

Application Ref	17/00578/REM		
Contact Name	Mr J E Cripps	Submission typ	O - Objection
Reocode	DRAIN - Insufficient drainage HIGHWA - Traffic generation/access	Contact addres	5 Durham Way Rayleigh Essex
Contact Email	[REDACTED]	Postcode	SS6 9RY
Objector type	NEIGH - Neighbour	Phone number	[REDACTED]
Id	6511	Timestamp	2017-06-29 14:38:48+01

Comment

I appreciate that the scope of this application is somewhat limited ( to Reserved Matters ) which is at odds with the Developer's recent press release implying a 2018 start on Site. There would seem to be little timescale left available to go through the subsequent aspects of planning / approvals given the complexity of this proposed development. I therefore submit my comments to highlight key aspects that would not appear to be addressed in this submission - but need to be in order to meet the notional timescale implied within the associated press release ( namely a 2018 start on site).

1. GENERAL -  
The submission is not user friendly online, the small light grey font ( predominantly on Plans ) used is difficult to read and blurs with magnification ( i.e.: unreadable ) -  
I therefore apologise if I have missed or misinterpreted some details?.

2.CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC IMPACT -  
The previous OPP did not address the local impact of large scale/long term Site construction traffic , only a superficial review of current and future domestic traffic was appraised for this site. Other potentially simultaneous Sites ( Grange Villa, Timber Grove , Hockley and Hullbridge ) will likewise only be appraised in isolation of each other - and only cover light domestic traffic aspects.

The prospect of multiple / simultaneous construction Site traffic in the same area will, without doubt, negatively impact the already problematic local road/junction situations. Individual Developer's will not take this into account; the holistic overview must come from those awarding approvals to such schemes - in the form of "conditions" of planning approval , namely Rochford District Council Officers.

In 2016 , RDC ran several 'workshops' based on this particular Site, in order to gain local knowledge input, I personally tabled a draft document outlining some simple Traffic management measures that would mitigate, to some extent, the impact of

Site traffic flows. This was seen as positive by the Officials and Councillor's in attendance ( and handed over to the Planning Portfolio holder ) - if adopted this would obviate the need for any construction vehicles to go anywhere near the East ends of either Rawreth Lane and London Road.

By virtue of it's size ( even just phase 1 ) this development would qualify as ' a notifiable Site ' to the HSandE executive who would under CDM rules ( Construction, Design and Management ) require an Execution Plan covering all aspects of works. The core ethos of CDM is that Health, Safety and Environment should be considered at all stages of the project life - including the Planning stages ( that means now !! ).

I therefore object to this application as it continues to ignore the fundamental impacts it will create by virtue of it's inward looking approach to the Site itself.

### 3.INTERIM FLOODING IMPLICATIONS -

This application does not include an outline execution plan ( timelines/durations ) nor commit to access and egress points for construction purposes - which might well be different from the completed Estate road locations. Apart from influencing the points made above ( on Site Traffic impact ) the usual early groundworks might well influence rainwater run-off behaviour, as will other stages of construction periods.

This Site is bisected by a Brook ( rated as Liable to flood by the EA maps ) which drains Eastward ( downstream ) towards Rawreth Village - with a history of floods. The OPP concept ( SUDS ) was that increased rate of run-off ( due to 500 homes, roads, pavement and other hard surfaces ) would be buffered in Holding Ponds then released at a controlled rate.

Whilst the 'Landscaping' document in this submission looks at the whole site and indicates Ponds , the rump Phase 1 set of Plans does'nt appear to include Swales, Ponds and Landscaping - in fact it seems to ring fence it's scope to exclude those features.

In the absence of any sort of execution plan it is impossible to judge if an effective SUD system will be in place at any stage of this Phase 1 proposal , either during construction or indeed at the end of the 192 house occupations?. Whilst Phase 1 might be positioned 'up the slope' the Brook remains at the 'bottom of the slope' so any increased run-off rate will pass downstream if not controlled by a completed system.

I therefore object to this application on the basis that there is no clear brief for the early development of this Site , which could have negative implications unless clear ' conditions' are placed on planning approvals by those responsible, namely RDC Planning Officers. The cumulative impact of run-off during all stages is also compounded by the the adjacent Sites ( Grange Villa / Timber Grove ) to the South.

Please note that my concerns stated above will be passed onto both the HSandE office and the ECC SUDS Approval Group - for future reference if required.

### SUMMARY -

There are numerous issues involved but I have limited my observations to the two key impacts on the local area that require an "outside the box" perspective which is unlikely to be provided by an inward looking Developer or group of myopic Developer's.

Regards - [REDACTED]