

**SECTION 226(1)(A) OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990  
AND THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981**

**THE BASILDON BOROUGH COUNCIL  
(FRYERNS AND CRAYLANDS) (PHASE NORTH)  
COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2020**

**PUBLIC INQUIRY 29 JUNE 2021**

**REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF JAMIE SULLIVAN OF  
ICENI PROJECTS ON BEHALF OF BASILDON COUNCIL**

**PLANNING INSPECTORATE AND PLANNING CASEWORK UNIT REFERENCE:  
APP/PCU/CPOP/V1505/3258817**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The rebuttal proof of evidence has been prepared following a review of Mr Howe's outline statement dated 10 June 2021.

1.2 In this rebuttal proof of evidence, I have sought to provide a response to points on which the Inspector may find it helpful to have a written response in advance of the inquiry. If I have not responded to or made reference to other points in Mr Howe's outline statement, it is not because I have accepted those points.

## 2. RESPONSE TO MR HOWE'S EVIDENCE

2.1 For ease of reference, Mr Howe's key points are outlined in italics below with my responses following. This should be read in conjunction with Mr Riley's Rebuttal.

*The development doesn't make any sense:*

*105 properties demolished with only 96 being built - resulting in the net loss of 9 homes despite masses of unused space on the Estate.*

2.2 The North Phase forms an intrinsic part of the wider project and will facilitate the comprehensive redevelopment of the whole Estate. While there would be a net loss of 9 dwellings within the North Phase, this is more than compensated for across the whole Estate redevelopment where there is a significant uplift in the number of dwellings.

2.3 When factoring in the number of demolished dwellings, there will be a significant uplift of 460 dwellings across the whole planning permission for the wider project. Please see the Affordable Housing Provision note which sets out the total dwelling schedule (CD 7.10).

2.4 The reduction in dwelling numbers in the North Phase is a direct outcome of removing the higher-density maisonette blocks and replacing them with houses in order to deliver wider placemaking objectives.

2.5 The approach focuses on areas within the estate that were identified, through consultation with local residents, as being in need of intervention to deliver key improvements. The Design and Access Statement (CD 5.7 and paragraph 3.17 of my proof) details the process of how these intervention areas were designed to deliver on these objectives.

2.6 As noted in Mr Riley's rebuttal proof of evidence (paragraph 2.3), the proposed housing mix that is delivered within these intervention areas seeks to meet the needs of the local community. The final approach is therefore a balance of delivering a viable

project that meets the needs of the local community and achieving the stated placemaking objectives identified by working with existing residents.

***105 three bedroom properties demolished with only 56 being built - resulting in the net loss of 49 three bedroom homes.***

2.7 This statement is incorrect as there would be 100 three bedroom properties demolished. The new provision 8 x 1-bed, 32 x 2-bed, 48 x 3-bed and 8 x 4-bed is to be delivered pursuant to the requirements of the Development Agreement (CD7.2). As such, the number of properties with at least three bedrooms will be reduced by 44 dwellings. However, as set out in paragraph 2.2 above, the North Phase should not be considered in isolation as the comprehensive redevelopment of the whole Estate will result in a significant increase of properties with at least three bedrooms. Prior to redevelopment the number of 3-bed dwellings on the Estate was 482, but this will increase by 85% to 817 x three-bed dwellings and 74 x four-bed dwellings. The Scheme is interlinked with the wider redevelopment, which cannot be fully realised without all the intrinsic phases. The overall quantum and mix of housing is a response to the requirements of Basildon Council's Housing Department (as set out in paragraph 2.3 of Mr Riley's rebuttal proof of evidence).

2.8 Furthermore, as highlighted previously it would be wrong to simply assess the development in terms of quantitative delivery in isolation. The redevelopment delivers significant qualitative improvements to the built environment which are a further driving force in the final form of the proposed development.

***A far better option is to renovate, refurbish & regenerate the existing housing and build on the surplus land increasing the housing stock.***

2.9 I do not agree with this statement, as in my view, it would not be possible to retain the maisonette blocks and deliver on the identified placemaking objectives. Mr Howe has not presented evidence as to how the refurbishment of the blocks can be accompanied by wider redevelopment of the surplus land in an acceptable way. Furthermore, redevelopment of the maisonette blocks allows for the large open car parking areas to be redeveloped (which are identified in DAS – CD 5.7 as a magnet for crime and anti-social behaviour) and deliver a tighter urban grain with dedicated parking and more natural surveillance. This will also help to establish a clearer street hierarchy as well as deliver permeability and urban design benefits. See Section 8 of my proof of evidence (CD 9.3)

2.10 It is important to note that careful consideration has been given to refurbishment of existing stock and only demolishing where necessary. As mentioned in the Planning Committee Report (paragraph 2 on page 3 of CD 5.6), the 2016 masterplan retains as many houses as possible where their demolition would be unsustainable and

unnecessary. A blanket approach was not pursued as demonstrated by the retention of a large number of houses on site.

***The costs of demolishing are far greater than renovating, refurbishing & regenerating the existing housing stock. I estimate about £500,000 per block for renovations making an overall cost of £3.5 million. The costs of demolition are many times greater when considering the following expenses; the planning process, surveys & surveyors legal costs, buyouts of 31 homeowners, compensation/disturbance payments/buying & selling legal fees/stamp duty & legal support of 31 homeowners, relocating 74 council tenants, maintaining and paying the bills of all the vacant properties for many years, the Public Inquiry and finally the actual demolitions.***

2.11 Mr Howe's figures are not based on any submitted evidence and thus cannot be accepted as accurate, I would also highlight Mr Riley's Rebuttal (para 2.7) which sets out the significant range of issue with the existing properties.

2.12 As with the point above, it is important to note qualitative returns associated with redevelopment of the Estate which cannot be achieved solely if refurbishment is pursued. As discussed in Section 8 of my proof of evidence, redevelopment of the maisonette blocks allows for placemaking improvements, such as redeveloping the large open car parking areas to deliver a tighter urban grain with dedicated parking and more natural surveillance, as well as improved legibility and permeability of the Estate.

***It is Government policy to discourage demolition unless absolutely necessary due to the environmental impact.***

2.13 I do not consider this statement to be correct as the only Government policy (which I am aware of from a planning perspective) that sought to encourage developers to consider refurbishment, prior to demolition formed part of the old Planning Policy Statements and has long been revoked. The National Planning Policy Framework (CD 3.3) does not describe demolition as a last resort or absolutely necessary, but instead seeks to new development to be delivered to a higher design standard, prioritise previously developed land and minimise environmental impacts. The Scheme achieves these objectives and utilises modern and sustainable methods of construction, including cross laminated timber from Swan's modular housing factory which is located 1km to the north of the Estate (as set out in paragraph 2.9 of Mr Riley's Rebuttal). It should also be that two of the Government's key planning objectives 'Build, Build, Build' and prioritising the redevelopment of brownfield land would not be conducive to a policy of discouraging demolition.

- 2.14 Furthermore, Section 9 of the Estate Regeneration National Strategy (CD 3.2) acknowledges that there may be environmental issues which may add weight in favour of demolition.
- 2.15 Notwithstanding this, demolition is considered absolutely necessary in this instance to deliver the placemaking principles outlined in my proof of evidence.

***Large industrial and heavily polluting machinery will be transported on to the Estate in preparation for demolition, knocking down the buildings will release tonnes of CO2 into the atmosphere, large polluting lorries will go on to the site to collect the rubble, the polluting lorries will transport the material to a disposal location and finally very polluting industrial machinery will crush all what has been demolished.***

- 2.16 Whilst I appreciate demolition and construction will result in impacts, I do not consider this statement to be correct. An Air Quality Assessment was prepared for the application which supported the 2017 planning permission and includes mitigation measures for demolition, earthworks and construction. A Construction and Environmental Management Plan was also required for each phase of the planning permission under Condition 6 (CD5.1). The CEMP was approved for the North Phase works in February 2020 (ref. 19/01741/COND), and included various mitigation measures and targets such as:

- 2.16.1 Reducing waste to landfill to <14% of all waste;
- 2.16.2 Placing monitors at site boundaries to ensure that the air quality on site or leaving site is at least equivalent to that of the surrounding environment;
- 2.16.3 localised dust extraction and collection methods if needed; and
- 2.16.4 Implementation of a Traffic Management Plan.

- 2.17 With these measures in place, it is considered the demolition impacts can be adequately minimised and controlled. Paragraph 2.3 of Mr Riley's rebuttal proof of evidence also explains how the use of off-site manufactured cross-laminated timber construction methods further reduces this harm.

***The improvements to the layout of the Estate through demolitions have been greatly exaggerated. Only pockets of the Estate will be demolished, therefore only certain areas of the Estate will have an improved layout. The majority of the Estate's layout will be untouched. Given the masses of spare space on the Estate the layout can be improved without any demolitions occurring.***

- 2.18 I do not consider these to be an accurate outcome of the Scheme and no evidence has been provided to support these claims. As demonstrated in Appendix JS1 of my proof of evidence, the intervention areas have been selected to deliver placemaking improvements suggested by residents of the Estate. This includes improvements to legibility and removing areas that feel unsafe as outlined in Pages 21-23 of the Craylands Community Action Plan (CD 7.5). The demolition has been focussed on areas which need this intervention to deliver on the stated placemaking objectives. Refurbishment of the maisonette blocks would not assist in achieving what was requested by residents living on the Estate.
- 2.19 Whilst there are only 5 intervention areas, the positive effects will benefit residents and visitors to the Estate as a whole. The large car parking area is used by a significant number of residents, so the improvement of this area and the car parking situation is felt across the Estate. The maisonette block demolition and redevelopment also improves a key gateway to the Estate and so the placemaking benefits will be widely felt by residents. In addition, the improvement of the alleys to the rear of the maisonette is a very significant benefit for all those who use this pedestrian linkage.
- 2.20 The redevelopment also needs to be seen in the context of the wider development which improves the urban realm of the whole redevelopment (improved landscaping, new play areas and community facilities) which provide widespread benefits for all the residents on the estate.
- 2.21 Finally, while there are more site-specific benefits to the immediate areas (e.g. improving the urban realm in that location) which are being demolished, that is because the current situation is negative in terms of place making and fear of crime and so these are in need of the most improvement.

3. **STATEMENT OF TRUTH**

3.1 I declare that the evidence set out in this proof for the inquiry is true and follows accepted good practice. The opinions expressed are my own and are formed from professional judgements based on my experience.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jamie Sullivan', written in a cursive style.

Signed.....

**JAMIE SULLIVAN MRTPI**

**DIRECTOR, ICENI PROJECTS**

22 June 2021