

**Statement for SCAAP hearing to be held on Thursday 26th May at 2 p.m. at the Civic Centre in
Southend**

I have very strong reservations regard Section 8 of the SCAAP plan.

The development in Baxter Avenue, which it is suggested will be 're-generated' , was built within the last 35 Years by Springboard Housing Association, with part of the development **(The Clusters)** being passed to the Local Authority. The whole development is a '**Social Housing complex**' with a range of accomodations including

'Sheltered housing' **(Katherine Lodge')**

(Originally) Single person units **(Elizabeth Tower)** with the lower floors being utilised by older people.

Charlotte Mews (self contained units for the elderly)

Alexandra Court (2 bedroom units) small family homes. There are two three bedroom houses which originally staff working at Katherine Lodge were accommodated in.

The whole development was thoughtfully planned, with communal gardens/off-road parking facilities. The location is very central to Southend and all amenities.

My reservations are around:

Infrastructure:

Baxter Avenue is adjacent to Victoria Avenue (Victoria Gateway) , where currently Office Blocks which were defunct for a good number of years are now being converted into 'luxury' flats and into Part Buy/Part Rent properties 60 of which will be retained and managed by Genesis Housing Association (Harcourt Avenue/Victoria Avenue). In addition to these 'luxury ' flats, just across the way opposite this site, (Carnarvon Road) there is further re-development taking place on the site which was South East Essex College.

Baxter Avenue and roads in the vicinity are already subject to Residents Parking Permits although the Baxter Avenue development, currently already has off-road parking facilities (but still require parking permits).

There are two main routes into Southend:-

1. Victoria Avenue

and

2. London Road (which comes to a dead-end as the High Street is pedestrianised)

(With East Street being a much smaller access route, (which has to be accessed by both main routes already mentioned.)

Baxter Avenue/Boston Avenue are already 'rat runs' with motorists trying to avoid the congestion that is Victoria Avenue. So with the proposed increased density of the population, the 'Victoria Gateway', could very easily become the 'Victoria Bottleneck', with first of all working people trying to make their way to work, and then parents attempting to get their children to school.

Three local schools have already undertaken building works to increase their intake, St. Mary's C of E Primary School, St. Helen's RC Primary School, and Sacred Heart Primary School..... and now with Seabrook College moving to the building that was occupied until two years ago by Cecil Jones Lower School (Wentworth Avenue) Traffic will have to go through the centre of Southend to reach the building.

There could be a 'convergence' problem at specific times of the day. Even if parking facilities are provided (and currently I have no idea about parking for these new accommodations) at each of the locations mentioned, the cars will move at some time during each day, and their only way out of Southend is via the Victoria Gateway or East Street (a much smaller access route).

All of the proposed properties, whether or not they are 'luxury' will require access to all local amenities. So, doctor's surgeries/hospital/police all of whom are already under pressure and juggling cuts to their budgets, will be under even more pressure from the increased population.

'Regeneration' (Demolition) of perfectly good housing.

If the Baxter Avenue development were a 'crumbling slum' then I would have less hesitation in supporting 'regeneration' - but the development is well maintained, attractive and appreciated.; It is of course, not without its difficulties, but no different to other areas including places like Kensington and Chelsea, in London.

It is as I said earlier, a 'social housing complex' and as far as I can see there is no mention of 'social housing' in the SCAAP: what there is the insidious reference to 'affordable housing' .

Currently there are 240 (approx.) properties on this development: from the early 'plans' it appears that this development will have a further 200+ homes built in the same area.

In research that I have carried out , it is suggested that demolition (which in real terms is what regeneration is) should only go ahead if:-

- It has the residents support
- It does not result in a loss of social housing
- All other options have been exhausted.

Currently the development has some grassed areas, gardens, trees. There is abundant wildlife whose habitats would also be destroyed. It is a pleasant place to live.

There would seem to me to be no good reason to uproot the community from the support networks that are the bedrock of our social infrastructure.

Brenda Phillips, 28th April 2017