

BROOD

Burnham Residents Oppose Over Development

27th February 2015

Natalie Bettany [REDACTED]

Dear Mr Vickery

I am writing to you on behalf of the members of BROOD in connection with the joint education statement submission prepared by ECC, MDC , Boyer/Evolution/Pigeon and others .

BROOD disagrees with the statement for the following reasons

1. Fundamentally the direction given by your self was to ECC, MDC and Evolution to prepare this document following a statement by Evolution that they had already prepared a report on education matters. This document is very difficult to find even after contacting David Barker (Evolution Planning) & Steven Clyne of Education Facilities Management (EFM) no statements were forthcoming. To make a balanced assessment of the latest capacity statement we feel it would have been beneficial to have access to this.

BROOD believe that the joint statement has been prepared by several others including Strutt and Parker who had not expressed any opinion during the hearings on the subject and we wonder why then were they consulted.

The resulting report appears to be very heavy handed and clearly developer led.

2. There appears to be no consideration to developments of 10 or less houses. In Burnham there are many of these developments actually being built at present, all of which are large **family** homes for example Corinthia Mews currently under construction 11 large homes, multiple developments in Stoney Hills, Roman Way and Mangapps. These 4 & 5 bedroom houses should also be taken in to consideration and taken off the final figure as their children will also require school places !

3. The figures in the statement do not seem to include children from other parishes such as Althorne or take into account the rural allocation of houses that will affect capacity in all schools since Southminster appears set to take a large proportion of the allocation.
4. The statement does not consider parental choice. Parents of small children would ultimately be faced with sending their very young children to infant/primary school by bus or car outside the town. This is not sustainable and will create more CO2 emissions plus a cost to the local authority to provide transport. (We do know developer contributions will be sought for the first 5 years but this still is not guaranteed). The road is in poor condition between Burnham and Southminster with NO footpath to enable a walking bus or a cycle path. This is in conflict with the emerging LDP policy.
5. One of the head teachers believe that it is the parents' choice where to send their children, whether it is to a local church or local community school but should NOT be dictated to by any developer. This would force *some* local children to be bussed to the next town from the age of 4.
6. The actual capacity for Burnham County Primary School is 420, currently operating below capacity. One classroom was removed when a recent refurbishment took place. The agreement is that it will be reinstated by Education Authority as & when the numbers dictate.
7. This additional report should not be taken as a joint statement in conjunction with the LDP. Burnham on Crouch & Southminster are 2 individual towns, varying in size with mixed limited facilities (1 part time bank in BoC). Both wish to keep their own identity & clear boundaries. Both towns have been assessed in MDC viability studies as individual settlements and any new development should be assessed accordingly. Development in The Dengie DOES have infrastructure difficulties and by allowing developers to keep "adding on" to their current large allocations by **manipulating data** is not only inaccurate but wrong.

BROOD strongly believes that the housing for Burnham should be capped at 450 due to the above constraints and all developments should be included in the 450 ceiling.

Yours Sincerely

Natalie Bettany