



HULLBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

Email planning@chelgate.com

Dear Sirs,

Re: Crest Nicholson Public Consultation for Lubards Farm, Rayleigh.

We are writing with regard to the proposed development at Lubards Farm and your recent public consultation and survey.

Hullbridge Parish Council are vehemently opposed to this development on several grounds.

You emphasise that the development should have good integration with surrounding communities, yet you fail to appreciate that there are other surrounding communities that will be impacted by this development. Should this development go ahead it will significantly reduce the green belt open space between Rayleigh and Hullbridge; potentially leading to an urban amalgamation of the two communities leading in turn to a loss of community identities.

The current road infrastructure that would surround your proposed development cannot cope with existing levels of traffic. Watery Lane/Beeches Road, Hullbridge Road, Rawreth Lane, Hambro Hill and Down Hall Road are frequently gridlocked especially at "Rush Hour". So, ANY increase in the number of vehicles from your development would only exacerbate the problem. There will also be "knock on" impacts on other communities such as Ashingdon, Hockley and Hawkwell from the consequential higher volumes of traffic. By way of illustration of what we mean, recent utility works undertaken in Hullbridge Road that coincided with a closure of Watery Lane meant a 45-minute crawl along Hullbridge Road up to the Hambro Hill Roundabout for a significant part of the day. Traffic was queued along Lower Road towards Ashingdon and Hockley in one direction and along Rawreth Lane and Hambro Hill from the other direction.

We understand that you've quoted 300 additional car movements per day between the hours of 8am and 9am and 5pm and 6pm. We know from the experience of the High Elms development that this is not representative of a development of this size. 550 houses will likely create double that in owned vehicles, with all using the existing road network. Therefore, the traffic calculations quoted should be reviewed and a wider time frame and vehicle number considered to evaluate a more accurate figure of traffic movement.

By virtue of the development's location, all vehicles will exit onto Hambro Roundabout, which is at a standstill most weekdays. Traffic will then either follow Hullbridge Road in the direction of Hullbridge to head eastbound towards Ashingdon, Hockley and beyond or westbound towards Chelmsford and the A12, navigating a narrow road (Watery Lane/Beeches Road, including a weight limited bridge) through Battlesbridge up to Hawk Hill Roundabout. There are already enormous volumes of traffic accessing this road westbound in the mornings and eastbound in the evenings causing lengthy delays at either end. Any additional increase in vehicular usage of Watery Lane/Beeches Road will only create intolerable "logjams" particularly at "Rush Hour".

Alternatively, traffic will head south to Rawreth Lane and Hambro Hill with a large number then entering Down Hall Road. Down Hall Road has a T junction at either end, no traffic lights or roundabouts are in existence or are proposed. These are already dangerous junctions, yet no consideration has been given for infrastructure improvements to accommodate extra traffic



HULLBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

usage. The same can be said for Rawreth Lane, which every day is at standstill, normally westerly in the mornings and eastbound in the evenings and again no consideration has been given for infrastructure improvements to mitigate additional traffic usage.

Having said that, it is not just the road infrastructure that is at “breaking point”, so too are the current utilities, educational and healthcare provision. Equally we know that both water services and sewerage cannot cope with existing levels of residential housing.

The local primary school is already over-subscribed and the development you are proposing will put extra strain on local education provision generally. Your representative stated that no new school is proposed, therefore, as part of any planning permission a condition should be made that Section 106 funding be allocated to primary and secondary education schools and pre-schools in the areas of Hullbridge, Rawreth and Rayleigh and not a generalised Essex County Council education fund.

No health provision is being proposed and when asked your representative stated that the site would filter into existing GP surgeries. These surgeries are already oversubscribed with patient numbers. The Hullbridge (Riverside) GP surgery is trying hard to expand in order to cope with existing demand created by the High Elms and Wolsey Park developments. Therefore, before any planning permission is granted it should be agreed that as part of this development proposal a fully constructed and funded new GP surgery should be a condition of the permission, and it should be constructed before the first house is erected.

Essex Police advise that they are under-staffed and frequently have to provide cover to neighbouring Southend who are in danger of being overwhelmed. Similarly Fire Fighting capabilities are significantly stretched. Yours and other development proposals will only make this situation even worse.

We agree that all proposed developments should have greater bus connections but not just to Rayleigh Station as you suggest. Not all residents who require a bus service wish or need to travel to Rayleigh Station and yet you appear to base this part of your transport plan on this single premise, ignoring any other needs. A broader network of buses is required to connect with neighbouring communities, hospitals and schools. This does not currently exist. Yes, school buses are required for the secondary schools in Rayleigh but they are also required to those in Hockley and further afield.

We are also extremely concerned at the loss of green belt space that the development would create and the consequential impact on the local bio-diversity. You can include planting, cycle paths, play and recreational areas as well as other additional measures but a development of this size will actually be reducing biodiversity and cannot replace what will be lost. Therefore, to suggest the development would increase biodiversity is inaccurate and, in any case, a proposed net Increase of just 10% is woefully insufficient.

Any proposed development should focus on protecting and reinforcing existing hedgerows and trees. The development you are proposing will actually detract and reduce the existing walks, green open spaces, trees and hedgerows rather than add to them.

All proposed developments should include community facilities such as clubs and halls; however your proposal shows no such facilities. Amenities of this type should be made condition of any agreed planning permission and should be built and funded by the developer for community use.



HULLBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL

As part of your “consultation”, you have asked that a ranking be given to the most needed housing locally and have listed housing from 1- or 2-bedroom apartments to 5 bed houses. All developments should be a mix of housing but should ensure smaller more affordable 1- and 2-bedroom properties are built and are available to younger residents, first time buyers, and those wishing to downsize, as well as a Social Housing element. On a proposed development of this size our fear is that the type of housing being considered by yourselves will unfortunately focus on profitability rather than resident need.

Hullbridge Parish Council strongly oppose the proposed development of Lubards Farm. As described above the existing infrastructure is already inadequate. It does not serve those already using it and therefore a proposed development of 550 homes with no major infrastructure improvements, changes or additions cannot be supported.