

RAYLEIGH ACTION GROUP

APPEAL FOR FUNDS

Your last chance to stop 1379 HOUSES AND FLATS AND A HUGE TRAVELLER SITE being built in Rayleigh/Hullbridge

We are taking Rochford District Council to the High Court to try and stop this massive overdevelopment in our area

Please give whatever you can afford to help

Rayleigh Action Group Treasurers Account

Lloyds Bank Rayleigh Branch

Sort code 30 96 94

Account 22329568

Facebook

Rayleighactiongroup

Website (being updated)

www.RayleighActionGroup.org

Address for correspondence

4, Lubbards Close Rayleigh Essex SS6 9PY

Email

Rayleighactiongroup@yahoo.co.uk

Telephone

07702 922665

You may have received an 'In Touch' Conservative political communication that claimed RDC have done everything to protect this district. RAYLEIGH ACTION GROUP DISAGREE. We challenge many of the statements contained in that document including the following:-

a) THE CLAIM THAT RDC CONSULTED THE PUBLIC ON THESE DEVELOPMENTS.

98.5% of Hullbridge residents knew nothing about the plans.

93% of Rayleigh objectors had no idea until Rayleigh Action Group informed them in July 2013

SO WHAT EXACTLY DID RDC SPEND £2.1 MILLION POUNDS OF TAXPAYERS MONEY ON?

b) THEY CLAIM THAT THE HOUSING NUMBERS PLANNED ARE 550. WHAT IS THE TRUE FIGURE? IT IS CURRENTLY 1329550+ on London Road 500+ on Hullbridge Road 279 on Rawreth Ind Est - all these houses off the two main roads into our town with no new major INFRASTRUCTURE!

NO NEW MAIN SEWERS, NO NEW MAIN ROADS, NO MAJOR DRAINAGE TO PREVENT FLOODING, NO NEW DOCTORS, SCHOOLS OR SPORTS FACILITIES.... NOTHING BUT HOUSES.

c) The Greenbelt farmland to be built on is presently worth 6K an acre but worth millions as building land. The Planning rules state 'SUBSTANTIAL CONSULTATION' is required when developing Greenbelt. THAT CLEARLY DID NOT HAPPEN. It has been confirmed much of the land is owned by the wider family of a serving Councillor making it even more essential to have open public debate about this change of classification. Why did the RDC add a secrecy clause to their plans and documentation in 2012? What else don't we yet know? Who chose the farmland across Rochford?

d) THE REMOVAL OF GREENBELT CLASSIFICATION. Why is greenbelt being used when many brownfield sites remain across the district? Forget the figure of 1% greenbelt being used by RDC ...it is a huge area in Rayleigh. Greenbelt to the east of the district remains virtually untouched. Why did RDC dismiss the opportunity to build a 'Garden City', on the Rochford /Southend border that could provide 20,000 homes similar to the proposals for Ebbsfleet in Kent? Why didn't the Essex MP's fight for this instead of allowing all this for our towns and villages?

e) THE WITHDRAWAL OF RAYLEIGH TOWN SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB LEASE.

This lease held for 45 years on publicly owned land was to be withdrawn to provide for building land. Adopted in the Core Strategy in 2011 the Allocations Document Ratification confirmed this on 25/02/14. Now after years this new communication from Rochford Tories claims that RDC have changed their decision and it will now stay. WILL THE PRESENT LOCATION OF RTSSC NOW BE GUARANTEED FOR GOOD? Has this publicly owned land been totally removed as building land from the Adopted Core Strategy and LDF Allocations Document? How can Conservative political publications dictate policy with no reference to RDC? Where is the RDC confirmation of this fact?

f) TRAVELLER SITE. This is the only community site for the whole Rochford District and the only new one being planned by any council in Essex. It will cost £2.5 million of taxpayer's money with 15-22 Pitches - this will equate to 30-44 occupied units plus sheds and vehicles. Even Basildon Council objected to this site. It fits no criteria why should Rayleigh be forced to have this unsuitable site?

We think you might like to have an enquiry as to how so many policy decisions were made – they have cost so much of taxpayer's money in Consultancy fees plus Officer's salaries and are now proving unworkable and/or unachievable. This besides them being opposed by a huge majority of the people of this district.