

# Detailed Breakdown of Bellway Claims

## 1. What Bellway Claim

### **Bellway Claim:**

*“The site is a natural extension to Rayleigh, in a well-connected and sustainable location.”*

### **Reality:**

Their Plan shows:

- The site is **bisected by Daws Heath Road**, a **narrow rural lane** with no footways.
- The “connectivity” relies on **existing footpaths** that are **not continuous, not lit, and not suitable for increased pedestrian traffic**.
- The nearest bus stops are **7–14 minutes away**, and require walking along **unsafe sections** of Daws Heath Road.

**This is not a sustainable location under NPPF definitions.**

## 2. Transport & Access – The Weakest Part of Their Case

Bellway state: *“A new vehicular access from Daws Heath Road... provides safe access with suitable visibility.”*

### **Bellway claim but show no evidence of:**

- A visibility splay diagram
- A swept-path analysis for refuse trucks or fire appliances
- A width assessment of Daws Heath Road
- Any mitigation for the **ancient hedgerow** that lines the road
- Any plan for **two-way HGV construction traffic**

### **Critical flaw:**

The “safe access” claim is **unsupported** by any technical drawing. There is **no highways evidence** in the boards. This is a major vulnerability.

# Detailed Breakdown of Bellway Claims

## 3. Ecology & Hedgerows – Their Own Plans Undermine Them

Their Plan shows:

- **Multiple TPOs** (Tree Protection Orders) across the site
- **Root Protection Zones** overlapping the developable area
- **Existing vegetation belts** forming ecological corridors
- **Ancient hedgerow boundaries** along Daws Heath Road

(Reference: TPO and vegetation diagrams in the PDF — )

**But Bellway claim:**

*“Existing tree belts and hedgerows will be retained where possible.”*

**Reality:**

The access point from Daws Heath Road **cannot be created** without:

- Removing part of the ancient hedgerow
- Cutting into a TPO root protection zone
- Destroying the ecological corridor

This directly conflicts with:

- **NPPF 180(c)** (irreplaceable habitat)
- **Hedgerows Regulations 1997**
- **Essex Design Guide**
- Their own “green infrastructure” claims
- 



## 4. Density & Layout – 94 Homes on 3.6ha

Bellway propose:

- 94 dwellings
- On 3.6 hectares
- With 50% affordable housing

**Issues:**

- This is **high density** for a rural-edge site
- The boards show **no street layout, no parking plan, no drainage layout, no building heights, no character assessment**

# Detailed Breakdown of Bellway Claims

This is not a “detailed” proposal — it is a **concept sketch**.

## 5. Drainage & Flooding – Very Light Detail

Bellway state:

- *“The majority of the southern parcel is Flood Zone 1.”*
- *“SuDS will mitigate rainfall run-off.”*

### **But their Plans do not show:**

- SuDS locations
- Attenuation volumes
- Outfall routes
- Runoff calculations
- Impact on Daws Heath Road (which already floods)

This is a **placeholder**, not a drainage strategy.

## 6. The “Opportunities Plan” – What It Really Shows

The Opportunities Plan () reveals:

- **Large areas of TPO-protected trees**
- **Root Protection Zones** that overlap the developable area
- **A telephone mast** inside the site
- **A pumping station** that restricts layout
- **Only one viable access point** — the one Bellway want to use
- **Steep land rising to the south**, limiting road gradients

### **Conclusion:**

The site is **heavily constrained**, and Bellway are trying to fit a 94-unit scheme into a space that cannot support it.

# Detailed Breakdown of Bellway Claims



## 7. The Single Biggest Weakness in Bellway's Plan

**They have no viable access.**

Everything else — housing mix, green space, BNG, sustainability — is secondary.

If the access fails, the entire application fails.

And based on:

- Road width
- Visibility
- Hedgerow protection
- TPO root zones
- Highway safety
- Construction traffic constraints

...the access is **not deliverable**.



## 8. Summary – What You Can Use Against Them

**Bellway's plan is vulnerable because:**

- ✗ No highways evidence
- ✗ No visibility splays
- ✗ No swept-path analysis
- ✗ Access cuts through protected hedgerow
- ✗ Access conflicts with TPO root zones
- ✗ Ecological corridor cannot be broken
- ✗ Density too high for rural edge
- ✗ Drainage details missing
- ✗ “Sustainable location” claim is weak
- ✗ Consultation boards are superficial, not technical