

**Bowers Gifford &  
North Benfleet  
Residents' Association  
2013**

**SUMMARY OF  
OBSERVATIONS REGARDING  
THE DEVELOPER'S  
COMMUNITY BENEFITS  
PACKAGE**

**APPLICATION REFERENCE  
13/00140/OUT**

**Bowers Gifford & North Benfleet's Residents' Association observations on outline planning documents (13/00140/OUT)**

**Section 106 – Community Benefits Package**

<b>Transport Related Aspects</b>	
Meridian suggest widening the following 4 junction	No formal consultation has been carried out with the residents living near these junctions. We are surprised that Essex County Council Highways has no objection to these changes. The plans submitted are very brief and leave many questions. However, based on the brief and unclear information given, please note the reasons for our objections below.
At our private meeting with Meridian we were informed that Nottingham/the developer would finance the widening of the junction with Pound Lane and the A127	<p>The widening of this junction does not appear on the S106 mitigation summary. This is not surprising as the junction is too narrow and could have involved either a compulsory purchase or the diversion of the river that runs alongside the road.</p> <p>The first cottage in Harrow Road which is on the edge of this part of Pound Lane is 16<sup>th</sup> century – this and other nearby properties probably have no foundations and could be damaged by additional traffic.</p> <p><b>The perceived requirement for traffic signals at the junction with Burnt Mills and Pound Lane and the junction of Burnt Mills Road with Courtauld Road indicates that the developer expects heavy traffic flows on these roads. Burnt Mills Road and Pound Lane are minor roads and cannot withstand heavy traffic.</b></p>
Junction 2 – Pound Lane with Burnt Mills Road – Drawing 43072/P/04	<p>On our response to the Heritage Report we pointed out that there is an old pump in the undergrowth surrounding the copse. We queried whether the pump should be listed/preserved as it served as the water supply for the plotlands and other local areas in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and possibly earlier.</p> <p>We understand that roots from the trees, in the copse, soaks up surplus water in the area. The junction of Burnt Mills Road and Pound Lane floods constantly even in the summer (see photographs of 24<sup>th</sup> August flooding). Loss of part of the copse and any increase in hard standing could result in a worsening of the flood situation.</p> <p>Burnt Mills Road between Pound Lane and Courtauld Road floods. Repairs to this minor road do not seem to</p>

	<p>last long. We have been informed that the failure of repairs is due to either the lack of / or the poor foundations. To put the volume of traffic through this road which the developer/Nottingham appears to envisage would require a new road.</p>
<p>Junction 9 – Junction Burnt Mills Road and Courtauld Road</p>	<p>If traffic is to go in and out of Pound Lane, as per the plans, then we can see no need for the widening of this junction unless Meridian/Nottingham intend traffic to use this exit to get to the A127.</p> <p>There is no pavement along Burnt Mills Road and it is dangerous for pedestrians. In places it is difficult for two large vehicles, travelling in opposite directions, to pass. The road floods, particularly in the area near Bradfields Farm.</p> <p>Using this road as an outlet/inlet to the A127 or indeed the new incinerator in Courtauld Road would cause extreme noise, dirt and dust problems for the residents living in the surrounding area. Indeed, both Basildon Council and Essex County Council have received numerous complaints, from residents living in this area, fighting against the building of the incinerator.</p>
<p>Junction 4 – London Road with Rectory Road. Drawing No. 43072/P/03</p>	<p>Rectory Road and London Road are already extremely busy and this problem will increase when the new incinerator opens. Residents are concerned about children crossing Rectory Road to go to school. More traffic equates to more accidents, dust; dirt; and pollution – resulting in health problems and more pressure on a local health service which already finds it difficult to cope.</p> <p>We have also been informed of damage to dwellings as heavy lorries thunder along Pitsea High Street (adjoining London Road). We have asked the resident to report this separately.</p> <p>We have been informed that a study took place, a few years ago, regarding proposed traffic lights at this junction. The survey found that traffic lights would cause further queues and delays. However, we note that Meridian/Nottingham are proposing traffic lights in this same spot.</p> <p>Widening of this junction appears to result in the loss of a small part of Howard Park. This park was given to the people of Pitsea, by the Howard family, as a green play area not to facilitate widening the road for incinerator and new development traffic.</p>
<p>Junction 3 – London Road with Pound</p>	<p>Widening of this junction appears to take away an area</p>

Lane. Drawing 43072/P/02	<p>of green belt at Jackaman’s Farm. A number of years ago the road was widened to enable an additional lane for traffic turning left into Pound Lane. This second lane was dispensed with – so why are Meridian/Nottingham now proposing to reinstate this additional lane?</p> <p>More hard standing equates to more floods. The post box area on the boundary of Jackaman’s Farm already floods and this situation could worsen.</p>
<b>Summary</b>	
Paragraph 3b. First Paragraph. Last line. “The school playing fields and ground will be provided together with the actual buildings within a site of not less than (?) hectares	What does “(?) hectares” mean? Is this yet another example of Meridian’s lack of attention to detail?
Paragraph 3e also quotes (?) hectares	As above
<p>Bottom of the last page of document appears to have personal notes inserted:</p> <p>“should on-site flood attenuation be here also?”</p> <p>“what else might I have forgotten”</p>	As above – very unprofessional
Paragraph 3c. Refers to the proposed new medical centre.	GPs are difficult to recruit in the South East and the proposed new centre could end up being run by locum staff.
Paragraph 3f. Pound Line Diversion.	<p>As per the Residents Association’s other responses and the many letters of objection sent in by residents/people using Pound Lane to get backwards and forwards to work– we do not want Pound Lane diverted.</p> <p>From the plans it appears that traffic would be diverted past the proposed school and through a zebra crossing. We believe that this will cause additional delays, time and travel costs. It will also cause danger to children crossing the road to get to the proposed school.</p> <p>This diversion, or indeed any new road, will reduce the quality of life of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residents living in Pound Lane near the side of the proposed new roads around the “village hub”;</li> <li>- residents living at the end of Westlake Avenue which runs alongside the proposed new roads around the “village hub”; and</li> <li>- Residents living opposite the proposed new roads around the “village hub” in Pound.</li> </ul>

	Those living alongside the proposed new roads will suffer noise, pollution, dirt and dust. Those living opposite will suffer the same discomforts plus traffic lights facing towards their front windows.
Provision of Changing Facilities for Westlake Park	The chair of the Residents Association who is also a parish councillor has raised this matter with the parish council. The parish council would prefer to keep Little Chalvedon Hall Farm as green belt land rather than have a pavilion in Westlake Park.
<b>NPPF Retail Statement</b>	We note that this has been prepared for Nottingham County Council by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners <b>not</b> its pension fund or Meridian Strategic Land Development. We are continually told that NCC Pension Fund is separate to the council but this does not appear to be the case. We note that all nine of the pension scheme trustees are councillors. Also, please note that if the pension fund makes a large profit in any year that the Council will be entitled to ask for an employer's pension scheme contribution holiday.
Paragraph 2.5. Employment and Office opportunities	Basildon has a large industrial area in Burnt Mills. Many of the offices/industrial premises on the site have closed since the recession began. Now empty sites have been flattened. We do not want office/industrial opportunities in Bowers Gifford or North Benfleet we want to keep this as a rural area and keep industrial/offices sites in the areas already designated and where there is currently plenty of space.  Office and employment opportunities equates to more traffic which is not wanted.
Paragraphs 2.5, 3.2 and 3.3 - Sustainability	As above  Let us maintain sustainability by keeping a working farm especially as the UK is currently reliant on foreign imports. Let us ensure food resources for future UK generations.
Paragraph 3.3 – Improve health and social well being.	9 years of building an unwanted development will certainly not improve health or social well being. We have already suffered over 2 years of inconvenience, noise, dirt, dust and pollution with Sadler's Farm. The residents of Bowers Gifford and North Benfleet are happy as they are. As per the Residents Association's response to the Character Assessment document, we already have numerous social activities and a green environment.
Paragraph 3.25 – Local Plan Policy b) location should be accessible; c) should not give rise to traffic	As per our responses above and in our response to the Transport Report, we believe that the location of the proposed development is not easily accessible and will

	congestion	cause traffic congestion.
	Paragraph 3.25 d) should not harm the visual character	The proposed development will destroy priceless views which can never be replaced  The visual character of LCHF is its open and uncluttered landscape. To build on this would change this perspective and create a sense of enclosure to the villages of BG & NB.
	MSL Summary of Community gains (Delivery): Interim open space: <i>'The only extinction initially, will be the areas identified as Interim Open Space. Interim Open Space might be required for other purposes according to future planning requirements'</i>	This strongly suggests further changes to the character of the landscape with further building on green belt.
	Paragraph 3.25 e) should not materially prejudice other land users	The proposed development will destroy a working farm.
	Both the <b>Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners and the Richard Jackson documents</b> refer to alternative forms of transport to cars	Bicycles and walking are good weather alternatives to driving. They are not appropriate for parents dropping off children on the way to work, or if a second child, who will be absent from school, is feeling poorly and needs to travel by car.  N.B. Our response to the Transport Report states that walking and cycling times are generally understated and provide examples of understated distances.