertainty following the 'Brexit' vote. The UK would narrowly avoid a recession in this scenario, although there are particularly large uncertainties around any such projections after the Brexit vote. The main reason for the slowdown will be a decline in business investment, particularly from overseas, in areas like commercial property. This is being driven by economic and political uncertainty in the short term as well as concerns about the UK's future trading relationships with the EU in the longer term.
- 3.10 Consumer spending growth is projected to hold up better, but will still slow from previous strong rates, dropping to around 1.3% in 2017. This reflects the impact of a weaker pound in pushing up import prices and squeezing the real spending power of households, as well as lower consumer confidence levels and slower jobs growth.
- 3.11 Business and financial services sector growth will slow but should remain positive in 2016/17. Construction companies and capital goods manufacturers will suffer from lower investment levels, although some manufacturing exporters will benefit from the weaker pound.
- 3.12 The Bank of England decided to cut the base rate from 0.50% to 0.25% on 4 August 2016 for the first time in more than seven years as the economy faltered in the wake of the vote to leave the EU.
- 3.13 The National Institute of Economic and Social Research has warned of a 50/50 chance of a recession over the next 18 months. It should not be ruled out that the Bank of England Base Rate may fall further to 0% or possibly turn negative over the second half of the year.
- 3.14 The latest forecast issued on 16 November on the Bank of England Base Rate as issued by Capita is shown in the table below; it is possible that the base rate may be cut further to 0.10% by the end of the financial year.

	<b>Sept 2016 Actual %</b>	<b>Dec 2016 %</b>	<b>Mar 2017 %</b>	<b>Jun 2017 %</b>	<b>Sept 2017 %</b>	<b>Dec 2017 %</b>	<b>Mar 2018 %</b>
<b>Interest Rate Forecast February 2016</b>	0.50	0.50	0.75	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.25
<b>Current Forecast</b>	0.50	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
<b>5 Year PWLB Forecast</b>	2.10	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.70	1.70
<b>10 Year PWLB Forecast</b>	2.58	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
<b>25 Year PWLB Forecast</b>	3.30	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90	3.00	3.00

### **Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy update**

- 3.15 The Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) for 2016/17 was approved by Council in April 2016. All areas of the TMSS including Prudential Indicators remain the same. No changes to the Capital Indicators have been reported.

### **Investment Portfolio 2016/17**

- 3.16 In accordance with the Code, it is the Council's priority to ensure security of capital and liquidity, and to obtain an appropriate level of return that is consistent with the Council's risk appetite. Given this risk environment, investment returns are likely to remain low.
- 3.17 The Council's cash flow position is generally such that it has scope to undertake only short term investments of surplus funds. The Council started the year with no investments and £4.81m in its main current account. The balance of investments held as at 30 September 2016 was £6.60m, plus £0.53m in the main current account. The table below summarises the investment transactions that have taken place:

	<b>Investments £000's</b>	<b>Current Account £000's</b>	<b>No. of Investments</b>
<b>Balance on Investments 1 April 2016</b>	-	4,806	-
<b>Investments placed 01/04/16 – 30/09/16</b>	34,110		
<b>Investments realised 01/04/15 – 30/09/15</b>	27,500		
<b>Balance on Investments 30 Sept 2015</b>	6,610	571	5

- 3.18 The 5 investments comprising the balance of £6.61m were placed with the following counterparties:

<b>Counterparty</b>	<b>£000's of Investments</b>	<b>% of Investments including current account</b>
<b>Santander 31 day account</b>	1,000	13.9
<b>Santander 60 day account</b>	2,000	27.9
<b>Svenska Handlesbanken</b>	1,000	13.9
<b>Money Market Prime</b>	2,600	36.2
<b>Barclays</b>	10	0.1
<b>Lloyds</b>	571	8.0

- 3.19 Forecast investment return for 2016/17 is £30,000, around £55,000 lower than originally anticipated. The investment rates on offer for short term deposits have remained low during the year, primarily as a consequence of general economic conditions.
- 3.20 The Chief Financial Officer (Section 151 Officer) confirms that the approved limits within the Annual Investment Strategy were not breached during the first six months of 2016/17. A review of the Council's investment strategy will be undertaken in the new year and strategy considered that seeks to maximise returns on investment.

**Investment Counterparty Criteria**

- 3.21 The current investment counterparty criteria selection approved in the TMS is meeting the requirement of the treasury management function.
- 3.22 The financial institutions that the Authority is investing with are monitored on a regular basis in line with the risk document issued by Capita, the treasury advisors.

**4 RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 There are no new risk management implications arising from the contents of this report. However, Members will be aware of the uncertainty in the financial markets and the economy as a whole and the potential risks that this may have in general. TMS outlines the risks involved in the investments made by the Council and there have been no changes to the assessment of risk.

If you would like this report in large print, Braille or another language please contact 01702 318111.

**REPORT TO THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE - 30 NOVEMBER  
2016**

**PORTFOLIO: ENVIRONMENT**

**REPORT FROM ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, ENVIRONMENTAL  
SERVICES**

**SUBJECT: PUBLIC TOILET STRATEGY**

**1 KEY DECISIONS DOCUMENT REFERENCE NO: 13/16**

**2 REASON/S FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 Presently, Hockley Parish Council and Great Wakering Parish Council have both indicated that they do not wish to consider the transfer of public conveniences to their respective ownerships. Both sets of public conveniences are low use and therefore it is recommended that they are considered for closure. This would yield an estimated saving of £25,000 per annum.
- 2.2 The remaining Parish/Town Councils (Rayleigh, Rochford and Hullbridge) have expressed an interest in taking on ownership of the public toilets within their areas; either as a long-term lease, or as a full transfer of ownership. It is proposed that each site be offered to the respective Parish/Town Council on at least a 10 year lease. This leasing arrangement would yield an approximate saving of £50,000 per annum.
- 2.3 The Public Health Act 1936 gives Local Authorities the discretion to provide public toilets, but it imposes no statutory duty to do so.
- 2.4 The Business Plan 2016-2020 states that a key priority is to become financially self-sufficient; the report proposals are in agreement with, and will contribute to, such a priority.

**3 SALIENT INFORMATION**

- 3.1 There are six public toilet facilities owned by Rochford District Council. These are located at:-
- Back Lane, Rochford
  - Southend Road, Hockley
  - High Street, Great Wakering
  - Ferry Road, Hullbridge
  - Crown Hill, Rayleigh
  - Hockley Woods, Hockley

The Hockley Woods public conveniences are intrinsic to the woodland operation serving a specific amenity function and therefore have not been considered as part of the scope of this report.

- 3.2 Informal discussion with Members has identified a 75% reduction in funding for public conveniences as a concept to assist with delivering a balanced budget for the revised Medium Term Financial Strategy in 2017/18. The saving would represent a £25,000 reduction in 2017/18 and a further reduction of £50,000 in 2018/19.
- 3.3 The Council has given previous consideration, in 2011 and 2014, to seeking a reduction in expenditure on public conveniences. In summary, there appears to have been some previous reluctance for Parish/Town Councils to make a contribution towards the maintenance of Rochford District Council's public conveniences. Equally, there has been no appetite by Members to carry forward the closure of the public conveniences.
- 3.4 The appended options document scopes the different options available for service delivery of public conveniences; and then recommends the preferred option outlining a business case for further consideration.
- 3.5 Four broad options of service delivery were considered within the report, and the findings are summarised below:-
  - Close Toilets - all or some of the public conveniences are closed, without establishing any further provision. The asset is sold where possible for development. The closing of all toilets will effectively achieve the saving targets with a high degree of certainty, but will clearly have the highest impact upon the community. This can be mitigated by targeting to close the lower use toilets, so as to minimise the impact.
  - Establish community toilets – all or some of the public conveniences are closed with provision delivered via private facilities secured through use of a financial incentive. The level of saving is uncertain due to having to establish a level of financial incentive required to secure private toilets for public use. The level of sustainability and suitability of premises could prove problematic to secure over a long tenure.
  - Reduce running costs – the cleaning contract is separated from the main SUEZ street scene contract and re-tendered, or brought 'in-house'. The financial savings would be minimal, as would be the impact upon the community. This would not offer any significant contribution towards the savings targets.
  - Transfer ownership – The transfer of ownership/responsibility of public conveniences to the relevant Parish/Town Council would achieve the saving targets required. However, this is based upon the willingness of

the respective Parish/Town Council to agree to the transfer. This option would minimise any negative impact upon the community.

- 3.6 The options document concludes that an investment of £291,000 would generate a saving of £546,500 over a period of 10 years if all parts of the proposal are accepted. This would be achieved through the construction of replacement public conveniences at Hullbridge, Rayleigh, and Rochford, which would then be leased at a “peppercorn” rent to the respective Parish/Town Council for a period of at least 10 years; and through the closure of toilets at Great Wakering and Hockley.
- 3.7 At present there is an assumption that the initial expressions of interest, from the aforementioned Councils, are translated into concrete proposals whereby the assets are transferred for at least a period of 10 years.
- 3.8 Should the initial expressions of interest prove not to be formalised by April 2018 then it is proposed that the toilets would be considered for closure to provide the financial savings required. In the case of Great Wakering Parish Council and Hockley Parish Council, where indications are that there is no interest in the transfer of the public convenience asset to the respective Council, then it is proposed that these will also be considered for closure.

#### **4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 As part of the scoping exercise, four broad options were identified for consideration: Close Toilets; Establish Community Toilets; Reduce Running Costs; Transfer Ownership. These options have already been summarised above, under paragraph 4.5. Further detail can be found in the appendix.
- 4.2 A further alternative is to continue the existing service provision, and hence not deliver any of the financial savings.

#### **5 RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 There is a clear reputational risk in the closing of public conveniences; this can be off-set by pursuing the strategy of transferring the assets to a third party wherever possible. Prioritising low use public conveniences for initial closure will also reduce any potential impact.

#### **6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The development of new modern public conveniences will reduce the potential for anti-social behaviour. Where closures are identified, the toilets will remain open until any sale of asset has been completed so as to reduce the risk of vandalism often associated with a vacant building.



**7 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 Originally at the beginning of the twentieth century, the provision of public toilets was seen as part of the strategy to improve public health. Many of the sanitation issues and challenges at that time are not as relevant today, and thus any environmental issues would have a minimum impact.

**8 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 The proposed investment level of £291,000 looks to generate a significant return to Rochford District Council in line with its aim of becoming financially self sufficient by 2020. The return on investment is in the region of 50% and the saving over a ten year period would be £546,500 (or £365,440 NPV) if all parts of the proposal are accepted. This equates to £75,000 saving per annum to help close the funding gap.

**9 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The Public Health Act 1936 gives Local Authorities the discretion to provide public toilets, but it imposes no statutory duty to do so.
- 9.2 Should Members decide to sell or lease the toilets, legal agreements will need to be entered into and appropriate terms and conditions will need to be agreed prior to any transfer.

**10 EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the closure of toilets and concludes that it is likely to have a medium impact upon the community. There is likely to be a disproportionate impact on the more vulnerable groups should public toilets close.

Rochford District Council  
Options for the Delivery of Public Conveniences in the Rochford District  
15<sup>th</sup> November 2016

**ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**Options for the Delivery of Public**  
**Conveniences in the Rochford District**  
**15<sup>TH</sup> November 2016**  
**Assistant Director – Environment**  
**M. Hotten**

## **Options for the Delivery of Public Conveniences in the Rochford District**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1. Introduction**
  - 2. Aims**
  - 3. Background**
  - 4. Rochford District Council's Public Conveniences**
  - 5. Considering the Options for Delivery**
  - 6. Factors Influencing Choice of Options**
    - 6.1 Toilet Usage
    - 6.2 Cost of Public Conveniences
    - 6.3 The Current Cleaning Contract
    - 6.4 Long-Term Maintenance
    - 6.5 Parish/Town Councils
    - 6.6 Re-Development of Sites
    - 6.7 Community Toilets
    - 6.8 Installation of New toilets
  - 7. Summary**
  - 8. Conclusion**
  - 9. Recommendations**
- APPENDIX 1** Images of Rochford Council Public Conveniences  
**APPENDIX 2** Examples of New Toilet Block Designs

## **Options for the Delivery of Public Conveniences in the Rochford District**

### **1. Introduction**

Informal Discussion with Members have identified a 75% reduction in funding for Public Conveniences was discussed as a concept. This is to assist with contributing to a balanced financial budget for future planning of the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The saving would represent a £25,000 reduction in 2017/18; and a further reduction of £50,000 in 2018/19.

The below report sets out a possible approach to achieving that saving.

### **2. Aims:**

The report aims to:

- Scope the different options available regarding service delivery for public conveniences;
- To recommend a preferred option and outline a business case for further consideration.

### **3. Background**

The first public toilets were introduced in 1852. The Public Health Act 1936 gives local authorities the discretion to provide public toilets but it imposes no statutory duty to do so and this lack of compulsion, together with a perception of nuisance associated with them, has resulted in a general decline in the provision of public toilets across the UK in recent years.

There had been previous discussions with Members, in 2011 and 2014, to seek a reduction in expenditure upon public conveniences. The outcome of which have been summarised below.

A report to Executive in November 2011 recommended that the Public Toilets be considered for closure, with an offer made to Parish and Town councils to take on approximately 50 to 75% of the cost. This offer was declined by each of the Parish and Town councils. The recommendation to close all Public Conveniences was not carried.

A further report to the Executive in June 2014 outlined a strategy for the provision of public toilets, and resolved that:

- 1) *Reduced operating hours be introduced for the toilets in Back Lane, Rochford as detailed in the report. Public consultation to be undertaken on*

*whether these facilities are required in the longer term and/or whether they should be relocated.*

*(2) That an 'exit' survey be undertaken to ascertain the usage by the public of the facilities in Hockley and Great Wakering. A public consultation exercise to be undertaken to inform a final decision on the future of the toilets.*

*(3) That market testing be undertaken of the facilities in Hullbridge and Rayleigh, together with the adjacent land, to ascertain whether there is any business potential in developing the sites for alternative uses on the basis of an obligation to keep the facilities available to the public.*

*(4) That a further report be submitted to the Executive once the various options have been explored so that the results can be considered as part of the budget process. (HES)*

As part of the process of developing the 2014 report, meetings were again held with each of the Parish/Town Councils to discuss the feasibility of contributing to the cost of the maintenance of the toilets. The Portfolio Holder for the Environment was in attendance at the meetings with Hullbridge, Hockley, and Great Wakering Councils. All the Parishes and the Town Council notified the Council of their reluctance to become involved and take on the responsibility for any of the public conveniences.

In summary, there would appear to be previously reluctance for Parish/Town Councils to make a contribution towards the maintenance of Rochford Council's public conveniences. Equally, there has been no appetite, by Members, to carry forward the closure of the public conveniences.

#### **4. Rochford District Council's Public Conveniences**

There are six public toilet facilities owned by Rochford District Council, cleaned and maintained by SUEZ environmental as part of the Council's Street Cleansing contract. These six toilet facilities are located at:-

- Back Lane, Rochford
- Southend Road, Hockley
- High Street, Great Wakering
- Ferry Road, Hullbridge
- Crown Hill, Rayleigh
- Hockley Woods, Hockley

Each are discussed in greater detail, below:

##### Back Lane, Rochford

This site is located adjacent to the main car park in Back Lane Rochford. The toilets are located in a detached brick constructed building. Following refurbishment at the

turn of the century, the facilities are beginning to look worn. Given the toilet's location to the rear of the town centre, there have been problems at night with youths congregating outside which can be intimidating to the general public. The siting, location and design of the block have also resulted in undesirable behaviour occurring within both the female and male areas of the toilets from time to time. The Police are aware of these problems.

Internally the facility is not as clean as is desired, giving a very uninviting facility to use. Sexual graffiti is evident on the stainless steel cubicle walls.

#### Southend Road, Hockley

This site is located adjacent to the main car park in Southend Road, Hockley directly opposite the Parish Council Offices. This is a small facility located, in a detached brick constructed building, close to doctors, day centre and library. The area is well lit, and located on a main road. There is no history of youths congregating outside at night

Low footfall has led to signs of vandalism. Upon a recent visit, the facility was found to be dirty and needs refurbishing (Stained WC pans and peeling paintwork). There was an open window through which trailing ivy has grown.

#### High Street, Great Wakering

This site is located adjacent to the main road in Great Wakering next to the old fire station. The toilets are located in a detached brick constructed building. The toilets have relatively recently been refurbished. The area is well lit and located on a main road. It does not attract youths at night.

The structure of the building is in generally good order and during a recent visit the interior was in a reasonably clean state. However, there was evidence of alcoholic drinking occurring in the facility. Also the hand wash units were very unresponsive, often requiring several attempts to work.

#### Ferry Road, Hullbridge

The toilets are located in a detached brick constructed building. The toilet is in a reasonable condition but has in the past suffered fire damage. The area is well lit, but can attract youths at night. This is a scarcely used facility in a mainly residential area, close to the river and local pub and is mainly used by tradesmen, reps and van drivers.

Internally the building is not as well cleaned as is desirable. Cobwebs and dirty, dusty paintwork should not be apparent in a facility that is properly cleaned this often happens in "out of town" facilities with less visibility to council officers. Certain fixtures need to be looked at –the wood board façade on the doors is peeling at the

bottom due to dampness, internal signs have been ripped off giving a poor first impression.

#### Crown Hill, Rayleigh

This site is located on Crown Hill in Rayleigh adjacent to the main shopping area. The toilets are located in a detached brick constructed building which requires maintenance to the roof and the rainwater services. Following refurbishment a decade ago, the facilities are beginning to show signs of their usage. The area is well lit and located on a main road so it does not attract youths at night. This is a well used facility in a town centre location, close to many shops.

The fabric of the building is showing signs of wear including damp patches on the ceiling, probably caused by water ingress through the roof. Floor tiles were also loose upon inspection causing the facility to be closed. There were no toilet rolls in the accessible cubicle and also the stainless steel hand wash unit had considerable surface rust. The nearby leak (from an as yet un-identified source) is emitting an unpleasant smell and should be fixed as soon as possible.

#### Hockley Woods, Hockley

The toilets in Hockley Woods are provided for the visitors and staff. The toilets are modern and of the single cubicle type with direct access to the car park. The premises are not liable for Business Rates. Given their location and usage within the context of Hockley Woods, no external valuation has been sought at this stage, as they are seen as intrinsic to the woodland operation. They have not been considered as part of the scope of the report, serving a specific amenity function for Hockley Woods.

### **5. Considering the Options for Delivery**

For the purposes of this exercise, four broad options have been identified for consideration:

- Close Toilets - all or some of the public conveniences are closed without establishing any further provision with land sold where possible for development;
- Establish Community Toilets - all or some of the public conveniences are closed with provision delivered via private facilities secured through use of a financial incentive;
- Reduce Running Costs – the cleaning contract is separated from the main SUEZ street scene contract and re-tendered or brought in-house;

- Transfer Ownership – The transfer of ownership/responsibility of public conveniences to the relevant parish/town council.

## 6. Factors Influencing Choice of Options

### 6.1. Toilet Usage

Officers were deployed to observe the number of visits undertaken by the public to the public conveniences. These observations were made in hour to two hours periods, at differing periods of the day, replicated for each site to ensure a like for like comparison.

The average number of visits per hour could then be used to calculate an estimate of total visits per year; this presumes that use is consistent throughout the year which is unlikely, with the summer months usually representing the greatest use. However, for the sake of comparison it can be viewed that the estimate provides an alternative metric for comparison, than the Visits per Hour.

Table 1 – Estimated Usage of Rochford District Council Public Conveniences

Toilet Usage	Visits per year (estimate)*	Year and month of survey	Total Visits recorded	Number of survey Hours	Visits per Hour
Back Lane, Rochford	C.22,295	August 2016	<b>49</b>	8	6.125
Southend Road, Hockley	c.13,104	September 2014	<b>18</b>	5	3.6
High Street, Great Wakering	c.4,841	September 2014	<b>8</b>	6	1.33
Ferry Lane, Hullbridge	c.15,470	August 2016	<b>34</b>	8	4.25
Crown Hill, Rayleigh	c.116,480	July 16	<b>192</b>	6	32.0

\*visits per year= (visits per hour x 3,640 hours (based on toilets open for 10 hours a day 364 day year).

It should be noted that surveys for Hockley and Wakering were undertaken in 2014 rather than 2016. There have been no apparent socio-economic changes within the district over the last two years to suggest that the usage would have significantly changed, therefore it is viewed that the survey results are still current.

The figures highlight the significantly greater use that the toilets at Rayleigh experience in comparison to the other public conveniences in the district. The low number of visits to Great Wakering toilets is also notable. Given the margin of error that can be expected, with the limited survey time undertaken for each set of public conveniences, the usage of toilets at Rochford, Hullbridge and Hockley should be viewed as broadly similar.



Rochford District Council  
Options for the Delivery of Public Conveniences in the Rochford District  
15<sup>th</sup> November 2016

A general assumption can be applied, that an individual toilet can on average accommodate 10 to 12 visits per hour. Applying this assumption to the average use of Rochford District public conveniences would conclude that with the exception of Rayleigh, a single toilet at each site would adequately cope with public demand, and that such sites can be described as having a low public demand.

## 6.2. Cost of Public Conveniences

The total annual revenue cost of maintaining and cleaning the Council's public conveniences is set out below.

Table 2 –Annual Revenue Cost of Rochford District Council's Public Conveniences (2016/2017)

Item	Annual Cost
Utilities	£7,600
Business Rates	£5,800
Maintenance	£10,700
Cleaning	£75,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>£99,100</b>

This has been further broken down into the individual sites for comparison of cost.

Table 3 - Annual Revenue Cost of Rochford District Council's Public Convenience (2016/2017) for individual sites

	Cleaning	Building Maintenance	Utilities	Business Rates	Total
Back Lane, Rochford	12,500	1,800.00	£1,350.00	2,064.00	<b>£17,714.00</b>
Southend Road, Hockley	12,500	1,800.00	£500.00	480.00	<b>£15,280.00</b>
High Street, Great Wakering	12,500	1,800.00	£600.00	984.00	<b>£15,884.00</b>
Ferry Road, Hullbridge	12,500	1,800.00	£750.00	792.00	<b>£15,842.00</b>
Rayleigh, Crown Hill	12,500	1,800.00	£2,400.00	1,416.00	<b>£18,116.00</b>
Hockley Woods	12,500	1,700.00	£2,000.00	n/a	<b>£16,200.00</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>99,036</b>

The costs for individual sites can be seen to be broadly similar; this is due to approximately three-quarters of the cost being attributed to the cleaning contract, which has been apportioned in equal amounts across the six public conveniences blocks that are visited.

## 6.3. The Current Cleaning Contract

For the main public toilets the contractor has the responsibility for the opening and closing of the toilets, the general cleaning and all minor maintenance obligations.

The cost for the cleaning of the toilets is part of the Street Cleansing contract awarded to SUEZ Environmental, for a seven period, that is due to expire in April 2022.

The contract is effectively one person, a van, plus equipment. The contract states that all toilets should be serviced by 8am. The toilets should be closed 30 minutes before dusk (April until September) and 6pm between October and the end of March. The toilets must be open by 8am. The toilets are visited during the day but the frequency of visits and level of attention depends on their condition and usage.

Previous discussions with the contractor have indicated that no saving could be offered for reducing the number of public conveniences sites visited, due to the level of resourcing that would be needed remaining the same, i.e. one member of staff. However, the bill of quantities associated with the current contract identifies that toilet cleaning as a separate item. This should allow for the removal of that cost if the Council requests for the service to cease.

Consideration should be given to the implications of TUPE, with any transfer of the contract in a form similar to its current undertaking, potentially resulting in the existing incumbent staff, and hence level of resourcing cost, being transferred.

If it is considered desirable that the implications of TUPE be avoided, then the contract can be broken into smaller elements, whereby different parties are responsible for different sets of public conveniences.

#### **6.4. Long-Term Maintenance**

Of the five public convenience buildings, only the High Street, Great Wakering toilets has received any significant capital expenditure in the past 10 years. It is anticipated that the remaining four buildings will require refurbishment, and potentially in the case of Crown Hill, Rayleigh and Back Lane, Rochford, re-roofing may also have to be considered.

At present an estimate of £100,000 has been budgeted to provide for the necessary refurbishment over the next five to ten years.

#### **6.5. Parish/Town Councils**

Previous discussions with Parish and town Councils suggested that it was unlikely that they would consider contributing to the running costs of Rochford Councils public conveniences. Further meetings have been undertaken with all five of the relevant parish/town councils to discuss if views have changed, or if a further alternative approach to reducing costs can be found.

There was a notable consistency in the tone of discussion, in that the parish/town councils wished to work in partnership with Council. An expression of interest was

tendered by all councils, with the exception of Great Wakering Parish, and Hockley Parish, who presently have yet to finalise a decision. In particular, the proposal that existing toilet blocks are replaced with modern facilities and that Parish/Town Councils maintain these on a 10-year full repair and maintenance lease, was greeted favourably.

## **6.6. Re-development of Sites**

Two of the sites have been identified in long-term potential redevelopment programmes. These are: Southend Road, Hockley and Back Lane, Rochford Toilets – in partnership with Essex Housing.

The remaining three sites were considered as part of the recent Asset Register Review (2016), undertaken by the Council. It was concluded that all three were viewed as being long-term redevelopment projects that represented a low value return, either due their size and location (Hullbridge and Great Wakering), or the complexity of easements and covenants (Rayleigh) that are associated with the site.

Therefore the re-development value of these sites has not been incorporated into this report, but would be subject of a further report if there is deemed to be a strong appetite for their development.

The need for flexibility in any approach in terms of future commitments for these sites, particularly Southend Road, Hockley and Back Lane, Rochford, should be given significant consideration in any proposals that are taken forward.

## **6.7. Community Toilets**

The potential for community toilets at each site has been briefly scoped, and broadly reflects the number of restaurants or pubs that are within the vicinity of each location. The concept broadly consists of a financial incentive to shops, restaurants and pubs, whereby their toilets are provided for the wider community, rather than limited to customers.

For Great Wakering little opportunity for a community toilet could be identified.

In Hockley there appears to be limited scope for a community toilet scheme with a public house having been identified previously as willing to accept the arrangement. There is no disabled access or baby changing facilities, and access by children is questionable as the premises are licensed. Other venues such as Costa may offer an alternative, but would be limited by the opening hours available

In Hullbridge the only potential options for a community toilet identified is the nearby Public House, or the Community Centre, although the facilities there would require a capital investment.

At Rochford there is a selection of Public Houses and restaurants within Rochford that may be suitable, albeit with limited opening hours throughout the day time.

In Rayleigh, publicly funded toilets are accessible at the Mill and the Town Council Pavilion between King Georges Playing Field and Websters Way car park. There are a number of coffee shops and the opportunities for community toilets are good.

## 6.8. Installation of New Toilets

Discussions have been held with Danfo, a leading provider of modern toilet facilities, to identify possible suitable alternative facilities and an estimate cost. Examples of toilet blocks installed by Danfo can be seen in Appendix 2. The below estimates provide an indicative cost of removing all existing toilets and replacing with new facilities.

Table 4 – Estimate Cost for Replacement Public Conveniences

Facility	Accessible WC Cubicles	Standard Cubicles	Cost	Demolition	Contingency	Total Cost
Hullbridge, Ferry Lane	1	0	£60,000	£6,000	£6,000	£72,000
Southend Rd, Hockley	1	0	£60,000	£6,000	£6,000	£72,000
Wakering, High Street	1	0	£60,000	£6,000	£6,000	£72,000
Rayleigh, Crown Hill	1	2	£90,000	£17,000	£9,000	£116,000
Back Lane, Rochford	1	1	£80,000	£15,000	£8,000	£103,000
					<b>Total</b>	<b>£435,000</b>

The new construction would offer a reduced number of cubicles in comparison to existing toilet provision, but would reflect the current usage of each set of public conveniences as identified by the survey work.

The expected life of such these conveniences would be in excess of 20 years, with examples of similar construction found in the Southend-On-Sea Borough in good condition after a 10 year period.

These modern constructions are designed to reduce vandalism and misuse. There are no lobbies where customers can congregate, the fittings and buildings are robust, functional and welcoming, and the external and internal surfaces are readily cleansable and graffiti resistant.

## 7. Summary

The below table sets out the considerations made for each of options, this is summarised below in the four broad option headings:

- Close Toilets – Closing all toilets will effectively achieve the saving targets with a high degree of certainty, but will clearly have the highest impact upon the community. This can be mitigated by targeting to close the lower use toilets only to minimise the impact.
- Establish Community Toilets – The level of saving is uncertain due to having to establish a level of financial incentive required to secure private toilets for public use. The level of sustainability and suitability of premises could prove problematic to secure over a long tenure.
- Reduce Running Costs – Financial savings would be minimal, as would be the impact upon the community. This would offer significant contribution towards the savings targets
- Transfer Ownership – The transfer of ownership/responsibility of public conveniences to the relevant parish/town council would achieve the saving targets required. However, this is based upon the willingness of the respective parish/town council to agree to the transfer. This option would minimise any negative impact upon the community.

Rochford District Council  
Options for the Delivery of Public Conveniences in the Rochford District  
15<sup>th</sup> November 2016

Table 5 -

Options	Outline Proposal	Potential Savings	Benefits	Risks
<b>Close toilets</b>				
Close All Toilets	All Toilets Closed without any further provision, land sold where possible for development	<b>£75,000 p.a.</b>  (Sale of assets will provide a capital receipt of circa £100,000.)	Certainty over savings that can be achieved. No requirement for longer term capital investment in toilet refurbishment.	£5,800 of the budget is Business Rates, this saving may not be realised. If land is not disposed of, then there is high risk of vandalism. Demolition of buildings has not been fully costed, an estimated cost of £50,000. High reputational risk, potential negative impact on street scene, disproportionate impact on vulnerable groups.
Close low use toilets	Low use toilets (Wakering, Hockley & Hullbridge) are closed with remaining toilets kept open. Possible to pilot closure although no saving would be realised.	<b>£ 25,000 – 40,000 p.a.</b>  (Possible value for disposal of assets although likely to be low value.)	Certainty over savings that can be achieved. Reduces requirement for longer term capital investment in toilet refurbishment.	New local cleaning contracts to be negotiated for remaining toilet site. Reputational risk for closing specific blocks, blocks will require sale/demolition, need to arrange sale of blocks before closure to ensure smoother transition.
<b>Community Toilets</b>				
Community Toilets	All Toilet blocks closed with provision via private facilities given a financial incentive.	<b>£35,000 pa.</b>	Some provision for use by the public is continued, may be an increase in trade for private providers.	Lack of up take of scheme results in no toilet provision; suitability of toilets may be found wanting for DDA purposes and children; opening times of providers may limit access; Continuity and quality hard to manage with range of potential providers, will be able to secure short-term licence arrangements, may be intensive in staff resource to manage and promote.  If land is not disposed of, then there is high risk of vandalism. Demolition of buildings has not been fully costed, this will cost an estimated £50,000.

Rochford District Council  
Options for the Delivery of Public Conveniences in the Rochford District  
15<sup>th</sup> November 2016

Reduce Costs				
Toilet Cleaning in-house	Cleaning and maintenance of toilet are brought into LATCO.	<b>£25,000</b> is possible, if combined with office cleaning contract.	Continuation of existing service and assets	Failure to deliver service may occur; business continuity is vulnerable due to small size of contract.  Long term capital re-investment in toilet refurbishment will be required.
Re-tender Contract	Contract is separated from main SUEZ street scene contract and re-tendered	<b>£5,000 to £10,000</b> is possible	Continuation of existing service and assets	Failure to deliver service may occur; business continuity is vulnerable due to small size of contract. May require transfer of existing staff and resources with very little financial saving achieved.  Long term capital re-investment in toilet refurbishment will be required.
Transfer Toilets				
Part contribution	Offer a contribution towards the running cost of toilets, maintenance costs are picked up by the Council.	<b>£35,000</b> pa, ensures continuation of existing service in partnership with local community	Continuation of existing service and assets. No requirement for longer term capital investment in toilet refurbishment.	Past and existing consultations with parish/town councils reveal a reluctance to take on toilet blocks of poor condition and still ultimately in Rochford Council control.  Long term capital re-investment in toilet refurbishment will be required
Complete transfer	Full transfer of ownership to parish council	<b>£75,000</b> pa, ensures continuation of existing service in partnership with local community	Continuation of existing service and assets.	Past and existing consultations with parish/town councils reveal a reluctance to take on toilet blocks of poor condition, and hence the negative image associated with them.
New toilets – complete transfer	Full transfer of ownership to Parish Council with new easier to maintain toilets	<b>£75,000</b> pa, possible relocation may realise capital receipt to off-set	Offer of new facilities may justify the rise in parish/town precepts. Ability to charge for use to off-set cost is also a possibility and reduce anti-social behaviour. New toilet facilities would provide an enhanced visitor experience and visual amenity.	Past and existing consultations with parish/town councils reveal a reluctance to take on toilet blocks of poor condition.  Would require a substantial investment of circa £400,000 to replace all toilet blocks.

## 8. Conclusion

It is proposed that if the financial savings targets are to be met, that either toilet closure, or full transfer of assets are given further consideration.

Presently, Hockley Parish Council and Great Wakering Parish Council have both indicated that they do not wish to consider the transfer of public conveniences to their respective ownerships. Both sets of public conveniences are low use, therefore it is recommended that they are closed. This would yield an estimated saving of £25,000 per annum.

The remaining parish/town Councils have expressed an interest in taking on ownership, either as a long-term lease, or as a full transfer of ownership. It is proposed that each site is offered to the respective parish/town council upon a 10 year lease or a greater length of time.

The costs and saving benefits are set out in the table below.

Table 6 –

	Hullbridge	Rochford	Rayleigh	Sub Total (with Investment)	Wakering	Hockley	Sub Total (Closure)	Hockley Woods	Total
Annual Saving £	15,842	17,714	18,116	51,672	15,884	15,280	31,164	(7,836)	75,000
Capital Investment £	(72,000)	(103,000)	(116,000)	(291,000)	-	-	-	-	(291,000)
Capital investment Avoided £	12,500	25,000	25,000	62,500	12,500	12,500	25,000	-	87,500
Years to pay back	4.5	5.8	6.4	5.6	-	-	-	-	5.6
<b>Gross Savings over 10 yrs £</b>	<b>170,920</b>	<b>202,140</b>	<b>206,160</b>	<b>579,220</b>	<b>171,340</b>	<b>165,300</b>	<b>336,640</b>	<b>(78,360)</b>	<b>837,500</b>
<b>Net Savings over 10yrs £</b>	<b>98,920</b>	<b>99,140</b>	<b>90,160</b>	<b>288,220</b>	<b>171,340</b>	<b>165,300</b>	<b>336,640</b>	<b>(78,360)</b>	<b>546,500</b>
NPV (3%) £	66,658	52,042	42,561	161,261	139,025	133,739	272,764	(68,585)	365,440

In summary an investment of £291,000 will generate approximately a saving of £579,220,000 over the period of 10 years (£516,720 Revenue + £62,500 avoided Capital expenditure), and can be viewed as a favourable return, generating a yield of approximately 50% over the life time of the project, with a payback period of 5 years and 6 months. This proposal combined with the closure of Wakering and Hockley toilets would generate a further £336,640 of savings over a 10 year period, partially offset by a small increase in the running costs of the Hockley Woods toilets, would mean a net saving to Rochford District Council of £75,000 per annum, or £546,500 over a 10 year period.

At present there is an assumption that the initial expressions of interest are translated into concrete proposals whereby the assets are transferred for at least a period of 10 years. Should the initial expressions of interest prove not to be formalised, then it is proposed that the toilets would close to provide the financial savings required.



In the case of Great Wakering Parish Council and Hockley Parish Council, where indications are that there is no interest in the transfer of the public convenience asset to the respective Council, then it is proposed that these will now close.

**9. Recommendations:**

1. That all Public Toilets, with the exception of those at Hockley Woods, either by closure and sale, or through transfer of the asset upon a long-term lease to the relevant town/parish council. The disposal of these assets to be completed by April 2018.
2. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Environment, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and the Portfolio Holder for Enterprise, to oversee the closure and sale of Public Toilets, as above (1), subject to appropriate public consultation
3. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Environment, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and the Portfolio Holder for Enterprise, to negotiate suitable lease arrangements with the relevant town/parish councils.
4. That should the negotiations in (2) above have been successful, the Investment Board be asked to present a business case in line with the budgetary principles set out in the appended options document for the installation of replacement Public Toilets.

## Appendix 1 – Images of Rochford Council Public Conveniences

### High Street, Great Wakering



### Crown Hill, Rayleigh



**Ferry Lane, Hullbridge**



**Southend Road, Hockley**



**Back Lane, Hullbridge**



**APPENDIX 2 – Examples of new toilet block designs**

**Quaileholme Road, Wyre**



**London Fields park, Hackney**

