

**Jericho, Matt**

---

**From:** Gerald Dove [gdvcu@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** 05 April 2010 14:17  
**To:** planning policy  
**Cc:** Nick Hill; John Grosvenor; harry.np@virgin.net  
**Subject:** Core document - purple area F.A.O. Matt Jericho

Dear Matt,

Further to your comments to Nick Hill on the core strategy and the “purple oval” in my area on the map in the core document. Could I point out there was a “so called” consultation in the area, I say so called because Residents do not feel it accurately reflected their views and wishes. The last thing residents in this area wanted was the tower block that has been imposed on them at the “What site”. The whole Planning tone seems to be aimed at redevelopment for this area, the planning brief was led by the Councillor for regeneration rather than conservation.

The resulting report seemed to focus on the views of paid professionals who did not live in the area, had little knowledge of the area, and did not seem to acknowledge the wishes and views of the local residents. Indeed the report itself was produced in tiny print which many of the local interested residents, as they were elderly, found it difficult or impossible to read.

The overriding wishes of the local community are for preservation of the character of Southend Village this is why the development of the Green Man was successfully objected to by so many people.

In this respect the Borough supported the residents, however it seems to be a lottery for residents, depending on which planning committee applications go to. Planning committee A does not seem to have any regard for the wishes of local residents.

Points of concern around the consultation are outlined in 1 to 4 below, points 5 to 9 below are additional concerns that have been raised since. I hope you find this feedback helpful

1. What actually happened was that local people who wanted to get to the first meeting were unable to do so. They were promised a second meeting to address this issue, but the second meeting was a sequel to the first, not a meeting for those who could not get to the first one.
2. The issues that residents felt needed to be addressed in this area should have been brought out as a result of this document. Instead residents feel that it was regeneration driven not restoration driven, as they were looking for. For example many residents believe The Green Man pub is listed, they would like to see the existing building restored to it's former glory of licensed restaurant, function rooms and shop this would provide much needed employment, training and recreation facilities for the locality, with the loss of the Tigers Head and What sites to housing there are no other suitable sites, and these facilities and much needed retail outlets are not to be found anywhere nearby.
3. The participants at this meeting were given a questionnaire asking whether they wanted high density Housing in the area or low density housing, there was not an option given for no additional housing, which from my conversations with many local residents was the preferred option. To this day although I attended these meetings I have not seen the results of this questionnaire.

4. The local residents wanted a conservation area to protect existing buildings of interest i.e. The Green Man, The vicarage, Homebase building and the village green in Beachborough Road all they were given via the SPD was "the experts" views which stated little of the original village remains. Residents know this that is why they would like what little remains preserved and protected.
5. Some of the existing housing stock is in need of improving, but this can be addressed by sensitively extending existing buildings on a rolling program, in conjunction with existing property owners, taking in to account any adverse impact on neighbouring properties. This is infinitely preferable to destroying attractive building and erecting inner city tower blocks creating a dormitory environment.
6. Health and employment is not improved by putting in high density housing which ignores the existing overpopulated housing guidelines. It merely creates a longer queue at the already oversubscribed Health facilities.
7. Training can be adequately dealt with through the local recreation centres, or local adult education centres. Some in the south of the Borough have had facilities moved to the North of the borough rendering them unavailable to those in the South.
8. Travel is an issue not mentioned, Many people prefer to travel in their own transport they are not then dictated to by the convenience of bus timetables, nor subject to the abuse by some of the more delinquent bus passengers, this is important for the elderly population in this area, which is why it is pointless putting in more housing than the roads can reasonably support. Car parking zones work against this freedom of choice and financially add to an already overburdened motoring public.
9. The Character of an area is important to local residents, this is not helped by tearing down existing building which are by most considered attractive, perfectly serviceable and have many good years left in them and replacing them with building that most local, and passing residents regard as eyesores. If this approach is used the sense of history in area is totally destroyed.

Gerald Dove.  
(Chair Southend Village Action Group)