

## Appendix 5: Summary of Individual Consultee Responses

- 1 This appendix below sets out summaries of responses received for each of the various consultation questions, giving an indication of the level of response to the various themes set out in the Document.
- 2 A number of questions in the Document asked whether consultees supported/objectioned to questions to various visions/options set out in the consultation. Respondents could support/object directly to individual questions if responding via the online JDI consultation portal. It is important to note that these questions also included the 'comment' option, for those respondents wishing to provide additional detail in their responses. Email and paper responses generally comprised of general feedback to the overall Document consultation, although many addressed specific themes and policy areas which required an officer to determine which consultation questions to attribute aspects of their response to.
- 3 Overall, comments varied in their nature, potentially expressing support, opposition, a neutral view, or one including elements of both support and opposition. Consequently, any analysis of the consultation responses needs to look beyond counts in the comments. These are summarised in more detail in paragraphs 4.4 and 5.1-5.54 in the main report. Where a question is worded in a way which makes a support or object option relevant, the count columns are shaded in green. Where the wording is less useful for this, the columns are shaded in grey. All counts for support/object/comment are included for each question, regardless of wording.

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

Section/Question		Total Reps	No. Support /Object/Comment (if applicable)			Summary of main issues raised by representations
			Support	Object	Comment	
SECTION 1 : Introduction	Q1: Are there any other technical evidence studies that you feel the Council needs to prepare to inform its new Local Plan, other than those listed in this section?	65	3	11	51	<p>Whilst some comments considered the technical evidence as satisfactory, others suggested more detailed and up to date additional evidence was required as detailed below.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Studies need to be up to date, detailed and robust, presenting capacity data and to include: community facilities (current and future community needs, and demographics inclusive of parish settlement level; transport evidence (highways, mitigation, modelling, delivery and funding plan), as well as an Infrastructure Delivery and Funding Plan. Essex County Council Strategic Policy context should be included to support the evidence base, e.g., provision and delivery of infrastructure / services to support / inform sustainable pattern of development. The Essex Minerals Local Plan and Essex Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan should also be included, and any other ECC studies, e.g., ECC Plan, as well as the Water Cycle Study.</p> <p><b>Climate Change</b></p> <p>Detailed studies including impacts; flood reports / Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment; and food production.</p> <p><b>Development Impacts</b></p> <p>Studies at settlement level inclusive of current and future impacts from development e.g., on crime levels.</p> <p><b>Pollution / Air Quality</b></p> <p>Detailed studies inclusive of all roads and junctions.</p>

						<p><b>Habitat</b> studies.</p> <p><b>Environmental Impact Study 2015</b> should be used as evidence as it raised concerns on future development.</p> <p><b>Heritage</b></p> <p>Heritage Asset Review, Lists of Buildings of Local Architectural / Historical interest, updated Conservation Area Appraisal, Heritage Impact Assessment, and Archaeological Evaluation Reports.</p> <p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <p>Evidence inclusive of updated SHMA, Housing Implementation Strategy and Settlement Capacity Studies.</p> <p><b>Business Growth</b></p> <p>Consultation requires updating due to Covid.</p> <p><b>Green Belt Study</b></p> <p>More detail required.</p> <p><b>Essex and South Suffolk Shoreline Management Plan</b></p> <p>Required to support the evidence base.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

SECTION 2: Rochford in 2050	Q2. Do you agree with our draft vision for Rochford District?	162	17	79	66	<p><b>General comments</b></p> <p>Many comments expressed that the vision contradicted with future development plans with unreasonable housing numbers offering unsuitable housing beyond the reach of local residents. There was concern that boundaries between towns are being reduced. There were also concerns of environmental impacts from development. Quality of life should be prioritized, and more natural areas implemented. Only brownfield sites should be considered for development.</p> <p>Many comments supported the option of a new large-scale development to meet the housing requirement. There was support for small developments that do not impact on existing areas (in District) which should be considered with good transport connections.</p> <p>Many comments raised the issue of ‘infrastructure first’ which needed to be addressed, with significance to flood protection, leisure facilities and responsive services ensuring the sustainability of communities.</p> <p>Most comments relayed the importance of consulting with local communities to adopt a range of separate visions for each settlement to help apply the district-wide vision at more localised settings. The character of the towns needs to be considered. Comments also stated that there was too much emphasis on Rayleigh.</p> <p>Comments also raised the concern for future employment with regard to employment types, suitable commercial units and location, and that employment should be a priority in the Plan.</p> <p>Noted that the vision did not make reference to demographic and climate change.</p>
	Q3. Do you agree that we should develop a range of separate visions for each of	87	50	12	25	<p><b>General comments</b></p> <p>Most comments agreed that it was important to adopt a range of separate visions for each settlement to help apply the district-wide vision at more localised settings. Each settlement has its own</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<p>our settlements to help guide decision-making?</p>					<p>characteristics and needs, e.g., retaining younger families to provide a balanced demographic, as well as constraints.</p> <p>It was also commented that separate visions are also required for 'growth areas' as per national policy, and that it may be necessary to have a generic 'villages / hamlets' vision for smaller communities.</p> <p>Many comments considered visions should be determined by each Parish Council, working with residents and groups with local knowledge, which would support planning decisions at local and district level ensuring the unique character of each distinct settlement remains. Separate visions provide clarity on type and level of appropriate development to developers, and should be informed by the following supporting evidence, but not be too restrictive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Historic Environment Characterisation Studies.</li> <li>2. Heritage Impact Assessments.</li> <li>3. Settlement Capacity Studies.</li> <li>4. Transport Studies and Strategies.</li> <li>5. Green Belt Studies.</li> <li>6. Strategic Land Availability Assessment.</li> <li>7. Flood Risk Assessment.</li> <li>8. Design and Development Briefs, and</li> <li>9. Master Planning Studies.</li> </ol> <p>It was also commented that the Council should have an overarching vision for the District that all settlements aspire to. There should also be separate visions for London Southend Airport; Baltic Wharf; and main town centres, focusing on regeneration.</p>
<p>Q4. Do you agree with the strategic priorities and objectives we have identified?</p>	<p>109</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>35</p>	<p>52</p>	<p>Comments comprised of a mix of objecting and supporting responses, with the theme of infrastructure most prevalent within the objecting comments. Supporting comments also suggested other priorities / objectives to be considered.</p>

						<p><b>Objecting Comments</b></p> <p>Comments throughout the consultation as well as to this question have stated that the Council should “push back against central government demands”.</p> <p>Many felt it was not clear how objectives will be delivered.</p> <p>Comments throughout the consultation as well as to this question have supported a new settlement due to lack of existing infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b> should be a priority, inclusive of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing (including social housing and in particular local exception sites, affordable homes based on income and mortgage attainment, eco-friendly homes).</li> <li>2. Employment.</li> <li>3. Health facilities.</li> <li>4. Leisure facilities.</li> <li>5. Education.</li> <li>6. Environment (green spaces, pollution, climate change and flood risk).</li> <li>7. Reduced road use.</li> <li>8. Public transport.</li> <li>9. Cycleways.</li> <li>10. Water and sewage.</li> </ol> <p><u>Strategic Priorities</u></p> <p><b>Strategic Priority 2: Making suitable and sufficient provision for retail, leisure and other commercial development</b> does not address an ageing population.</p> <p><b>Strategic priority 5: Making suitable and sufficient provision for climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape</b> should become <b>Strategic priority 1: Meeting the need for</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p><b>homes and jobs in the area.</b> Instead of adapting to climate change we should be pioneering and leading on solutions (including flooding).</p> <p><b>Strategic Priority 5</b> contradicts proposed growth.</p> <p>Small villages within Rochford need separate strategic priorities to protect them from being lost as villages.</p> <p><u>Strategic Objectives</u></p> <p>The Document lacks a SWOT analysis of the region to inform objectives.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objective 1</b> – no justification to prioritise previously developed land first when page 29 of the document confirms that previously developed land will not be able to meet the housing targets in full.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objective 9</b> – no intention of ensuring infrastructure. Infrastructure needs to come first.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objective 20</b> contradicts proposed growth.</p> <p>Strategic objectives need to consider current residents views on growth and take account of impacts.</p> <p>More emphasis needs to be placed on preserving wildlife and biodiversity, and farmland, with separate policies on climate change and woodlands.</p> <p>A view felt extensive support should be given to the Airport and retail park to recover from impact of COVID.</p> <p>A comment questioned why continued economic growth was sought, as was felt to it just benefits those who are already well off.</p> <p>More emphasis on walkable neighbourhoods and communities minimising need to travel.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p><b>Supporting and General Comments</b></p> <p><u>Strategic Priorities</u></p> <p><b>Strategic Priorities 2, 3 and 4</b> reflect national policy (para. 20.c NPPF).</p> <p><u>Strategic Objectives</u></p> <p>A wide range of comprehensive and broad objectives are covered reflecting national policy, embedding principles of sustainable development. Consider merging some of the Strategic Objectives as there appear to be overlaps with content. There should be more support for urban developments and extensions to existing settlements. Priorities and objectives could be more focused on the spatial challenges and opportunities. It is not clear where the district may seek to direct development. There should be a distinct objective to improve affordability of housing.</p> <p>The <b>Strategic Objectives</b> support opportunities for sport and healthier lifestyles, according with government policy (para. 92 and 93 NPPF), and Sport England’s ‘Uniting the Movement’ Strategy.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objective 1</b> should also include reference to opportunities for suitable greenfield and Green Belt sites (sustainable) to be delivered in the interests of local need.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objective 2</b> should recognise the importance of providing other types of retirement housing i.e., age-restricted housing alongside provision of care schemes.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objective 10</b> should also include bus routes / public transport and cycling connections (not restricted to highway network).</p> <p><b>Strategic Objective 15</b> needs to embed ‘access for all’ i.e., ‘delivery of a fully accessible multi-functional green infrastructure network’, and embedded throughout the lower sections.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Support for <b>Strategic Objective 21</b>, ensuring our Green Belt continues to serve its five purposes, and should be given a much higher priority.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objectives</b> should also include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Health and Wellbeing.</li> <li>2. Housing design and layout- need for flexibility, the ability to adapt homes over time (Lifetime Homes), and support homeworking.</li> <li>3. Businesses – need for flexible and adaptable accommodation in town centres.</li> <li>4. Provision for transport network improvements, especially active and sustainable networks to support existing and new communities, e-charging points and cycle storage.</li> <li>5. Need to balance the promotion of green tourism and protecting the environment.</li> <li>6. Include reference to the Essex SuDS Design Guide for new development.</li> <li>7. A new Country Park facility to the north-east of Southend.</li> <li>8. Recognition and support of development required for operation defense and security (para. 97 of NPPF).</li> <li>9. ‘Crime Prevention through Environmental Design’.</li> <li>10. Preservation of Metropolitan Green Belt Land (should be given a much higher priority).</li> <li>11. Eco-friendly housing.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

SECTION 3: Strategy Options	Q5. Do you agree with the settlement hierarchy presented?	66	29	21	16	<p>A majority of respondents supported the settlement hierarchy, feeling this was a correct representation of settlements based on population and facilities. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <p><b>Residents and Parish/Town Councils</b></p> <p>Most supported the hierarchy and their town’s position in it but did not feel this justified the settlement being identified for further development as a result. This feeling was particularly strong for Rayleigh, where a sizeable number of respondents felt the town had suffered from overdevelopment in recent years/decades, and infrastructure was now under strain as a consequence. It was not felt that further major development could be sustained and promoted sites caused concern.</p> <p>Concern for the existing population of settlements at various levels of the hierarchy, given the additional growth and development likely to be required.</p> <p>Some comments felt the Green Belt needed to be carefully maintained between settlements in the hierarchy to retain them as distinctive towns/villages in their own right.</p> <p>Some opposition from those in Tier 3, where several comments felt that these villages deserved to remain peaceful. View from Canewdon Parish Council that the village should be in Tier 4. Another comment felt Great Wakering was far larger than other Tier 3 settlements and they should not be considered for similar amounts of growth.</p> <p>Objection from Hawkwell Parish Council, as hierarchy proposals involve joining the East and West of the Parish to Rochford/Ashingdon and Hockley/Hawkwell respectively, to form functional settlements.</p> <p>Some felt hierarchy should be ‘inverted’, and that development should instead be directed to lower tier settlements (3&amp;4) which were not felt to have had their ‘fair share’ by residents of Tiers 1&amp;2.</p> <p>Some sentiment that increased population or density would not necessarily benefit settlements, and that services already present in towns/villages were barely adequate for current population.</p>
-----------------------------	---	----	----	----	----	--

						<p>Views that any further growth in settlements had to be accompanied by a proper plan for infrastructure delivery, along with consideration of factors such as flood risk.</p> <p>Some Barling/Little Wakering residents considered the villages should not be considered alongside Great Wakering, given the linear settlement pattern, meaning there was a long distance between Barling/Little Wakering and the main facilities in the East of Great Wakering.</p> <p>Questions as to whether changing patterns in how people work, and shop would require a rethink of hierarchy and what is considered important (e.g. are local shops/employment sites/commuter facilities as relevant anymore).</p> <p><b>Agents/Developers/Landowners</b></p> <p>Majority supported the hierarchy, feeling that the positioning of Tier 1/2 towns within the hierarchy (i.e., Rayleigh, Hockley and Rochford) justified the suitability of sites they were promoted in those settlements for development, particularly regarding Spatial Strategy Option 2a.</p> <p>The higher the position in the hierarchy, the greater the proportion of development that settlement should take, based on the assumption that such towns have a greater range and capacity of services, amenities and infrastructure to support housing growth. Some responses considered this to align with NPPF definition of ‘sustainable development’.</p> <p>Rayleigh noted by a number of respondents as having good public transport connections through its train station and bus routes, giving good access to larger settlements nearby, along with London. In addition, its role as the District’s main retail centre and home to a number of schools, medical facilities and other services made it a logical place to focus growth within walking distance of amenities and therefore not reliant on private car use.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Similarly, some responses supported Hockley’s Tier 2 status and felt the town’s station and range of amenities meant it could support further growth, helping to tackle local housing affordability issues.</p> <p>Several objections and requested clarifications from agents/developers included:</p> <p>Settlements’ places in the hierarchy should not be seen as ‘fixed’, as they can be bolstered through new development that could deliver additional infrastructure and services (e.g., schools or additional bus services). This would enhance their ‘completeness’.</p> <p>Proposed hierarchy does not align with that from 2011 <i>Core Strategy</i> or joint Southend &amp; Rochford <i>Settlement Role &amp; Hierarchy Study</i>, which ranks Rayleigh, Hockley (and Hawkwell) and Rochford (and Ashingdon) jointly as more ‘complete’, followed by Wakerings &amp; Barling and Hullbridge on the next tier. Some developers objected to their promoted sites now being in Tier 3, rather than Tier 2 as previously (e.g., sites in Hullbridge or Great Wakering), and sought to demonstrate how these settlements were more ‘complete’ than other Tier 3 settlements, such as Canewdon.</p> <p>Hockley (and Hawkwell) should be ranked more highly, alongside Rayleigh.</p> <p>In Tier 2, ‘Rochford and Ashingdon’ should be referred to collectively, recognising larger range of amenities the two settlements contain between them.</p> <p>Question of whether Rochford and Hockley should be in the same tier, given the former’s strategic location close to Airport which could give it greater growth potential.</p> <p>A suggestion that supporting text could clarify the anticipated level of growth for settlements in each tier – i.e., how much growth should each tier be expected to deliver.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>Q6. Which of the identified strategy options do you consider should be taken forward in the Plan?</p>	358	22	125	211	<p>Note: for further analysis relating to this significant question, please refer to Section 5 of the main Feedback Report.</p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Given the open-ended nature of the question, a wide range of responses were received, with the 358 responses received being one of the highest numbers for any question in the Document.</p> <p>Many responses indicated a preference for more than 1 approach, e.g., many supported multiple approaches within Option 3, whilst others indicated a certain option should be prioritised but that another option was the next acceptable alternative (e.g., several developers/agents favouring an Option 2 approach involving their site, but also supporting an Option 4 combined approach which still included their desired method).</p> <p>Many respondents supported a generic strategy option, without going into detail on the spatial location (e.g., supporting a ‘garden village’ approach under Option 3, without specifying the location).</p> <p>Paragraphs 5.5-5.27 in this Report records the range of different preferences expressed. In first preferences, the single largest category was ‘Other’ (141 responses), representing a wide range of different views (see below).</p> <p>In terms of the spatial strategy options presented, the single largest category supported was Option 1 (47 responses), followed by Option 3 – unspecified (40). However, when all Option 3 combinations were included, this totalled 115, indicating a strong level of support for a concentrated growth option. Where a specific location was given, the most popular first preference of respondents was <b>Option 3a (West of Rayleigh)</b>, followed closely by <b>3b (North of Southend)</b>. A preference for <b>either 3a or 3b</b> also attracted a degree of support, whilst <b>Option 3c (East of Rochford)</b> received only two representations in support.</p> <p>For responses received from individual residents and businesses, the most popular preference was for ‘Other’. In terms of proposed spatial options strategies, the majority supported Option 3 strategies as 1st</p>
--	--	-----	----	-----	-----	--

						<p>preference, whilst only a very small handful supported <b>Option 2</b> strategies.</p> <p>A significant number of respondents expressed that their preference was 'no development' but did acknowledge homes were needed and that their stated option (e.g., 1 or 3) was deemed the least detrimental option.</p> <p>Landowners, developers and agents advocated a strong preference for <b>Option 2</b> strategies, with most responses focused on promoting individual sites and expediting their development as part of a solution to meet the District's housing need.</p> <p><b>Option 1 (urban intensification, including development of existing allocations/permissions and brownfield sites)</b> was very popular, and many respondents expressed it as either their first option, or as one which should run alongside their preferred option. Many felt this would have the least detrimental impact upon the countryside and Green Belt.</p> <p>However, numerous developers, along with others such as neighbouring local authorities, observed that this option would not, by itself, deliver numbers of homes sufficient to meet the District's needs over the LP period.</p> <p>Although this question was open-ended, requesting views on various SSOs, a considerable number of respondents used their response to 'object' to the new Local Plan in general, with 125 responses (35% of total) being straight objections in this way.</p> <p>Overwhelming sentiments from most respondents involved concern over the state of existing infrastructure, which led to scepticism about the benefits of any future development. Concerns about the impact on the environment and openness of the Green Belt were a close second.</p> <p>Cross-boundary collaboration with neighbouring local authorities under Duty to Cooperate remains an option, with some authorities (e.g., Southend or Castle Point) welcoming an exploration of possibilities, whilst others (such as Chelmsford) expected Rochford to meet its own needs in full and not put undue pressure on settlements such as South</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Woodham Ferrers. Any collaboration with Basildon in the West of the District (e.g., Option 3a) subject to strict caveats and their own Local Plan timescales.</p> <p>Infrastructure providers who responded at this stage gave general feedback, which will be expanded upon as the preferred options identified from the consultation are explored further, for example:</p> <p>Anglian Water provided an overview of remaining capacity at wastewater treatment centres serving the District, with Southend, Rayleigh East and Rayleigh West having theoretical capacity for 2,500 additional homes each, whilst Rochford would reach its limit sooner. The main pinch points for capacity are in the network itself, which would need to be considered further as sites are shortlisted.</p> <p>The Mid &amp; South Essex Health &amp; Care Partnership and East of England Ambulance Service provided general guidance on how service provision could provide additional capacity to meet increased demand, which will be developed further in future stages of the LP development.</p> <p><b>Option 1 (Urban Intensification)</b></p> <p>Many responses supported this option due to its lesser impact on the Green Belt, habitats, and biodiversity. Some felt this would help to revive town centres and that existing infrastructure in these places was well-placed to support further growth.</p> <p>Some supporters of Option 1 recognised it would not deliver the numbers required but felt that the District only had a limited capacity for further growth, and that Central Government housing policy needed to shift radically. Concern that developers would resist this option, preferring to build 'executive' style homes.</p> <p>A general consensus amongst supporters of all options was that all brownfield possibilities should always be explored in the first instance, prior to decisions to develop elsewhere.</p> <p>Many considered Option 1 would be required to run alongside another option, recognising that redevelopment of existing sites will always be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>an important contributor to delivery of housing, jobs and services, and an efficient use of land.</p> <p>Others objected to Option 1 feeling it would burden already overstretched services and increase congestion. Many considered it ‘overdevelopment’, particularly with regard to building additional flats or replacing large single dwellings with a number of smaller ones. Proposals in Rayleigh (e.g., Mill Hall redevelopment and new flats behind Marks &amp; Spencer) put forward as examples.</p> <p>Some developers/agents observed that a LP based solely on Option 1 would not deliver the District’s housing needs and would likely be found unsound at examination stage. Many developers also felt that the ‘current trajectory’ and ‘standard methodology’ growth scenarios were insufficient to accommodate for both Rochford and Southend’s needs under Duty to Cooperate rules, meaning the District should plan for a buffer of +50% growth scenario.</p> <p><b>Option 2 (Urban Extensions)</b></p> <p>The majority of comments regarding this option were for 2a, which sought to distribute urban extensions to settlements based on hierarchy.</p> <p>This option was strongly supported by developers, landowners, housebuilders and agents, most of whom are promoting sites for adoption in the next LP. Many of these felt urban extensions were an effective way to meet housing need, whilst improvements to local infrastructure and biodiversity could be made through Section 106 contributions at planning application stage. Site promoters supporting this option generally considered existing services and infrastructure in higher tier settlements in the local hierarchy to be the most sustainable place for new homes.</p> <p>Supporters felt this option had lower risk as a larger number of smaller developers would be delivering sites, therefore less risk of a significant number of homes not being delivered if a particular site had complications.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Noted that major urban extensions delivered the majority of housing completions in the District in the most recent Authority Monitoring Report.</p> <p>Supporters considered this option to be less risky than a dedicated 'new town' or 'garden village' option, as it could be delivered in a far shorter timescale, and was dependent on fewer complex negotiations, meaning a LP based on this was more likely to be considered 'sound' by an inspector. Some views considered that urban extensions located close to major road links would not overly impact the existing network.</p> <p>ECC supported Option 2a, provided developments were built at an appropriate scale to deliver viable and sustainable infrastructure (e.g., schools and transportation), but did not feel 2b's 'pepper pot' approach would deliver at the scale necessary to deliver sustainable development or significant infrastructure improvements, whilst increasing demands on existing service provision.</p> <p>Proponents of Option 2b argued that some of the District's smaller settlements, e.g., Great Wakering, Hullbridge or Canewdon, had further capacity for growth and that new housing could provide additional amenities to existing communities, as well as supporting existing shops, schools, and pubs. Also noted that this would comply with paragraph 69 of the NPPF, requiring 10% of housing requirements to be met on small and medium sites. Support was chiefly from developers.</p> <p>Some support in rural communities for 2b, where it was felt this would deliver proportionate levels of housing that did not overwhelm the existing community.</p> <p>Those who supported this felt it could be a way of spreading housing around the District and not overwhelming infrastructure.</p> <p>Many local residents strongly opposed Option 2, which was considered the prevailing approach in the current Core Strategy, and which many felt had not delivered sufficient infrastructure alongside housing developments. Many housing developments (e.g., Hall Road, Star Lane, Rawreth Lane, Malyons Farm) named as having put strain on existing doctors, schools, roads whilst delivering little new capacity.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Improvements to some roundabouts/junctions not felt to do much to tackle prevailing issues of congestion within the District.</p> <p>Many residents felt this development was 'piecemeal', uncoordinated and failed to deliver strategic-level improvements.</p> <p>Southend Borough Council felt this option was unlikely to deliver the transport improvements which would be required in the area.</p> <p>2a objected to by many Rayleigh residents in particular, who felt their town would be subjected to the vast majority of development.</p> <p>Similarly, many Hockley residents opposed this option, feeling the local road network, dependent upon the B1013, ruled out further extensions to the town.</p> <p>2a/2b options criticised by many residents as creating 'sprawl' and in degrading the sense of openness, views, and wildlife habitats on the edge of settlements which many appreciated for recreation, particularly during recent lockdowns.</p> <p>Significant development in rural communities (e.g., Stambridge and Canewdon) generally opposed, as it had potential to overwhelm the existing character of such villages.</p> <p>Some respondents, however, felt schemes like Hall Road were well-located close to main roads, allowing for better access and less congestion.</p> <p><b>Option 3 (Concentrated Growth)</b></p> <p>The general approach of a 'garden village' or new town' was favoured by a significant number of respondents, with versions of Option 3 being the most popular of the SSOs set out in the Document. This was generally felt to be an ambitious approach which would deliver homes required whilst providing new infrastructure and not unduly overloading existing settlements, which were widely perceived to be under strain through traffic congestion and overstretched public services.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Many responses favoured this option as an alternative to further extensions to their particular settlement, and as a consequence the sub-option preference varied. Those in Rayleigh/Hullbridge were more likely (although not always) to favour Option 3b, whereas those in Rochford/Wakering normally backed 3a.</p> <p>Option 3 was deemed suitable by ECC for delivering the necessary large scale sustainable development alongside the required infrastructure.</p> <p>Some comments highlighted Beaulieu Park, Chelmsford, as a good example of a development built at scale alongside the required infrastructure and facilities. South Woodham Ferrers highlighted as another local example.</p> <p>Many respondents did not specify a particular location, although often favoured somewhere relatively unpopulated.</p> <p>Good access to main roads (particularly the A127) and railway lines also cited as important, along with dedicated bus service.</p> <p>New communities also noted as having particular opportunities to build in better cycling, public transport and walking routes from the outset, connecting up with existing communities. Pooled developer contributions could support this.</p> <p>A number of comments felt the best way to build a new community was in conjunction with one or more neighbouring authorities, allowing resources to be pooled to provide a greater scale of settlement and amenities.</p> <p>Some felt a new community was an ideal opportunity to design settlement along eco-friendly principles, with high levels of energy efficiency, on-site energy generation, cycle/public transport routes and shared allotments/orchards.</p> <p>Several developers (along with the House Builders Federation) felt this option was risky, as an over-reliance on strategic sites which take longer to develop would risk the District not having a 5 year land supply in earlier stages of the LP, and for it to be found unsound at</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>examination stage. North Essex draft LP highlighted as example of over-reliance on garden communities which were not found to be sound or viable.</p> <p><b>Option 3a (West of Rayleigh)</b></p> <p>This option received the largest volume of support, with the site considered by many to benefit from existing good road links via the A130, A1245 and A127. Sitting outside of the ‘peninsula’ occupied by Rochford and Southend was felt to give residents better access to a range of employment, retail, and leisure opportunities in Chelmsford/Basildon/Thurrock, whilst housing growth would not result in additional traffic on busy roads within the District (such as the A127 East of Rayleigh Weir or the B1013).</p> <p>Some comments felt its position between main roads and railway line meant it did not directly impact on existing communities such as Rayleigh or Wickford.</p> <p>Neighbouring Castle Point Borough Council expressed interest at a joint approach between Rochford, Castle Point and Basildon for a strategic scale development benefiting from main road links and upcoming improvements to the Fairglen Interchange.</p> <p>In addition to those in the East and centre of the District, this option had some popularity with residents of Rayleigh and Hullbridge, who felt it sufficiently far away and well-connected that it would not produce as much negative impact upon their settlements as urban extensions would.</p> <p>Landowner supporting the area’s development observed that Wickford had equivalence to Rayleigh in size and could be considered a Tier 1 settlement under the Document’s hierarchy, making sites close to Wickford in this option sustainable, given the wide range of amenities and railway station in the town, along with high frequency bus routes.</p> <p>However, Basildon Borough Council considered this option to be more closely related to the Wickford Urban Area than Rayleigh, and that development there would have a disproportionate impact on infrastructure and amenities within Basildon Borough. Given the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Basildon LP has been submitted for Examination in Public to the Secretary of State, it was not felt to be an appropriate time for Rochford to submit a major proposal on its boundary, which would likely undermine the Basildon Local Plan, and this would not be supported by Basildon. It was acknowledged that the South Wickford area did have potential to deliver further growth, something which will be considered at a future LP review. At that time, it may be appropriate to revisit the discussion with Rochford, which would need to consider impacts upon Basildon Borough and the required upgrades to infrastructure and services to compensate.</p> <p>There were some opposing comments that 3a would eat into Green Belt between Rayleigh and Wickford, and in reality, be more an extension of Wickford/Shotgate than part of the District.</p> <p><b>Option 3b (North of Southend)</b></p> <p>Felt by several consultees to provide an opportunity for a dedicated new community, along with new infrastructure, education, healthcare, transport, commercial space etc.</p> <p>This option was particularly favoured by Rayleigh residents, who felt it would direct development and congestion away from their town.</p> <p>Felt to be a 'blank canvas' that could create new communities with all their own facilities and attract investment.</p> <p>A couple of responses felt this would be a good place for a secondary school, which could also serve Great Wakering.</p> <p>Some responses felt this could be a good opportunity to cooperate with Southend Borough Council.</p> <p>Southend Borough Council welcomed further discussions with RDC on this option, recognising the potential to deliver a cross-boundary scheme which could help meet Southend's unmet housing need, and that development at scale could leverage significant infrastructure improvements to also benefit existing communities. Any development here would not be possible without cross-boundary cooperation and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>would require new road links, active travel networks and a possible transport hub at Southend Airport Railway Station.</p> <p>Significant concern from residents in the area (Wakering/Barling/Sutton) about the scale of development on the Green Belt and the feeling this would result in villages merging into Southend.</p> <p>Concern from one developer that 3b alone could not meet District's needs, along with unmet needs of neighbouring Southend-on-Sea, whose simultaneous consultation explored the option of siting up to 4,900 homes north of the borough, in Rochford District.</p> <p>Some responses felt this development would merely add further traffic congestion to the A127 and other roads in the District and should not be supported.</p> <p>Some respondents felt this option would not be feasible without a significant bypass, given existing pressure on the A127.</p> <p><b>Option 3c (East of Rochford)</b></p> <p>This proposal attracted very little support, as it was considered to have poor transport access via single carriageway roads and put strain on the existing town of Rochford. Concerns about effects on Ashingdon Road particularly pronounced.</p> <p>A couple of comments were expressed in support of ambitious 'eco village' proposals at Doggetts, which would form part of this option.</p> <p><b>Option 4 (Balanced Approach)</b></p> <p>Considered the de facto option by many developers, who wished to see their specific site allocated, but recognised that there may be some strategic/political desire to designate a larger concentration that would deliver more sustainable growth. Such developers argued that urban extensions could help deliver the required housing numbers in the early years of the plan, with larger allocations coming into effect at a later stage (such as the 2030s).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Considered to offer insurance against the risk of delays/disruption to the delivery of larger (Option 3) strategic sites by ensuring other allocated sites can still provide housing.</p> <p>Some residents felt this was the most realistic/logical approach, although whether Option 1 was combined with small Option 2 allocations (to minimise Green Belt impact) or with a larger scale Option 3 approach varied.</p> <p>Many felt this was the best way to deliver both required housing and infrastructure.</p> <p>Also suggested that Option 4 could see both a strategic development, providing new infrastructure and employment opportunities, whilst also allowing for small sites spread across the District, helping younger people to remain in their local communities.</p> <p><b>‘Other’ responses</b></p> <p>Several responses felt it inappropriate to pursue any option until a full infrastructure assessment had been carried out.</p> <p>Many comments opposed any form of growth within the District, urging the Council to push back on Government housing targets.</p> <p>General concern at the extent of promoted ‘blue’ sites and worry that further growth would take away the District’s historic/semi-rural character. Some respondents mistakenly understood that all promoted sites were to be developed, which caused particular concern.</p> <p>Many of these comments simply rejected any development in their specific town, village or local area, feeling the locality was ‘full’, or ‘at capacity’. A number felt existing developments had changed their settlements for the worse and had not provided the infrastructure improvements that were required. Hall Road and Rawreth Lane cited in particular as examples of where promised infrastructure (i.e., primary school) had not been delivered along with housing).</p> <p>Some comments observed how all existing access routes (e.g., the A127, B1013, Eastwood Road and railway line) were unsuitable for</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>handling significant extra volumes, whilst limited local employment opportunities meant greater out-commuting, demonstrating that little further growth could be accommodated in South-East Essex.</p> <p>Opposition to developing the Green Belt was a strong theme running through many responses. Some felt the strategy options and promoted sites were contrary to the vision of the District as a ‘green and pleasant place’, and open space/countryside was cited as particularly important for recreation and mental wellbeing during Covid lockdown. Concern at loss of agricultural land also flagged on multiple occasions.</p> <p>Areas various residents felt to be ‘overdeveloped’ included Great Wakering, Hockley, Hullbridge, Rayleigh and Hawkwell.</p> <p>Some felt SSOs would render District similar to Greater London in terms of population density.</p> <p>Importance of suitable provision of housing for older people flagged as a key issue that needed to be worked into whichever strategy option selected.</p> <p>State of District’s roads (both their capacity and condition) deemed a major obstacle to any further development in a very large number of responses. Significant numbers of respondents felt similarly about community infrastructure (e.g., schools/healthcare) and water supply/sewage.</p> <p>Many favoured an ‘infrastructure first’ approach, with no development permitted until the necessary roads, healthcare, education and other services had been provided. Differing views as to whether this should be funded by developers or Central Government. Much cynicism as to whether required infrastructure would ever be delivered. Hullbridge Residents’ Association observations on healthcare that District’s ageing population needed to be adequately provided for in any future LP, with a full consideration of how existing primary healthcare facilities will be impacted by future developments, along with consideration for sufficient ‘lifetime homes’ to enable full accessibility at all stages of life.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Importance of employment provision in any strategy option highlighted, if ambition is for the District to be more than a 'dormitory'.</p> <p>Many responses felt any approach that did take place needed to fully tackle affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Some comments felt that whatever option was chosen, the East of the District should avoid major development, given the additional road constraints and heightened flood risk.</p> <p>Many replies to this question sought to oppose specific promoted sites which had been put forward for development.</p> <p>Some comments identified the peninsular geography of Rochford and surrounding areas, along with flood zone, habitat and Green Belt constraints as significant barriers to development in much of the District.</p> <p>Environmental concerns expressed in terms of impact on climate change (which some felt the Document did not sufficiently tackle) and sentiment that building more homes would result in generally higher emissions, even if houses were built to net zero standards, due to loss of vegetation and increased traffic. Also highlighted were harm to the District's natural habitats, wildlife, air quality and road noise. Additional surface flooding to existing properties from development of Green Belt sites also raised as a concern.</p> <p>Some responses proposed alternatives. Within the District, these included redeveloping the Airport site as a sustainable option. Some favoured a policy which directed growth away from Essex and South-East England towards the North, possibly linked to Government 'Levelling Up' agenda.</p> <p>Design of recent housing developments has not been sympathetic to heritage of the District, and greater attention should be paid to design in future, to reflect local character.</p> <p>Any development in the smaller villages should be small scale, focused on providing affordable/family housing for local needs.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>Q7. Are there any reasonable alternatives to these options that should be considered instead?</p>	85	6	9	70	<p>Many responses felt no significant development was viable/achievable within the District, given current severe constraints on infrastructure and environmental concerns, and a preferable strategy would be to refuse to plan for any further growth (or at least plan only for a token amount). This would involve 'pushing back' on targets from Central Government, which were often not felt to accurately reflect local need. Some residents felt this had been done successfully in other councils, whilst the recent rejection of the Bloor Homes proposal at Ashingdon Road was cited as an example of how large schemes could be challenged.</p> <p>Option 1, or a narrower variation of this involving building only on brownfield sites (and not on existing allocations or encouraging greater density in residential areas), was favoured by some respondents, who felt that only brownfield development should be permitted.</p> <p>A number of responses felt developing Option 3a, in a cross-boundary approach with Basildon Borough, would deliver growth in a more sustainable and accessible location, with only brownfield/intensification taking place elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>Importance of maintaining existing Green Belt stressed in many instances – this was often felt to be sacrosanct.</p> <p>Similarly, some felt the constraints presented by low-lying areas at risk of flooding had to be considered (including potential for further sea level rise), and that such areas should not be built on.</p> <p>Several respondents used this section as an opportunity to explain why additional growth in their particular area was not suitable, due to infrastructure constraints, flood risk or poor access (e.g., Hullbridge, Great Wakering).</p> <p>Many respondents considered an 'infrastructure-first' approach the only way forward, with further development only possible if existing infrastructure and services improved in advance.</p> <p>Alongside opposition to major growth, a prevailing view amongst respondents was to build for local needs, which some comments felt could be met in a range of ways, including reusing empty shops, flats</p>
--	--	----	---	---	----	--

						<p>on brownfield sites, or small development plots on the edge of settlements (e.g., 50-100 small, affordable homes in every village, to spread development widely), or exception sites in rural areas to meet local needs only.</p> <p>Changes in working patterns due to technology and Covid meant some respondents felt fewer offices were needed (which could become homes), and that generally there was less need to encourage growth in the London Commuter Belt, as fewer workers now needed to be in the South-East.</p> <p>Some felt other parts of the country (particularly outside Essex/South East) were more suited for meeting national future housing and employment growth needs, particularly where there was better road/rail access. Locations suggested included the North of England (alongside the 'Levelling Up' agenda), somewhere closer to London, or an unspecified 'open' area, not within the District.</p> <p>A New Town approach was felt by some to offer an alternative which also provided the relevant infrastructure for a growing population. Some comments expressed support for a 'garden village' approach, along the lines of Option 3, though significant new infrastructure would be required. Beaulieu, Chelmsford, cited as a model.</p> <p>A number of replies felt there were no reasonable alternatives available, given the geographical constraints on the District.</p> <p>Amongst property developers/landowners/agents, most felt RDC should do more to work cross-boundary with Southend Borough Council, fulfilling its Duty To Cooperate obligations to help meet Southend's unmet needs by planning for a 'buffer' level of growth above the minimum expected by Central Government. One developer explained that, given the increasing elderly population, this would help meet local needs by attracting further investment and preventing younger people from having to leave the District to find a home. One developer observed insufficient detail had been given to Southend's own ongoing LP, and the need to meet much of the borough's OAN under Duty to Cooperate.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Several responses felt that housing delivered through 'windfall' (i.e., not on allocated sites) should be counted in housing number <i>[NB – this is already the case, but is a common misconception that such housing does not count against Government targets]</i>.</p> <p>Some felt that, with a change in Housing Minister, it would be better to pause and wait to see if a change in policy direction came from Central Government.</p> <p>Two comments that expanding Hullbridge to the East or West could accommodate growth, but only through improvement of Watery Lane.</p> <p>Redevelopment of Airport suggested as being able to accommodate large volume of housing in a sustainable location.</p> <p>A suggestion to work collaboratively with Southend to realise potential of brownfield sites in both areas.</p> <p>Some responses felt insufficient attention had been paid to planning for dedicated, off-road cycle routes to encourage genuinely sustainable travel and reduce congestion, and that such networks were sorely needed if major new extensions planned. Ironwell Lane suggested as an easy option to improve connectivity.</p> <p>A view that multiple home ownerships should be tackled before genuine housing need could be accommodated.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>Q8. Are there any key spatial themes that you feel we have missed or that require greater emphasis?</p>	65	3	8	54	<p>Many felt various <b>environmental</b> aspects required greater emphasis in the document. These included climate change (and the particular impact caused by additional housing and traffic); biodiversity/existing habitat preservation and green infrastructure; measures to manage air quality/pollution; flood risk (and design of front gardens to reduce the risk); and loss of green belt. Natural England requested that climate change theme refers to Suffolk &amp; Essex Shoreline Management Plan.</p> <p><b>Climate change</b> in particular raised comments regarding provision of EV charging points, dedicated cycle routes, carbon neutral building standards and a dedicated programme of tree-planting and green infrastructure creation.</p> <p>A sizeable number of comments raised concerns about the loss of <b>agricultural land</b> in the District, citing a greater need for self-sufficiency post-Brexit and greater emphasis on plant-based diets to counter climate change as reasons to protect land for food production.</p> <p><b>Culture</b> was a theme identified in many responses, with one linking this to the potential redevelopment of the Mill Hall site in Rayleigh.</p> <p><b>Green infrastructure</b> flagged as an importance issue, both generally by residents and specifically by Natural England, who requested reference to Essex Green Infrastructure Strategy 2020 and to ensure green infrastructure networks proposed in the plan are multifunctional and support climate change, health &amp; wellbeing and sustainable travel objectives, and also continue across boundaries into neighbouring Districts.</p> <p>Some respondents flagged <b>waste &amp; recycling</b>, with the existing Castle Road site considered not fit for purpose and many residents in the East of District having a long distance to travel. Question of whether a purpose-built site will be proposed.</p> <p>Need for more emphasis on <b>integrated transport and connectivity</b> highlighted. Specifically on reducing car usage, establishing a safe network of pedestrian/cycling routes (off-road) to remove barriers to walking/cycling and greater modal shift from driving to public transport.</p>
--	--	----	---	---	----	--

						<p>Particularly important given emphasis on housing growth in the Document.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure delivery</b> – where will roads be improved? More detail on community infrastructure provision required – schools, doctors, leisure facilities (e.g., an additional swimming pool felt to be needed). ECC noted that Document is silent on delivery mechanism for infrastructure, whether developer contributions or CIL.</p> <p><b>Affordable housing</b> needs to be properly addressed to provide properties affordable on average local salaries.</p> <p><b>Health &amp; wellbeing</b> – a number of respondents flagged this as important, including ECC, Essex Police and Natural England. Places, buildings and communities should promote physical and mental health and wellbeing, and separate themes such as sustainable travel (walking &amp; cycling) or green infrastructure should also be recognised for their contributions to health and wellbeing. Mental health in particular flagged as a pertinent issue from recent Covid lockdowns, with open spaces and nature having potential to aid this.</p> <p>ECC response on health &amp; wellbeing suggests the amendment of Strategic Objectives 14 and 15, to include an overarching health &amp; wellbeing strategy. Recommendation of a Health Impact Assessment as LP progresses. Essex Design Guide and Essex Developers Guide references to be included.</p> <p><b>Digital infrastructure</b> – this supports many aspects of improvements to health, the economy etc., and is particularly an issue for remote, rural areas.</p> <p>More specific reference to <b>biodiversity</b> as per paragraph 179 of the NPPF with regard to nationally/locally protected sites and biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>A number of developer responses felt the various themes had been covered appropriately for this stage of the consultation.</p> <p><b>'Accessibility'</b> mentioned by a number of respondents, although no detail given on whether this related to general transport matters, or</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>more specific accessibility for the disabled, or those with impaired mobility.</p> <p>A developer considered the important issue of <b>Green Belt release</b> to satisfy housing requirements not sufficiently addressed, and that accompanying Green Belt Study does not look in adequate detail at the performance of green belt sites.</p> <p>Potential for <b>modular/’flat-pack’ construction methods</b> in future housing delivery.</p> <p>Some concern over <b>water</b> – both capacity of waste water network and whether there is sufficient supply of fresh water for growing population.</p> <p><b>Enforcement</b> of unauthorised development.</p> <p>One developer noted evidence base regarding <b>Heritage</b> currently not up to date.</p> <p>Concern regarding existing and proposed residential sites often extending across parish boundaries and the implications this has for collection of council tax revenue.</p> <p>Some respondents raised an issue with a broken link to some of the evidence base documents accompanying the consultation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>SECTION 4: Spatial Themes – Climate Change &amp; Resilient Environments</b></p>	<p>Q9. Do you agree we should take a sequential approach to flood risk and coastal change in our plan, locating development away from areas at risk of flooding and coastal change wherever possible? How can we best protect current and future communities from flood risk and coastal change?</p>	<p>77</p>	<p>43</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>Most comments agreed that the sequential approach should be undertaken when considering development for flood risk and coastal change. Comments on how communities could be protected were also provided:</p> <p><b>Sequential Approach</b></p> <p>Expert advice should be sought. Sequential approach will also protect coastal bird habitats.</p> <p>Would also accord with the proposed settlement hierarchy, concentrating development at the main settlements of the District and at lower risk of flooding.</p> <p>Will result in further constraints on potential suitable land available for development and further necessitating the release of suitable Green Belt to ensure sustainable development can take place.</p> <p><b>Protection</b></p> <p>Flood areas could be considered for green energy initiatives, public open space provision and ecological enhancement.</p> <p>Ensure use of accurate data to project sea level rises and coastal flooding.</p> <p>Building should be prohibited on flood plains and directed to flood zone 1 but important that sites, part of which lie in fold zones 2/3 but capable of accommodating a quantum of development in fold zone 1 are not rejected on flood risk grounds.</p> <p>Developments should ensure a significant portion of the site remains permeable and have adequate drainage with a strong policy on SuDs including maintenance. New surface water infrastructure needs exploration with regard to Options 1 and 2 to manage and mitigate urban intensification.</p> <p>Avoid large scale development.</p>
---	--	-----------	-----------	----------	-----------	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>Modelling on impacts of sea level rise should be undertaken to inform mitigation of flooding.</p> <p>Design and carbon footprint of new developments need to be considered to limit and mitigate flood damage.</p> <p>Future social and community infrastructure will need to consider mitigating future climate change.</p> <p>Regard needs to be had to smaller flood areas that regularly flood and local knowledge</p> <p>Improve land drainage (less open empty fields, more trees/hedges etc.) maintain drain ditches, increase open spaces and landscaping on developments. Natural areas also need protecting.</p> <p>Flood defenses in Hullbridge need to be considered. Do not build in Hullbridge.</p> <p>Maintenance of sea defenses needs to also be considered.</p> <p>Consideration of the Shoreline Management Plan should be given.</p>
	<p>Q10. Do you agree that the Coastal Protection Belt and Upper Roach Valley should be protected from development that would be harmful to their landscape character? Are there other areas that you feel should be protected for their special landscape character?</p>	57	36	1	20	<p>Most comments agreed that the Coastal Protection Belt and Upper Roach Valley should be protected from development, with other areas that should also be considered:</p> <p><b>Coastal Protection Belt (CPB) and Upper Roach Valley</b></p> <p>Development near / on Coastal Belt should be limited.</p> <p>No development should be allowed within this area.</p> <p>The National Trail in the Roach Valley should be protected.</p>

						<p>A plan should be included to identify the extent of the CPB, as protection of these informal areas ensures recreation for residents of south east Essex including Southend.</p> <p>Needs protection from flooding.</p> <p>CFS216 – Land at Fambridge Road, Ashingdon should not be considered for development as within the CPB Special Landscaped Area.</p> <p><b>Protection of other areas for their Special Landscaped Character</b></p> <p>Sites which are unconstrained from such designations should be the focus of allocations in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>All areas should be considered.</p> <p>Hockley Woods, Marylands Nature Reserve and other ancient / woodland.</p> <p>A buffer zone should be required between wildlife habitats such as Hockley woods and new development on the edge of the protected area.</p> <p>Kingsley Woods, Rayleigh Grove Woods and all natural parks and surrounding areas should be protected.</p> <p>Villages, habitats.</p> <p>The ridge of high ground to the south of Rayleigh, behind Spring Gardens and High Mead, leading onto Great Wheatley Road due to unique unspoilt landscape, forming the backdrop to the historic centre of Rayleigh.</p> <p>Open spaces, green belt areas, specifically CFS077 for farming, wildlife, health and wellbeing in an area of open space deprivation.</p> <p>Rayleigh Mount and surrounds.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Historical and ecological sites, scale and identity of adjoining communities.</p> <p>Cherry Orchard Country Park and surrounding farmland as a small area and development would reduce its impact as a green centre.</p> <p>The Saffron Trail should be afforded protection.</p> <p>The flood plain areas of Little Wakering, Barling and Stonebridge should be protected.</p> <p>Hullbridge river front.</p> <p>The following sites were listed by comments as ones which should not be considered for development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CFS045 – Belchamps Scout Site, Holyoak Lane, Hawkwell</li> <li>2. CFS251 – Land at Peartree Cottage, Holyoak Lane, Hockley</li> <li>3. CFS191 – Land at Mount Bovers Lane, Hawkwell</li> <li>4. CFS074 – Land South of Mount Bovers Lane, Hockley</li> <li>5. CFS160 – Northlands Farm, 65 High Road, Hockley</li> <li>6. CFS161 – 57 High Road, Hockley</li> <li>7. CFS083 – Land South of Hall Road and West of Ark Lane, Rochford</li> <li>8. CFS078 – Land West of Cherry Orchard Way and South of Cherry Orchard Lane, Rochford</li> <li>9. CFS079 – Land West of Cherry Orchard Way and East of Cherry Orchard Lane, Rochford</li> <li>10. CFS135 – Land at Flemmings Farm Road, Eastwood</li> <li>11. CFS059 – Land at Sandhill Road, Eastwood</li> <li>12. CFS037 – The Ramblers &amp; Dahlia Lodge, Eastwood Rise, Leigh</li> <li>13. CFS027 – Land North of Bull Lane, Rayleigh (development would link Rayleigh and Hockley)</li> <li>14. CFS029 – Land at Turrett Farm, Napier Road, Rayleigh (development would link Rayleigh and Hockley)</li> <li>15. CFS053 – Land South of 38 and 39 Wellington Road, Rayleigh.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>16. CFS098 17. CFS086</p> <p>All these promoted sites fall within or in proximity to the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area which should be extended to encompass the land in the above sites to be protected for environmental and wildlife reasons.</p> <p>Fields around St. Mary’s Church, Hawkwell and the network of footpaths around Clements Hall and Glencroft Open Space need to be protected for contribution to wildlife habitat.</p>
	<p>Q11. Do you agree we should require development to source a percentage of their energy from low-carbon and renewable sources? Are there other opportunities in the District to supply low carbon or renewable energy?</p>	<p>58</p>	<p>36</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>21</p> <p><b>Strong support</b> for proposal, with 36 (63%) of responses in outright support. The majority of those who chose to ‘comment’ also supported or agreed in principle.</p> <p>Many felt measure should be the <b>minimum</b> prerequisite for permitting development. A sizeable number felt the percentage of energy sourced in this way should be an ambitiously high one, rather than a ‘token’ 10%.</p> <p>Many commenters felt any new developments should not only source energy from low-carbon/renewables, but should do so on site (i.e., through solar panels). Community renewables projects (e.g., <a href="https://www.gmc.org.uk/">https://www.gmc.org.uk/</a>) highlighted as a possible option.</p> <p>Many residents felt that developers achieve large profits and as a consequence should ‘do their bit’ in fulfilling climate change obligations set by Central Government and on the international stage (through construction methods, design of houses with renewable energy, and by offsetting their emissions).</p> <p>ECC supported the ambition for all new developments to be net zero as current building regulations lack ambition, making the challenge to</p>

						<p>reach net zero by 2050 more problematic. ECC supports the inclusion of sustainable energy and waste recycling infrastructure on all large developments which would be sufficient to meet 100% of the needs of the development, in accordance with Essex Design Guide. Also highlighted LETI Design Guide recommendations. Highlighted ECAC report recommendations for solar panels and highlighted opportunities for heat networks and capture/reuse of waste heat on larger developments. Also suggested consideration of low-grade agricultural land for solar farms, consideration of wind power and welcomed feasibility studies considering locations which bring wider socioeconomic benefits to Essex.</p> <p>Some respondents felt all new properties should also include heat pumps, water recycling and that all building designs should be as energy efficient as possible (including positioning houses in a way to benefit from maximum solar gain). One respondent also suggested a hydrogen network as an alternative to gas boilers.</p> <p>Developers generally welcomed the measure for sourcing a percentage of energy from low-carbon sources and transitioning towards a zero-carbon economy, with most keen to state their sustainability credentials and highlight their progress towards net-zero. However, there were questions over the exact percentage, with this being a matter of viability and deliverability which could vary between sites. It was mentioned that the construction method and building standards of homes for energy efficiency purposes was as important as energy source, and that all these factors should be considered in terms of viability in the LP. Forthcoming Government Future Homes Standard will be in place by time LP is adopted.</p> <p>Two developers (one major national and one small site promoter in Canewdon) highlighted plans for community heating networks to decarbonise their schemes. Doggetts Farm proposals for eco housing also highlighted by a couple of respondents as an interesting option for developing carbon-neutral housing.</p> <p>The sole objector to this question felt proposals to require ‘a percentage’ of energy from low-carbon and renewable sources did not</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>go far enough, and that this should be 100%, in support of the Paris Climate Agreement.</p> <p>Some felt that areas of the District not suitable for housing could be used for generating renewable power – e.g., solar farms. Alternatively, tidal power or offshore wind could be options that would suit the District’s natural resources. Other parts of the District could be used for ‘carbon capture’ (i.e., planting woodlands and other habitats to capture carbon).</p> <p>Industrial/commercial buildings, public buildings and schools suggested as sites for solar panels – particularly where flat roofed. Incentives should be provided for retrofitting of existing properties.</p> <p>A view that, alongside these measures, RDC should invest properly in public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure, rather than road building/widening.</p> <p>Some respondents felt EV charging point provision needed to be considered in tandem with renewables on new developments.</p> <p>One respondent felt not developing should also be an option, if constructing a particular scheme was assessed to generate excessive amounts of carbon.</p> <p>Some views that solar panels and wind farms should not be sited on agricultural land, or that a legal agreement should oblige the landowner to reinstate the land to agricultural if/when not used for renewables. Concern that such sites could then be regarded as ‘previously-developed land’ suitable for development.</p> <p>One response concerned that new ‘windfall’ schemes could overshadow existing properties’ ability to source solar energy, and that this should be prevented.</p>
Q12. Do you agree we should require new development to achieve energy efficiency standards higher than building	69	33	6	30	Proposal was <b>strongly supported</b> , given concerns about climate change. Current ‘minimum’ building regulation standards not felt to be enough by many respondents, with a number expressing preference for the highest possible standards, or net zero. Some felt a clear message needed to be given to the development industry that

	<p>regulations? What level should these be set at?</p>				<p>technologies to reduce energy use should be adopted as much as possible. Some sentiment that standards should <b>not</b> be negotiable.</p> <p>Some parish councils supported this, provided it did not mean additional costs were passed onto the future occupiers of such buildings.</p> <p>Passivhaus suggested by a couple of responses as a standard to aim for.</p> <p>Many respondents observed that demolition of buildings to rebuild on the same site was far worse for the environment than reusing/adapting existing buildings – both in the case of Rayleigh Mill Hall, but also more generally.</p> <p>Opposition to this proposal came largely from developers and the House Builders Federation, who felt forthcoming national building regulations would set sufficiently high energy efficiency standards (31% improvement on CO2 emissions on development up to 2025, and a 75% improvement from 2025, when Future Homes Standard is adopted. A universal standard was felt to better provide the required supply chains and trained workforce to deliver this across the whole country – House Builders Federation pointed out it would take considerable time and resource to deliver the efficiencies required (e.g., installation of heat pumps on all new builds), and that locally-imposed standards would result in considerable duplication. Any higher standards RDC wishes to apply would require robust supporting evidence, with consideration given to the impact on viability of future proposed developments.</p> <p>Echoed by some residents, who felt improvements in such standards should be a nationwide approach.</p> <p>A developer in support of this measure felt that developers building to higher standards should have this recognised positive merit of the scheme in the wider planning balance.</p> <p>ECC agreed that all homes meet at least Future Homes standards and pay heed to ECAC recommendations of all new homes and commercial buildings being net zero from 2025, and all new buildings</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>being carbon negative. Cited Gilston Garden Town principles regarding net zero standards as good practice. These seek firstly to reduce energy need through highly efficient building design, and then fill remaining demand with renewables.</p> <p>Several respondents felt improved energy efficiency standards should be delivered alongside other measures, such as solar panels and EV charging points (which should also be included in building regs), and that a transition away from fossil fuels to heat homes needed to begin. One comment that the siting of EV charging infrastructure (and additional power capacity) needed to be carefully considered, along with policies for charging vehicles that did not have their own driveway.</p> <p>Mid and South Essex Health and Care Partnership expressed support, stating all new NHS buildings are designed to achieve efficiencies higher than the standards.</p> <p>Essex Police noted that buildings constructed to Secure By Design specification were, by their nature, more energy-efficient.</p> <p>Two respondents noted that even carbon neutral homes generated more carbon when compared with the Green Belt sites they replaced.</p> <p>Doggetts Farm 'eco village' proposals highlighted as a potential exemplar of how this could work in future.</p> <p>Promoters of CFS043 and CFS065 highlighted how their sites could deliver housing well in excess of existing standards (in the first instance through renewable energy sources, PassivHaus standards and EV charging points), and in the second case through modular methods of construction).</p> <p>A comment that homes needed to be able to cope with future extreme heat events.</p>	
	Q13. How do you feel the plan can help to support the local generation of low-carbon and renewable energy? Are there locations	32	8	1	24	<p>Several comments supported on-site renewables on housing developments contributing to energy generation (e.g., solar panels on new houses as standard), along with widespread installation of heat</p>

	<p>where you feel energy generation should be supported?</p>					<p>pumps. Possible developer obligations to provide a degree of renewable production for each house built.</p> <p>Some respondents advocated exploring the potential for tidal power in the District, with one considering the Rivers Crouch or Roach ideal. Hydro-electric micro-generation schemes also mentioned by one respondent as a possibility.</p> <p>ECC, along with others, supported identification/allocation of sites for larger scale energy production, as well as facilitating an interconnected approach to energy in the area through wider opportunities to incorporate renewable energy infrastructure e.g., heat networks, capturing and reusing waste heat (as per ECAC Report recommendations).</p> <p>Allocation of sites for solar power/renewables supported, possibly including some of the current promoted sites. A developer suggested a specific 'Call for Sites' for renewable/low carbon sources could be held. Some felt it important that any land allocated for renewable generation had a legal agreement that this would be reinstated to its former agricultural use in the event it was no longer used for energy, to prevent it becoming previously-developed land.</p> <p>A number of comments felt installation of solar panels on flat roofs (e.g., industrial buildings) was an easy way to increase renewable generation in the District.</p> <p>Wind turbines suggested by a number of respondents, either on land (as in Burnham-on-Crouch, or as part of new developments) or offshore (e.g., off the coast of Foulness. Some opposed wind turbines, particularly on land, due to their unsightly nature and a concern that once developed for wind power, developers may attempt to subsequently redevelop farmland for other means. Also, the potential for on/offshore wind turbines to affect migratory birds.</p> <p>With solar farms, there was some acknowledgement this would require use of green belt/agricultural land, which concerned some people due to possible loss of biodiversity or productive farmland.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Suggestions that green energy generation best where the Green Belt not affected – e.g., offshore or on flood plains.</p> <p>Significant level of support for incentives to retrofit existing properties with features such as solar panels and heat pumps.</p> <p>A suggestion to provide funding to encourage companies, charities and individuals to come up with local renewable/low-carbon projects and provide administrative and financial support.</p> <p>Some support for District-wide targets for a percentage of local electricity generation.</p> <p>Some comments felt the plan proposed little to reduce carbon emissions and too much in terms of carbon-producing development.</p> <p>Small number of comments advocating creation of eco communities with network of cycle paths between developments, eco homes, charging stations, shared allotments and new planting schemes, along with no-till farming to take carbon back into the soil.</p> <p>One suggestion to build a waste-to-energy plant, which would also tackle waste management.</p> <p>Promoters of CFS043 highlighted how site could be powered by renewable power and linked by a community heating network.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>SECTION 4: Spatial Themes – Placemaking &amp; Design</b></p>	<p>Q14. Do you consider that the plan should include a place-making charter that informs relevant policies? Should the same principles apply everywhere in the District, or should different principles apply to different areas?</p>	<p>52</p>	<p>24</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>Most comments agreed that a place-making charter should be included in the plan with supporting evidence, and through local consultation:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>An over-arching policy, considering impacts of development on different areas, supplemented with design guides, codes (high level unless in relation to areas of very strong character, heritage or landscape value) or masterplans for individual settlements and growth areas. Emphasis on carbon neutral and environment sustainability.</p> <p>Needs to consider facilities, services and accessibility, inclusiveness and green and blue spaces. Align with the District Vision and Strategic Objectives. Will help inform policies and determination of planning decisions.</p> <p>Would comply with NPPF and provide clarity to developers.</p> <p>Will not work unless infrastructure in place to support a place-making charter.</p> <p>Will contribute towards maintaining a higher standard of housing.</p> <p>Would need to be supported with evidence documents.</p> <p>Needs to be formulated through consultation with stakeholders to ensure it is realistic, achievable and does not result in development becoming unviable.</p> <p><b>Reference to Principles</b></p> <p>The place-making charter for Rochford sets broad principles that identify key priorities without being overly rigid. The principles should apply throughout the District but with flexibility to create certainty. principles need to be consistent with the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code.</p>
--	---	-----------	-----------	----------	-----------	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<p>Q15. Are the principles set out in the draft place-making charter the right ones? Are there other principles that should be included?</p>	33	14	2	17	<p>Most comments agreed that the principles were the right ones, with some comments suggesting further principles to be included:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Commendable principles and should be set out in policy, based on evidence and fully costed in the viability study and consistent with national policy. But would have to be financially budgeted for and may slow development.</p> <p>Accords with Sport England's 'Uniting the Movement' Strategy and Active Design guidance.</p> <p><b>Other Principles</b></p> <p>Reference should be given to provision of infrastructure i.e., roads and digital connectivity, accessibility for all, to promote social and economic benefits.</p> <p>Principles should also apply to empty buildings that can be used for housing.</p> <p>Provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Garden sizes and landscaping should be considered.</p> <p>Biodiversity should be considered.</p> <p>The charter should give consideration to ECC's goals and outcomes outlined in the Essex Housing Strategy 2021-2025 (2021) with emphasis on net zero homes and businesses.</p>
<p>Q16a. Do you consider that new design guides, codes or masterplans should be</p>	46	23	3	20	<p>Most comments agreed that design guides, codes or masterplans should be created alongside the new Plan, with the development industry providing extensive feedback to this question. Some comments suggesting what should be included:</p>

	created alongside the new Local Plan?					<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Design guides, codes (high level and not specific unless areas have strong character, heritage and landscape value) and masterplans are needed as they go hand in hand, and should be underpinned by district level principles set out in any charter.</p> <p>Gives certainty to developers.</p> <p>Should only be relevant to strategic allocated sites.</p> <p>Should set out anticipated rates of delivery.</p> <p>References should be provided as to how guidance adhered to in policies.</p> <p>Ensures development appropriate to its location.</p> <p>Need to consider how they provide additionality to existing design guidance e.g., Essex Design Guide (EPOA).</p> <p>Should be done at county level.</p> <p>Should include infrastructure and housing need (affordability) requirements.</p> <p>Need to be consistent with principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code.</p> <p>Should be kept under review and reflected as policies updated.</p> <p>Masterplans should be led by developers to reduce council time and resources.</p> <p>For medium / small scale development, management policies relevant to urban design and placemaking would be sufficient.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Should be developed subsequent to Local Plan adoption so as not to delay the Local Plan review.</p> <p>Should be produced in collaboration with landowners and developers.</p> <p>Design guides, codes and masterplans are not necessary, planning system is capable of ensuring good design without the need for additional work added to the Local Plan process delaying housing delivery.</p>
<p>Q16b. If yes, do you think it is more appropriate to have a single design guide/code for the whole District, or to have design guides/codes/masterplans for individual settlements or growth areas?</p>	<p>40</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>32</p>	<p>Most comments agreed that a single design guide / code for the whole District was more appropriate, but there were also a mix of comments supporting individual settlements / growth areas as well as for each site. Few comments favoured a higher county and national level:</p> <p><b>District Level</b></p> <p>Should be for District as a whole.</p> <p>For District with amendments per growth/settlement area.</p> <p><b>Settlement / Growth Areas Level</b></p> <p>Should be for individual settlement areas, as own needs.</p> <p>Each area should have own design code / master plan.</p> <p>Each phase of a site should have its own design code.</p> <p>Should be based on community engagement</p> <p><b>County Level</b></p> <p>Should be at county level with specific additional guidance for individual settlements.</p> <p>Essex Design Guide could be used / aligned with.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p><b>National Level</b></p> <p>National Design Guide and the National Model Design code should be used to guide planning and in the use of decisions in the absence of locally produced design guides or design codes.</p> <p>Prescriptive design codes on a site-by-site basis would without flexibility, restrict the use of innovative methods and technologies impacting on development viability and contribution to “beauty”.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 4: Spatial Themes – Placemaking &amp; Design</b></p>	<p>Q16c. What do you think should be included in design guides/codes/masterplans at the scale you are suggesting?</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>24</p>	<p>Comments included the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road layouts.</li> <li>2. Garden size.</li> <li>3. Cycle paths.</li> <li>4. Green open spaces and landscape strategy.</li> <li>5. Public spaces.</li> <li>6. Active transport.</li> <li>7. Connectivity.</li> <li>8. Climate change mitigation.</li> <li>9. Alignment with existing infrastructure.</li> <li>10. Community infrastructure.</li> <li>11. Alignment with housing affordability.</li> <li>12. Local consultation.</li> <li>13. Movement strategy.</li> <li>14. Access.</li> <li>15. Street hierarchy.</li> <li>16. Land use.</li> <li>17. Development mix including employment provision.</li> <li>18. Density.</li> <li>19. Building heights, identity and character.</li> <li>20. Coding plans and guidance for area types.</li> <li>21. Master plans for larger sites.</li> <li>22. Designing out crime /ASB guidance based on a Security Needs Assessment.</li> <li>23. Stewardship promotion.</li> <li>24. Policies.</li> <li>25. Vision.</li> </ol>

					<p>26. Needs to be detailed to mitigate ambiguity, including design and materials.</p> <p>27. Review date.</p>
SECTION 5: Housing for All	<p>Q17. With reference to the options listed above, or your own options, how do you feel we can best plan to meet our need for different types, sizes, and tenures of housing?</p>	80	5	6	<p style="text-align: center;">69</p> <p>A broad mix of comments were made on the different types, sizes and tenures of housing considered to be needed in the District and how best to plan for these. <b>Non-exclusive Option 2</b> was more favourable, and <b>Non-exclusive Options 1 and 3</b> were less favourable. General comments were also made with regard to meeting housing need:</p> <p><b>Housing Types, Sizes and Tenures</b></p> <p>Developments should consider statistical need, e.g., Census data. It is important to understand the demographics of the locality.</p> <p>Only social and family starter houses for local young people should be considered.</p> <p>Different types of sites should be made available to deliver different types, sizes and tenures of housing. Ranging from brownfield sites in urban areas to Green Belt land being released for new developments.</p> <p>Demand for different type, size and tenure will fluctuate as the demographic and requirements in relation to services of the district change. Flexibility must be designed into policy taking into account the local housing context. Affordable houses need to be calculated for a given period so as not to slow down the application process with lengthy negotiations.</p> <p>Community consultation required to establish need.</p> <p>Infrastructure, not housing is needed.</p> <p>First time buyers and affordable housing should be considered, proportion should be split including types and sizes supported with policies.</p>

						<p>Affordable homes should be provided on site and not from financial contributions.</p> <p>All affordable housing should be for local people.</p> <p>Reference should be made to ECC’s <i>Essex Housing Strategy 2021-2025</i> (2021), to inform the approach and different type of housing to be planned for. A key strategic goal of the Strategy is to enable independent living with access to high quality specialist and supported accommodation for those who need it. It should be noted that specialist and supported accommodation falls within the definition of “affordable” housing within the NPPF.</p> <p>Good placemaking would be achieved by requiring all developments to deliver policy compliant levels of affordable or specialist housing (subject to viability etc.) and to ensure same build quality / appearance as market housing.</p> <p>Terraced and semi-detached housing should be considered for local first-time buyers at a price enabling them to get on the property ladder instead of having to move out of the District.</p> <p>A minimum number of Lifetime Homes with full wheelchair accessibility should be required.</p> <p>Specific sites should be allocated to meet the needs for housing for older people which would then allow sites to come forward without needing to try and compete with developers seeking to build general open market housing, which specialist housing providers are often unable to do.</p> <p>Homes for the elderly should only be built if supporting services are available.</p> <p>Housing for older people should be ‘pet friendly’.</p> <p>Bungalows and purpose-built flats for the ageing population should be considered.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Council housing to provide low rent and secure homes to retain young households and reduce child poverty should be considered. The Council should purchase a large proportion of the affordable housing for local families.</p> <p>Downsizing, hidden homeless and emergency housing needs to be considered.</p> <p>Flats should not be considered.</p> <p>Adequate parking must be incorporated within the design and future proofed as households evolve, e.g., 4 bed house must have space for 4 vehicles, on or off-street.</p> <p>Housing need should be met outside of the District.</p> <p>Policies that are intended to secure the right type of housing must be cast with sufficient flexibility to ensure viability.</p> <p><b>Non-Exclusive Options</b></p> <p><b>Option 1</b> is too inflexible / prescriptive and does not recognize that individual areas have different needs, and would be overly restrictive. Certain sites are unable to deliver certain types of housing, e.g., brownfield urban sites are unlikely to deliver suitable proportions of larger dwellings; likewise, heritage constraints in certain areas may influence the size of swellings to satisfy historic environment consultees.</p> <p><b>Option 1</b> could lead to unviability of sites and not reflect needs of the local area.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> is supported, requiring a suitable or negotiable mix (types, sizes and tenures including specialist housing) of housing responding to type or location of development and provides flexibility. It recognizes that different scales of development can be better placed to provide greater flexibility of types of housing, such as self-build, and the Council should proceed with this;</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p><b>Option 2</b> is supported to meet local needs and of the wider district, it would factor in a level of negotiation on suitable housing mix;</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> is supported in conjunction with <b>Option 3</b>- allocating specific sites for specialist housing and self and custom build housing would allow housing need to be addressed where it is most needed in line with PPG.</p> <p><b>Option 3</b> is too prescriptive and would have the potential to result in ‘ghettos’ and not create mixed inclusive communities (as required by NPPF);</p> <p><b>Option 3</b> could lead to unviability of sites and not reflect needs of the local area;</p> <p><b>Option 4</b> is supported to meet housing needs across the District. Broad evidence-based figures should be given within the Plan regarding the demand observed for different types, sizes and tenures of housing to provide stakeholders with a guideline requirement. A market-led approach should be the initial starting point of discussions to determine agreed house type mix with flexibility to respond to a given site and context, with regard to cumulative impacts of infrastructure costs – biodiversity net gains, landscape enhancements, electric vehicle charging, sustainable design and construction, and renewable energy.</p> <p><b>Option 4</b> would provide flexibility.</p> <p><b>Option 5</b> is supported with all homes to meet NDSS, but the Council would need to provide sufficient justification to implement NDSS taking account of need and viability.</p> <p><b>Option 6</b> is supported with all homes to meet M4(2), would require appropriate evidence to be provided (within an updated SHMA or a Local Housing Needs Assessment) to justify inclusion of bespoke policies.</p> <p><b>Option 7</b> is supported with a proportion of homes to meet M4(3), would require appropriate evidence to be provided (within an updated SHMA</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>or a Local Housing Needs Assessment) to justify inclusion of bespoke policies.</p> <p><b>Options 2, 3c, d and 5</b> are preferable.</p> <p><b>Options 2, 5 and 7</b> offers the best prospect and should be pursued.</p> <p>A combination of <b>Options 2 and 4</b> are supported as most appropriate, and agree that all homes should meet, or exceed, Nationally Described Space Standards, unless exceptional circumstances prevent that, such as conversions or co-living schemes.</p> <p>All homes should meet M4(2) of Building Regulations unless exceptional circumstances prevent this. A suitable proportion of new homes should be built to M4(3), but evidence should be produced to identify and justify any prescriptive requirement set out in policy to ensure it is not overly onerous and proportionate to the level of need.</p> <p>The approach to Part M4 of the Building Regulations could reflect that adopted in the London Plan.</p> <p>The proposed Rochford Eco Village of Doggetts Farm is supported as will have all the benefits of providing growth, homes and employment while protecting the environment.</p> <p>Green Belt land, including the site at Lower Wyburns Farm and Land off Sutton Road should be considered and will assist in meeting overall housing need.</p> <p><b>General Comments on Meeting Housing Need</b></p> <p>RDC needs to consider how it can contribute to meeting Southend' s unmet housing need.</p> <p>Engagement with planners, developers, charities and communities, residents and businesses will inform a better understanding of need and what is achievable.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>Woodside Park site include 12 to 15 self/custom build plots, alongside bungalows and other specialist accommodation.</p> <p>The [RDC] local plan must consider the potential review of Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Empty buildings and brownfield sites should be evaluated first.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be considered.</p> <p>Density for outer suburbs should be as stated 20-40 dph, fewer apartments and more bungalows.</p> <p>Approval should not be granted for development that straddles parish / village / ward boundaries.</p> <p>On-site renewable and low carbon energy should be required on all developments.</p> <p>All developments should be made to comply with their Local Design Guide especially car parking arrangements and with Secure by Design.</p> <p>Empty houses and flats left unoccupied for more than 2 years should be re-purposed.</p>
	<p>Q18. With reference to your preferred Strategy Option, are there areas or sites in Rochford that you feel require a specific approach to housing types, size, and tenure? What is required to meet housing needs in these areas?</p>	39	5	1	33	<p>Most comments supported the need for a mix of affordable housing suited to young families and the older population. Comments presented a mix of preferred Strategy Options:</p> <p><b>Specific Areas / Sites of Housing Need Requirements</b></p> <p>More affordable housing to the East of Hullbridge is required.</p> <p>100% of affordable housing needed to respond to community needs in Hullbridge.</p> <p>Sheltered housing for older people is required in Hullbridge, close to facilities around the Doctors Surgery in Ferry Road.</p>

						<p>Rochford and Ashingdon need more affordable housing.</p> <p>Infrastructure is needed for large scale development; it would be more beneficial for smaller developments – link up Rochford and Ashingdon with a road in between.</p> <p>Consider lesser populated areas where better infrastructure and growth can be created, e.g., Stambridge and Canewdon, to meet housing needs.</p> <p>Young people/families find it difficult to purchase property in Hockley, and so new developments should cater for their needs with more semi-detached homes.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be considered first.</p> <p>New development should be away from current population centres and only where large-scale projects (500+ homes) can be constructed to be accompanied by infrastructure investment, to avoid worsening of traffic congestion and demand on public services. Site CFS261 meets this criteria.</p> <p>Woodside Park site is proposed to include 12 to 15 self/custom build plots, and bungalows and other specialist accommodation and should be considered</p> <p>All residential development should be stopped in town centres, in particular Rayleigh Conservation Area, other than already accepted change of use for accommodation above shops.</p> <p><b>General Housing Need Requirements</b></p> <p>Need more first-time buyer starter homes across the District and quality housing association rented homes. Affordable homes must not be all flats.</p> <p>Terraced housing and flats as a more affordable option rather than detached and semi-detached housing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Flats should be avoided, especially in our crowded town centres.</p> <p>Homes need to be lifetime homes, adaptable for disabilities.</p> <p>Downsizing needs to be provided for and not just assisted living, residential or retirement homes.</p> <p>Small bungalows need preserving and also more provided in new housing mix.</p> <p>Sheltered accommodation should only be provided where support available, and should cater for those with pets.</p> <p>Consider small scale developments of Council housing within each of the communities targeted to retain young families.</p> <p>Needs to be freehold (market housing).</p> <p>All homes should meet, or exceed NDSS unless exceptional circumstances prevent, such as conversions or co-living schemes.</p> <p>All homes should meet M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless exceptional circumstances prevent.</p> <p>A 'suitable' proportion of new homes should be built to M4(3) but evidence needs to support prescriptive policy requirements.</p> <p><b>Reference to Strategy Options</b></p> <p>The Council need to be flexible with policies relating to housing units within schemes as need may be unable to be met due to site constraints, therefore a combination of <b>Options 2 and 4</b> more appropriate.</p> <p>Housing delivery needs to focus on provision of 2/3 bedroom homes to benefit local families for their first homes, with bungalows for the elderly and downsizers, as well as residential care, all accommodated within <b>Spatial Strategy Option 3a</b>.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Sites CFS081 and CFS082 at Hall Road, Rochford, <b>Spatial Strategy Option 2b</b> would be suitable for a mix of 1-to-4-bedroom homes, and should be a mix of tenures.</p> <p>A dispersed, mixed strategy with underperforming areas of Green Belt release and brownfield land development will ensure the delivery of the required level of affordable housing. A greater housing choice with the right types of homes in the right areas to meet the needs of all communities will be enabled.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 3a</b> can accommodate the need for more flats, bungalows and 2 bed houses.</p>
	<p>Q19. Are there any other forms of housing that you feel we should be planning for? How can we best plan to meet the need for that form of housing?</p>	39	6	1	<p>32</p> <p>Comments presented a mix of housing to be planned for utilising urban brownfield sites:</p> <p><b>Forms of Housing</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council houses.</li> <li>2. 50+ housing, inclusive of freehold tenure to enable downsizing.</li> <li>3. Bungalows and other smaller sized dwellings.</li> <li>4. Sheltered accommodation, including for those with disabilities (physical and mental).</li> <li>5. Assisted living schemes.</li> <li>6. Starter homes.</li> <li>7. Accommodation for young adults inclusive of supported housing.</li> <li>8. Shared ownership schemes for local residents.</li> <li>9. Self and custom build housing (CFS043 Lark Hill, Canewdon).</li> </ol> <p><b>How Best to Plan</b></p> <p>Specific sites should be allocated preferably on brownfield land in urban and suburban environments.</p> <p>Regard should be had to identified need and tailored to individual circumstances of sites and agree that a combination of <b>Non-Exclusive Options 2 and 4</b> would be the most appropriate.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>Q20. With reference to the options listed, or your own options, what do you think is the most appropriate way of meeting our permanent Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs?</p>	31	2	9	20	<p>A mix of comments were presented in how to meet Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Existing unauthorised sites should not be regularised as will encourage further sites.</p> <p>Existing unauthorised sites which appear to be ‘permanent’ should be allocated.</p> <p>An appropriate site should be identified.</p> <p>Should not provide transit sites.</p> <p>A transit site is the best option.</p> <p>No provision should be considered.</p> <p>One / two large sites, close to main roads, outside of urbanised areas should be provided /allocated.</p> <p>Temporary (maximum stay of 6 months) pitches of 3 or less grouped together should be considered as pitches of 10-15 are poorly managed.</p> <p>Sites should be made available for purchase by travellers.</p> <p>RDC should identify an appropriate site either from within own stock or purchased specifically.</p> <p>A site within the Green Belt to obviate unplanned and unauthorized sites fragmenting the green belt.</p> <p>A well-regulated site away from communities to avoid uncontrollable development of other land.</p> <p>Full need must be met over the Plan period.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p><b>Reference to Non-Exclusive Options</b></p> <p><b>Option 1</b> should be removed as a spatial option (Michelins Farm) due to utility infrastructure constraints.</p> <p><b>Options 2 to 6</b> should be considered including private pitch provision.</p> <p><b>Options 3, 4 and 5</b> would provide the most flexible approach and future need.</p> <p>Sites should not be considered as part of new strategic residential allocations (<b>Option 6</b>) due to integration considerations.</p> <p><b>Specific Locations / Sites</b></p> <p>Michelin Farm should still be considered.</p>
	<p>Q21. With reference to the options listed, or your own options, what do you think is the most appropriate way of meeting our temporary Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs?</p>	16	2	2	<p>12</p> <p>A mix of comments were presented, including:</p> <p>No temporary sites.</p> <p>Permanent site required with little room to expand.</p> <p>RDC should identify sites from within own ownership or purchases specifically, and should be away from local communities but close enough to schools.</p> <p>Transit site or negotiated stopping place ideal to mitigate unauthorised encampments.</p> <p>Joint strategy with Southend, Castle Point and Basildon Councils needed, as a cross boundary matter an approach should be explored through co-operation with Essex authorities, through the EPOA.</p> <p>Should not be considered as part of strategic residential allocations.</p> <p>Previously identified site close to A1245 / A127 (west side).</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<b>Non-exclusive Option 1</b> not suitable choice, Michelins Farm is not deliverable as G & T site and is more favourable for employment use, therefore needs to be removed as a spatial option for G & T.
Q22. What do you consider would need to be included in a criteria-based policy for assessing potential locations for new Gypsy and Traveller sites?	19	2	0	17	<p>Comments presented a broad mix of policy-related criteria:</p> <p>Location chosen should avoid friction.</p> <p>Specific allocation of land.</p> <p>Green Belt should not be sacrificed.</p> <p>Quota should be spread out across the District, not all on one site.</p> <p>Policy needs to consider local community impact and use of facilities.</p> <p>Integration with easy active travel options and public transport.</p> <p>Proximity to settlements with access to employment, education, health, shopping and other local services and infrastructure; consider rural locations where well located to major roads and or public transport.</p> <p>Avoidance of sites on or near Source Protection Zones, contaminated land and refuse tips, floodplains, protected areas / designations, no adverse impacts on landscape character.</p> <p>Community engagement.</p> <p>Site management / regulation.</p> <p>Consider the revoked <i>Good Practice Guidance on Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites</i> (CLG, 2008).</p>

SECTION 6: Employment & Jobs	Q23. With reference to the options listed above, or your own options, how do you feel we can best ensure that we meet our employment and skills needs through the plan?	31	1	2	28	<p><b>Non-Exclusive Option 1</b> (designating sites for specific employment uses) was generally supported. There was also a degree of support for allowing employment sites to more flexible in repurposing uses to the needs of business.</p> <p>A number of comments felt the Council needed to protect existing and designate new sites, based on local demand and up to date forecasting. Numerous respondents felt RDC should work closely with local businesses to identify the types of business accommodation needed and where, including ‘start-up’ and ‘grow-on space’.</p> <p>Strong general sentiment that more skilled job opportunities should be provided within the District, and that business space provision and skills strategy should be integrated to help attract more inward investors and support existing business start-ups and growth.</p> <p>ECC comments recommended focusing on a mix of existing/new sites to support additional inward investment and reduce current high-rates out out-commuting from the District. Recommended these are accessible to communities across the District. Also cited evidence showing existing sites needed to provide higher-quality business accommodation, a greater proportion of B1 (office-based) jobs and plan effectively for ‘grow-on space’, enabling growing small &amp; medium-sized businesses to expand into more appropriate premises and increase productivity and job numbers. This should be accompanied by strategies to address skills challenges and improve digital connectivity.</p> <p><b>Non-Exclusive Option 4</b> attracted some support, with responses considering strategic housing developments should include space for start-up businesses, to cater for a growing population. Specific comments within this voiced support for creation of business hubs/co-working space or live/work units on such sites.</p> <p>ECC supported this, recommending a sequential test approach to apply NPPF paragraph 73b, ensuring larger developers provide access to employment opportunities on-site, or sufficient access to external employment sites.</p> <p>A recognition of technological advances that support home-working and home-based businesses ran through many comments, and <b>Non-</b></p>
------------------------------	---	----	---	---	----	--

						<p><b>Exclusive Option 10</b> (supporting ultra-fast digital connectivity) was cited as important, along with a flexible approach to those seeking to run businesses from home, provided they did not impact adversely on neighbours.</p> <p>Support for the continued role of the Airport to drive future inward investment and skills development, along with expansion of activities at Airport Business Park and other JAAP sites to provide new employment opportunities linked to this. ECC identified that current JAAP sites also meet much of SBC’s employment needs, so a joint approach is required.</p> <p>Concern from one business regarding gradual downgrading of ambitions at Airport Business Park over time, shifting from aeronautical/medical innovation towards warehousing. Something that needs to be reversed if good quality local jobs are to be provided to reduce out-commuting.</p> <p>Several reps stated that employment sites (particularly town centres and industrial estates) should not be used for housing, with too many conversions having already taken place.</p> <p>Strong support for <b>Non-Exclusive Option 11</b>, identifying sites for further/higher education in the wider area. This was alongside strong support for a strategic skills-based approach to work with businesses, training providers, ECC and other stakeholders to identify skills shortages and provide appropriate employment/training opportunities to enable local residents to train, upskill or reskill and access higher-paid opportunities in the local area.</p> <p>Several responses felt RDC should meet identified employment and retail land needs in full over the LP period, allocating new sites accordingly, although one suggestion was that past modelling should be reviewed in light of Covid and resultant changes to employment patterns.</p> <p>The importance of transport connectivity for employment was raised, including the continuing importance of commuting elsewhere (especially London) to accessing high-quality employment. The unequal distribution of employment sites was also mentioned by one</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					respondent, who felt the East of the District (Barling/Wakering) had few employment prospects, requiring travel further West on poor roads, or reliance on Southend for employment.
Q24. With reference to Figure 30, do you consider the current employment site allocations to provide enough space to meet the District's employment needs through to 2040? Should we seek to formally protect any informal employment sites for commercial uses, including those in the Green Belt?	14	1	3	10	<p>Almost half responses felt existing allocations were insufficient in providing enough modern employment space to meet future needs.</p> <p>Although there was a general preference for developing brownfield sites for employment, there was some support for regularisation of existing informal sites in the Green Belt, with one comment highlighting how previously-developed sites were more likely to be developed for housing than employment.</p> <p>A number of respondents expressed concern at existing unauthorised commercial uses in Green Belt and rural areas, feeling these should be properly enforced against.</p> <p>Two parish councils felt regularisation of informal/farm employment sites would help provide employment in rural areas, whilst providing more control to unauthorised sites in the Green Belt. One felt rural employment would cut down on transport use and pollution, whilst another observed most informal sites were in the West of the District and questioned whether further farm sites could be identified in the East for diversification.</p> <p>A sympathetic approach to home-based businesses in rural areas was one option.</p> <p>A handful of comments opposed any use of Green Belt sites for any purpose, including commercial.</p> <p>Existing poor infrastructure was also mentioned as a barrier to business growth.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	Q25. With reference to your preferred Strategy Option, are there opportunities for growth to deliver new employment facilities or improvements to existing employment facilities?	18	2	1	15	<p>4 <b>Spatial Strategy Option 3</b> (concentrated growth, or a 'garden village') was identified by the majority of respondents as being a good way to align with Employment Option 4 and deliver new employment and commercial facilities alongside new communities, reducing the need for commuting and attracting new businesses to the District.</p> <p>5 <b>Spatial Strategy Options 3a, 3b</b> and <b>3c</b> were all identified as possible sites to provide a range of different employment units, alongside appropriate transport infrastructure and complementary retail/leisure facilities. The accompanying community infrastructure (schools, surgeries, shops etc) coming with such facilities were also identified as additional generators of employment, along with the construction workforce required to build the housing.</p> <p>6 <b>Option 3b</b> in particular was noted as complementary to the nearby Airport, whilst land North of Temple Farm Industrial Estate (e.g., CFS260Y) was promoted by one developer as a logical employment site within a concentrated growth option.</p> <p>7 A developer highlighted potential of an existing site allocation (NEL1 - Michelins Farm, to accommodate additional high-quality employment, currently constrained by an existing designation of part of the site as a Gypsy &amp; Traveller site.</p> <p>8 A couple of comments felt there was a need to think more flexibly beyond traditional industrial estates and consider how technology could enable London-based workers/businesses to locate in environments which would attract skilled professionals, e.g., in attractive town centres.</p> <p>Hullbridge was highlighted as a sizeable settlement with almost no employment opportunities and a consequent heavy reliance on out-commuting.</p>
	Q26. Are there any particular types of employment site or business accommodation that you consider Rochford	19	0	0	19	Most comments felt the District had an opportunity in environmental/green industries, but that existing sites did not cater for these. This category included woodland conservation/management, local crafts, upcycling/repair facilities, sustainable food/lifestyle,

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	District is lacking, or would benefit from?					<p>commercial organic smallholdings and outdoor sports. Foulness Island mentioned as a future location for 'green' industries.</p> <p>Improved digital infrastructure was a key theme uniting many comments, as this will enable home working, flexible business hubs and increased automation in manufacturing industries.</p> <p>Some felt District requires flexible and affordable workspace and meeting rooms for small businesses to start up and grow. Libraries, Mill Hall or Freight House cited as possible locations.</p> <p>Comments that the District's market towns should build on their heritage and hold more seasonal/farmers markets. For Rochford Town Centre, banking facilities and a supermarket were given as uses that were lacking.</p> <p>Accommodation for high-tech manufacturing.</p> <p>Education/training facilities, including for HGV drivers.</p> <p>A comment felt the growth of homeworking would see less of a need for office space, but additional requirements for homes in rural areas equipped with live/work purposes in mind.</p>
	Q27. Are there other measures we can take through the plan to lay the foundations for long-term economic growth, e.g., skills or connectivity?	18	0	0	18	<p>Digital connectivity was a major priority, supporting deployment of digital technology across the economy and everyday life. One example suggested of providing flexible 'hub' workspace in the District to enable workers usually commuting elsewhere to work within a professional environment in the local area, supporting local town centres.</p> <p>Skills priorities widely mentioned, including provision of further education and school facilities within the District (or working with neighbouring authorities on accessible provision, as highlighted in Employment <b>Option 11</b>). Working closely with education providers and businesses to enhance provision of apprenticeships, placements and training linked to jobs with skills shortages. Particular emphasis on STEM subjects to increase candidates with skills in fields such as engineering, information technology and biomedical.</p> <p>Improved road, public transport, walking and cycling links required to help people access work/education/training opportunities. Sustainable</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>transport to both employment sites and schools/colleges seen as a way of stimulating growth and removing barriers for those without access to cars. Existing sites should be made more accessible by working with ECC and public transport providers.</p> <p>New employment or education schemes should be accessible by means other than car, and this should be a condition through the planning stage. Should preferably be close to residential areas, but need, however, to be mindful of NPPF para. 83 and impact on existing communities.</p> <p>Some interest in attracting new inward investors into the area, with improved skills seen as a key offer for this.</p> <p>A request to include social value policies in the new LP, obliging developers to produce Employment &amp; Skills Plans to ensure local communities benefit more directly from development.</p> <p>Initiatives to encourage more local start-ups, particularly high-tech manufacturing.</p> <p>Stop developing existing commercial land into housing.</p> <p>Providing affordable housing cited by a developer as a way of retaining local young people, along with creating jobs and upskilling workers during the construction phase.</p>
	<p>Q28. With reference to the options listed above, or your own options, how do you feel we can best manage the Airport's adaptations and growth through the planning system?</p>	32	3	4	25	<p>Most felt LSA should be protected as an important local resource and economic asset, attracting jobs and investment, both to LSA itself but also surrounding employment sites. Some support for RDC to help LSA weather current challenges, including lobbying for Government support.</p> <p>Some support <b>for Options 1, 2, 3 and 4</b>. General agreement that the future of LSA should be developed jointly with SBC, and that the new LP should devise appropriate policies to cover LSA's recovery and growth within the plan period.</p> <p>SBC (also consulting at a similar stage to RDC on a new LP) suggested joint cooperation to develop consistent policies across both</p>

						<p>LPs to manage future growth, whilst also considering environmental and other sensitivities that had been associated with growth pre-Covid.</p> <p>Some question as to whether a new JAAP is currently needed, given the global downturn in aviation due to the Covid-19 pandemic and impact on LSA.</p> <p>Any future expansion should be accompanied by transport infrastructure improvements, both to the airport site itself, to surrounding employment sites and on key roads and public transport networks to enhance accessibility.</p> <p>ECC and other local authorities viewed LSA as an international gateway for South Essex for both passengers and freight, and should be viewed as a strategic, cross-boundary matter. Sub-regional connectivity to it should be enhanced and consideration given to development of a multi-modal transport hub adjacent to site, enhancing its links across South Essex and also serving local residents and employers. Any growth proposals should include improvements to the bus network and strategic roads (i.e., A127).</p> <p>LSA's own view that Airport should reach pre-Covid levels by 2026 and could serve 7-8m passengers/year by end of 2020s. Support for <b>Non-Exclusive Options 2 &amp; 3</b> and a need for new LP policies and joint approach with SBC to support growth within new LP period, including revisiting terms of current S106 agreement. Alongside this, LSA proposed restrictions to limit off-site parking and backed use of land adjoining railway station to provide transport interchange.</p> <p>Future policies relating to LSA should have regard for forthcoming <i>Government Aviation Strategy 2050</i>, <i>DfT Decarbonisation of Transport Plan</i>, <i>DfT Jet Zero Consultation</i> and requirements of Essex Climate Action Commission, considering context of climate change.</p> <p>Some concern about effects of any future expansion on what is largely a built-up surrounding area, in terms of noise, congestion, pollution and additional land requirements (i.e., LSA adjoins residential areas and a Grade I-listed church and has little scope to further expand its footprint).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Given recent loss of commercial flights, question of whether any new policies are currently required to support growth. Review in 5 years when activity may have returned to pre-Covid levels.</p> <p>Some views that any revised JAAP (or similar policy) should bear the local community in mind and consider further restrictions on night flights, noise and air quality.</p> <p>Some suggested that, in light of loss of commercial flights, LSA site should be considered for alternative housing or employment developments.</p>
SECTION 7: Biodiversity	<p>Q29. Do you agree that the plan should designate and protect areas of land of locally important wildlife value as a local wildlife site, having regard to the Local Wildlife Sites review? Are there any other sites that you feel are worthy of protection?</p>	84	28	1	<p>55</p> <p>Most comments supported the need for designation and protection of wildlife sites and presented other sites felt worthy of protection:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Agree that there is a need to protect wildlife and countryside sites.</p> <p>All 8 sites should be protected.</p> <p>Designating initial sites is a step in the right direction.</p> <p>Designation must be justified by robust evidence.</p> <p>The Plan should create new wildlife meadows to encourage pollinators.</p> <p>Specific reference should be made to nationally or locally protected sites and development impacts on biodiversity should be minimized along with pursuing opportunities for securing biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Conclusions of the <i>Local Wildlife Review</i> (2018) are supported, but the site selection assessment needs updating and the potential for biodiversity net gain needs to be reviewed.</p> <p><b>Specific Sites Worthy of protection</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Doggetts pond (deer, voles, hares, cormorants and herons) should be protected, could recover with positive management.</li> <li>2. Blounts Wood (bluebells, wildlife including weasels) with land alongside the railway that leads to the wood.</li> </ol>

						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Hockley Woods (rare species e.g., Lesser Spotted Woodpeckers and haw finches).</li> <li>4. Hockley Hall Woods – ancient woodland.</li> <li>5. Beckney Woods (privately owned) – ancient woodland.</li> <li>6. Marylands Woods – ancient woodland.</li> <li>7. Crabtree Woods – ancient woodland.</li> <li>8. All woodlands.</li> <li>9. The whole of the sea wall (includes red kite birds and sparrow hawks).</li> <li>10. Land along Disraeli Road, and land behind Hillside Road, and adjacent to Eastwood Rise act as protection to both woodland and ancient woodland.</li> <li>11. All green belt land.</li> <li>12. All green belt land adjoining woodland, parkland, ancient copses etc., should be retained and reinforced as protected green space – important wildlife havens and CO2 catchments.</li> <li>13. The site behind and surrounding Clements Hall playing fields and the adjoining farmland gives a green corridor for wildlife.</li> <li>14. Land at Belchamps.</li> <li>15. Land adjoining Poyntens, Rayleigh and to the rear of Spring Gardens and High Mead (supports badger setts, foxes, nesting birds, butterflies, and has numerous trees and hedgerows) should become a Local Wildlife Site.</li> <li>16. Plot CFS077 provides a buffer from human development benefits deer, badgers, foxes and squirrels, birdlife (heron, geese and carrion), amphibians (newts, toads and frogs).</li> <li>17. Site CFS053 - presence of slow worms.</li> <li>18. Rayleigh Mount.</li> <li>19. Plumberow Mount and woods – ancient woodland.</li> <li>20. St Peter’s Road Open Space (maintained by the Parish Council).</li> <li>21. The lake on Star Lane Pits, Great Wakering.</li> <li>22. Land behind the Royal Oak, Stambridge is used by migrating geese.</li> <li>23. Magnolia Park.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>24. Fields surrounding the treatment works at Stambridge are home to badgers, deer, buzzards, barn owls, hares and pheasants.</p> <p>25. Field between Betts Wood (ancient hornbeam wood) and Folly Chase (wildlife including ants nests).</p> <p>26. The Lower Crouch Valley and the River Crouch and banks are important habitats for fauna – curlews, whimbrels and other wading birds. The pasture land flanking the Crouch towards Battlesbridge is an important habitat for skylarks and other species.</p> <p>27. Hullbridge meadows and foreshores.</p> <p>28. Nature reserves, parkland and areas fronting rivers.</p> <p>29. Open /agricultural land on the edge of towns and villages.</p> <p>30. CFS064 should be protected due to wildlife habitats on and in proximity.</p> <p>31. COL7 – contribution to biodiversity.</p> <p>32. COL20 – contribution to biodiversity.</p> <p>33. Merryfields Avenue site - borders on the Nature Reserve, consideration should be given to incorporating it into the Reserve.</p>
<p>Q30. Do you agree that the plan should designate and protect areas of land of locally important geological value as a local geological site, having regard to the Local Wildlife Sites review? Are there any other sites that you feel are worthy of protection?</p>	21	15	0	6	<p>Most comments agreed with the designation and protection of locally important geological sites, and presented a mix of other sites felt worthy of protection:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Comments felt they should be protected.</p> <p>Conclusions of the Local Wildlife Review (2018) are supported, but the site selection assessment needs updating and the potential for biodiversity net gain needs to be reviewed.</p> <p><b>Other / Specific Sites worthy of Protection</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sea wall.</li> <li>2. All green belt land.</li> <li>3. All woodlands.</li> </ol>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The Upper Valley Special Landscape should be protected and expanded.</li> <li>5. Land between Clements Hall and St Mary's church.</li> <li>6. Rayleigh Mount.</li> <li>7. Star Lane Pits Wildlife Site.</li> <li>8. Doggetts Pond.</li> <li>9. Hullbridge Meadows and Foreshores.</li> </ol>
Q31. Do you consider net gains for biodiversity are best delivered on-site or off-site? Are there specific locations or projects where net gain projects could be delivered?	37	3	0	34	<p>Most comments supported net gain for biodiversity, favouring both on-site and off-site with a broad range of specific locations, sites and projects:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Net gains should be delivered on-site, but off-site if not possible.</p> <p>Best delivered off-site to enhance existing wildlife sites, lands of local geological interest and parks.</p> <p>Should be a mixture of on and off-site.</p> <p>All developments should demonstrate environmental net gains, on or off-site.</p> <p>Conservation in situ is preferable, and then explore additional gain.</p> <p>Should not remove natural habitats and replace with others.</p> <p>A broader environmental net gain allows for wider natural capital benefits such as flood protection, recreation and improved water and air quality.</p> <p><b>Specific Locations, Projects and Strategic Options</b></p> <p>Rayleigh Mount.</p> <p>Areas where there are issues i.e., poor air quality.</p>

						<p>Best by maintaining farming and rural lands alongside hedgerows, ditches and streams.</p> <p>New developments should be required to create green corridors to maintain or improve wildlife connectivity.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Options 2a and 2b</b> would provide greater biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>CFS100 and CFS015 could each achieve 10% biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Existing vegetation at Land South of Pooles Lane site would be retained and enhanced through woodland belt planting to enhance the potential for habitat creation.</p> <p>More trees and open green spaces, green corridors for wildlife and forest schools.</p> <p>The Council should undertake research and identify a suitable pipeline of sites where off-site biodiversity net gains could be made where developments are constrained geographically or by viability or other factors.</p> <p>Land South of Mount Bovers Lane, Hawkwell (CFS074) has potential for biodiversity net gain delivered on site through habitat creation and restoration.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

SECTION 8: Green & Blue Infrastructure	Q32. With reference to the options above, or your own options, how do you feel we can best deliver a quality green and blue infrastructure network through the plan?	51	4	1	46	<p>Comments comprised a broad range of green and blue infrastructure implementation favouring <b>Non-Exclusive Options 2 and 3</b>, with some reference to specific locations and sites:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Green and blue infrastructure must be balanced against the region’s need for growth.</p> <p>Require new developments to provide local green and blue infrastructure on-site to mitigate local impacts of development and achieve environmental net gain.</p> <p>Provision of waymarking and information boards to encourage visitors and engagement.</p> <p>Consider how to integrate the emerging South Essex Estuary Park proposal.</p> <p>Require a 30% minimum of tree canopy cover in new developments securing the wide range of benefits these would provide.</p> <p>Maximise alternatives for housing before considering green belt.</p> <p>Connectivity through easily accessible rights of way (including the disabled), / footpaths, and opening footpaths to cyclists. Green and blue corridors to sustain and increase biodiversity at District wide scale across multiple developments.</p> <p>Public facilities (toilets, hand washing in car parks should be offered.</p> <p>Identify key opportunities and funding, and seek to facilitate / enhance future community access (existing and new) to Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>The RSPB would like to see a strategic approach (identifying and mapping) adopted for delivery of new and enhanced green and blue infrastructure.</p>
--	--	----	---	---	----	---

					<p>Equestrians should be considered with regard to inclusivity and active travel.</p> <p>Thought needs to be given to accessibility, especially to coastal path areas, i.e., car parking and charges, inclusivity, public transport and coastal path maintenance.</p> <p><b>Reference to Spatial Strategy Options / Specific Sites and Locations</b></p> <p>Combination of <b>Spatial Strategy Options 1 and 3</b> supported to address green and blue infrastructure and contributions towards funding projects (e.g., Coastal Path and South Essex Estuary Park <b>Option 1 and 3</b>) and / or delivering onsite green and blue infrastructure (<b>Option 3</b>) through S106 contributions;</p> <p>Objectives of strategic green and blue infrastructure could be identified within <b>Option 2</b> and should be pursued by relying on other existing allocations to deliver improvements as well as delivery of improvements on site where appropriate without constraining development.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> could enable funding to deliver strategic improvements to the green and blue infrastructure network meeting criteria for soundness as identified in the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Option 2b</b> - sites in close proximity to existing and proposed green and blue infrastructure networks should be selected to ensure sustainable alternative car use. Land to the South of Pooles Lane within <b>Option 2b</b> strategic area is well placed to enable development to integrate into existing highway network providing vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access points, and will provided accessibility into existing walking and cycling infrastructure. This site is also in proximity to a PRoW (ref 287_12) which runs to the east of the site boundary, and to a PRoW (287_6) to the south.</p> <p><b>Option 3</b> – will deliver new and enhanced green infrastructure networks through the District, but would need to be supported by a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>robust green and blue infrastructure strategy. Development should be offset by preservation and enhancement projects.</p> <p><b>Option 3</b> may worsen green and blue infrastructure connectivity through piecemeal development.</p> <p>Promoted site at Western Road, Rayleigh benefits from an existing PRow running through the centre with informal footpaths along the southern boundary along the woodland edge. Development of this site would retain and enhance these links, including to Kingley Woods.</p> <p>Use of shoreline for walking and cycling, and providing recreational activities would benefit local area and attract visitors.</p> <p>Protect the green belt and repair sea walls.</p> <p>Rayleigh Mount should be included.</p> <p>Do not over develop villages and hamlets.</p> <p>Peggle Meadow, Rochford site, sets out green and blue infrastructure within the Vision Document.</p> <p>The proposed Regional Park boundary needs to be amended to exclude any MOD land ownership to safeguard security.</p> <p>CFS043, Lark Hill will aid / provide on-site green space, improved walking infrastructure, creation of bridleways, wildlife ponds, a 22-acre reed bed and maintenance of Upper Raypits seawall.</p>
	<p>Q33. Do you agree that the central woodlands arc and island wetlands, shown on Figure 32 are the most appropriate areas for new regional parklands? Are there any other areas that should be considered or</p>	22	11	0	11	<p>Most comments agreed with the areas presented on Figure 32, and other specific areas were suggested for consideration:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Needs to be assessed periodically in order to add further links to any new creation of future parkland.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>preferred? [Please state reasoning]</p>				<p>Agree, but precise boundaries of any such designation do not preclude highly sustainable sites for housing from consideration for residential allocation.</p> <p>Must not be at expense of GBI delivery and biodiversity net gain on-site.</p> <p>Agree, but the current location and extent of the park [at south of the district / Southend-On-Sea up to the River Roach] needs to be reconsidered as the site [promoted site] will not deliver any new homes or education facilities, or provide publicly accessible open space as the site would remain in private ownership.</p> <p><b>Other Areas that should be Considered / Preferred</b></p> <p>The designation should be drawn tightly against the western edge of Hullbridge.</p> <p>Wakering Common should also be considered as attracts families.</p> <p>The fishing pond in Rochford should be considered as is close to town centre, frequented often by local community.</p> <p>Rayleigh Mount should be included.</p> <p>Land to the North East of Rochford provides scenic importance for visitors and local community should be included.</p> <p>Large open space to the South West of Rayleigh (on the border), south of Bardfield Way and The Grange / Wheatley Wood which could be enhanced.</p>
	<p>Q34. With reference to your preferred Strategy Option, are there opportunities for growth to help deliver new strategic green and blue infrastructure?</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>16</p> <p>Comments presented a broad range of Strategy Options which would provide opportunities to deliver new strategic green and blue infrastructure:</p>

						<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>It is critical that the sensitivity of important species and habitats is accounted for rigorously in the planning of any such proposals with a HRA as per para.1.12 of NPPF at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><b>References to Preferred Spatial Strategy Option</b></p> <p><b>Option 1</b> – there is no need to build and encroach on blue and green areas.</p> <p>Due to lack of facilities and support for Rochford town centre there is a significant loss of potential for tourism especially with the potential of Wallasea and Southend.</p> <p><b>Options 2,3 and 4</b> - a strategic land allocation east of Wickford could support the opportunity for new green infrastructure, including a new hub for sports provision, improvements to connectivity (e.g., bridleways), biodiversity net gains and strategic landscaping, supporting environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt, as set out in NPPF para. 142.</p> <p><b>Option 3a</b> – to protect rural areas and the green belt.</p> <p><b>Option 3b</b> – concentrated growth north of Southend offers opportunities to deliver new accessible green space including provision of a new sub regional scale Country Park, aligning with the River Roach and incorporating land within flood zone 2.</p> <p>A new settlement would be able to deliver green space and recreational facilities, ensuring suitable links, access and inclusive footpaths.</p> <p>Utilising a range of sites across the District, especially edge of settlement extensions, can provide significant opportunities for new green and blue infrastructure.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>It is critical that the sensitivity of important species and habitats is accounted for rigorously in the planning of any such proposals with a HRA as per para.1.12 of NPPF at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><b>References to Specific Sites / Locations</b></p> <p>Land north of Brays Lane can provide significant new public open space with connectivity to wider area.</p> <p>A garden village in the east of the district is the best option for future growth and provides opportunity to deliver the eastern extent of the South Essex Estuary Park.</p> <p>Peggle Meadow (CFS095), Rochford has potential for green and blue infrastructure enhancements to be delivered as set out in accompanying Vision Statement.</p> <p>Provision of growth in southeast of Rochford and north of Southend will enable investment into strategic green and blue infrastructure projects in the location.</p> <p>Land south of Mount Bovers Lane, Hawkwell (CFS074) is capable of contributing enhanced local green infrastructure as indicated in the illustrative Landscape and Ecological Masterplan, helping to deliver the objectives of the South Essex Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy, in particular the creation of the Central woodlands Arc Regional Parkland and enhancements to the Upper Roach Valley. The site provides opportunities for links to be provided to existing PRoW network.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

SECTION 9: Community Infrastructure	<p>Q35. With reference to the options above, or your own options, how can we address the need for sufficient and accessible community infrastructure through the plan?</p>	100	6	3	91	<p><b>Non-Exclusive Option 1</b> – support for protecting of existing school/healthcare facilities through allocations. One comment concerned that school sites are already becoming overcrowded, with temporary buildings used permanently (e.g., portacabins).</p> <p><b>Non-Exclusive Option 2</b> received one suggestion of a co-located facility combining a school with other community facilities (e.g., cinema and elderly day centre), to be coordinated by a local trust.</p> <p><b>Non-Exclusive Option 3</b> (i.e., requiring new developments to deliver community infrastructure on-site) attracted particularly strong support from members of the public, with one noting that provision for this was clearly set out in the <i>ECC Developers’ Guide to Infrastructure Contribution</i>, and this should be adhered to. Several respondents identified that a ‘garden village’ or similar could be a solution in delivering this.</p> <p>Views on this option were often coupled with frustration at the current Section 106 process, which was felt to have not delivered adequate infrastructure in recent years alongside new developments. Hall Road and Rawreth Lane schemes cited as having not delivered in this way, with many believing the former had seen the site ‘split’ between separate developers to avoid fulfilling obligations. A number of comments expressed a desire to see this process improved, to ensure promised improvements were actually delivered.</p> <p>Frustration that recipients of Section 106 funding (e.g., ECC or NHS) do not always spend it in a timely fashion, leading to scepticism that the future LP will manage to deliver meaningful infrastructure alongside housing.</p> <p>Many cited difficulty securing doctors’ appointments, or sending children to local schools, and felt this situation had to be resolved prior to any further development. Concern that digital solutions (e.g., online GP appointments) insufficient to address additional pressure.</p> <p>As with other sections in this Document, a prevailing theme was ‘infrastructure first’, with many respondents wishing to see community infrastructure delivered ahead of any new residential development. A strong perception that existing healthcare, education and other public</p>
-------------------------------------	--	-----	---	---	----	--

						<p>services (along with provision/state of roads/cycle paths) are insufficient to cope with existing levels of demand, let alone that of new residents.</p> <p>Alongside concerns about local GP services, capacity of Southend University Hospital also a cause for concern, with some reps stating patients were often having to be transferred further afield to facilities such as Chelmsford. Uncertainty as to how this facility could expand further to cope with additional demand.</p> <p>Concern from some communities that existing Section 106 contributions given by developers have not yet led to the promised improvements – e.g., in Hullbridge, where an expansion to the medical centre and primary school were supposed to take place following development of Malyons Farm site.</p> <p>ECC requested that ‘community infrastructure’ definition is expanded to include a wider range of ECC services, including libraries, waste management and recycling, all of which developers would be required to contribute towards, as set out in the <i>Developers’ Guide</i>.</p> <p>ECC also requested more focus from this section on Early Years &amp; Childcare (EYCC), which they set out developer requirements for in the <i>Developers’ Guide</i>. Welcomed working closely with RDC on future stages of the LP to ensure a full range of EYCC provision is accounted for in the plan, with the exact make-up of new provision dependent on where future development will be located, and at what scale, considering level of existing provision. Increased future provision could be in form of expansion at existing sites, new stand-alone nurseries, or nurseries co-located within primary schools (ECC’s preferred option in future). ECC intend to seek developer contributions for allocated sites, which will be set out further within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Similarly, ECC set out their role as a commissioner of sufficient school places to serve the area and any future growth, along with parameters for providing new school places to serve existing and future communities. They will work jointly with RDC as the LP progresses. Explained that delivery is often in the form of expanding existing sites rather than building new schools (e.g., expansion of Sweyne Park School, Rayleigh, from 8 to 9 entry forms from September 2021,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>funded by developer contributions). However, planning for future growth may require the delivery of new schools, based on a range of factors. Typically, primary schools are required to have two entry forms (420 pupils in total) and new ones are likely to be required by a development of 1,400-2,000 dwellings (depending on housing mix). New secondary schools would need to be minimum 6 entry forms, typically generated from approximately 4,500 houses. ECC will seek contributions from developers and may request land to be set aside to future proof school sites. Recommended consideration given to Essex County Council <i>Local &amp; Neighbourhood Planners' Guide to School Organisation</i>. This provides a clear appreciation of what is expected and how ECC can work with RDC in seeking to develop their emerging Local Plan. ECC also explained that all new schools need to conform to Net Zero requirements.</p> <p>Local MP's comments echoed sentiment that any expansion in population needs to be accompanied by commensurate increase in service provision, expressing frustration at process of 'passporting' developer contributions to bodies such as NHS or ECC, whilst also stating desire for developer contributions to go further to provide meaningful infrastructure, given profit levels often achieved. Hope that government policies to replace Clinical Commissioning Groups with Integrated Care Systems, and to provide more medical student places, will bear fruit.</p> <p><b>Non-Exclusive Option 4</b> attracted a few supportive comments, with people feeling that school facilities could be made accessible in a way that would better benefit their communities. However, one comment felt existing standard of facilities was poor and would need upgrading.</p> <p>Roads, cycle lanes and public transport all mentioned as important supporting infrastructure that needed to be delivered and expanded on top of provision of community facilities.</p> <p>Issue of sufficient transport provision particularly highlighted by residents of Tier 3 or 4 settlements (e.g., Hullbridge), where existing community infrastructure is limited, and residents need to travel further afield to access facilities such as secondary schools.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Possible loss/downgrading of an existing community facility (Mill Hall, Rayleigh) highlighted as a concern by some respondents. Suggested it should be listed as an Asset of Community Value, recognising its wide use by the community and potential to further support the tourist and night-time economies. Supported by Theatres Trust, who stated any community or cultural facility should be protected (as per. NPPF para.93), and any replacement for existing facilities be at least of equal standard to that which was lost.</p> <p>Sport England considered that all 4 options outlined would have a role to play in delivering community sports facilities, and that both protecting/enhancing existing facilities and providing new ones (standalone and co-located) would be important. Suggested various co-location options could be explored, e.g., GP surgery and leisure centre.</p> <p>Several comments highlighted strain on existing community infrastructure and set out how further development would further exacerbate the problems. CFS064 in Hockley mentioned in particular, with impact on local schools and healthcare facilities cited as concerns. Others referenced included CFS024; CFS074).</p> <p>A comment stressed the importance in considering future ageing population and corresponding demand on healthcare and other community infrastructure.</p> <p>Some felt a limit had to be imposed on the amount of new development the District could accommodate, reflecting the geographic constraints and limited capacity of infrastructure to accommodate a larger population.</p> <p>Concern that only larger developments had to contribute meaningfully towards infrastructure, and that the additional pressure on the system which came from small sites and windfall developments never formally provided for.</p> <p>Representing development community, the House Builders' Federation urged maximising use of existing facilities, noting that many community centres, halls and libraries were underused and could benefit from co-location of various services. Not always most appropriate to build a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>new building when an existing one can be used more effectively. HBF also stated that, as per NPPF para.57, new infrastructure should only be proportionate to the development, and development should not be required to address existing shortfalls in supply.</p> <p>Developers generally supported the options, with some identifying how their promoted sites could help provide either new facilities, or contributions to existing ones, subject to considerations on viability and evidence from the future Infrastructure Delivery Plan. A preference by many developers to highlight the potential of existing community infrastructure in close proximity to their promoted sites, which could be supported by new housing, or where there is potential to locate additional services within existing facilities. One pointed to the greater ability of high-growth SSOs (e.g., Option 3) to deliver more community infrastructure, as identified in the Integrated Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Some developers would welcome the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to simplify the process of developer contributions and provide greater transparency.</p> <p>A number of comments believed that towns such as Rayleigh could not accommodate further infrastructure, as the road network was already at capacity and could not be improved. Alongside this, some felt a better way than providing new facilities would be to limit new demand on existing ones.</p> <p>Mid &amp; South Essex Care Partnership (NHS) advised that each SSO would need additional healthcare capacity, although how this is achieved will need to be further informed by more detail about the scale and location of development. Advised that new development would not necessarily deliver new facilities, as this could also be achieved by additional capacity at existing facilities.</p> <p>Several comments felt that there was insufficient information to take a decision about infrastructure at this stage, as the Council needed to progress its preferred locations for development, whilst additional studies were needed to assess the amount of infrastructure required as a result.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>One comment expressed doubt on the SSO 3b proposals (North of Southend), which would overload the scant infrastructure in the East of the District without significant new provision.</p> <p>Other community infrastructure mentioned as being needed (aside from education and healthcare) included community centres, green open spaces, an adventure playground, allotments, facilities for those with special needs, forest schools, and youth facilities, with a couple of comments questioning whether the latter was informed by sufficient engagement with young people. A response felt that youth facility provision should go beyond sports pitches, which were commonly offered by developers.</p>
Q36. With reference to your preferred Strategy Option, are there opportunities for growth to deliver new or improved community infrastructure?	41	8	1	32	<p>Creation of new settlements/garden villages under versions of <b>Spatial Strategy Option 3</b> widely seen as the best opportunity for new community infrastructure provision, as this would be a key part of the planning phase. Pooling of developer contributions from a large concentration of homes under this model would be sufficient to attract a 'critical mass' of infrastructure that would deliver major improvements to new and existing communities. The potential for these new communities and services to generate local jobs also highlighted.</p> <p>Beaulieu Park highlighted as a major new community which delivered community infrastructure alongside or in advance, including a new secondary school.</p> <p>Some comments expressed doubt that any new development would genuinely deliver infrastructure improvements required at the scale that was needed, and that possible public funding may be required to support any shortfall.</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> particularly seen by some as not likely to deliver infrastructure required, citing example of recent developments. Comments felt more needed to be done to hold developers to account and secure the required funding in advance of development taking place.</p> <p>ECC consider <b>Options 2a or 3</b> (or <b>Option 4</b>) as best for both meeting housing needs and delivering an appropriate scale of infrastructure. Flagged in particular the risk of a concentration of housing</p>

						<p>overwhelming existing secondary school capacity. ECC expect to be closely involved in developing the LP and assessing infrastructure provision required, dependent on SSO(s) selected, which could include cross-boundary opportunities.</p> <p>Better coordination suggested to ensure multiple developments contributed to facilities that were needed District-wide (secondary school, open spaces, state-funded nurseries, new GP surgeries and further education).</p> <p>Concern that urban extensions in places such as Rayleigh will add to pressure whilst continuing to not deliver new infrastructure. Opposition to proposals unless significant infrastructure provided, including new school(s) and surgery.</p> <p>Hall Road, Rochford, widely cited as an example of significant housing development which failed to deliver the promised community facilities.</p> <p>Developers promoting sites likely to be considered under <b>Option 2</b> expressed commitment to helping address community infrastructure needs, e.g., Taylor Wimpey in Hawkwell, subject to evidence of the need and viability.</p> <p>Agent promoting site CFS097 (south of Great Wakering) carried out Community Infrastructure Audit and Education Needs Assessment and identified that, whilst community infrastructure provision generally good, there is projected shortfall in provision of secondary school places in both Rochford and Southend in the coming years, along with a specific deficit in special education needs facilities, allotments and facilities for young people. Part of this site could potentially be used to address these issues.</p> <p><b>Option 3a</b> mentioned by some as a chance to provide significant new community facilities in a place which already benefits from good road connections.</p> <p>Landowner promoting a site East of Wickford (within <b>Option 3a</b>, or part of an <b>Option 2 or 4</b> solution) with potential for 1,500 homes highlighted</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>potential (and space) available for new primary school, local centre, green infrastructure, and sports provision.</p> <p><b>Option 3b</b> (North of Southend) identified as a significant opportunity to provide for a range of community infrastructure, including new school, leisure and health facilities, backed by SBC and developers.</p> <p>Agent promoting a site on the Southend side of the boundary highlighted need for better cross-boundary cooperation to deliver appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposed ‘eco village’ at Doggetts (part of <b>Option 3c</b>) mentioned by one household as a positive way to secure a range of amenities, including special needs school, sensory play facilities, doctor’s surgery, and leisure facilities.</p> <p>Concern from some communities that existing Section 106 contributions given by developers have not yet led to the promised improvements – e.g., in Hullbridge, where an expansion to the medical centre and primary school were supposed to take place following development of Malyons Farm site.</p> <p>Several developers highlighted the potential for their specific sites to contribute towards the upgrade and maintenance of existing facilities</p> <p>Mid &amp; South Essex Care Partnership (NHS) advised that each SSO would need additional healthcare capacity, although how this is achieved will need to be further informed by more detail about the scale and location of development. Advised that new development would not necessarily deliver new facilities, as this could also be achieved by additional capacity at existing facilities.</p> <p>Some respondents expressed a desire for particular community infrastructure. These included a secondary school (offering vocational education), a cinema, swimming pool and new healthcare facilities.</p> <p>Some comments took the opportunity to protest the possible loss of existing community facilities at the site of the Mill Hall, Rayleigh, stressing their importance.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>Several comments expressed frustration at the pressure existing facilities were under (i.e., GP surgeries, schools and roads) in Great Wakering.</p> <p>Some comments felt even new brownfield development needed to deliver new community infrastructure, as existing services felt to be insufficient.</p> <p>One respondent suggested technological advances could mitigate pressure on infrastructure and public services (e.g., video GP appointments and better building design to reduce fire risks).</p> <p>Suggestion that brownfield sites could be used to provide leisure facilities, such as swimming pools, that the community already needs as demand exceeds provision at Clements Hall.</p>
	<p>Q37. Are there areas in the District that you feel have particularly severe capacity or access issues relating to community infrastructure, including schools, healthcare facilities or community facilities? How can we best address these?</p>	151	2	1	148	<p><b>Summary Comments</b></p> <p>This question attracted a large number of responses, with the majority of these frustrated at the state of existing community infrastructure either District-wide, or in their localities (e.g., the ability to book a GP appointment or secure a school place). Concerns at how additional development, homes and new residents might exacerbate these issues. Prevailing themes raised by most respondents included strong concern about existing community infrastructure being overwhelmed by new development and population growth; and some scepticism that new development would be accompanied by the required improvements and new facilities to mitigate the impact.</p> <p>Key points by theme as follows:</p> <p><b>Healthcare</b></p> <p>Widespread difficulty in obtaining GP appointments at surgeries across the District, felt to have already been a severe issue, but further exacerbated by Covid pandemic, meaning system under too much pressure.</p>

							<p>Southend University Hospital felt by numerous respondents to be at capacity, with long waiting lists. Unclear how it could accommodate additional population growth in Rochford, Southend and elsewhere.</p> <p>Concern about the impact of population growth on health and wellbeing in rural areas – Public Health England report on this referenced.</p> <p>Difficulty getting dental appointments highlighted by many along with a desire to see additional provision.</p> <p>Not all local surgeries have the space to expand, even if funded to do so.</p> <p>Concern about availability of trained healthcare personnel to staff new facilities.</p> <p><b>Education</b></p> <p>A strong feeling that many schools at or nearing capacity.</p> <p>ECC Report 10 Year Plan – <i>Meeting the demand for school places in Essex 2019 – 2028</i> quoted, which noted demand for school places forecast to grow, but that reception year and secondary school places already exceeded capacity in some areas, with secondary school places for Rochford/Hockley having been exceeded.</p> <p>Concern that no vocational sixth form/college provision available in the District (i.e., for those who do not wish to study A-levels), requiring young people to travel elsewhere.</p> <p>A need for better school provision and more places in villages, to stop children having to travel long distances.</p> <p>District-wide reporting of shortage of nursery spaces.</p> <p><b>Waste &amp; recycling</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Many felt Castle Road Recycling Centre insufficient for the District's needs, due to its size and location, and that an alternative/additional site should be sought.</p> <p>Some views that commercial waste should be accepted at ECC waste facilities, to prevent fly-tipping.</p> <p><b>Policing</b></p> <p>Widespread concern at closure of local police stations (e.g., Great Wakering), coupled with additional population growth, felt to bring additional crime and anti-social behaviour to communities that had not previously experienced much.</p> <p><b>Other community facilities</b></p> <p>Strong level of concern regarding the Mill Hall site, valued by many respondents as an important community/cultural facility with potential to be enhanced. Theatres Trust considered any loss of this facility would need to be compensated by cultural provision of equal or greater value.</p> <p>Absence of free facilities for young teenagers that don't involve organised sports.</p> <p>Lack of disabled play equipment</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Developer urged RDC to work closely with neighbouring SBC on cross-boundary opportunities that could deliver new infrastructure within walking distance of communities, planning appropriately for future growth.</p> <p>Community infrastructure should be made more accessible by foot and bicycle, through provision of new routes. One response felt every home should be within walking distance to, at the very least, a doctor, a dentist, school - both primary and secondary, which would reduce demand on the roads.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Need for many residents to travel long distances to access services (e.g., secondary school children in Wakering travelling to Rochford, in Hullbridge travelling to Rayleigh, and residents needing to visit recycling centre having to take long journeys from other parts of the District). Criticised for promoting car use and not having climate change impacts in mind.</p> <p>Some concern amongst residents that a clear plan has not yet been set out for infrastructure delivery, along with concerns that perceived shortcomings associated with the Hall Road development might be repeated.</p> <p>Alongside concerns over the ability of new development to deliver community infrastructure, a request to ensure new schemes also include integrated shops and public houses alongside them, seen as important parts of local communities.</p> <p><b>Location-Specific Comments</b></p> <p><b>Rayleigh</b></p> <p>4 GP surgeries not considered sufficient, some felt the town could benefit from a 5th, with difficulty reported in securing appointments. Many referenced difficulty at Audley Mills Surgery in particular.</p> <p>Some felt a new primary and secondary school was required, with more children travelling to Rayleigh schools from the new development in Hullbridge, along with new schemes in Rayleigh.</p> <p>General view that any new LP should resolve these issues before allocating further development.</p> <p>Problems with traffic congestion also mentioned (see Q.51-55).</p> <p>One resident reported lack of recreational facilities in the Hambro Hill area.</p> <p>Building work at secondary schools being expanded has caused disruption.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p><b>Rochford &amp; Ashingdon</b></p> <p>Puzey Family Practice difficult to secure an appointment at – often staffed by locum GPs.</p> <p>Some schools (e.g., Rochford Primary) incapable of expanding further, due to their location. Some children having to attend schools in outlying villages as places in Rochford not available.</p> <p><b>Hockley &amp; Hawkwell</b></p> <p>A response claimed strong competition for places at schools; the ECC <i>Primary, Infant and Junior Schools Admission Policies Directory 2022/2023</i> reflects that the number of applications at each of these schools was between 3-5 times more than total places on offer.</p> <p>Reports that children in Hawkwell were unable to attend schools within their catchment, whilst recent OFSTED reports show schools at or nearing capacity. Hockley Primary singled out by some as having no room to expand.</p> <p>Widespread concern that new housing estates would mean insufficient capacity in Hockley for all children to go to school locally. CFS064 and large housing proposals on Rector yRoad, Hawkwell, particularly identified as having potential to overwhelm local infrastructure.</p> <p>Concern over influx of traffic transporting children to schools in Hockley/Hawkwell from elsewhere, which causes congestion and road safety issues for children.</p> <p>Concern that congestion on the B1013 may prevent ambulances getting to/from hospital when attending patients.</p> <p>Only limited provision of pre-school facilities in Hawkwell Village.</p> <p>Lack of appointments at local doctors and dentists, with concern about the extra strain new development would bring to these facilities. One resident noted Hockley’s health clinic closed recently, meaning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>residents such as young mothers and elderly now had to travel to Rayleigh for some services.</p> <p>More care facilities required for the elderly.</p> <p>Lack of provision for youths/adolescents.</p> <p>Lack of police or ambulance presence.</p> <p>Concern about the uncertain future of Hockley Library.</p> <p><b>Hullbridge</b></p> <p>Due to ongoing development of Malyons Farm, full impact of an additional 500 homes yet to be seen, let alone additional homes proposed in the new LP. However, several respondents reported local services already under strain.</p> <p>Lack of secondary school, requiring children to travel further afield to Rayleigh (however, school bus service has recently been withdrawn by First).</p> <p>Primary school has had to increase the yearly intake to accommodate new children moving into the area and local children are not always able to get a place.</p> <p>Much of South Hullbridge is a long walk from the primary school.</p> <p>Medical centre felt to be good but insufficient for growing population, whilst promised expansion as a result of Section 106 contributions has not materialised as expected.</p> <p>Ageing population of the village means there will be additional need for healthcare and other services in the future.</p> <p>Lack of leisure facilities or youth amenities. Hullbridge only has one small play park for the children to use, whereas other areas have larger play areas and more leisure facilities.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Residential areas to East of Hullbridge (and any future development) could not access community facilities as there is a lack of footpaths and bus services.</p> <p><b>The Wakerings and Barling</b></p> <p>Lack of a local secondary school a major issue – many expressed dissatisfaction at the arrangement for children to be bused to King Edmund School in Rochford (and the resultant congestion).</p> <p>ECC highlighted this as an opportunity to improve local secondary school provision through the Local Plan.</p> <p>Medical Centre widely considered oversubscribed and difficult to get an appointment at.</p> <p>Some residents felt the primary schools in the area were already full, with siblings being separated between different schools. One respondent commenting that Barling Magna Primary currently has a class without a dedicated classroom, against DfE regulations.</p> <p>Lack of dentist and police station.</p> <p>Little for teenagers, with recreation areas often poorly-equipped/maintained.</p> <p>One respondent felt Great/Little Wakering has grown considerably in recent decades, but no new infrastructure provided alongside it, only closure of existing pub and petrol station.</p> <p>Shortage of nurseries observed.</p> <p><b>Great Stambridge</b></p> <p>A comment that the village primary school is oversubscribed, whilst there are no healthcare facilities.</p> <p>Poor access to King Edmund School for secondary education.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Concern that village's present lack of social/extracurricular facilities for young people, coupled with poor transport links for those without cars (including lack of pavements in some places), would make it unable to cope with the numbers of homes proposed by some of the promoted sites.</p> <p>Concern at poor digital connectivity, both in terms of broadband and mobile phone coverage.</p> <p><b>Ashingdon/South Fambridge</b></p> <p>A request to let the local community develop its own neighbourhood plan and influence its future.</p>
<b>SECTION 10: Open Spaces &amp; Recreation</b>	<p>Q38. With reference to the options above, or your own options, how do you feel we can best meet our open space and sport facility needs through the plan?</p>	52	3	2	<p>47</p> <p><b>Comments Relating to Non-Exclusive Options</b></p> <p><b>Option 1:</b> Attracted a response supporting this approach.</p> <p><b>Option 3:</b> Support for hub sites at local schools being enhanced and accessible to local community in Hockley.</p> <p><b>Option 4</b> attracted a degree of support from agents and developers, who considered that the holistic redevelopment of large scale promoted sites could deliver areas for open space and recreation. This could be in the form of either on-site provision of new open spaces/recreation facilities, or contributions to existing open spaces and facilities nearby.</p> <p>A number of site promoters sought to demonstrate that their sites could contribute to open space and recreation provision in this way. CFS074 (Hawkwell) put forward as a site which could deliver a network of circular footpaths, amenity green space, play areas, new woodland/orchard planting and 'blue corridor' of ponds. These would all be publicly-accessible and increase the amount of accessible open space in Hawkwell. CFS084 (Rochford) mentioned as being capable of delivering 4.18ha of public open space, including play area.</p> <p><b>Option 5:</b> Hullbridge Parish Council (HPC) considered it more appropriate to focus on improving and maintains open spaces within</p>

					<p>the District, rather than collaborate across boundaries, using Section 106 funding to best effect.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>The creation/designation of more parks and open spaces was generally supported, with the recent lockdowns underlining the importance of these to people.</p> <p>A view that the options proposed were counterproductive, as the development of promoted sites in the LP would reduce the amount of 'open' (Green Belt) land in the District. Also concern that development would threaten existing network of public rights of way.</p> <p>More tree planting to aid physical and mental health.</p> <p>HPC favoured the designation and development of the proposed Central Woodlands Arc for a range of recreational activities, including an additional Parkrun (building on the success of Hockley) and orienteering.</p> <p>Parks and open spaces should be well-designed and appropriate for all ages. They should also be keep in good order.</p> <p>A view that all open spaces should have free parking.</p> <p><b>Location-Specific Comments</b></p> <p><b>Rayleigh &amp; Rawreth</b></p> <p>A comment felt existing open space provision was insufficient and that population growth would make this more of an issue. Concern that no concrete proposals made for increased provision of public open space at this stage.</p> <p>Some concern over development proposals at CFS105, which would lead to the loss of horse stabling facilities and threaten public right of way PROW 298_48, an important route already felt to be poorly-maintained.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>A view that existing open spaces need safeguarding and leisure facilities need improvement, such as the tennis courts in Fairview Park.</p> <p>More leisure provision required than just football pitches, e.g., skateboard park, BMX track and other facilities for teenagers.</p> <p>A suggestion that in previous adopted documents, public parkland would provide a buffer between A1245 and development, which is contradictory to promoting sites extending right up to this road.</p> <p><b>Hockley and Hawkwell</b></p> <p>Hockley mentioned as needing a sports field for local youth – supported the option of using Greensward playing field for the community.</p> <p>Hawkwell Parish Council saw opportunity to use Section 106 monies to improve football pitches at Clements Hall. Also highlighted the need for the leisure centre to benefit from better bus links.</p> <p><b>Hullbridge</b></p> <p>Numerous responses raised the issue of a lack of public open space/leisure provision in Hullbridge, where the dispersed urban form and dependence on cars meant much of the South of the village not within an easy walk of public facilities.</p> <p>The South of the village also suffered from a lack of pavements and road crossings, limiting accessibility.</p> <p>Some concern that existing riverside walks, footpaths and bridleways could be under threat if large-scale development took place in the village. Rural character would be lost with development of surrounding Green Belt.</p> <p>Concern at development of promoted sites, many of which are agricultural fields, or contain established trees and hedgerows. With most promoted sites to the East, a view was that a mooted country</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>park to the West would not be useful in providing new open space for this additional population, leading to more car travel.</p> <p>Hullbridge Parish Council (HPC) felt Section 106 money should be used fully to improve and maintain existing open spaces and leisure facilities. They also considered the village needed better public transport links to Clements Hall Leisure Centre to enable residents to access this important facility.</p> <p>HPC also favoured the designation and development of the proposed Central Woodlands Arc, highlighting this as an ideal site for activities such as a Parkrun and orienteering.</p> <p><b>The Wakerings and Barling</b></p> <p>The lack of a sports hall raised, with this having been sold off in the past.</p> <p>Lack of park for local children and few pavements make the village unsuitable for accommodating more development.</p>
	<p>Q39. Are the potential locations for 3G pitch investment the right ones? Are there other locations that we should be considering?</p>	15	1	0	<p>14</p> <p>Around half the responses agreed that the locations set out were the right ones, or generally supported the principle of providing additional 3G pitches.</p> <p>Support in principle from Sport England, who recognised the comprehensive feasibility study that led to the proposed locations. However, they also suggested considering other alternatives identified through the consultation if they were not explored as part of the feasibility study. In addition, stated the LP should not dismiss the option of investment into 3G pitches in adjoining local authorities that are suitably located for meeting Rochford's needs in view of the close proximity of potential sites just outside of the district.</p> <p>A comment emphasised support for Rayleigh Leisure Centre as one of the proposed sites, feeling that as the main urban centre it should benefit from being a hub for outdoor pitches.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Some suggested RDC should consult the local football teams on the proposed locations, given they will be the primary users.</p> <p>ECC are not seeking existing school playing pitches to be allocated for community use, although it may be an option as and when future school sites are allocated alongside development of new communities. This is something that can be explored further with RDC.</p> <p>One response suggested Hullbridge Recreation Ground as an ideal further location for a 3G pitch, whilst another suggested providing them at the site of existing clubs (e.g., Ashingdon FC or Hawkwell FC, on the condition that they are also made available for public use.</p> <p>Some more cautious responses urged that any 3G pitch needed the backing of local residents, citing an instance at Fitzwimarc School, where a proposal in 2016 was rejected following local opposition.</p> <p>One respondent considered that investment would be better spent on providing free pitches, tennis courts etc available, rather than paid-for facilities, as this would deliver greater benefits to children.</p> <p>A response expressed concern at installing artificial grass in open spaces, citing environmental concerns relating to the plastic. Suggested this is only done on sites in a poor state of repair, ideally using recycled plastic.</p>
	<p>Q40. Are the listed potential hub sites and key centres the right ones? Are there other locations that we should be considering?</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>11</p> <p>Several comments expressed general support at the list of hub sites and key centres, although some observed funding would be required.</p> <p>ECC stated that they are not seeking existing school playing pitches to be allocated for community use, although it may be an option as and when future school sites are allocated alongside development of new communities. This is something that can be explored further with RDC.</p> <p>Support in principle from Sport England, who recognised the comprehensive feasibility study that led to the proposed locations. Once decisions have been made on sites for 3G pitch investment, these sites should be considered as potential hub sites, especially if</p>

						<p>they are located on multi-pitch sites as a 3G pitch provides the basis for a community football hub.</p> <p>A couple of comments felt more should be done to support existing clubs by investing at their sites, including Rochford Hundred Rugby Club, Ashingdon FC, Hawkwell FC, Hockley Tennis Club and Rayleigh Tennis Club, with any public investment here on the basis that the facilities are made accessible to the public.</p> <p>Other locations suggested by respondents included Hullbridge Recreation Ground, Magnolia Park, King George V Playing Field (Ashingdon), King George V Playing Field (Rayleigh) and the District's nature reserves, parks and woodlands.</p> <p>Public open spaces benefiting from existing pavilions/changing rooms flagged as an opportunity to invest in as hubs.</p> <p>District's primary schools also suggested, with one respondent highlighting need for 5-a-side and hockey pitches.</p> <p>One comment felt Wakering had been omitted from plans (although Burroughs Park was listed as a proposed key centre for playing pitches).</p> <p>A couple of developers supported the proposals, but also suggested parts of their promoted sites could provide open spaces and recreation facilities as part of strategic housing allocations.</p> <p>One comment felt additional facilities should be created, given the additional housing growth required in the LP.</p> <p>One agent promoting a site on former playing fields disagreed with the recommendations of the two Studies to designate all other facilities below hub sites/key centres as being of 'local importance', contending that some are no longer in use and which could be better provided for elsewhere.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<p>Q41. With reference to your preferred Strategy Option, are there opportunities for growth to help deliver improvements to open space or sport facility accessibility or provision?</p>	27	3	0	24	<p>Several comments considered that new development could help provide much-needed improvements to existing recreation facilities, open spaces or footpaths, along with new ones. Both on-site (e.g., open spaces and walks featuring biodiversity) and off-site (e.g., more strategic sports/recreation facilities) contributions were seen as important amenities development could help provide.</p> <p>Sport England observed that all strategy options had potential to help deliver improvements in open space or sport facility accessibility/provision. Smaller developments offer the potential to make financial contributions towards off-site strategic priorities while the options that provide for larger developments provide opportunities for on-site provision in the form of new playing fields and strategic open spaces like country parks, shared use of new school facilities and providing accessibility improvements e.g., joining up footpath/cycleway networks and providing access to the countryside.</p> <p>Developers/agents/landowners stated larger strategic development sites were capable of providing new public open spaces and recreation facilities for the whole community.</p> <p>The most popular option put forward was <b>Spatial Strategy Option 3a</b> (West of Rayleigh), backed by Hawkwell and Hullbridge Parish Councils, a number of residents plus a local landowner. The scale of a strategic option such as this was felt to have a better chance of delivering transformational new facilities.</p> <p>Within <b>3a</b> (or as part of an <b>Option 2 or 4</b> scenario), a number of sites East of Wickford, controlled by Bloor Homes (CFS223 and CFS226) were suggested as being able to provide recreation space on retained Green Belt land as part of a housing allocation, with this providing greater security of tenure to existing The Warren sports facility on CFS223, identified in the <i>Playing Pitch Assessment and Action Plan</i>.</p> <p>Promoters of <b>Spatial Strategy Option 3b</b> underlined how their proposals would see creation of new high-quality public open space across each neighbourhood at a range of scales, including 'green fingers' separating different neighbourhoods, new sports facilities and a</p>
---	----	---	---	----	---

					<p>significant contribution towards the delivery of a new sub-regional South Essex Estuary Park.</p> <p>The promoted site CFS050, currently designated as sports pitches, has no community user following redevelopment of adjacent site. The agent seeking residential allocation for this site instead proposed an off-site contribution to fund improvements to the hub sites and key centres identified in the <i>Local Football Facility Plan for Rochford</i>, as per para.99 NPPF and Sport England guidance.</p> <p>A site promoter stated that allocation of CFS043 (Lark Hill, Canewdon) will deliver new public open space and 8km of bridleways, benefiting isolated rural communities that are physically detached from Canewdon Village itself.</p> <p>A number of residents felt more recreational options could be provided in the Wakering/Barling area, with one respondent bemoaning the lack of any indoor sports facilities, whilst another raised the issue of a golf course which was promised by a developer, but never delivered. In Little Wakering/Barling, the lack of footpaths/pavements was flagged as being dangerous for pedestrians, something which would be exacerbated if CFS004 was developed, and which any development in the area should seek to resolve.</p> <p>Promoter of CFS194 (Land North of Rectory Road, Hawkwell) highlighted how development at their site could help provide better sustainable travel options to Clements Hall Leisure Centre, as well as enhancing bridleways/footpaths connecting with the surrounding countryside. It could also contribute towards improvements in provision of open spaces and sports facilities.</p> <p>Promoter of sites under 'Land South of Pooles Lane', Hullbridge, explained how residential allocation at their site could help address existing deficits of public open space in the village, which has some of the highest deficits of spaces such as children's playspace, amenity greenspace and natural/semi-natural greenspace. Explained that a residential development would bring forward 3ha of open space throughout the site, including landscaped natural and semi-natural areas, new woodland belt planting and mixed grassland areas, along</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>with circular walking routes (linked to local footpaths) and an area for a play space.</p> <p>Housebuilder promoting site CFS074 supported the provision of open spaces and recreation as part of any future allocation, explaining that their indicative masterplan of the site would retain almost 50% of it as public open space and green infrastructure, including recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Several respondents felt that, as the largest settlement, Rayleigh was underserved in terms of leisure facilities, and that a swimming pool was required – something which would benefit the area’s ageing demographic. Rayleigh Leisure Centre was suggested as requiring expansion to accommodate this and additional leisure facilities to cater for population growth.</p> <p>Hawkwell Parish Council, amongst others, suggested additional enhancements to Clements Hall would be required, including improving its public transport accessibility, particularly to rural areas to enable people to access leisure facilities in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Some expressed concern at the proposed allocation of CFS024, adjacent to Marylands Nature Reserve, and the general negative impact increased development would have across the District on existing habitats and natural open spaces. To help mitigate against this, it was proposed that this site should be incorporated into the adjoining nature reserve.</p> <p>The need to incorporate a network of off-road cycle paths across the District flagged as an opportunity, given the unsafe nature of many of the roads for cycling. The possibility of an electric bike hire scheme also raised.</p> <p>A view from Ashingdon that the village has potential to provide additional leisure and recreation options, based on upgrades to Rochford Hundred Rugby Club, facilities at King George V Field and St Andrew’s Minster (with adjoining graveyard and battlefield). This needs to be better promoted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					A suggestion RDC should meet with local sports clubs to assess their needs.
Q42. Are there particular open spaces that we should be protecting or improving?	39	7	1	31	<p><b>Note:</b> The responses in this section should be considered alongside parts 'd' and 'e' of <b>Q56-65</b>, in which respondents are asked whether there are areas in specific local communities which require additional protection.</p> <p>Many comments felt all existing public recreational/open spaces highlighted in the Document should be protected and, where possible, improved.</p> <p>Common view from many residents was that all Green Belt areas should be protected/enhanced (including agricultural land), along with woodlands, public open spaces, footpaths, and nature reserves, and that only brownfield sites should be developed. Comments underlined the general importance of such areas for recreation, mental health and wildlife, and that further development threatened the safety of walking, cycling and wildlife. Promoted sites in the Green Belt were suggested to be sites for creating new open space/recreational facilities, instead of residential.</p> <p><b>Rayleigh</b></p> <p>Several respondents used this section to voice opposition to the redevelopment of the Mill Arts Centre site (COL07), along with its attendant green space, with a couple of these comments also feeling this protection should extend to the entire Rayleigh Conservation Area, including site COL20 and its gardens.</p> <p>Other sites receiving mentions for improvement included sports areas on London Road and playing fields on Weir Gardens (Kingley Woods) whilst one respondent felt Rayleigh's children's play spaces were in a poor state and in need of enhancement. Public right of way PROW 298_48 on Hambro Hill also flagged as being in a poor state.</p> <p>Promoted sites mentioned by a small number of respondents for protection included CFS027, CFS029, CFS053, CFS077, CFS086 and</p>

						<p>CFS098. These were all felt to be important parts of the Green Belt, valued for their agricultural and recreational qualities.</p> <p>One respondent objected to the ‘wilding’ of a field behind Rayleigh Leisure Centre, highlighting its importance as safe place to play and picnic for families.</p> <p><b>Rochford &amp; Ashingdon</b></p> <p>Whilst one major housebuilder felt no open spaces required additional protection, another suggested Millview Meadows in Rochford should be protected, improved and its accessibility enhanced. This was on condition that the adjacent Rocheway site could be developed for residential uses.</p> <p>A suggestion King George Playing Field in Ashingdon and the nearby grounds of the Minster should be enhanced to be more welcoming and walkable, have more for teenagers, as well as encouraging wider use of the pitches.</p> <p>Rochford Reservoir also suggested</p> <p><b>Hockley &amp; Hawkwell</b></p> <p>Several residents felt promoted sites in their neighbourhoods should be protected from residential development, with many suggesting site CFS064. This was felt to be important due to its position adjoining a number of ancient woodlands and the public footpath running around its perimeter, which provided an important source of recreation, particularly during Covid-related lockdowns.</p> <p>Magnolia Park and Hockley Woods also suggested.</p> <p><b>Great Wakering</b></p> <p>Suggestions that Cupid’s Country Club and Wakering Common should be protected/enhanced, along with footpaths, flagged as being poorly maintained and overgrown.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p><b>Hullbridge</b></p> <p>The Recreation Ground and other nature reserves and woodlands mentioned, suggesting they are used to promote walking and other exercise. A comment also noted the lack of public recreation facilities to the south of Hullbridge, with only a private sports club. Public facilities such as Kendal Park and the Recreation Ground are a considerable walk away.</p> <p>One suggestion that allotments should be expanded and improved, providing a benefit to those aged 40-70.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 11: Heritage</b></p>	<p>Q43. With reference to the options listed in this section, or your own options, how do you feel we can best address heritage issues through the plan?</p>	<p>42</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>39</p>	<p>Comments presented a broad range of heritage protection strategies as well as identifying specific heritage / historical sites and locations that were considered as in need of protection:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p><i>Protection</i></p> <p>Ensure all new developments are in keeping with each area and of a scale not to overwhelm and impact heritage assets.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the heritage setting – surrounding landscaping and open spaces.</p> <p>Consider mitigating harm including reasonable alternative sites.</p> <p>Consider how any enhancements could be achieved / maximised, and consider and set out the public benefits where harm cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>Protect from increased traffic due to development.</p> <p>An updated evidence base inclusive of Local List should be implemented to consider and assess impacts of proposed growth on heritage assets.</p>

						<p>Local engagement and consultation should be undertaken when reviewing, compiling maintaining heritage lists.</p> <p>Reassess development management and enforcement policies for historical/heritage buildings especially in conservation areas.</p> <p>Conservation Area Appraisals should be updated as part of the emerging Local Plan process due to settlement and area changes over time, and be regularly reviewed.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to designing out crime within new developments in proximity to heritage assets.</p> <p>Heritage Impact Assessments should be undertaken for sites considered as preferred allocations where heritage issues have been identified.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Sites / Locations / Options</b></p> <p>Heritage/conservation areas should be kept preserved with maintenance, and complete, not split due to development especially COL7 and COL20.</p> <p>Stambridge listed buildings alongside the main road are impacted from HGVs and need protection with HGV road restrictions / improved road network, i.e., a bypass road.</p> <p>The Council should look towards options with no/limited heritage constraints i.e., Land East of Wickford, recognised in both the Site Appraisal Paper and IIA.</p> <p>Assessment of proposed development impacts on built heritage should take into consideration the relationship between both, i.e., distance and screening specially to site CFS087 Western Road, Rayleigh.</p> <p>Do not consider sites that threaten key heritage sites e.g., CFS035,084 and 085.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>Q44. Are there areas of the District we should be considering for conservation area status beyond those listed in this section?</p>	21	5	0	16	<p>Comments presented specific and broad landscaped areas to be considered:</p> <p>Little Wakering / Barling should be conservation areas due to a high number of listed buildings in the area for its size.</p> <p>Rayleigh Mill and surrounding area, including Mill Hall.</p> <p>Area surrounding Dutch Cottage, Crown Hill.</p> <p>Rayleigh's conservation area should be extended to the south as far as Rayleigh Weir. Although less attractive it could be designated an improvement area not just due to historical buildings but to landscape as well.</p> <p>Rawreth Village.</p> <p>Countryside around coastal areas.</p> <p>Villages fronting riversides: Hullbridge, Paglesham, Canewdon and South Fambridge.</p>
	<p>Q45. Are there any buildings, spaces or structures that should be protected for their historic, cultural, or architectural significance? Should these be considered for inclusion on the Local List of non-designated assets?</p>	33	7	1	25	<p>Comments presented a range of buildings, spaces and structures to be considered for protection:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Forge, Great Wakering.</li> <li>2. Rayleigh Mill, and Mill Hall for cultural significance.</li> <li>3. Rayleigh Mount views in and out of.</li> <li>4. Rayleigh Civic Suite due to location to Barringtons.</li> <li>5. Rayleigh Library (Paul Pry pub, Rayleigh House and old post office).</li> <li>6. Trinity Church.</li> <li>7. St Peter and Paul's Church, Church Road and adjacent buildings (the old school house, Hockley hall and former rectory).</li> <li>8. Plumberow Mount (a Romano / British tumulus) should be designated with protection.</li> </ol>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. All older buildings of historical importance in the District.</li> <li>10. Ancient woodlands.</li> <li>11. Hullbridge – school house next to the school, Brick Cottages, Tap’s Cottage and the Anchor Cottages.</li> <li>12. Setting of Rochford Hall.</li> <li>13. Hambro Hill, site CFS105 for historical importance reference to The Historic Environment Record (Place Services assessment).</li> <li>14. CFS077 – development would impact the setting of three designated building at Great Wheatley Farm.</li> </ol>
SECTION 12: Town Centres & Retail	Q46. With reference to the options listed above, or your own options, how do you think we can best plan for vibrant town centres in Rochford, Rayleigh and Hockley? How can we also ensure our village and neighbourhood centres remain vibrant?	55	3	0	42	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>A general sense that market forces and consumer preferences were shifting towards online retail and convenience, and that existing town centres needed to have variety, flexibility and accessibility to attract both new and existing shoppers, and also a greater share of evening and leisure trade. Comments also acknowledged there was a shift to town centres being places for socialising/recreation, and that policies needed to support businesses to adapt and offer new experiences. This could involve the provision of more flexible facilities to enable temporary retail (e.g., ‘pop-up’ uses, or commercial units along the lines of a ‘Box Park’).</p> <p>Most responses preferred to state their own preferences for ways to make the District’s town centres more prosperous and vibrant, rather than suggested options in the Document. However, a number of agents/developers did address these options. Most did not express a preference between <b>Options 1 and 2</b>, feeling it was most appropriate for the Council to determine whether new masterplans/area action plans were created, or whether these were dealt with by policies within the new LP. However, there was a narrow preference for the latter option.</p> <p>Developers generally supported <b>Options 5 and 6</b>, as an increased population would provide a greater demand for retail and leisure services in local town centres and shopping parades. This would in turn allow for a more varied mix of uses and make local town centres more sustainable and resilient. Also recognised by some that major</p>

						<p>new housing allocations (e.g., under <b>SSO 3</b>) could bring opportunities for new retail/leisure facilities.</p> <p>Some respondents frustrated that recent businesses opening in town centres were overwhelmingly hairdressers, beauty salons and cafes/restaurants, but acknowledged that these were amenities which did not have to compete with the internet in the same way as traditional retail.</p> <p>Some responses opposed further housing in town centres, particularly the conversion of commercial units to residential through <b>permitted development</b>, feeling this would irreversibly change the character of such areas, break up shopping frontages and undermine their role as shopping and community hubs. It was felt that fewer units in retail use would lead to fewer reasons for people to come into town centres. One response was concerned that noise complaints from residential units in town centres would lead to the closure of community/leisure/social facilities, and that the apartments proposed would not be priced for first time buyers. One comment felt any new residential in town centres should only be on upper levels, and that retail units should be preserved.</p> <p>ECC response recommended the vibrancy of town centres is supported through regeneration efforts, which could consider a wide range of options, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking a mix of developments (housing, retail, office, leisure).</li> <li>• Some intensification of housing, optimal use of the land.</li> <li>• Creating flexible commercial space, and co-location of services in “community hubs”.</li> <li>• Considering identifying an optimal location for specific business sectors, science, medical and technology sectors.</li> <li>• Optimising the provision of digital connectivity, and</li> <li>• Seeking opportunities for public realm improvement and focal points, pedestrianisation / car free areas, increase in provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging parking spaces, and inclusion of green spaces.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Numerous responses favoured an approach that celebrated the unique characteristics and <b>heritage</b> of each town centre to encourage new independent businesses, alongside protecting and enhancing existing community and cultural facilities. One comment supported the renovation and retrofitting of historic buildings to make them energy-efficient and 'green'.</p> <p>Maintaining and improving the street scene was popular, including enhancing plantings and flower displays. Several respondents also suggested enhanced or additional markets and programmes of community events to increase footfall and the variety of people using town centres.</p> <p><b>Reductions in rents and business rates</b> mentioned several times as ways to attract more independent retailers into town centres, with these being more resilient than national chain retailers in weathering negative impacts on high streets in recent years.</p> <p>Several comments suggested Council should work closely with landlords to re-let vacant units through a scheme to support start-up or independent local businesses with reduced/subsidised rents, possibly on a 'pop-up' basis. An alternative approach to vacant units was to fill their windows with visual displays (e.g., photography or information) to reduce the visual blight.</p> <p>Some felt building new <b>housing</b> in or on the edge of existing towns would not necessarily support existing centres, as these residents would be likely to drive to out of town retail parks and shopping malls with free parking.</p> <p><b>Transport and accessibility</b> mentioned as an important factor in driving both daytime and evening footfall, with several respondents mentioning poor public transport links between Hullbridge/the Dome Caravan Site and Rayleigh, Hockley and Rochford cited as a barrier preventing residents from the village in accessing businesses and facilities in these towns.</p> <p>Better road and public transport links to enable residents from outlying villages and housing developments to access town centres was felt by several comments to be a necessity. These comments also felt there</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>should be a dedicated cycle network to improve this access and reduce traffic congestion.</p> <p>A couple of respondents acknowledged the structural shifts in retail and felt it was inevitable that some of this would/should become residential, with one questioning whether the <i>South Essex Retail Study</i> requirement for an additional 20,000 sq. m of retail space for the District was still relevant. Suggested that providing more residential in town centres could reduce development on the Green Belt.</p> <p>A couple of comments stressed the importance of also planning for and maintaining village and neighbourhood <b>shopping parades</b>, recognising their crucial role for local communities.</p> <p>One comment considered commercial development should be supported in town centres, secondary shopping areas and industrial estates, but that the latter should not become retail/leisure sites (i.e., through flexibility of the Class E designation).</p> <p><b>Town-Specific Comments:</b></p> <p><b>Rayleigh:</b></p> <p>Many responses to this question opposed the proposed redevelopment of site COL07 (Mill Hall) in Rayleigh. Common reasons for opposing were:</p> <p>The loss of valued community facilities, events spaces, cafe, and toilets at the Mill, which were considered to support the wider town centre and attract visitors and footfall. Some comments felt proposals to provide a smaller community centre on part of the site were not sufficient for Rayleigh’s needs, given proposed housing growth.</p> <p>The loss/reduction of parking spaces proposed at the Mill Car Park, with many considering sufficient parking essential to the vibrancy of Rayleigh Town Centre. Some comments also opposed the redevelopment of the nearby COL20 (Civic Suite) site, due to the loss of weekend public car parking.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>The addition of flats, which were not felt to be in keeping with aspects of the surrounding Conservation Area, including Trinity Church, Rayleigh Windmill and Rayleigh Mount, and which would visually encroach upon some of these.</p> <p>Some felt the Mill Hall had never been used to its full potential, and suggestions were received that felt it would make a good venue for a theatre, pop-up cinema and exhibition space.</p> <p>Some felt more needed to be done to preserve/celebrate the Conservation Area, with the existing 1960s buildings in the town centre already detracting heavily from this and deterring quality retailers to locate in Rayleigh.</p> <p>Several respondents feared traffic congestion would deter visitors and shoppers from accessing Rayleigh.</p> <p>Numerous respondents felt existing parking facilities should be protected, and that they should be made cheaper/free to encourage shoppers.</p> <p>Better cycle links, pedestrian routes and public transport suggested as ways to connect Rayleigh with its surrounding residential areas and villages and cut down on the need to drive to the town.</p> <p>Some comments supported additional themed markets to add vibrancy and footfall to Rayleigh.</p> <p>Some comments expressed desire for a swimming pool in the town centre.</p> <p>One response felt Rayleigh’s position between Southend and Chelmsford, along with free parking on Saturday afternoons, meant the Mill Hall had considerable potential as a theatre on the East of England touring circuit. Cited potential audience spend as both an opportunity for Rayleigh, but also a risk if this venue was lost.</p> <p>One response felt that Rayleigh had taken the brunt of development in the District, but without significant infrastructure improvement and that</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>additional development should be restricted, particularly in the Conservation Area.</p> <p><b>Rochford</b></p> <p>A concern that the town was being 'left behind' compared with Rayleigh, was a 'ghost town' by the afternoon, not helped by long-vacant former supermarket. This was attributed to the bypass, which took passing trade away from the centre.</p> <p>One response felt Rochford benefited from excellent parking provision, but felt a greater focus was needed on encouraging quality independent shops and restaurants, along the model of Leigh-on-Sea.</p> <p>A suggestion that the square could be pedestrianised, encouraging more cafes and restaurants into the town. One response felt a museum was needed.</p> <p>A planning agent supported Option 6, contending that the development of sites CFS081 and CFS082, along with providing new sustainable transport links to these, would help provide greater footfall to Town Centre businesses.</p> <p>An agent promoting a site in South Rochford considered that local neighbourhood centres, such as that on Southend Road, were also very important and needed support, and that new development in this area could help sustain shops and services there.</p> <p><b>Hockley</b></p> <p>A couple of responses identified Hockley as a centre which performs well in meeting everyday needs, although did not feel the Hockley Area Action Plan is appropriate in seeking additional large retail or residential uses in the town centre, which was felt have little additional space.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<p>Q47. Do you agree with the local centre hierarchy set out in Figure 36? If not, what changes would you make?</p>	15	6	0	9	<p>The majority of responses agreed with the hierarchy, with respondents feeling the key town centres needed to be supported, particularly Rayleigh, as the largest settlement with the widest range of shops and services.</p> <p>ECC response recommended the vibrancy of town centres is supported through regeneration efforts, which could consider a wide range of options, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking a mix of developments (housing, retail, office, leisure).</li> <li>• Some intensification of housing, optimal use of the land.</li> <li>• Creating flexible commercial space, and co-location of services in “community hubs”.</li> <li>• Considering identifying an optimal location for specific business sectors, science, medical and technology sectors.</li> <li>• Optimising the provision of digital connectivity.</li> <li>• Seeking opportunities for public realm improvement and focal points.</li> <li>• Pedestrianisation / car free areas, increase in provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging parking spaces, and inclusion of green spaces.</li> </ul> <p>A couple of respondents felt that Rayleigh’s status at the top of the hierarchy was dependent on its retaining its cultural and heritage facilities, threatened by the possible redevelopment of sites COL07 and COL20.</p> <p>One response supported the hierarchy, but also requested protection for local centres and parades, which could disappear through redevelopment or change of use otherwise.</p> <p>3 comments (including 2 parish councils) urged RDC to protect town centre businesses by helping them to be profitable, which it was considered could be achieved through free parking and reduced business rates. Also believed businesses should cooperate more, e.g., through later opening hours on one evening, alongside special offers and community events.</p>
---	----	---	---	---	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>One respondent noted the structural changes ongoing in town centres and move towards online retail, but urged against permitting widespread change from retail to residential, particularly on ground floors (including through 'Class E permitted development). Identified Hockley as a centre which performs well in meeting everyday needs, although did not feel the Hockley Area Action Plan is appropriate in seeking additional large retail or residential uses in the town centre, which was felt have little additional space.</p>
	<p>Q48. With reference to Figures 38, 39 and 40, do you agree with existing town centre boundaries and extent of primary and secondary shopping frontages in Rayleigh, Rochford and Hockley? If not, what changes would you make?</p>	14	7	0	<p>7</p> <p>Majority of comments supported existing town centre boundaries and shopping frontages.</p> <p>ECC response recommended the vibrancy of town centres is supported through regeneration efforts, which could consider a wide range of options, e.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking a mix of developments (housing, retail, office, leisure).</li> <li>• Some intensification of housing, optimal use of the land.</li> <li>• Creating flexible commercial space, and co-location of services in “community hubs”.</li> <li>• Considering identifying an optimal location for specific business sectors, science, medical and technology sectors.</li> <li>• Optimising the provision of digital connectivity, and</li> <li>• Seeking opportunities for public realm improvement and focal points.</li> <li>• Pedestrianisation / car free areas, increase in provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging parking spaces, and inclusion of green spaces.</li> </ul> <p>A business in Hockley suggested developing an imaginative town setting that connects the town with Hockley Woods, e.g., ‘timber’ shop facades, woodland street furniture etc, thus celebrating the setting of Hockley in its ancient woodlands and Spa.</p> <p>A respondent noted structural changes ongoing in town centres and the move towards online retail but urged against permitting widespread change from retail to residential, particularly on ground floors (including through 'Class E permitted development). Identified Hockley as a centre which performs well in meeting everyday needs, although did</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>not feel the Hockley Area Action Plan is appropriate in seeking additional large retail or residential uses in the town centre, which was felt have little additional space.</p> <p>A suggestion to keep streets and street furniture tidy and in good repair, and to conserve character of town centres by avoiding high rise development and buildings that are at odds with the street scene.</p>
Q49. Should we continue to restrict appropriate uses within town centres, including primary and secondary shopping frontages within those centres? If yes, what uses should be restricted?	13	6	0	7	<p>Most responses felt some restrictions were necessary to maintain a variety of different activities in town centres, which encourages a greater sense of vibrancy.</p> <p>Some comments supporting this also wished to restrict uses they felt were too prevalent in town centres, including hairdressers, takeaways and charity shops.</p> <p>Some concern about the growth of residential in town centres at the expense of commercial, which could lead to noise complaints against existing businesses from new residents.</p> <p>A small number did not agree with this approach. One felt centres needed to be flexible to prevent units remaining vacant for a long-term, allowing alternative uses to retail (e.g., offices) to generate employment. Another considered that pressure on retail due to Covid meant it was important to attract other business uses to occupy vacant space, whilst housing could also fill these spaces and add vibrancy if units remained empty for a period of time.</p> <p>One comment did not believe there were presently any restrictions to uses in Rayleigh Town Centre, so did not feel there was a need to introduce any further ones.</p> <p>Some comments felt this was not possible to enforce, as businesses would not remain in a town centre if there was no benefit to do so.</p> <p>One response noted structural changes ongoing in town centres and the move towards online retail but urged against permitting widespread change from retail to residential, particularly on ground floors (including through 'Class E permitted development). Identified Hockley as a centre which performs well in meeting everyday needs, although did</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					not feel the Hockley Area Action Plan is appropriate in seeking additional large retail or residential uses in the town centre, which was felt have little additional space.
Q50. With reference to your preferred Strategy Option, are there opportunities for growth to deliver improved retail and leisure services in the District?	18	3	0	15	<p>Some comments felt large-scale new developments were an opportunity to deliver new small/medium/large shopping facilities (dependent on size), and that this could help reduce congestion and traffic caused by people travelling to overcrowded existing shops, particularly supermarkets. This was a particular issue in Rochford/Hawkwell/Ashingdon, where people had to drive elsewhere for a large supermarket.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 3a</b> mentioned by a number of respondents and providing an opportunity to both provide a range of new retail facilities alongside a new community, but also to bring new shoppers into nearby towns (i.e., Rayleigh and Wickford), provided transport links were convenient.</p> <p>Some felt Rayleigh needed a range of interventions to improve and protect its town centre. This included protecting the Mill Hall and preventing the redevelopment of sites COL07 and COL20; providing a swimming pool; improving cycling facilities such as cycle parking, bike hire schemes and dedicated cycle routes to surrounding villages such as Hullbridge; and providing bridleways and additional open space such as dog fields.</p> <p>ECC response recommended the vibrancy of town centres is supported through regeneration efforts, which could consider a wide range of options, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking a mix of developments (housing, retail, office, leisure).</li> <li>• Some intensification of housing, optimal use of the land.</li> <li>• Creating flexible commercial space, and co-location of services in “community hubs”.</li> <li>• Considering identifying an optimal location for specific business sectors, science, medical and technology sectors.</li> <li>• Optimising the provision of digital connectivity, and</li> </ul>

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking opportunities for public realm improvement and focal points.</li> <li>• Pedestrianisation / car free areas, increase in provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging parking spaces, and inclusion of green spaces.</li> </ul> <p>Some comments backed business support initiatives, such as financial assistance for start-up businesses and incentives to support new street market initiatives in the District. Also, one comment in support of a scheme to revitalise run-down buildings.</p> <p>3 responses felt the District would benefit from a cinema and bowling alley, suggesting the Airport Business Park site as a suitable location.</p> <p>A couple of comments stated that Great Wakering had insufficient shops and leisure facilities for its size, whilst its pharmacy and doctors were too small. Parking problems also given as an issue.</p> <p>A couple of responses concerned over the number of commercial to residential conversions taking place.</p> <p>Some comments felt that, given the preference by consumers to shop at out-of-town retail parks, some of the promoted sites would be more appropriate for this purpose than for housing – particularly in Rayleigh.</p> <p>One response was concerned that the limited range of shops and parking in Hullbridge was no longer sufficient for the size of the population, and that this was generating additional traffic as people drove out of the village to shop.</p> <p>One respondent noted the structural changes ongoing in town centres and the move towards online retail but urged against permitting widespread change from retail to residential, particularly on ground floors (including through 'Class E permitted development). Identified Hockley as a centre which performs well in meeting everyday needs, although did not feel the Hockley Area Action Plan is appropriate in seeking additional large retail or residential uses in the town centre, which was felt have little additional space.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

SECTION 13: Transport and Connectivity	Q51. With reference to the options above, or your own options, how do you feel we can best address our transport and connectivity needs through the plan?	93	2	1	90	<p>Comments mostly presented a range of transport issues that need to be addressed strategically at both a District and local level, a mix of options were both supported and objected to:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>An infrastructure delivery plan / strategy (consulted and agreed with residents) is required with infrastructure committed to ensure new development delivers improvements to transport networks.</p> <p>A Transport Study should only happen once there is a better understanding of cross boundary issues, particularly housing to enable planning of infrastructure.</p> <p>Transport carbon emissions should be accounted for.</p> <p>Accessibility and connectivity are needed to accommodate growth, attract investors, and address congestion and air quality issues.</p> <p>Work with government, Highways England, ECC and neighbouring LAs to deliver new transport options, e.g., rapid transport.</p> <p>Improvements to existing road networks are supported, but bypass scheme is not as would cut through green belt and increase development.</p> <p>Consider a bypass.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure issues (including maintenance) need to be addressed first to ensure new development does not worsen issues.</p> <p>Public transport upgrades coincident with developments coming online, and strategic road improvements to accommodate increased volume of traffic.</p> <p>Welcome connected and defined (with waymarking) walking and cycling routes from villages into towns, schools, and link with public transport.</p>
--	---	----	---	---	----	--

						<p>Design of local roads, access and transport links should have regard to the “Safe System Approach”.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to secure external storage facilities and bicycle security on new developments Consider mobile phone apps and websites that offer friendly routes.</p> <p>Footpaths need maintaining regularly.</p> <p>Equestrians need to be included in the preparation of a Local Walking and Cycling Infrastructure Plan as horse riding is a form of active travel.</p> <p>Development will exacerbate road congestion.</p> <p>Encouragement is needed for rail and bus links, including a local frequent minibus service for elderly or disabled.</p> <p>Road safety analysis needs to be undertaken.</p> <p>Existing communities, new developments and travelling communities should be integrated with easy active travel options, public transport, technology and electric vehicle charging for health and wellbeing of all residents.</p> <p>Emphasis should be placed on “movement” rather than traffic, and what the movement requirements are, generated by development and how can these be addressed. How will developments connect and link to existing communities and services, and how will they be integrated into existing settlements, seeking to avoid creating additional severance, e.g., urban extensions need to be connected into the existing town.</p> <p>Consider electric scooter scheme.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Options, Sites and Locations</b></p> <p>Consider a bypass through Land South of Battlesbridge, South of Hullbridge and through to Southend Airport, and beyond to mitigate congestion through Rayleigh, improving air quality, creating a safer</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>environment for active travel. It would also create a corridor for future development.</p> <p>Southend Bypass Scheme is opposed.</p> <p>A new road could be built from the A1245 to Hullbridge, limiting traffic on Rawreth Lane.</p> <p>Do not support any bypass given intrusion into the Crouch Valley.</p> <p>CFS146 and CFS147 should not be considered due to Rayleigh town being gridlocked.</p> <p>An appraisal question should be considered as to whether an option promotes the use of sustainable transport modes and can then assess the extent to which a proposal meets the Health and Wellbeing IIA Objective.</p> <p>Support the four options (logical approaches) to address transport and connectivity.</p> <p>A combination of strategic options is supported to address infrastructure needs.</p> <p>Ashingdon Road issues need to be resolved in the Plan. HGVs should be prohibited from part of the route.</p> <p>Make Ashingdon Road a 20mph.</p> <p>Widen roads at bus stops to prevent congestion.</p> <p>Road safety analysis needs to be undertaken, especially in Barrow Hall Road.</p> <p>Public Rights of Way need to be kept accessible for all.</p> <p>Growth should be directed / dispersed to the most sustainable locations (existing settlements) already well-served by high frequency public transport, services and facilities, and where there is the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>opportunity to deliver a scale of development to sustain new services and facilities to deliver truly walkable neighbourhoods. Improvements could be made to less sustainable locations.</p> <p>A dispersed growth strategy will avoid overuse and unnecessary congestion on more densely populated areas.</p> <p>Land East of Wickford is identified as having a positive contribution to sustainable transport in the IIA.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 1</b> is the only way to minimize environmental damage.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 2</b> would be relevant to Land South of Mount Bovers Lane, Hawkwell (CFS074)– Taylor Wimpey would support appropriate contributions evidenced by a robust Infrastructure Delivery Plan as being required to support the development.</p> <p>Support <b>Spatial Strategy Options 3a and 3b</b> (new garden village).</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 3b</b> North of Southend appears less suitable in transport terms due to lack of suitable infrastructure to support significant growth in this region when compared with Land East of Wickford, and less well-served by public transport.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 3b</b> (North of Southend), <b>3c</b> (East of Rochford), land allocations from Rochford to Hockley in the 2017 SHELA, as well as some other sites in Lower Hockley and Rayleigh, are objected to due to transport infrastructure and related risk. Specific areas of concern are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CFS035 land west of Rochford Hall.</li> <li>2. CFS041 Lee Valley Farm.</li> <li>3. CFS074 land south of Mount Bovers Lane.</li> <li>4. CFS084 Land south of Hall Road.</li> <li>5. CFS085 land west and north of Hall Road.</li> <li>6. CFS087 land between Western Road and Weir Farm Road.</li> <li>7. CFS121 land north of A127.</li> <li>8. CFS150 land on the north side of Victor Gardens.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>9. EXP12 land adjacent 44 Great Wheatley Road.</p> <p>These will exacerbate the B1013 congestion and comprise emergency evacuation, and with the potential risk of severe flooding with nuclear contamination (Bradwell), and airport / rail disaster.</p> <p>Development should be located where there is immediate link to A127/A13.</p> <p>Growth would be required to utilise the A127 as the main route, or the A13 London Road and require traffic to travel through the centre of Southend. Significant infrastructure would be required for this area, whereby the location of 3b presents limitations to enhance connections.</p> <p>More work is required on the A127 and the Carpenters Arms roundabout.</p> <p>Feeder lanes to link the Fairglen interchange with the Rayleigh Weir in both directions is required.</p> <p>Hockley needs another access.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 4</b> is supported.</p> <p>Land South of Pooles Lane, Hullbridge (supported by a developer/agent) was considered to be well placed to encourage the shift away from the private car, integrating into the existing highway and pedestrian infrastructure. Access to services could be further improved through new development resulting in an increased level of users.</p> <p>Support the options identified to address transport and connectivity needs, but cross boundary working to be done for planned transport infrastructure.</p> <p>All four options need to be pursued as part of an integrated approach with South Essex Authorities, Essex County Council and the Government.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Rail level crossing safety – any development may require mitigation to be installed, with solutions leading to closure of level crossings, i.e., extinguishment, diversion or replacement with a footbridge. The level crossings are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Norman Crescent.</li> <li>2. Blounts Wood.</li> <li>3. Blounts Farm.</li> <li>4. Woodstock Crescent.</li> <li>5. Barbara Close.</li> </ol> <p>Level Crossing Policy Request – Network Rail would seek improvements towards level crossings and level crossing safety (as detailed in response). Network Rail should be consulted during planning, design and construction stages.</p> <p>Promoted sites next to major roads, especially the A127, should not be considered due to air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Rochford Town Centre – a foot /cycle path is required between Dalys Road and the market square to improve economic activity.</p> <p>Need to re-establish rural bus routes.</p> <p>RDC should oppose any “Southend Outer Bypass” scheme as would impact the Green Belt and increase development impacting further the Green Belt, natural habitats and the wider environment.</p> <p>Retain all Rayleigh Town Centre car parks for vitality.</p> <p>An up-to-date road traffic survey (Hockley) needs to be undertaken before continuing with the District Plan.</p> <p>A129 - Essex County Council is developing a route improvement strategy for the stretch from Victoria House Corner in Hadleigh to the Rayleigh Weir, promoting sustainable travel. Castle Point and Rochford Council need to work together with Essex County Council to ensure the strategy extends into Rayleigh town centre and Rayleigh station. Castle Point BC believes that there are potential strategic cross-boundary issues to be addressed through the preparation of the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Rochford Plan in relation to: any proposed development to the west of Rayleigh, and sustainable travel on A129.</p> <p>Provision of an extension to the A130 would be better placed to create a new village along its course with infrastructure incorporated.</p> <p>Airport growth must be contingent on the transport infrastructure comments in this representation. For quality of living, night flights should be stopped, and pollution and noise controls enhanced.</p> <p>CFS064 – only has the B1013 as a feeder road that regularly experiences severe congestion.</p> <p>CFS160, CFS161, CFS074, CFS194, CFS169, CFS150, CFS120 are all going to increase traffic on the B1013 road.</p>
Q52. Are there areas where improvements to transport connections are needed?	183	4	1	178	<p>Comments comprised of specific connectivity issues and road capacity, and with reference to specific sites and locations with objections to development and suggested interventions:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>There needs to be an extensive review of the area with highways and sustainable transport revisions, with an inter-urban transit solution and significant capacity improvements to public transport to accommodate growth.</p> <p>Alternative routes out of the District are needed to ease congestion.</p> <p>Ensuring footpaths / bridleways / cycleways have right of way, connected and fit for purpose to encourage walking / cycling to school, and adults for recreation and accessibility ensuring safety.</p> <p>A tram system is needed. No new roads should be built.</p> <p>Cross boundary, and across the whole sub-region working is required.</p>

						<p>Main transport hubs need a good supply of cheap day commuter parking or reliable public transport.</p> <p>Park and ride would be good for town shopping centres, industrial areas and out of town shopping areas.</p> <p><b>Specific Areas / Locations / Sites</b></p> <p>Bypass going through Rayleigh.</p> <p>Wider paths to encourage walking on London Road, Rayleigh.</p> <p>A direct shuttle bus between Rayleigh and Basildon is needed as service is too convoluted.</p> <p>Southend Airport Rail Station – access needs to be made more convenient for local residents. Pedestrian routes could be made shorter and direct if access was provided to the east side of the station through the “green buffer” (currently protected by policy ENV6 of the Joint Area Action Plan). The “green buffer” could be more effectively used to provide opportunity for improved local bus connectivity / interchange to station and airport.</p> <p>Bypass through south of Battlesbridge, south of Hullbridge and through to Southend Airport and beyond.</p> <p>A new dual carriageway is required connecting Hullbridge via Lower Road with Hockley and Southchurch via Sutton Road.</p> <p>Improvements to public transport – Hullbridge to Hockley / Rochford / Rayleigh to reduce traffic congestion.</p> <p>Watery Lane is in much need of attention – poor drainage, overgrown hedges and lighting and should not be considered as a main thoroughfare.</p> <p>Lower Road between Hullbridge and land to the west of Wadham Park Avenue – unpathed parts of this road hindering safe pedestrian access.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>No transport links along Lower Road east ward from Ferry Road. The score of '5' and "very good public transport links" is inaccurate.</p> <p>No no.820 school bus service as discontinued for school travel to and from Sweyne Park School to Hullbridge.</p> <p>More work needs to be done to A127 and Carpenters Arms roundabout.</p> <p>Further improvements are needed to the junction of Rawreth lane and the A1245.</p> <p>Feeder lanes are essential to link the Fairglen interchange with Rayleigh Weir in both directions.</p> <p>Ashingdon Road, Sutton Road and the Southend Road (dangerous with blind corners) have traffic flow problems.</p> <p>Speed reduction measures are needed from Lascelles Gardens up to the Victory pub and down to Ashingdon school</p> <p>Road connections from Great Wakering / Little Wakering / Barling are very poor and busy, roads are narrow and dangerous, and at capacity.</p> <p>The narrow bridge by Butler's Farm cannot safely accommodate any more traffic.</p> <p>Great Wakering – parking in the village around the shops and at school times is a significant issue. Public transport links also poor and encourages car use. Safe footpaths are also required to encourage walking.</p> <p>Travelling from Wakering to the Fairglen Intersection can take over an hour at commuter times.</p> <p>Barling – limited public transport and lack of suitable footpaths.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Parish of Sutton does not have good public transport service – East-West along Shopland Road to Purdys Estate there is no public service.</p> <p>Shopland Road has no public footpaths, Sutton Road has only one footpath, both have limited street lighting.</p> <p>Road network in Sutton is at capacity.</p> <p>Stambridge Road is at capacity, and hazardous.</p> <p>Provide a path in King Georges Field, Ashingdon.</p> <p>Hockley needs another access. Severe disruption particularly between Hambro Hill and Spa Road junctions.</p> <p>There is no room for bus lanes or cycle lanes on the congested B1013 through Hockley.</p> <p>Greensward Lane, Hockley is heavily congested at peak times.</p> <p>Hockley – limited local car parking inhibits local trade.</p> <p>Betts Farm Estate, Hockley suffers road congestion.</p> <p>Hambro Hill – overloaded, dangerous junction – poor visibility, the low bridge impacts public transport, no cycle paths or means to have one, limited footpaths. The Public Right of Way (298_48) is poorly maintained.</p> <p>Access from the east of the district to and through the rest of the district is beyond capacity and cannot be expected to take any more traffic.</p> <p>There are transport infrastructure and risk related objections concerning the following sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CFS035 Land west of Rochford Hall.</li> <li>2. CFS041 Lee Valley Farm.</li> <li>3. CFS074 Land south of Mount Bovers Lane.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. CFS077 Land North of Great Wheatley's Road.</li> <li>5. CFS084 Land South of Hall Road.</li> <li>6. CFS085 Land west and north of Hall Road.</li> <li>7. CFS087 Land between Western Road and Weir Farm Road.</li> <li>8. CFS121 land north of A127.</li> <li>9. CFS150 land on the north side of Victor Gardens.</li> <li>10. EXP12 land adjacent 44 Great Wheatley Road.</li> <li>11. Canewdon to the stations of Hockley and Rochford can take 25 mins</li> <li>12. The route to Baltic Wharf needs upgrading.</li> </ol>
Q53. With reference to your preferred strategy option, are there opportunities for growth to deliver new transport connections, such as link roads or rapid transit? What routes and modes should these take? [walking, cycling, rail, bus, road etc]	42	6	2	34	<p>A broad range of comments were presented comprising of preferred strategic opportunities for growth as well as objections to specific strategy options and specific sites. <b>Spatial Strategy Options 3a and 3b West of Rayleigh</b> were well supported:</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>An analysis of current transport needs to be undertaken to identify routes used for shopping, commuting, school runs etc. to see what impacts the various Options have on these.</p> <p>High quality dedicated bus services required for major growth locations.</p> <p><b>Reference to Strategy Options / Locations</b></p> <p>A road bypassing Hockley and Rayleigh is required.</p> <p>A link between the Potash roundabout directly to the A127 should be considered to avoid congestion through Hockley and Rayleigh.</p> <p>Alternative route needs to be considered for Baltic wharf and through traffic re Ashingdon Road.</p> <p><b>Option 1</b> – adapting what we have gives us the most options to improve roads.</p>

						<p>Preferred Strategy is one that delivers concentrated growth focused to north of Southend and south of Rochford so that development is contiguous with Southend and able to deliver transport and accessibility benefits.</p> <p>Development opportunities around Fairglen Interchange requiring joint working with Castle Point Borough Council on planning for this area if the decision is taken to concentrate all or some of the growth to West of Rayleigh. Basildon Council should also be part of this discussion.</p> <p>CFS087 – Western Road, Rayleigh is within a very sustainable location with easy access to the wider main road network. Betterment would be provided to existing footpaths, enhanced foot and cycle links. The existing PRow could be upgraded into a cycle link and a formal path running from Western Road to Weir Farm Road, allowing a good connection to High Road and access to the wider countryside through development of existing footpaths.</p> <p>Support <b>Option 3a (West of Rayleigh)</b>, would solve traffic issues east of Rayleigh. Development suitable is:</p> <p>Along the north side of the A127, accessed by a new slip road off the A127.</p> <p>Land adjoining or close to the A130 in south Rawreth area, (CFS146, 147, 167, 144, 168, 145, 137, 055,121). Good access here to A130, A127, A13 and to Rayleigh Station. Do not support bypass as would increase pressure for development in green belt. A127 should be the main East-West route with potential to widen it from M25 to as far east as The Bell.</p> <p><b>West of Rayleigh</b> housing provision would enable easy access to the A130 and A127.</p> <p>A bypass (“Southend Outer”) is unacceptable as will impact green belt and natural environment.</p> <p><b>Option 3b (North of Southend)</b> would create opportunities for improved links to Southend.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p><b>Option 3b</b> is supported - concentrated growth north of Southend as offers potential to provide improved transport connectivity. Dependent on a new link road from east Southend to the A127 via Warners Bridge, utilising land within the Rochford District, as well as a new transport hub at Southend Airport Train Station. Any such link road should also give consideration to the potential for a Rochford bypass to the east of the town particularly if <b>Option 3c</b> concentrated growth to the east of Rochford is taken forward. This could provide first phase in a potential opportunity to deliver an outer strategic highway route linking to the A130 between Rayleigh and Hullbridge.</p> <p>Cluster north of Southend, CFS260, a new road could resolve a long-standing problem by linking the A127 at Tesco / RBS roundabout, the Airport and eastwards towards Fossetts Farm and east of the District.</p> <p>Do not support <b>Option 3b North of Southend</b> and <b>3c East of Rochford</b> and land allocations from Rochford to Hockley in the 2017 SHELA as well as some other sites in Lower Hockley and Rayleigh. These are transport infrastructure and risk related objections, and concern the following sites which would exacerbate the B1013:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CFS035 Land west of Rochford Hall.</li> <li>2. CFS041 Lee Valley Farm.</li> <li>3. CFS074 Land south of Mount Bovers Lane.</li> <li>4. CFS077 Land North of Great Wheatley's Road.</li> <li>5. CFS084 Land South of Hall Road.</li> <li>6. CFS085 Land west and north of Hall Road.</li> <li>7. CFS087 Land between Western Road and Weir Farm Road.</li> <li>8. CFS121 land north of A127.</li> <li>9. CFS150 land on the north side of Victor Gardens.</li> <li>10. EXP12 land adjacent 44 Great Wheatley Road.</li> </ol> <p><b>Option 4</b> (balanced combination) is supported . Will need to be in specific sites and will be easier to quantify for housing targets if we were to identify sites we would not support.</p> <p>CFS097 – Icen Transport Assessment of this site provides enhancement options for the Poynter Lane / Star Lane Priority Junction to ensure sufficient capacity when site developed. Also, opportunities</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>to improve recreational footpaths along site boundaries to provide purpose-built routes to nearby local amenities. This site is also in proximity to a number of bus routes including Southend and Stansted Airport, and for local trains stations and major employment hubs. Sustainable transport modes are considered feasible in this location.</p> <p>Cycle lanes and encouraging walking will not ease traffic through Rayleigh into Hockley, Ashingdon, Rochford, Canewdon etc. Most traffic passes through Rayleigh particularly if A127 blocked.</p> <p>A bypass is needed through south of Battlesbridge, south of Hullbridge, and through to Southend Airport and beyond. This would create a corridor for future potential development.</p> <p>Support CFS043 – Lark Hill, Canewdon as would provide improvements to walking infrastructure alongside Lark Hill Road, and creation of up to 8km of bridleways.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

SECTION 13: Green Belt and Rural Issues	Q54. Do you feel that the plan should identify rural exception sites? If so, where should these be located and what forms of housing or employment do you feel need to be provided?	22	7	3	12	<p>ECC referred to their comments on Transport and Connectivity. These identified that managed rural exception sites at Stambridge, Canewdon, Wallasea Island, Paglesham and Ballards Gore could provide an opportunity to secure improvements to the bus network serving the area, possibly in conjunction with other developments and urban extensions elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>Supportive comments recognised there were local needs in rural communities for housing, but that such housing should only be for the needs of the local communities, should be small-scale, and should be affordable or social in nature.</p> <p>Many comments in support also expressed caution or unease at developing the Green Belt adjoining villages in conjunction with rural exception sites.</p> <p>Some concerned that houses on such sites could be acquired by buyers from outside the area, who may seek to rent out the property.</p> <p>Two supportive comments felt a retirement village in a rural area which also included community facilities would be welcomed.</p> <p>Developers responding to this question noted that rural exception sites catering to unmet community needs are encouraged by NPPF para.79 and could be used to provide affordable housing or elderly care facilities.</p> <p>Places mentioned as possible locations for rural exception sites by respondents included East Hullbridge, Canewdon, Paglesham, Rawreth, Stambridge and South Fambridge.</p> <p>Whilst supporting the principle of rural exception sites, a response felt Paglesham to be unsuitable due to flood risk.</p> <p>One view felt such sites more appropriate in the rural East of the District, which had experienced less development than the Rayleigh area.</p> <p>Those who objected tended to be opposed to any development in the Green Belt, with some comments feeling villages and rural</p>
---	---	----	---	---	----	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>communities would lose their unique characters and the peaceful status which makes them sought after places to live. Great Stambridge and Great Wakering were referred to.</p> <p>General concerns linked to overdevelopment cited (e.g., strain on roads, infrastructure etc).</p> <p>Some general concern that small villages need to retain their rural character and not merge together, as this would result in a loss of green space and affect the unique selling points of village pubs.</p> <p>A further objection opposed Green Belt development generally, specifically sites CFS027; CFS029 and CFS098 adjoining Rayleigh, which would be unlikely to be considered for rural exception purposes in any case.</p>
Q55. Are there any other ways that you feel the plan should be planning for the needs of rural communities?	24	1	1	22	<p>Several responses raised the issue of infrastructure, noting that rural communities had very little in the way of community or transport infrastructure, and that such places could not support further growth without significant investments. The very limited nature of public or sustainable transport and poor state of rural roads were flagged.</p> <p>A popular response from both parish councils and residents was for the introduction of a S106 or Community Infrastructure Levy equivalent for developments of under 10 homes in rural areas, which could raise funds to mitigate the impact of any housing and support rural infrastructure.</p> <p>Some comments opposed any further development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>ECC stated some rural schools could benefit from limited rural growth in their area, e.g., Canewdon Endowed CE Primary School has 6 class bases and offers up to 22 places per year which means, even when full, mixed age classes are required. The school potentially has site area to become one-form entry (30 places per year group) with appropriate additional accommodation. A feasibility study could be commissioned if development is proposed in this area.</p> <p>East of England Ambulance Service noted that a number of small (&lt;50 dwellings) developments in rural areas could have an impact on</p>

						<p>ambulance service provision, and requested that financial contributions from developers are assessed on a block basis to enable expansion or introduction of new response posts to retain the nationally mandated response times. Also emphasised importance of regular public transport services in such areas.</p> <p>Some felt rural communities needed to stay 'rural' and retain their feeling of isolation and surrounding fields and habitats, and that no effort should be made to change this. There was a concern that any additional development would lead to a loss of existing community/character and harm the Green Belt, agricultural land or local wildlife.</p> <p>Several comments felt agriculture and farming should be prioritised in such communities, as this would support food security/self-sufficiency and keep rural identities strong, as well as ensuring younger generations continue to work in farming. This could include support for additional agricultural development, or the provision of allotments in rural villages.</p> <p>A response was concerned about some pieces of Green Belt being termed 'less valuable' than others in the Document. Cited recent and planned expansion of West Great Wakering and stressed importance of preventing development from joining the village to neighbouring areas, such as North Shoebury.</p> <p>Noted that building to the East of Rochford would inevitably impact traffic on routes such as Ashingdon Road.</p> <p>Affordable housing to the East of Hullbridge requested by one respondent.</p> <p>Comments by one planning agent contested the findings of the Green Belt Study that developing the site they were promoting, CFS067, would result in 'moderate' harm to the Green Belt. They instead asserted that the harm would be 'low', or 'low-moderate', and that site represented a sustainable location for development within the Green Belt.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities	Q56a. Do you agree with our vision for Rayleigh? Is there anything you feel is missing?	118	9	65	44	<p>Comments reflected the themes of infrastructure and sustainability and the concerns for housing development impacts.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Community infrastructure should be preserved and extended; Access to town centres, secondary shopping and open spaces by active travel should be made easier and safer; Secondary shopping facilities would be supported and encouraged with public finance where required.</p> <p>A strict boundary for the settlement area should not be identified as the urban area does not have a clean cut off (for example) Rayleigh and Hockley.</p> <p>Should include that Rayleigh will remain the only Tier 1 settlement given its existing population mass, infrastructure provision and ability to accommodate growth relative to other settlements.</p> <p>Vision ignores major traffic problems in Rayleigh.</p> <p><b>Specific Reference to the Vision</b></p> <p><i>Agree / Missing</i></p> <p>Agree but how will this be accomplished with current infrastructure.</p> <p>The vision is fine but needs to include how it will be achieved, and what the impacts of housing will have.</p> <p>Agree – as Rayleigh a Tier 1 settlement, it should take a large proportion of the District’s Plan requirements.</p> <p><i>Object / Missing</i></p> <p><u>Heritage</u></p> <p>Retaining Rayleigh’s strong historic cultural character is vital and should be protected – your vision statement does not reflect reality.</p>
---	---	-----	---	----	----	---

						<p><u>Housing</u></p> <p>Focuses on housing, where is the planning for infrastructure.</p> <p>Vision needs to reflect in context with existing overdevelopment of housing.</p> <p>Houses should be built in the rural areas as Rayleigh overpopulated.</p> <p>How can Rayleigh be a “green and pleasant place” when construction allowed for new houses on Green Belt.</p> <p>Higher density housing in the town centre.</p> <p>Need to ensure a majority of affordable housing.</p> <p><u>Employment / Commercial / Retail</u></p> <p>Should include: Support for commercial development in town centres, secondary shopping facilities and on approved industrial estates which should not become retail/entertainment locations and residential development should not encroach on them to avoid conflict.</p> <p>“Job opportunities” – what is proposed.</p> <p><u>Reference to Specific Sites</u></p> <p>COL7 and 20 need to be cancelled if you want to keep this draft statement true.</p> <p><u>Sustainability</u></p> <p>Need to include sustainability and inclusivity themes</p> <p>A definition of walking distance needs to be given.</p> <p>Lacks improved transport infrastructure.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Community Improvement Districts should be established.</p> <p><u>Community Infrastructure</u></p> <p>Lacks retention of green spaces.</p> <p>Should mention need for more leisure facilities.</p>
<p>Q56b. With reference to Figure 44 and your preferred Strategy Option, do you think any of the land edged blue should be made available for any of the following uses? How could that improve the completeness of Rayleigh?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</li> <li>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retail, other]</li> <li>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</li> <li>4. Other</li> </ol>	414	13	355	46	<p>A mix of object and support comments were presented with regard to housing development. Comments objecting to housing did support infrastructure development.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>The town cannot cope with any more houses/people/traffic. Commercial sites within the town centre, but not for flats.</p> <p>Development should only be for infrastructure, not houses.</p> <p>Only consider brownfield sites.</p> <p>Support the sites to be used for open space, education and allotments to maintain congestion levels / resident welfare, improve the very poor Green completeness score, object to other uses.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Strategy Options or Sites - Oppose / Support</b></p> <p><i>Oppose:</i></p> <p>Oppose all sites being available.</p> <p>Sites explicitly opposed by respondents included: CFS105 (should be included within regional park, proximity to ancient landscape); 148, 147, 053 (oppose housing, flood risk, support keeping as open space, farm land, green belt), 027 (oppose housing, impact on local roads, flood risk, support keeping as open space, farm land, green belt), 170, 077 (support open space), 025, 139,121, 029 (support open space, farm land, green belt, impact on local roads) 098 (support keeping as</p>

						<p>open space, farm land, green belt), 086 (support keeping as open space, farm land, green belt), 087, COL7.</p> <p>Significant opposition to adjoining sites CFS027; 029; 053; 086; 098 due to impact on local roads and infrastructure; loss of Green Belt; flood risks; impact on biodiversity and wildlife buffer zones; importance of footpath for physical/mental wellbeing; sites partially within Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area.</p> <p><i>Support:</i></p> <p>CFS053 and CFS086 south of Wellington Road – sustainable site achieving “completeness”.</p> <p>CFS077 Land to the north of Great Wheatley Road, Rayleigh, could contribute to completeness of Rayleigh.</p> <p>CFS087 north of the A127 by Rayleigh Weir is sustainable.</p> <p>CFS127 Eastwood Nurseries, Eastwood Road – brownfield, should be removed from the green belt. Highly sustainable as on a major bus route, 5-minute walk from major food store, 15-minute walk from a secondary school, well served by open space.</p> <p>CFS146 (for recycling centre).</p> <p>CFS044 represents a natural rounding off to the existing development form, and makes little contribution to the greenbelt (could maintain the 5 purposes), has reduced landscape quality, well screened; not in full agricultural use; excellent accessibility to bus services; no impact on protected trees; no drainage impact; well placed to accommodate elderly persons/general housing.</p> <p>CFS256 offers opportunity for housing need in a green belt location that could maintain the 5 purposes of green belt and has reduced landscape quality and well screened.</p> <p>CFS047 supported as would provide a more regular defensible green belt / urban boundary, does limited harm to green belt, makes better use of previously developed land, would provide quality housing in a</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>highly sustainable area. Could be considered as “limited infill”, or as limited urban extension to Rayleigh.</p> <p>CFS121 for a solar farm.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 3a (concentrated growth West of Rayleigh)</b> where there is more access to the main road and rail network, for housing need, mixed use and infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Option 3a and 3b</b> due to infrastructure.</p> <p>Need for a small local shopping centre to meet the needs of the development to the west of Rayleigh.</p> <p>Rayleigh needs a medical centre.</p> <p>Sites nearest to the A130 should be considered first.</p> <p>Sites in proximity to major roads.</p> <p>CFS105 Land at Hambro Hill should be considered and included within the area of Rayleigh as capable of providing sustainable development and closely associated with Rayleigh. Benefits from access to existing infrastructure, and is unconstrained other than green belt.</p> <p>CFS164 – Lubbards Lodge Farm (part of and excluding the brownfield land) is supported for housing, community infrastructure, outdoor sports area and a country park.</p> <p>CFS068 and CFS069 (Land at Lower Wyburn’s Farm) for residential development, 5-minute walk from existing bus stops with routes to major locations and a close connection to the A127.</p> <p>Lime House Nursery Industrial Park site – does not meet green belt objectives, highly sustainable as on a major bus route and a 5-minute walk to major food store.</p> <p>New village in East of district preferred.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					Castle Road recycling site for housing.
Q56c. Are there areas in Rayleigh that development should generally be presumed appropriate?	87	12	52	23	<p>Whilst respondents to this question mostly objected to development, the majority of comments made supported development for specific sites and Options.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No.</p> <p><b>Areas / Sites Presumed Appropriate</b></p> <p>Brown sites (that do not have a detrimental effect on current population and heritage) and derelict industrial areas.</p> <p>CFS171, 170 and 164 and all land between these sites should also be considered.</p> <p>CFS121, 137, 145, 146, 147, 167, 144, 168, 055 - access into existing road infrastructure (A127) and train station, will divert traffic away from Hockley and Hawkwell, and room for additional infrastructure.</p> <p>Areas to west of Rayleigh by Wosley Park development, where pooling of Wickford development can be used to meet growth target to release infrastructure funding.</p> <p>Option 3a West of Rayleigh.</p> <p>West of Rayleigh for access to main road (A127 / A130) and rail network, less impact on traffic in Rayleigh and Hockley.</p> <p>Land East of Hooley Drive;</p> <p>CFS087,COL07, CFS053, 086, 027.</p> <p>CFS044 / CFS256 would offer an opportunity to contribute to housing need in a green belt location that could maintain the purposes of green</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>belt which has reduced landscape quality and well screened from surrounding areas.</p> <p>Castle Road recycling centre – as is inadequate and causes traffic congestion.</p> <p>Lubards Farm area.</p>
Q56d. Are there areas that require protecting from development?	397	291	41	65	<p>The majority of respondents to this question supported protection from development, and comments also supporting protection presented specific areas, locations, sites and Strategic Options that they considered needed protecting. The main theme being presented was for protection of green infrastructure.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>All areas need to be protected.</p> <p>All areas green with trees, wildlife and open space.</p> <p>Medieval ancient woodlands.</p> <p>Water frontages and hill tops. All are ancient landscapes.</p> <p>All areas of green belt where planning declined, or appeals dismissed.</p> <p>All conservation areas should be protected. <b>Specific Areas / Locations / Sites / Options</b></p> <p>Green belt areas.</p> <p>Rayleigh Borders.</p> <p>Rawreth.</p> <p>CFS001 – green belt, impact on trees and agricultural land and flooding.</p>

						<p>CFS027 (access to Upper Roach valley / Hockley Woods), 029, 053, 098 and others in the local area around Bull Lane, Napier Road, Wellington Road and Albert Road (including horse paddock). These are green space areas used by public and wildlife, mature trees, bridleways, and flood risk – keeps the Rayleigh urbanisation separate from Eastwood and Hockley. Sites support a myriad of wildlife, e.g. badgers, bats, owls, foxes, rabbits, buzzards, pheasants and deer – used as wildlife corridor. These sites also intercept water which could otherwise flood adjacent (downhill) houses. Footpaths across sites are extremely well-used.</p> <p>CFS105, 053, 029, 027, 098, 086,087, 134,102,181, 207, 003, 014,037, 135,047,089, 178, and 157 - loss of green space would make little impact on overall housing target, and join Hockley Road with Eastwood Road impacting traffic.</p> <p>CFS053,086,027 because of proximity to Hockley Woods.</p> <p>CFS027, 053, 098, 086, 105, 163, 164, 146, 147, 121, 077, 171, - provide green access routes to other green belt / open spaces.</p> <p>CFS146 and 147 – provides a buffer avoiding continuous belt of housing, would cause significant harm to green belt and detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity and setting of Rawreth Hall and Grade 11 Listed Barn.</p> <p>CFS059 Sandhill Road, Eastwood – habitats, road infrastructure too narrow at site entrance, and road is private.</p> <p>CFS135 Land at Flemings Farm Road Eastwood.</p> <p>CFS037 The Ramblers &amp; Dahlia Lodge Eastwood Rise.</p> <p>CFS024 land north of Merryfields Avenue – woodland of environmental and ecological importance.</p> <p>CFS105 is a site of geological interest, provides unique deposits of Bagshot sand on Hambro Hill. In the NW corner of the site is a former tip covered in tarmac. Any development of the site threatens a dangerous spilling out into the surrounding area. Also, there is</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>insufficient road access onto Hambro Hill and lack of footpaths - <a href="http://www.essexfieldclub.org.uk/portal/p/Geology+Site+Account/s/Hambro+Hill+Sand+Pits/o/Hambro+Hill+Sand+Pits">http://www.essexfieldclub.org.uk/portal/p/Geology+Site+Account/s/Hambro+Hill+Sand+Pits/o/Hambro+Hill+Sand+Pits</a> , horse paddocks.</p> <p>Land behind Nelson Road (area of special character and wildlife habitat including slow worms) and at the end of Wellington Road should be protected.</p> <p>CFS134 and CFS037 – These woods and green spaces have a beautiful addition to the local area. The sites back on to ancient woodlands and accessed by narrow lanes, proximity to Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>CFS087 Land Between Western Road and Weir Farm Road – noise pollution will increase, traffic congestion.</p> <p>West Rayleigh – over development, not accessible by public transport.</p> <p>Proposed Urban Extension (Rayleigh) – traffic impact.</p> <p>Rayleigh town area.</p> <p>Areas either side and around London Road should be protected as this area is already overdeveloped with new housing on the old EON site.</p> <p>Fields along Rawreth Lane and London Road, and those separating Rayleigh and Hockley need protection as provides a buffer between Rayleigh and local towns. Offers vital flood plains against tidal river Crouch and from surface water flooding.</p> <p>COL07 is part of an ancient historical site known as Rayleigh Castle Outer Bailey.</p> <p>COL20 – historic and cultural importance.</p> <p>New England Wood (Woodland Trust) R10 (TQ832909): HC1 Ancient Woodland. SC18 Invertebrates listed as Species of Principal Importance in England.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>All farmland between Hockley Woods, Grove Woods and Rayleigh – should be included in Upper Roach valley regional park to protect Hockley Woods.</p> <p>All green areas between Hockley Road, Eastwood Road and Cherry orchard Road should be protected.</p> <p>Area to North of Great Wheatley road (CFS077) – not sustainable, natural habitats, woodland and access.</p> <p>Area between A127 and Eastern Road, Weir Farm Gardens and Western Road.</p> <p>All sites next to major roads (especially A127) should not be considered due to air and noise pollution.</p> <p>All areas which are on or adjacent to National Trails of Roach Valley Way and Saffron trail – CFS164, 128, 265, 151, 172, 033, 193, 190, 099, 074.</p> <p>CSF164, 148, 147, 146, 121 on grounds of over development, pollution, overcrowding, lack of infrastructure, traffic, and wellbeing of community.</p> <p>Lubbards Farm and surrounding areas – lack of infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Spatial Strategy Options 1 and 2</b> will add to existing issues with traffic and community infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Options 2a and 2b</b> will exacerbate traffic congestion.</p> <p><b>Option 4</b> – no.</p> <p>Sweyne Park and Grove Park.</p>	
	Q56e. Do you agree that the local green space shown on Figure 44 hold local significance? Are there any	55	17	6	32	<p>Most respondents agreed with this question, and comments agreeing made reference to other Open Spaces that they also considered had particular local significance due to informal recreational uses.</p>

	<p>other open spaces that hold particular local significance?</p>				<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Agree, but all green spaces, green belt and borders need protecting to prevent urban sprawl.</p> <p>Sites next to major roads (especially the A127).</p> <p>No additional green spaces should be identified as having local significance.</p> <p><b>Other Open Spaces that hold Particular Local Significance</b></p> <p>CFS105 – has footpaths that need protecting.</p> <p>New England Wood, and the area between Fishers Farm and The Cottons are significant to local residents, and Grove Wood.</p> <p>CFS027, 098, 029 and 053 should be considered as open space as have public footpaths and bridle paths.</p> <p>CFS105, 086, 164 and 163 – areas connecting these green spaces should also be protected.</p> <p>CFS077 (Land to the north of Great Wheatley Road as locally significant with footpath around, south of the railway line), 087 and 121.</p> <p>CFS086 – Turret House, bridleway should be retained.</p> <p>CFS059 should be marked as local wildlife area / open space.</p> <p>The space between Wellington Road and Bull Lane are significant.</p> <p>The green areas on COL07 and COL20 contribute to biodiversity.</p> <p>Garden rear of Barringtons building is significant as complements open space area of King George’s Playing Field.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>The whole region from Rayleigh Mount through to Rayleigh Trinity Church should be considered of local significance, incorporating Mill Hall and Windmill.</p> <p>The area around Hockley Woods, Grove and London woods and Cherry Orchard Country Park, including farmland is of significance to meet needs of community.</p>
SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities	Q57a. Do you agree with our vision for Rochford and Ashingdon?	53	5	32	16	<p>Most respondents did not agree with the vision, those that commented presented what they considered should be included. Supporting comment also presented what should be considered.</p> <p><b>Objecting / Suggesting Comments</b></p> <p>Not agree as existing infrastructure will not support vision.</p> <p>Proposed development is excessive and contrary to the vision.</p> <p>Community infrastructure provision needs emphasis.</p> <p>Scenery should be included.</p> <p>Children and older generation (suitable homes) should be included.</p> <p>The best way of ensuring that the vision is realized is by allocating suitable available deliverable sites for residential development on the edge of Rochford.</p> <p>Rochford and Ashingdon should remain a Tier 1 settlement. 'the gateway to our rural countryside' undermines the designation of these areas as a Tier 1 settlement.</p> <p>Do not agree with pedestrianisation of Rochford Square as will destroy remaining small businesses.</p> <p><b>Supporting / suggesting Comments</b></p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Description of centres is accurate, but provision of a new motorway is largely out of the question.</p> <p>Agree – historic character is key.</p> <p>Agree – should remain a gateway to rural areas.</p> <p>Agree but should include reference to the provision of new homes to meet local needs and help sustain existing services and facilities.</p> <p>Vision is appropriate given the Tier 2 status of these 2 settlements.</p> <p>Agree, but places too much emphasis on economic growth and should be amended to include a more balanced and holistic approach – Council should recognise the role of residential development has in supporting vitality and viability of town centres.</p>
<p>Q57b. With reference to Figure 45 and your preferred Strategy Option, do you think any of the land edged blue should be made available for any of the following uses? How could that improve the completeness of Rochford and Ashingdon?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</li> <li>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retail, other]</li> <li>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</li> </ol>	140	12	114	14	<p>The majority of respondents objected to land being made available for the given uses. Comments that supported the use of land presented a mix of housing and infrastructure uses with reference to specific sites and Strategic Options.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No major housing development within Rochford.</p> <p>Only consider for open spaces, allotments and community infrastructure e.g., healthcare, supermarket, education.</p> <p>Fields should be used for forestry, wind farming / solar panels only.</p> <p>Retail only.</p> <p>Rural areas only – back of Rochford.</p> <p>Only sites away from existing population centres and with new infrastructure.</p>

	4. Other				<p><b>Spatial Strategy Option 3a</b> would alleviate pressure on Hockley, Hawkwell, Ashingdon and Rochford.</p> <p><b>Option 3a</b> should be considered on land west of Rayleigh.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Sites</b></p> <p>CFS261 Doggetts Farm – most viable large size site and would negate need for any other sites to be developed in the future. Close to existing facilities, allowing for a very large area of natural wildlife.</p> <p>CFS261 Doggetts Farm – support for eco-village. Would allow safer link improvements between Rochford and Ashingdon and the schools.</p> <p>CFS261 Doggett’s should be used for wildlife conservation area not residential.</p> <p>CFS119 could be a good opportunity to expand open space and recreation at Ashingdon Park.</p> <p>CFS217 Land at Doggetts Chase, Rochford should be made available for specialist older people homes as sustainable location and would support proposed vision for Rochford town centre. Would form part of <b>Options 2,3 or 4.</b></p> <p>CFS218 Land at Oxford Road, Rochford as no longer accessible for agriculture.</p> <p>Only for expansion of King George’s Fields to link the village hall and pavilion.</p> <p>Only to expand Upper Roach Valley Special Landscaped area using CFS083 Land South of Hall Road and west of Ark Lane, Rochford, CFS078 Land west of Cherry Orchard Way and south of Cherry Orchard Lane, Rochford, CFS079 Land west of Cherry Orchard Way and east of Cherry Orchard Lane, Rochford.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>CFS013 and CFS119 should only be used for community infrastructure – open space, allotments or as an extension to King George’s Playing Field.</p> <p>CFS007 and CFS126 – Land north of Brays Lane should be used to provide new homes and new public open space as locations already benefit from infrastructure and allows development to commence early in the Plan period. The site represents a logical infill adjacent to the existing settlement. Considered to have low potential to lead to unrestricted urban sprawl. Has readymade access to Brays Lane.</p> <p>CFS050 Land South of the former ACL Centre, Rocheway would enhance completeness of Rochford. 10-minute walk to train station.</p> <p>CFS095 considered suitable as in sustainable location and does not undermine the green belt.</p> <p>CFS081 and eastern part of CFS082 should be made available for housing for strategy <b>Option 2b</b> as could improve completeness of Rochford and Ashingdon.</p> <p>CFS067 (Sutton Road) should be made available for residential development as sustainable location.</p> <p>CFS160, 161 and 074 suitable.</p> <p>CFS084 Land South of Hall Road provides suitable site.</p> <p>Only small sites and intensification should be used in Rochford town.</p>
Q57c. Are there areas in Rochford and Ashingdon that development should generally be presumed appropriate?	35	12	16	7	<p>Most respondents objected to development. Comments supporting development presented specific areas, locations and sites presumed appropriate.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Enough development already.</p>

						<p>Large scale sites that do not border people's homes.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Areas / Locations / Sites Presumed Appropriate</b></p> <p>Rochford town centre should be the focus of any building.</p> <p>CFS095 is supported due to its high-quality walking and cycling permeability of the site. Meets sustainable transport objectives.</p> <p>North of Rochford Garden Way should only be considered for minor / small development.</p> <p>Brownfield sites for housing.</p> <p>Farm land should be considered for wind farms, solar panels or country park.</p> <p>CFS261, but not the section which borders Lingfield Drive.</p> <p>Southend Airport would make an ideal building plot.</p> <p>Back Lane car park as underused.</p> <p>Rochford 100 Golf Club due to proximity to rail station and easy access to road network.</p> <p>CFS081 and Eastern half of CFS082 should be presumed appropriate as within sustainable walking distance to Rochford town centre and would effectively continue the urban area around planned open space.</p> <p>CFS084 Land South of Hall Road, CFS078 Land west of Cherry Orchard as will have little impact on already congested roads with good access to the A127 and train station.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	Q57d. Are there areas that require protecting from development?	108	81	17	10	<p>Most respondents supported protection from development and most comments made reference to specific areas, locations and sites, presenting themes of infrastructure and flood.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Farmland.</p> <p>All areas – traffic congestion.</p> <p>All green areas.</p> <p>Rural communities.</p> <p>Green belt land.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Areas / Locations / Sites that Require Protecting</b></p> <p>CFS013 and 119 due to views (namely historical Ashingdon Hill and St Andrew’s Church), offer peace and tranquility to existing bordering homes.</p> <p>SER8 (current Allocations Plan).</p> <p>CFS159 – area of woodland, bordered by Ashingdon Hill.</p> <p>Local green spaces.</p> <p>Sites South of Napier Road, Land North of Bull Lane, The Tower, Hockley – each form the eastern end of the ‘lung’.</p> <p>CFS105 – due to habitats and increased flood risk to Hambro Hill.</p> <p>CFS053, 098 and 027 provide a defined boundary between Rayleigh, Hockley and Eastwood providing a wild life corridor.</p> <p>Areas either side of Hall Road.</p>
--	---	-----	----	----	----	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>Site north of Cherry Orchard Country Park and South of Hall Road should be seen as extension of the Park.</p> <p>Sites north (badger sets within) / south of Brays Lane due to insufficient road infrastructure.</p> <p>CFS126, 129, 130, 131, 007, 261,119, 013, 261, 217 due to walking paths and creation of urban sprawl.</p> <p>CFS180, 013, 129 – flood risk, green belt harm.</p> <p>CFS119, 130, 131 – flood risk, green belt harm, impact on agricultural land.</p> <p>CFS261 Land East of Oxford Road – flood risk, green belt harm, impact on local habitats, impact on protected trees and safeguarded minerals, impact on agricultural land, road infrastructure inadequate.</p> <p>CFS261 Land east of Oxford Road, CFS141 Stewards Elm Farm Great Stambridge, CFS116 Land South Coombes Farm, CFS111 Land North Coombes Farm , CFS124 Land East of Little Stambridge Hall – all would increase traffic congestion on access routes via Ashingdon Road, Bradley way and the Rochford One Way system on Stambridge Road.</p> <p>CFS074, 194, 169, 150, 020 – road infrastructure inadequate.</p> <p>CFS045, 046, 064,160, 161,074, 194, 169, 150, 020, 023, 261, COL38 – inadequate infrastructure, unsustainable.</p> <p>CFS008 – damage to environment and wildlife.</p> <p>CFS035.</p> <p>CFS126, 081, 082, 084, 079, 078, 083, 085, 217 - flood risk, green belt harm, impact on protected trees and safeguarded minerals, impact on agricultural land.</p> <p>CFS216 Land at Fambridge Road, Ashingdon – keep clear for school and children’s benefit, within Coastal Protection Belt Special</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Landscape Area, would cause coalescence of Ashingdon, South Fambridge and Hockley (urban sprawl).</p> <p>CFS133 increased traffic congestion, flooding and urban sprawl.</p> <p>Magnolia Park.</p> <p>Doggetts Chase site – natural features within (wildlife area), farm house is of historic value.</p> <p>The Chase, Ashingdon and Ashingdon Hill bordering The Chase – The Chase is a private road and so no right of way for access to these sites.</p> <p>CFS124 Land East of Little Stambridge Hall Lane, Rochford – due to being positioned under Southend Airport flight path / runway – noise and air pollution.</p> <p>CFS111 Land North of Coombes Grove, Rochford – under flight path / proximity to runway.</p> <p>COL83 Millview Meadows, CFS050 Land of Former Adult Community College – as local amenity to the South of Tinkers Lane, Rochford.</p> <p>CFS067 Three Ashes, Land.</p> <p>COL27 Freight House Car Park, Rochford, COL13 The Freight House, Bradley Way, Rochford – community facilities.</p>
Q57e. Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 45 hold local significance? Are there any	23	15	3	5	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Agree, but need more. All green space is significant. Need more allotments.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	other open spaces that hold particular local significance?					<p>Agree King Georges Fields Ashingdon – community asset.</p> <p>Edwards Hall Park - serves the informal recreational needs of residents of Eastwood and provides important pedestrian / equestrian gateway into Cherry Orchard Jubilee Country park.</p>
<b>SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities</b>	Q58a. Do you agree with our vision for Hockley and Hawkwell? Is there anything you feel is missing?	84	4	41	39	<p><b>Specific References to the Vision</b></p> <p>Concern that some aspects of the vision (focusing on retaining village character and being the gateway to the ‘green lung’ of the Upper Roach Valley were at odds with many of the promoted sites and general plans for housing growth.</p> <p>ECC considered the vision of a ‘complete community’ to be good in principle, but which would need detailed consideration of each community’s capacity going forward, to determine what infrastructure would be required to accommodate any further growth, along with other key considerations, such as flood risk. ECC will work closely with the Council on future stages of the LP to help inform this.</p> <p>Hawkwell-specific issues included a desire for additional retail/community infrastructure and recreation spaces. Also, a feeling that the village was being subsumed into wider Hockley/Rochford and losing its identity.</p> <p>Hawkwell Parish Council was keen to make the distinction between Hockley, which had a more urban centre, and Hawkwell, which comprised largely residential areas and green spaces. As a result, the parish Council considered that Hawkwell needed its own, separate, vision. The Parish Council considered the protection of Hawkwell’s green spaces and recreation areas to be paramount, although did agree with the need to address housing affordability issues.</p>

						<p><i>Agree / Missing</i></p> <p>A number of comments agreed with the principle of the vision, with some recognition that housing was needed, but that this needed to be done in a sustainable way.</p> <p>Residents who supported the vision generally felt that Hockley should retain its character and status as a gateway to the District's open spaces, with ancient woodlands and a strong network of local footpaths. As such, some respondents stressed that any development needed to be sustainable and proportionate, with smaller 'infill' developments (e.g., the 'Spencers' or Christmas Tree Farm developments) highlighted as good examples. The principle of building en masse on large agricultural fields was less favoured.</p> <p>Some support for additional services and facilities in the villages.</p> <p>The vision was also supported by several agents/developers who were promoting sites in the area and keen to express how their sites could contribute to aspects of the vision. Reasons given included: the provision of a range of housing to meet the community's needs; the provision of affordable housing (or increasing housing supply to aid housing affordability); the enhancement/preservation of key natural habitats and open spaces (e.g., through additional planting, landscaping and biodiversity net gain projects); the enhancement of access to such spaces and the trails connecting them; the provision of self/custom-build plots. One response supported the delivery of affordable housing, but that this would only be possible through the delivery of a viable market housing development to help pay for this.</p> <p><i>Object / Missing</i></p> <p>A sizeable majority objected to the draft vision presented in the Document, with the key points on these as follows:</p> <p><u>Overdevelopment</u></p> <p>Many thought proposals for Hockley and Hawkwell represented overdevelopment which would undermine the character of the 'villages, whilst the numbers potentially proposed through the number of sites,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>along with increased density in existing neighbourhoods, could be unsustainable.</p> <p><u>Green Belt and Open Space</u> Concern at the potential loss of open spaces and farmland accessed via public rights of way, along with concern at impact on remaining green spaces and wildlife habitats, including ancient woodland, from greater numbers of people visiting for recreation.</p> <p><u>Community Infrastructure:</u> Many residents were concerned that additional housing growth in Hockley &amp; Hawkwell would overwhelm existing schools, nurseries, GP surgeries and dentists, along with Southend Hospital, all of which were already felt by many to be at capacity.</p> <p><u>Roads and transport:</u> The capacity of the B1013 was questioned, with many consultees feeling further development in the area would overwhelm a road already under considerable strain and often in poor repair. General presumption in responses that a new home would lead to at least 2 additional cars. Some comments felt existing public transport and provision in the area very poor, with bus service irregular and trains often already full at peak times. Several comments that cycle network locally is also very poor, with few dedicated off-road routes. All this meant new residents would be more likely to travel by car, adding to congestion issues.</p> <p><u>Pollution and air quality:</u> Concerns from some over the addition of large numbers of cars and congestion on local roads if new housing developments approved (coupled with the loss of trees which help mitigate against this). Concern that development, loss of vegetation and increased traffic would also be contrary to national priorities to reduce CO2 emissions. Noise pollution, both from traffic and construction, also cited as a worry.</p> <p><u>Specific Sites</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>A number of objections were based on opposition to particular sites being developed, rather than a comment on the draft vision itself. These comprised the following:</p> <p>CFS024: Concern about impact on adjacent nature reserve and protected trees, along with surface flooding.</p> <p>CFS064: Concerns regarding loss of rural feel; loss of wildlife habitats; valued local footpath; loss of agricultural land; additional traffic congestion on local roads and B1013; impact on local primary school; air pollution; poor site access via private roads.</p> <p>CFS074: Comment that the land needs to be conserved to retain sense of openness, biodiversity and farmland. Unhappiness at potential loss of a valued facility for young people.</p> <p>CFS259: Concern at flood risk, effect on bridle path, impact on wildlife and strain on local roads and community infrastructure.</p> <p>CFS263: Concern at flood risk, effect on bridle path, impact on wildlife and strain on local roads and community infrastructure.</p> <p>CFS264: Concern regarding impact on ancient woodland and public footpaths, harm to wildlife and loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Sites CFS004, CFS020, CFS150, CFS169, CFS194 raised some objections due to concerns over flooding, congestion and strain on infrastructure.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Several responses praised the area’s peaceful village environment, excellent recreational facilities and access to the natural environment, but expressed concern or doubt as to how additional housing could be accommodated in Hockley and Hawkwell, given the capacity of existing infrastructure and considerable constraints on the road network as a result of the historic street patterns.</p> <p>Comments highlighted the lack of affordable housing in the area, with the Right to Buy having drastically reduced housing stock. As a result,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>one comment felt only wealthy, middle-aged people could now afford to live in Hockley. Parish Council expressed a need for housing to address the issue of 'hidden homeless' and for all new developments to include social housing.</p> <p>Some acknowledged the need for younger and first-time buyers to find somewhere to live (including Hockley Parish Council), and hoped that the right housing for these residents could be created.</p> <p>Similarly, some comments identified a need for specialist accommodation for the elderly, which would help single people downsize from large homes, freeing these up for families. Suitable accommodation could include bungalows or purpose-built flats, whilst the importance of building 'lifetime homes' that would allow people to adapt to their own homes with age was highlighted. However, a comment noted that existing sheltered housing at Poplar Court and Lime Court was at risk of being lost.</p> <p>A developer felt that a good mix of different types of market housing (not only limited to 'affordable' housing) was the best way to ensure wider housing affordability, with an increased supply of housing on the market helping to make it more accessible.</p> <p>A number of comments felt all brownfield sites should be evaluated and prioritised before any other sites considered.</p> <p>Some questioned whether any housing was needed at all.</p> <p>Some responses worried about promoted sites on agricultural land and felt that these should be retained for agriculture and food production.</p> <p>One comment expressed concern regarding whether there was sufficient local supermarket/shop provision to cater for population growth, along with whether there was sufficient local employment for residents.</p> <p>A response from the SE Essex Organic Gardeners Society identified a considerable shortage of allotment sites in Hockley and Hawkwell and called for more to be allocated.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Some responses felt that any development needed to be small-scale and sustainable, embodying energy-efficient construction methods to make them carbon-neutral. This could also be combined with self-build plots to satisfy the Council’s register.</p> <p>There was a desire for more control over the types of shops in Hockley Town Centre – particularly in relation to the number of take-aways. Also, a desire for additional retail facilities in Hawkwell. Another view that some of the retail units on Spa Road to be of poor visual appearance and in need of improvement, whilst the landmark Spa Hotel was in need of a full restoration.</p> <p>Many comments felt that significant investments would need to be made in terms of transport and community infrastructure to mitigate the pressure from additional homes. The example of the Hall Road Estate, Rochford, which did not deliver the expected primary school or GP surgery, was cited as a cause for concern.</p> <p>A deep desire to preserve local open spaces, woodlands, nature reserves and the Green Belt ran through many responses. Local appreciation for green and open spaces has strengthened during the Covid-19 pandemic, something which greater flexibility to work from home will continue to support.</p> <p>A developer sought to suggest how development could enhance access to existing open spaces and provide enhancements to existing natural and recreational green spaces.</p> <p>All acknowledgement of housing need was set against wider concerns on overdevelopment and pressure on existing infrastructure and the Green Belt. Some felt the only housing developed should be affordable.</p> <p>Many residents felt strongly that Hockley Woods and surrounding Upper Roach Valley needed to be protected and preserved, along with the much-valued local network of public rights of way, and that further development would erode the capacity of these spaces for wildlife and tranquillity.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Hockley Parish Council stressed importance of ensuring the town did not merge into surrounding settlements through development.</p> <p>Numerous comments were concerned that Hockley and Hawkwell already had infrastructure (i.e., schools, GP surgeries and dentists) that was oversubscribed.</p> <p>Hockley Parish Council felt some recreation spaces needed upgraded facilities, including additional toilets and upgraded play equipment.</p> <p>The B1013 was frequently cited as a major issue, given it already experiences severe congestion and has no room for widening or expansion. Some residents were concerned that this would emergency service access. The Spa roundabout was a notable bottleneck for traffic, whilst Hockley Town Centre was noted to have significant parking problems. Overall, the B1013 and Spa Road roundabout were seen by many to be an insurmountable barrier to any significant development in the area.</p> <p>A view that styling the villages as a 'gateway' was inappropriate, given current traffic congestion issues.</p> <p>Comments felt that Hockley's present bus service was insufficient, as it was not frequent enough and prone to delays due to traffic congestion.</p> <p>Similarly, cycling infrastructure not felt to be sufficient and sufficient cycle routes needed to be provided separate to main roads to prevent congestion. More widely, a District-wide review of strategic cycle infrastructure was needed. Hockley Parish Council considered that all new developments should be planned with cycle paths and walkways linking to existing footpaths.</p>	
	Q58b. With reference to Figure 46 and your preferred Strategy Option, do you think any of the land edged blue	638	26	586	26	<p>This question attracted one of the largest responses of any in the consultation, largely due to a considerable body of reps on a single promoted site, CFS064. More than half the responses on this question related wholly or partly to this site.</p>

	<p>should be made available for any of the following uses?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</li> <li>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retail, other]</li> <li>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</li> <li>4. Other</li> </ol>				<p>Due to the volume of responses received, this summary is divided into general views on proposed uses in the Hockley/Hawkwell area, and site-specific ones.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Many comments expressed views on various land uses or needs in Hockley and Hawkwell but did not reference specific sites for these.</p> <p>Many residents were concerned about the cumulative number of houses the sites shaded blue on the map could amount to, and the consequent impacts on the existing community and loss of Green Belt and countryside this could entail.</p> <p>Many comments felt the area had already seen too much development, and that existing infrastructure and the transport network was unable to accommodate any further development, especially housing.</p> <p>Responses Generally felt blue promoted sites should be left as Green Belt, open space or farmland, although there were alternative suggestions of uses which might be welcome on some sites, such as designated open spaces, nature reserves or community facilities (See site-specific comments below).</p> <p>The capacity of the B1013 and Spa roundabout widely raised as a concern, whilst various sites had implications for other roads feeding from the area, including Church Road, Lower Road and Ashingdon Road. Frequently noted that Hockley and Hawkwell only have a small number of road access points into the villages, and that these were already under considerable strain. A lack of investment in dedicated cycleways or buses was mentioned as a further barrier to housing capacity in the area. Many residents felt these facilities needed considerable upgrading prior to any further housing growth.</p> <p>Preservation of wildlife and biodiversity raised widely. Lockdown brought more residents into their local areas on walks, leading to strong feelings that local habitats should be protected and concern that many of the areas shaded blue were very close to sensitive habitats. Some noted successful conservation efforts in the area in recent years which had led to an abundance of many species, but that this was</p>

						<p>potentially under threat if development led to habitat degradation and removal of wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Many comments were concerned with potential loss of valued public rights of way, many of which were felt to give Hockley and Hawkwell their special character amongst a network of green spaces.</p> <p>Some felt the area either did not need additional housing, or that any housing that was built would not be occupied by locals who needed it. Many respondents felt developers preferred to build large 4/5+ bedroom homes for buyers from London, rather than local first-time buyers and young families. Generally felt that any new housing schemes would not deliver sufficient starter homes or affordable housing.</p> <p>In terms of uses which respondents felt would be suitable for areas shaded blue, these were largely limited to publicly-accessible open/recreation space, education/healthcare/community facilities or allotments. These uses attracted mainly very positive comments.</p> <p>Many comments considered loss of agricultural farmland unacceptable, whilst the biodiversity supported by existing hedgerows was considered important to protect.</p> <p>Sites to the East of Hawkwell in particular (i.e., around Rectory Road) were raised as potentially at risk of fluvial flooding from Hawkwell Brook, being low-lying. Elsewhere, numerous sites were claimed to had surface flooding or drainage issues, which would require a thorough analysis.</p> <p>Rectory Road was flagged as a road of concern, with multiple development sites considered to have the potential to cause severe congestion on a busy route which already experienced bottlenecks due to the railway underpass.</p> <p>There was a general feeling that existing healthcare and school facilities were insufficient for the needs of the existing population, and many comments welcomed further details regarding the delivery of these for Hockley and Hawkwell. However, there was some cynicism in comments that development would help deliver these, with the Hall</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Road scheme in Rochford cited as an example of promised infrastructure not materialising.</p> <p>Allotments were viewed positively in several comments, enabling people to grow their own food and providing a source of social, mental and physical wellbeing, particularly for older people.</p> <p>Proposals for new leisure facilities were welcomed for the area.</p> <p>A significant number of comments did express a desire for more housing in the area. These were usually people who acknowledged there was a need for some more housing, but that this should be prioritised for brownfield/previously-developed sites, and small-scale, avoiding changing Hockley/Hawkwell’s character. Others expressed a strong desire for affordable housing, particularly to allow younger generations to get their own home, with one response noting that young adults were living with parents longer and on-street parking was becoming more prevalent as a result. Many local residents who did believe more housing was needed did, however, want to see firm details of infrastructure improvements accompanying any proposals.</p> <p>Developers and agents sought to promote their sites. It was mentioned that Hockley’s infrastructure was superior to that in some other parts of the District earmarked for possible development, such as Hullbridge.</p> <p>Some responses felt that the range of promoted sites was not in keeping with an agenda to promote sustainability and fight climate change, as developing many of the sites would result in both a loss of trees and biodiversity, whilst also generating additional traffic and carbon emissions. Linked to this, several residents were concerned about proposals to develop green space with the likelihood of extreme weather events and surface flooding predicted to increase.</p> <p>Some responses backed any plans to attract further commercial investment to the area, and one comment highlighted the need for affordable office space in the Hockley area for local businesses. However, other comments felt additional employment or retail sites would add to traffic congestion problems.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Some considered Hockley Town Centre to be a suitable place to develop further, to provide more facilities for the community and good quality retail/food &amp; drink facilities. A number of vacant units were noted, along with some whose appearance required improvement.</p> <p>Although outside the area, site CFS261 in Rochford attracted considerable numbers of objections from Hawkwell and Hockley residents, who felt this would impact unacceptably on Ashingdon Road, which would in turn add to pressures on Rectory Road and the B1013.</p> <p>A number of respondents suggested the Magees Nursery site (currently not promoted) as a brownfield alternative to developing Green Belt sites around Rectory Road.</p> <p>Some comments felt that sites closer to Rochford and Cherry Orchard Way, such as CFS078 and CFS081, would be more suitable, as they are better-positioned in relation to the strategic road network and further from existing residential areas, reducing the potential for congestion.</p> <p>Some Rayleigh residents expressed concern at proposals in the Hockley area, as traffic would be likely to use the B1013 and further impact on congestion to the West.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Sites</b></p> <p>CFS002: Objections due to loss of habitats, biodiversity, agricultural land and green space, visual impact on the landscape, along with impact on road network and community infrastructure.</p> <p>CFS017: Objections due to loss of habitats, biodiversity, and green space.</p> <p>CFS018: Objection due to loss of habitats, biodiversity, and green space. A comment felt developing this site would add additional strain on local roads already under pressure due to the Clements Gate development.</p> <p>CFS020: Concern over surface flooding risk from Hawkwell Brook and impact on traffic congestion. Comments noted the site is close to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Glencroft Open Space and contributes to biodiversity as a wildlife corridor, something which could be affected by development. Other issues included impact on the local roads of increased traffic and congestion; a lack of infrastructure to support walking and cycling; and the visual impact on nearby historic church.</p> <p>CFS023: The site attracted a large number of objections on the following issues:</p> <p>Location of site within the buffer zone of a local wildlife site (Beckney Wood) raised as a matter of concern, given the potential for development to degrade the ancient woodland.</p> <p>Existing access via Harrogate Drive is single track with no footpaths and is inadequate – would need widening, resulting in loss of a hedgerow and ditch.</p> <p>Loss of trees on site, as well as to facilitate an access, resulting in loss of habitats for wildlife. Several residents reported sightings of protected species on the site, and many considered the site to have high ecological value.</p> <p>Risk of surface flooding and subsidence to neighbouring properties due to the gradient of the site and soil type.</p> <p>No mains sewer in the area and low water pressure reported.</p> <p>Inadequate nature of local roads for access and parking.</p> <p>Impact on existing community infrastructure.</p> <p>Disruption of laying utilities to service the site.</p> <p>Impact On Greensward Lane and Ashingdon Road from additional traffic.</p> <p>A response suggested that existing site access constraints via Harrogate Drive would mean the site would need a new access on to Lower Road, but that in this event the adjoining COL38 could form part of a cycle link, providing a sustainable way of accessing Hockley.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>A comment in support felt site was suitable for infill development to provide housing to meet needs of local first-time buyers, families, and elderly, due to its location close to main bus route and within walking distance of schools and Hockley Town Centre (which additional housing could help support). Also noted that the site was an opportunity to extend mains drainage to a number of existing properties in the area not currently served.</p> <p>In support of the site’s allocation as part of the ‘Woodside Park’ proposals, the agent promoting it highlighted the following reasons:</p> <p>Site is in walking distance to the station, schools, surgery, and shops.</p> <p>Site envisaged to deliver a range of different housing types, including for families, bungalows, housing for older people, affordable housing and self/custom-build. This would contribute significantly towards the District’s housing needs.</p> <p>Site could provide substantial new areas of public open space, play facilities, habitat, and landscaping, supporting biodiversity on site.</p> <p>Studies commissioned suggest no major landscape, ecological, heritage, utilities, or drainage constraints to development.</p> <p>The agent considered the <i>Green Belt Study</i> has overstated the contribution of this piece of Green Belt Land by including it in a much larger site assessment, and that if looking in more granularity at the specific site, its contribution to Green Belt purposes is not as significant. Cited own Green Belt assessment to support arguments.</p> <p>CFS024: this site attracted significant opposition on the grounds that:</p> <p>It is adjacent to Marylands Nature Reserve Local Wildlife Site. Developing it for housing would have an impact on the adjacent wildlife habitat, given this site can function as a ‘buffer’ site and corridor for wildlife.</p> <p>Protected species observed on the site.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Loss of protected trees on the site.</p> <p>Contrary to draft Strategic Priorities 5 and 20.</p> <p>Impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Poor access from adjoining residential streets. Increased street parking and through-traffic, leading to road safety issues on narrow roads.</p> <p>Sewage overflow issues.</p> <p>Heightened risk of surface water flooding on nearby properties, which had experienced this in the past. This would be exacerbated by loss of trees.</p> <p>The presence of a stream on-site, which could flood if interfered with. Disruption from construction traffic on already poor-quality roads.</p> <p>Alternative uses proposed for the site included additional woodland or community allotments.</p> <p>CFS036: Objection received due to loss of habitats, biodiversity, green space, green fields, nature; agricultural land.</p> <p>CFS039: Objections received due to loss of habitats; biodiversity; green space; green fields; nature; agricultural land; and additional strain on local roads already under pressure due to the Clements Gate development.</p> <p>CFS040: Raised comments concerning traffic and road safety on Folly Lane/Church Road, with the latter being very narrow, without footpaths and popular amongst cyclists and equestrians; the recent planning approval of two large residential properties on the site, which may make it unsuitable for allocation in a Local Plan; loss of habitats, biodiversity, green space, green fields, nature and agricultural land; and surface flooding concerns.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>CFS045: Attracted a sizeable number of objections, with Belchamps seen as a vital resource for young people and promoting active lifestyles, as well as an important buffer zone for the nearby Hockley Woods, providing habitat for wildlife. The single lane nature of access roads to the site was also mentioned as a major barrier to development, along with impact on the nearby B1013 and general lack of infrastructure capacity in the area.</p> <p>CFS049: Objection due to loss of Green Belt land. A further comment highlighted the unsustainable location of this site in terms of transport, with a dangerous junction, poor bus service, lack of cycle route and distance from the station.</p> <p>CFS064: This site attracted a very large volume of representations. Most responses objecting to this site were worded in an identical or similar way, and many objectors made no other response to the consultation, suggesting local organisation against the site was the primary driver of these responses. Key concerns raised in relation to the site were as follows:</p> <p>Proximity of the site to 3 ancient woodlands/local wildlife sites, raising concerns about impact on biodiversity and wildlife habitats if site was developed.</p> <p>Some comments noted seeing protected species on the site.</p> <p>Betts Wood raised particular concern, given this patch of ancient woodland could be cut off by development, preventing wildlife from travelling to/from the wood.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Impact on a valued public right of way around the perimeter, which was heavily used for recreation.</p> <p>Concerns around impact on local infrastructure (including schools and healthcare) and road network, particularly the B1013 and Folly Lane. Impact on local roads on Betts Farm Estate and concerns on road safety for children at nearby primary school.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Increased air pollution because of development and increased traffic.</p> <p>Difficult road access to site via narrow private road or through site of Community Centre.</p> <p>Presence of several protected trees on site access points.</p> <p>Impact on local landscape and loss of Green Belt. Visual impact on listed church.</p> <p>Sewage/drainage issues, demonstrated by nearby Pond Chase development.</p> <p>Risk of surface flooding could impact railway line.</p> <p>Concern about the impact on the existing community centre and pre-school.</p> <p>A lack of infrastructure in the area to support walking and cycling also mentioned.</p> <p>Suggestions of other uses for CFS064 included as designated open space/woodland; a site for expanding Hockley Primary School; a far smaller development of community-led, self-build housing; or a visitor centre linked to adjoining ancient woodlands. Many felt it should be retained as arable farmland, citing the importance of food security and self-sufficiency.</p> <p>CFS074: Attracted a large number of objections, citing:</p> <p>Capacity of existing infrastructure to accommodate further housing growth, along with the likely impact of congestion on the already-strained B1013.</p> <p>Several residents along this stretch of the road were also worried about increased noise/air pollution from an increased traffic accessing this large site.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Alongside this, the current bus service was noted as being poor and inadequate to mitigate against increased traffic volumes due to development.</p> <p>A lack of infrastructure to support walking and cycling also mentioned.</p> <p>No cycle route in the area.</p> <p>Loss of biodiversity, hedgerows and wildlife corridors which currently connect Hockley Woods, Gusted Hall Woods and other important wildlife sites.</p> <p>Impact on popular local public rights of way and bridleways, some of which are historic routes, used regularly by locals for recreation.</p> <p>The need to retain agricultural land.</p> <p>Site's proximity to the Belchamps scout site raised concerns amongst some respondents.</p> <p>Visual impact on the landscape and far-reaching views that would result from a loss of open Green Belt land within the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>Impact on small, single-track roads surrounding the site.</p> <p>A suggestion for the site was for it to form an extension of Cherry Orchard Country Park and Gusted Hall Woods.</p> <p>The agent promoting CFS074 supported its allocation for up to 400 homes, stating the following:</p> <p>Site has the potential to contribute significantly to provision of market and affordable housing, helping meet local needs.</p> <p>In addition, it could also contribute to upgrading of existing infrastructure, subject to future Infrastructure Delivery Plan publication.</p> <p>To meet the District's housing targets, some release of Green Belt will be required.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Housebuilder’s own Green Belt assessment claims the site makes a lower contribution to Green Belt purposes than that of the Council, whilst the proposal seeks to provide a significant area of open space in the Western part of the site to mitigate the visual impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Site is of limited ecological interest and in the course of development habitat would be improved through provision of significant greenspace on the site and biodiversity net gain measures.</p> <p>Site is well-situated on a main bus route between Hockley, Rochford, and Southend, whilst various amenities and infrastructure in Hockley and Hawkwell are within walking distance.</p> <p>CFS082: Highlighted as unsuitable for development by some comments, citing the capacity of existing infrastructure to accommodate further housing growth, along with likely impact of congestion on the already-strained B1013; loss of habitats, bio-diversity, green space, green fields, nature and agricultural land; and visual impact on the landscape.</p> <p>CFS088: Objections due to loss of habitats, trees, bio-diversity, green space, green fields, nature and agricultural land; increased traffic in narrow local roads such as Clements Hall Lane which would disturb tranquillity and conflict with use by equestrians; site was felt to be far from public transport links and would impact the B1013; and the cumulative effect of such sites on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>CFS093: Objections due to loss of habitats, bio-diversity, green space, green fields, nature; agricultural land; increased traffic in narrow local roads such as Victor Gardens would disturb tranquillity and conflict with use by equestrians; and the cumulative effect of sites such as this on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>CFS105: Objection on basis it would negatively impact the openness of the Green Belt between Rayleigh &amp; Hockley.</p> <p>CFS118: A comment felt this site should not be developed, in keeping with environmental and local residents’ concerns. Noted that it was</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>retained following the granting of permission to the Clements Gate/Christmas Tree Farm development to retain green separation from Rectory Road and may have a legal agreement enforcing its protection. Further comments noted any road exit to the main road would be unsafe, and that the local road network was already overcrowded due to the Clements Gate development.</p> <p>CFS132: A comment felt developing this site would add additional strain on local roads already under pressure due to the Clements Gate development.</p> <p>CFS140: A comment felt developing this site would add additional strain on local roads already under pressure due to the Clements Gate development.</p> <p>CFS150: Objections over loss of Green Belt and trees; overlooking of existing properties and impact on the road network, along with surface flooding risk from Hawkwell Brook; a lack of infrastructure in the area to support walking and cycling; heightened road safety concerns; proximity to Glencroft Open Space, home to birds of prey and contributes to biodiversity as a wildlife corridor, something which could be affected by development; and impact on existing community infrastructure was raised.</p> <p>CFS156: Several comments concerned at the loss of sheltered housing allocating these sites would result in.</p> <p>CFS160 &amp; CFS161: These sites raised concerns over their proximity to Hockley Woods and lack of a buffer zone between possible development and ancient woodland, along with loss of Green Belt land and wildlife corridors. Felt to have an inappropriate impact on the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area. Several comments felt this development would erode the ancient woodland. Impact on the nearby B1013 and lack of infrastructure/amenities in the area also raised.</p> <p>CFS169: Objecting comments cited flood risk from Hawkwell Brook; impact on the local roads, and their safety; impact on the B1013; a lack of infrastructure in the area to support walking and cycling; proximity to Glencroft Open Space, home to birds of prey and a wildlife corridor</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>which could be affected by development; loss of agricultural land; the cumulative effect of sites such as this on existing community infrastructure; and the visual impact on nearby listed church.</p> <p>CFS191: Some comments felt the site would lead to added pressure on the B1013 and on existing infrastructure. A comment stressed the importance of retaining existing bridleways, whilst others expressed concern at proposed development so close to Hockley Woods, in or near the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area. Surface water drainage issues also flagged.</p> <p>CFS194: This site attracted a significant number of comments in opposition, including the following points:</p> <p>Concern over flood risk from Hawkwell Brook (which has flooded in the past). Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Impact on the road network, particularly the B1013, as the site was deemed to generate a large number of private car journeys by local residents, due to lack of sustainable transport options or amenities in the vicinity.</p> <p>Site is far from railway stations.</p> <p>Increased traffic on local roads also felt to create safety issues and has already led to increased air and noise pollution, whilst Rectory Road was noted to be a traffic bottleneck which could not be widened and which had no bus service.</p> <p>A lack of infrastructure in the area to support walking and cycling, with Rectory Road too narrow for a cycle path.</p> <p>Possible loss of popular local public rights of way which provide an alternative to walking on Rectory Road and surrounding streets with no pavements.</p> <p>Loss of productive agricultural land.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Proximity to Glencroft Open Space, a wildlife corridor, which could be affected by development. Protected species were noted on the site.</p> <p>Limited community infrastructure in the area for volume of housing proposed.</p> <p>Several respondents suggested the Magees Nursery site (currently not promoted) as a brownfield alternative to developing Green Belt sites around Rectory Road.</p> <p>The visual impact on nearby listed church listed as a concern.</p> <p>In support of its allocation as a housing site, the agent promoting the site made the following points:</p> <p>The site would prove a supply of c.200 market and affordable houses with a range of tenures to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>Areas of the site falling within Flood Zones 2 and 3 would not be developed, and could be used as green, open space and screening the development from the church/road.</p> <p>Development of the site would result in creation of a new, enhanced defensible Green Belt boundary and increased planting and landscaping to the South of the site.</p> <p>The North of the site would be retained as an accessible public open space. Existing vegetation and hedgerows would be retained wherever possible, along with provision for new habitats and wildlife corridors.</p> <p>The site would be integrated into the existing network of public rights of way, and additional routes to these would be provided.</p> <p>Developing the site could deliver new community infrastructure, along with new footpaths and cycle routes. This would be developed in consultation with the local community and could include allotments, play areas, cycle routes and outdoor gym equipment.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>The agent contested findings of the Green Belt Study relating to the site’s contribution to the existing Green Belt, contending that releasing portions of the site for residential development could be achieved with minimal harm to the Green Belt, due to the strong boundaries present on and around the site (i.e., hedgerows and the railway line).</p> <p>CFS197; CFS199; CFS201; CFS204: In support of the site’s allocation as part of the ‘Woodside Park’ proposals, the agent promoting it on behalf of the developer highlighted the following reasons:</p> <p>The site is located in a sustainable location in terms of proximity to the station and amenities including schools, surgery, and shops within walking distance.</p> <p>Site is envisaged to deliver a range of different housing types, including for families, bungalows, housing for older people, affordable housing and self/custom-build. This would contribute significantly towards the District’s housing needs.</p> <p>The site could provide substantial new areas of public open space, play facilities, habitat, and landscaping, supporting biodiversity on site.</p> <p>Studies commissioned suggest no major landscape, ecological, heritage, utilities, or drainage constraints to development.</p> <p>The agent considered the Green Belt Study has overstated the contribution of this piece of Green Belt Land by including it in a much larger site assessment, and that if looking in more granularity at the specific site, its contribution to the Green Belt 5 purposes is not as significant. Provided details of their own Green Belt assessment to support arguments.</p> <p>CFS219: A comment felt developing this site would add additional strain on local roads already under pressure due to the Clements Gate development.</p> <p>CFS240: Objections due to concerns about impact on residential roads and the B1013; loss of wildlife habitat and Green Belt; the cumulative effect of sites such as this on existing infrastructure.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>CFS242: A comment in support considered this to be previously-developed land which would deliver housing with minimal Green Belt harm, whilst also being large enough to deliver new public open space.</p> <p>Comments objecting to the site mentioned additional traffic and parked cars on Victor Gardens; overlooking of existing homes; impact on local community infrastructure; the distance from amenities (meaning more car journeys); surface flooding issues; the loss of trees and biodiversity; and doubt that houses developed would be suitable or affordable for younger locals.</p> <p>CFS251: Objections over the impact on local wildlife; concern at proposed development so close to Hockley Woods; surface water drainage issues; the cumulative effects on local infrastructure; and the unsustainable location which would lead to increased traffic on the B1013.</p> <p>CFS259: Objection on the basis of threat to wildlife; the loss of a buffer to noise pollution from the road/railway; potential flood risk due to surface run-off; and with poor quality roads accessing the site.</p> <p>CFS262 (Rawal Pindi Nursery) attracted a significant number of comments in support of its redevelopment from a closed commercial site to a small, well-designed housing scheme which could help address some of the local housing need which many respondents acknowledged existed in the area. This site was generally viewed as previously-developed land where housing could represent an improvement, whilst the established vehicular access afforded good visibility to Main Road (see responses to Q58c for further details).</p> <p>The owner of adjoining plot supported the release of CFS262 from the Green Belt, along with their own plot, labelled 49 within Stage 2 Assessment Area AA78 within the Green Belt Study. Stated that the inclusion of these plots East of Main Road within the Green Belt was anomalous, given the existing development on the plots and their location immediately adjacent to the Hawkwell urban area, particularly anomalous given the development of the Highwell Gardens estate to the North. Noted the low-moderate harm to the Green Belt of releasing this plot.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>However, despite largely positive feedback, a small number of objections highlighted the unsustainable location of this site in terms of transport, with a dangerous junction, busy B1013, poor bus service, lack of cycle route and distance from the station. Concerns with cumulative impact on local infrastructure also raised.</p> <p>CFS263: Objections expressed worry over loss of Green Belt; the unsafe current access from Greensward Lane; potential loss of bridleway; drainage/surface flooding issues; loss of agricultural land and impact on local road network.</p> <p>In support of its development, the agent promoting this site (Land at Pulpits Farm) highlighted its suitability. Argument included the following points:</p> <p>To meet District’s housing needs, a proportion of housing will need to be developed in Hockley, which will inevitably mean some Green Belt release required.</p> <p>Given parts of the site are already developed, Green Belt Study notes developing these would result in only ‘moderate’ harm, whilst developer argues existing field boundaries can form a new, more easily-defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Location 12 mins walk from Hockley Station, close to existing bus routes and a short walk from schools, shops, and healthcare facilities, reducing car use. Developing the site could provide market and affordable housing, along with public open space and planting/landscaping for wildlife.</p> <p>A suggestion also made to use site for open space, allotments and healthcare.</p> <p>CFS264: Numerous objections received over inappropriate site access via Folly Chase private road, which was noted to be very narrow and unsafe for significant volumes of residential or construction traffic by the majority of residents on the road; increased traffic on Folly Lane/Church Road and Fountain Lane (parts of which are narrow, have no pavements and are prone to accidents); drainage and sewage</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>issues, which had been reported at the nearby Pond Chase development; loss of Green Belt land; and flood risk concerns.</p> <p>A comment in support considered this to be previously-developed land which would deliver housing with minimal Green Belt harm, whilst also being large enough to deliver new public open space.</p> <p>COL38: This site raised a number of concerns and objections from the local community, with a number of responses claiming that the site was designated a play area when the surrounding Malvern Road housing was developed in the 1970s. Site is reported to be owned by RDC and leased to Ashingdon Parish Council. Several responses felt the site should be formally designated/upgraded as a play space. Objections on basis of a loss of privacy for existing residents; unstable ground and risk of subsidence; concern at the loss of Green Belt land and wildlife habitats; and potential loss of a public right of way, the existence of which was established at a 2014 appeal.</p> <p>One suggestion was for this site to form part of a cycle route, should any development be allocated to adjoining site CFS023.</p> <p>GF01: location within buffer zone of Maryland Wood Local Wildlife Site noted. One comment also noted part of this site was presently in use as the station car park, which would cause parking problems if developed.</p>
	<p>Q58c. Are there areas in Hockley and Hawkwell that development should generally be presumed appropriate?</p>	56	26	15	15	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Responses not listing particular sites focused largely on infrastructure, echoing the need for this to be fully identified prior to any housing site allocation.</p> <p>Several comments also stressed preference for brownfield or non-agricultural sites only.</p> <p>A view that whatever approach taken should prioritise the protection of Hockley Woods and its access points above all else.</p> <p>Supportive comments received generally favoured the redevelopment of brownfield, commercial or previously developed sites. The prospect</p>

						<p>of developing large tracts of agricultural Green Belt was generally strongly resisted. The delivery of affordable housing over other types was a priority in several comments.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Sites</b></p> <p>Regarding supportive comments, the most regularly mentioned was CFS262 (Rawal Pindi Nursery site), which was reported to be closed. The large number of comments supporting this site mentioned that it was a good use of a previously developed site to deliver 'infill' development, preferable to developing some of the nearby agricultural fields; its close proximity to the B1013; easy walking and cycling links to Hockley; the potential for this site to contribute to greater affordability of housing stock in Hawkwell, an area which typically has high property prices which are outside the range of first-time buyers; that a housing scheme here would generate less traffic than the existing nursery/garden centre; and that , the site in its present, semi-derelict, form was an eyesore which detracted from the visual appearance of the area. A number of comments also considered a small development here would be in keeping with other, nearby schemes such as Highwell Gardens and Thorpe Road, provided it was of a good design standard. Some responses also noted the commercial operation had provided very few jobs, and that the nearby Potash Garden Centre fulfilled all local needs for such an amenity.</p> <p>Some supportive comments linked to CFS262 stressed that they wished the adjacent corner plot to remain open Green Belt if the nursery site was developed, to retain openness in the area. The B1013 was suggested as the logical new Western boundary for Green Belt in this area.</p> <p>CFS023 was highlighted as a good potential infill site to provide housing which was needed by the local community for first-time buyers, families and the elderly with ties in the Hockley area. The site was noted for its proximity to existing infrastructure and services, as well as the potential for its development to contribute new mains drainage to the area that would benefit existing properties.</p> <p>The agent promoting the site also considered CFS023 to be sustainable in terms of proximity to transport links and existing</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>services. They argued that much of the site is not presently accessible to the public, but that developing it would provide new public space, pedestrian and cycle links which would connect into existing networks of public rights of way. The agent also argued the site's contribution to the Green Belt was limited.</p> <p>Other sites which attracted comments in support comprised:</p> <p>Eldon Way Industrial Estate suggested as a mixed-use site which could incorporate a mixture of housing, retail and commercial uses, along with having potential for a village square, acting as a focal point for Hockley.</p> <p>A comment supported the development of further accommodation above shops in Hockley Town Centre, which could support existing/encourage new businesses.</p> <p>The former railway siding in Hockley (GF01).</p> <p>CFS049 – a comment supported this due to its small scale (9 houses).</p> <p>CFS160; CFS161 or CFS074 attracted a comment that developing these sites would negate the need for any other sites to be developed in future, whilst still allowing for a large amount of wildlife habitat to be retained.</p> <p>A response from a developer identified CFS017; CFS024; CFS242; CFS262; and CFS264 as extensions of the existing urban area.</p> <p>A comment felt CFS082 would be suitable as it was not close to many existing housing areas and would therefore have less impact on existing communities while being developed.</p> <p>Although not a promoted site, Magees Nursery in Hawkwell was suggested, as this would constitute redevelopment of a brownfield site.</p> <p>Similarly, a plot of land behind the station building in Plumberow Avenue was highlighted as a sustainable site to develop as an alternative to the Green Belt.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Some comments identified alternative sites outside Hockley/Hawkwell as being more appropriate, e.g., CFS261 (East of Rochford), or CFS133 (Land South of Ashingdon Road).</p> <p>Several objections were also received. Some felt the Hockley/Hawkwell area was already fully developed, or overdeveloped, and could not accommodate additional housing sites. As part of this, additional strain on existing infrastructure, additional congestion or loss of Green Belt were not considered acceptable.</p> <p>A comment felt the area had seen too many approvals for very large houses, which had reduced its capacity to provide any housing types with a broader appeal.</p>
Q58d. Are there areas that require protecting from development?	534	460	26	48	<p>This question attracted an overwhelming level of support, with many responses keen to highlight the need for one or more sites within Hockley and Hawkwell to be protected. Many comments received were identical to responses people gave against particular sites in Q58b. These comments were divided between general comments and site-specific ones, and focus on reasons for protecting the sites, rather than general arguments against their development (e.g., traffic impact or infrastructure concerns), which are covered in 58b.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Across Hockley and Hawkwell, large numbers were concerned about the number of sites being promoted and potential scale of Green Belt land which could be developed. Many representations felt strongly that the network of green spaces were what gave the area its distinct, semi-rural, character, and were keen to see as much of this protected as possible, both for recreation/physical wellbeing and for preserving biodiversity and enabling wildlife to move safely around the area.</p> <p>Many respondents determined to see the area's ancient woodlands and local wildlife sites protected, along with the promoted sites surrounding them. These may not be protected or publicly-accessible in the same way but were widely considered to be critical in providing buffer zones around wildlife habitats and providing corridors to allow wildlife to travel, in addition to providing green, open space and mental wellbeing for residents. Sites around places such as Hockley Woods,</p>

						<p>Gusted Hall Wood, Betts Wood, Potash Woods, Beckney Wood, Plumberow Mount and Marylands Nature Reserve were considered in this way.</p> <p>Many felt all Green Belt sites warranted protection for a variety of reasons, including public recreation; food production; wildlife habitats/corridors and biodiversity; loss of views and local character; impacts on air quality; concerns over increased carbon emissions; and concerns over the impact on the road network and infrastructure of further development.</p> <p>Locations which attracted particularly strong cases for protection included the fields, agricultural and semi-rural areas surrounding Hockley Woods in the Upper Roach Valley (seen as a vital buffer zone for the Site of Special Scientific Interest); sites between Folly Chase and the railway line (strongly supported by surrounding community for their value as open spaces for wildlife, agriculture and recreation); sites between Clements Hall and Rectory Grove (considered an important network of green spaces and corridors important to Hawkwell’s village character); the site adjoining Maryland Nature Reserve (considered a natural extension to the Local Wildlife Site and important buffer); and the network of sites either side of Greensward Lane (which acted as a buffer to open countryside and ancient woodland, as well as having their own recreation value).</p> <p>Protection of wildlife and enabling biodiversity was a strong theme running through most comments. People felt development would remove both wildlife habitats and corridors and displace animals into residential areas, where they could sometimes become a nuisance (e.g., foxes, badgers and rats/mice). Some comments pointed to a decline in many local bird species across the UK due to loss of agricultural and wooded land and expressed concern that populations would be further impacted by development.</p> <p>As a large tract of ancient woodland, Hockley Woods was widely felt to be of paramount importance for protection, with responses generally in favour of protecting sites on its edges from development and protecting/improving its accesses. Some also felt RDC could further</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>enhance and enlarge the woodland through protecting adjacent plots of land for rewilding.</p> <p>A view that ancient woodland, such as Hockley Woods or Trinity Woods, along with surrounding farmland, could benefit from a designation similar to Cherry Orchard Country Park, providing more space for both public access and nature conservation. Another view was that farmland surrounding Clements Hall and St Mary's Church, Hawkwell, would benefit from protection in this way.</p> <p>Some views considered the entire Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area required permanent protection from all development.</p> <p>Farmland was identified as something which should be protected by several comments. These noted the importance of agriculture both in food production (which was felt to be crucial in providing national food security) and in contributing to the District's heritage and semi-rural character.</p> <p>Some comments mentioned that hedgerows in particular required protection, due to their key role as 'corridors' enabling wildlife to travel between different habitats.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Sites</b></p> <p>CFS002: A request for this site to be protected due to its importance for Green Belt and agricultural land.</p> <p>CFS017: This site was considered to be rich in wildlife and an important corridor, as well as being one of the largely green spaces that gave Hawkwell its character.</p> <p>CFS023: Adjoining Beckney Woods, site attracted numerous comments in support of its protection. Felt to be a crucial buffer zone between the ancient woodland and residential areas (protecting the wood from pollution, noise/light disturbance, fly tipping and encroachment), with Beckney Woods being home to numerous plant species which would be threatened by increased footfall. The site was felt to be a wildlife habitat in its own right, having only been used for summer grazing rather than intensive agriculture, also being home to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>mature trees such as oak and ash. It was also valued locally, along with adjoining public rights of way, for walking, cycling and horse riding, and provided access to the ancient woodland. Finally, it was considered to be an important amenity in protecting nearby housing downhill from the site from flooding.</p> <p>CFS024: Adjoining Maryland Nature Reserve, this site attracted a large volume of comments calling for its protection and/or incorporation into the nature reserve. Reasons for this included protected trees on the site; numerous sightings of protected species (e.g., bluebells, slow worms, woodpeckers, badgers, bats, deer); protecting neighbouring properties from additional flood run-off; impact on public right of way; and the importance of maintaining a 'buffer' zone between the nature reserve and adjoining residential areas, something which development would remove.</p> <p>CFS045; CFS191; CFS251: Belchamps Scout Site and its environs attracted large numbers of representations calling for its protection, with the public viewing it as an important amenity for the youth of the District and beyond. The importance of the site for wildlife and biodiversity amongst its trees and hedgerows was widely noted, whilst some commented that the site was formerly common land and should therefore be used only for public purposes. Close to Hockley Woods, responses felt these sites should be protected due their role as wildlife corridors and due to impact on the adjacent public right of way.</p> <p>CFS064: As in Q58b, this site attracted a very large volume of responses objecting to development and backing its protection. These commonly cited its proximity to 3 ancient woodlands and local wildlife sites (and within the buffer zones of these); protected trees, both on-site and in adjoining woods; a much-valued public right of way; wildlife/biodiversity value (including protected species in adjoining woods); productive agricultural land; loss of peace and tranquillity; protecting adjacent housing from flooding; loss of hedgerows containing berries for foraging; and the importance of the land to the local community, which used it regularly for walking/running/dog-walking and physical/mental wellbeing. Linked to this, many responses felt the site could be rewilded and become a nature reserve.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>CFS074: This site was felt to have important, far-reaching views across to Gusted Hall Woods, Ashingdon and Canewdon, meaning any development would impact the character of the landscape. This was particularly sensitive, given the site's location within the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area. Other reasons for protecting included its value for recreation and walking, containing a bridleway and ancient public rights of way that connected Hockley and Gusted Hall Woods; its hedgerows, considered important wildlife corridors and habitats; the importance of retaining agricultural land; presence of protected species (e.g. badgers and birds of prey); a claim that, historically, this land was part of Hockley Woods before having its timber harvested for the war effort, and that it would be appropriate to replant trees on the site; and its location near the busy B1013, which made it a valued local as a resource for purifying the air, with comments concerned that its development would significantly worsen local air quality.</p> <p>CFS081 &amp; CFS082: Reasons for protection included far-reaching views over Ironwell Lane were part of the area's historic heritage; concern about impact on local wildlife; and the need for greenspace to be retained to protect surrounding residential properties from surface flooding.</p> <p>CFS088: Suggested for protection due to its role as a wildlife corridor and habitat within a residential area, alongside nearby Glencroft Open Space, CFS242 and back gardens of residential properties in the Green Belt. It was felt development of such small sites would make the network of quiet lanes increasingly busy, impacting recreational amenity for walkers and equestrians, and disturbing wildlife.</p> <p>CFS093: This site was considered to be rich in wildlife and an important corridor, as well as being one of the largely green spaces that gave Hawkwell its character.</p> <p>CFS150: this site was considered to be rich in wildlife and trees, acting as an important wildlife corridor and border for the Green Belt, protecting development encroachment into open fields. It was also noted to be a home for birds of prey.</p> <p>CFS160 &amp; CFS161: These sites were felt in need of protection due to their proximity to the Hockley Woods SSSI, with development here</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>potentially having a negative impact on the ancient woodland. The sites were also seen as an important part of the Green Belt with biodiversity and wildlife corridor functions.</p> <p>CFS194; CFS017; CFS020; CFS050; CFS093; CFS169: Sites near Clements Hall attracted numerous comments in support of their protection for their network of footpaths and bridleways; sense of openness, habitat for protected species (including bats, slow worms, badgers and birds of prey); contribution to tackling air pollution; recreation value; wildlife corridors; network of quiet lanes with recreational amenity for walkers and equestrians (which would be threatened by increased traffic), and proximity to the listed St Mary’s Church. These sites were also identified as being prone to surface flooding, leading to concerns that their development would also impact on surrounding residential areas. Sites such as CFS169 and CFS194 were considered important as productive agricultural land which needed to be contained.</p> <p>CFS197; CFS198; CFS199; CFS201; CFS206: These were considered to be a wildlife corridor linking to the adjacent Beckney Woods ancient woodland, whilst their loss would reduce the openness of the area surrounding Beckney Woods.</p> <p>CFS242: Suggested for protection as part of a wildlife corridor and habitat within a residential area, alongside nearby Glencroft Open Space, CFS088 and back gardens of residential properties in the Green Belt.</p> <p>CFS259 &amp; CFS263 (Pulpits Farm): Calls for this area to be protected felt that the area provided valuable agricultural land and Green Belt openness, along with valued public rights of way and open space to the residents of the nearby Broadlands Estate, and important corridors for wildlife.</p> <p>CFS264: Reasons for this site to be protected centred around the importance of its nursery, which was felt to be needed in providing plants.</p> <p>COL38: This attracted a number of comments in support of its protection, with many understanding it to have been designated by the</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Council in the past as a play space and leased to Ashingdon Parish Council in 2000 for 100 years to maintain as a public space. Some felt it should be formally developed as a play space, whereas others now valued it for its own green amenity value (with mature hedges), biodiversity and as an important public right of way enabling access towards Beckney Woods.</p> <p>Some comments wanted to ensure that existing designated public open spaces were protected and were concerned that these could be developed. Such sites included Hockley Woods, Clements Hall sports field and Spencers Park.</p>
Q58e: Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 46 hold local significance? Are there any other open spaces that hold particular local significance?	46	14	9	23	<p>Whilst this question was intended to consult on proposals to designate existing open spaces as 'Local Green Spaces', as identified in the NPPF, many comments interpreted this as an opportunity to oppose the development of promoted sites, none of which are designated public open spaces.</p> <p>Most comments in support agreed that the proposed Local Green Spaces outlined in the figure held local significance and should be protected. Comments noted that its range of open spaces and natural greenspace was what made Hockley so special and formed its heritage, whilst another felt that more green spaces needed to be added to the area, given the scale of potential development proposed. Climate change was cited as a factor in protecting these sites, given the large number of trees in this area.</p> <p>Hockley/Hawkwell's ancient woodland (e.g., Hockley Woods, Beckney Woods, Marylands Nature Reserve, Plumberow Mount and Betts Wood) were seen as sacrosanct, with promoted sites adjoining these generally considered in need of protecting and unsuitable for development.</p> <p>Many respondents felt this principle should also extend to Green Belt land, which was not necessarily publicly accessible, but which still had a value as open space for preventing urban sprawl, supporting biodiversity and facilitating public rights of way. This view covered the majority of the promoted sites.</p>

						<p>One response noted that two of Hawkwell’s well-used public open spaces were originally facilitated through agreements with housing developers, demonstrating how development could deliver new spaces for the community.</p> <p>Comments called for promoted sites CFS038 and CFS023 to receive protected status. The former was stated to be in use as an active park, whilst the latter was felt to be locally significant due to its role in acting as a buffer to the Beckney Woods ancient woodland. Similarly, CFS024 was suggested for inclusion on the list, due to potential harm development on this plot could cause to the adjoining nature reserve.</p> <p>Belchamps scouting site (CFS045) also listed as locally significant and in strong need of protecting, given its importance to local young people. Close to this, sites such as CFS074 and CFS191 (and others adjoining Mount Bovers Lane) were also mentioned as worthy of protection, given their positions adjoining ancient woodland and roles as natural habitats and wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Promoted site CFS064 was considered by numerous responses to be important to the community due to its wildlife, public right of way and location adjoining a number of ancient woodlands and Local Wildlife Sites. Several comments suggested it is considered for re-wilding and inclusion in a wider country park.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities	Q59a. Do you agree with our vision for the Wakerings and Barling? Is there anything you feel is missing?	84	4	41	39	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Almost half the comments objected to the vision, with many more containing critical feedback. Whilst some agreed with the sentiment of retaining rural village character and relative tranquillity, they also considered the scale of potential building was at odds with this.</p> <p>A prevailing theme was that locals strongly valued the rural village character of the Wakerings and Barling, along with its accompanying agricultural Green Belt and natural/rural open spaces. There was a corresponding concern that significant additional development would erode the area’s rural identity, particularly in the case of Great Wakering, which many felt was becoming more of a town than village.</p> <p>Many prized the peace and tranquillity of rural life and gave this as their reason for living there, and did not wish to see this reduced, even if this led to enhanced transport links and local amenities, which were not viewed as being as important.</p> <p>The scale of the promoted ‘blue’ sites on the maps alarmed many respondents, who felt the development of this area would completely remove the rural character of the villages and their biodiversity. This raised the prospect of Wakering coalescing with Shoebury, Southend or Rochford, something large numbers of residents had no desire to see take place.</p> <p>Most responses opposed developing on Green Belt land, with some noting the strong physical and mental health benefits provided by green space and open countryside.</p> <p>There was a strong desire to protect and preserve wildlife, and prospective development on various sites raised concerns that this</p>

					<p>would affect biodiversity, impact wildlife habitats and sever corridors used by wildlife to travel. Hedgerows and fields present in the current agricultural landscape were seen as an important in providing shelter for a range of wildlife, including bats, owls, bees and badgers.</p> <p>ECC considered the vision of a ‘complete community’ to be good in principle, but which would need detailed consideration of each community’s capacity going forward, to determine what infrastructure would be required to accommodate any further growth, along with other key considerations, such as flood risk. ECC will work closely with the Council on future stages of the LP to help inform this.</p> <p>Some comments also noted that proposals for significant housing development on Green Belt land on the Southend side of the boundary would also impact the area and reduce the separation between Great Wakering and Southend/Shoeburyness.</p> <p>A view that the vision needed to focus more closely on Local Wildlife Sites and Local Geological Sites to ensure biodiversity was enhanced on these sites, and that new sites were created.</p> <p>Questions were raised over how building on Green Belt land in an area dependent almost completely on car travel was aligned to local and national aims to reduce carbon emissions.</p> <p>Health and wellbeing was felt by many respondents to be a critical issue, with there being a risk that this would be impacted negatively through loss of open space/public rights of way and increased air pollution.</p> <p>Some felt the vision needed to go further in enabling the villages to be self-sufficient, through the provision of more shops, facilities and community infrastructure, reducing the need to drive elsewhere.</p> <p>Some concern about the ability of limited local shopping and leisure facilities to provide for local needs, leading to more car travel. The lack of local leisure provision also had implications for both younger people’s recreation and for promoting healthy lifestyles.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>A number of comments felt existing digital infrastructure and broadband speeds were insufficient and needed upgrading. This was felt to be more important than ever, given the need for some healthcare to be delivered remotely and the rise of working from home.</p> <p>Some considered that recently-developed and ongoing housing schemes were more than enough for the village and that the area had already accommodated its fair share of District's growth. There was also concern that these schemes had not delivered infrastructure improvements to mitigate the increased demand they were likely to place on local services and roads. Some comments also felt that these schemes had eaten significantly into the village's existing Green Belt buffer.</p> <p>Concern that the noise and air pollution reported from current construction would continue if additional sites were to be developed.</p> <p>A view that recent housing schemes had done little to reduce reliance on cars and promote walking, given they did not deliver any new amenities or shops, making them contradictory to the proposed vision.</p> <p>The small number of comments in support of the vision felt that some housing was required, however this needed to be implemented on a small scale and in a way that was sympathetic to local character, and not on the large scale that the blue promoted sites on the maps could suggest. The need for a secondary school was also identified, along with social housing.</p> <p>Some comments, including from the Defence Infrastructure Organisation, highlighted the proximity of the MOD test ranges at Shoeburyness and Foulness, the safety zones for which would impact the possibility of development on some of the promoted sites on the Eastern edge of the village.</p> <p>One comment felt any development in the villages would need to provide better links to Southend (Thorpe Bay/Southchurch), which many locals were reliant on for services.</p> <p>An agent promoting a site on behalf of a developer felt it was important to retain the identity of the villages through design considerations, but</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>that this should not prejudice the needs of the District and Southend-on-Sea to meet their housing needs in the area north of Southend. The agent felt that a masterplan for the area could provide visual green separation to keep the villages distinct, whilst delivering concentrated housing growth that would provide significant improvements in accessibility, infrastructure and local facilities.</p> <p>An agent promoting a site in the area felt Great Wakering should be designated as a Tier 2 settlement in the Settlement Hierarchy, observing that their site had the potential to improve walking access to day-to-day services through the delivery of a new school site, along with other infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>A developer disagreed with the vision as they considered it would be insufficient to accommodate the housing needs of both the District and also neighbouring Southend under Duty to Cooperate measures, prejudicing the ability of Southend to meet its housing need. They called for a greater degree of strategic cross-boundary cooperation to address this.</p> <p><b>Comments by Theme</b></p> <p><u>Housing Need</u>          Whilst some comments supported the need for local people and their children to be able to afford their own homes, they were sceptical that any housing developed would meet this need, subscribing to the view that it would more likely be ‘executive’ style housing sold to people moving from Greater London.</p> <p><u>Community Infrastructure</u>          Concern at housing growth was accompanied by a concern at the capacity of existing infrastructure in the area. This included the capacity of the local primary schools and nurseries for children and ability of the local health centre and pharmacy to cope with increased demand, leading to long waits for appointments. Residents were also concerned that an increased population would put further strain on emergency services in the area, particularly police at a time when there was no longer a police station in Great Wakering.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>A current lack of facilities and recreation for young people and teenagers was an issue that could worsen and lead to more anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Residents were unhappy about current arrangements for waste disposal, with the nearest recycling centre at Rayleigh, a long drive away through congested areas, something which was felt to be bad for the District's carbon footprint.</p> <p><u>Transport</u> The car-reliant settlement patterns of Great Wakering and the other villages were noted to be creating parking issues outside schools and shops due to the volumes of traffic driving to them from outlying areas.</p> <p>The local transport network was widely felt to be inadequate, comprising often narrow, rural, single carriageway roads in poor condition, a limited bus service and a lack of walking and cycling infrastructure, meaning there were few alternatives to driving. The dispersed nature of the villages meant residents had no choice but to drive to access services, whether in the Wakerings or elsewhere. Many residents did not feel these roads could cope with the large numbers of additional cars further development would bring, whilst increased volumes of traffic would make cycling and horse riding more dangerous. It was also reported that those needing to travel around the area for work (e.g., delivering healthcare or care in the community) were being impacted by delays and having to cut back their visit schedules).</p> <p>The lack of a secondary school and need for pupils to travel elsewhere was widely given as a fundamental issue for Wakering residents, something which it was felt would worsen road traffic if further housing was built, unless a new secondary school was delivered in the area as a result.</p> <p>Rail access was an issue for residents, with train stations on the C2C line not being too far geographically, but no safe walking or cycling routes to reach these.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>The bus service in particular was singled out for being inadequate and unreliable, with the previous Arriva no.4/4A service direct to Southend having been replaced with the much longer 7/8 route, which had a greater likelihood of delays. The no.14 service was considered not frequent enough. This was felt to be unhelpful in persuading motorists to take public transport instead.</p> <p>Also concerning was the reliance of the villages on the A127 and A13, increased congestion on which made it slow to travel anywhere in the local area. It was not felt that further development would help this, whilst the isolated nature of the villages in terms of limited road links was thought by some to be a risk if the area needed to be evacuated quickly in an emergency.</p> <p><u>Climate Change and Flood Risk</u> The low-lying nature of much of the surrounding countryside and potential flood risk were widely cited as concerns that made many of the sites inappropriate for development. In addition, several responses highlighted concerns about the current capacity of the sewerage network, which was not thought to be able to cope with further demand from new homes.</p> <p><u>Green Belt and Agriculture</u> Many responses strongly believed agricultural land should be preserved for the purposes of food security and combating climate change, as well as to preserve farming as a central part of the villages' heritage. Some felt a strategy for retention and preservation of farming should feature.</p> <p><u>Little Wakering and Barling</u> A response considered the needs and situation of Great Wakering to be different from that of Little Wakering and Barling, with the former being closer to a small town and appealing to those with need of being nearer amenities, whereas the smaller villages cater for those who are willing to accept fewer services as a consequence for greater openness and tranquility, along with larger plots.</p> <p>Some comments in Little Wakering were concerned at the scale of promoted sites in the area, with the narrowness of the existing road mentioned as a cause for concern, as this could be easily blocked by</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>even small building projects or deliveries. The existing poor bus service was mentioned as something which urgently needed improvement to reduce car reliance. Little Wakering residents were also concerned about the impact increased development would have on local wildlife.</p> <p>In Barling, there was concern at additional development proposals, given the very limited services and narrow roads currently there, whilst some residents felt the gas supply in the area was already insufficient. One resident felt the promoted site CFS004 would be better used to provide expanded school facilities or parking.</p> <p><u>Economy and Employment</u></p> <p>The lack of local employment opportunities meant people had to drive elsewhere to work, which would be exacerbated if more homes were built. Linked to this, valuable mineral resources in the area were proposed to be developed over with housing, leading a respondent to feel this was a missed opportunity.</p> <p>A number of comments felt existing digital infrastructure and broadband speeds were insufficient and needed upgrading. This was felt to be more important than ever, given the need for some healthcare to be delivered remotely and the rise of working from home.</p>
<p>Q59b. With reference to Figure 47 and your preferred Strategy Option, do you think any of the land edged blue should be made available for any of the following uses?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</li> <li>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retail, other]</li> <li>3. Community infrastructure [open</li> </ol>	80	8	57	15	<p><b>General comments</b></p> <p>Many responses were concerned about the scale of the blue promoted sites shown on the map, and felt that increasing the size of the villages, or allowing them to coalesce with surrounding settlements, would both seriously impact existing infrastructure and roads, whilst removing the tranquil, rural character that many people chose to live in the area for.</p> <p>Large numbers opposed development of the Green Belt, citing reasons such as the need to retain agricultural land; concern at loss of wildlife habitats/corridors and biodiversity; loss of tranquillity; increased air pollution; loss of rural/village character; strain on infrastructure and roads; and negative impact on climate change.</p> <p>Many responses strongly felt no further development should take place in the area without improvements to existing infrastructure being made</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

		<p>space, education, healthcare, allotments, other] Other</p>				<p>first, including schools, GP surgeries, roads, nurseries, cycle/footpaths, bus services, parks/open spaces and leisure/youth facilities.</p> <p>The road network was a particular concern, with many of the sites proposed being in rural parts of Barling/Sutton/Shopland, where roads were especially narrow, with no pavements. Many of these lanes are popular for cycling, horse riding and walking, and concern was raised at the increased likelihood of accidents that larger numbers of cars would bring, something particularly likely given their narrowness and the number of bends and blind corners.</p> <p>Some comments considered blue sites should only be suitable for providing community infrastructure and meeting local needs, rather than open market housing. The resources of the medical centre were noted to be stretched, so some residents welcomed the possibility of this expanding. Comments also felt school expansion or provision of community allotments may be suitable uses.</p> <p>It was observed that much of the land was low-lying, marshy, close to creeks and with drainage issues, things which were considered to make many of the blue sites unsuitable for housing, given the heightened future risks of flooding.</p> <p>A large number of comments expressed alarm at the promoted sites on farmland to the West of Little Wakering. Residents widely felt this would fundamentally change the agricultural character of the area, overwhelm infrastructure and harm wildlife. In addition, resident parking on one side of the main road in the village effectively made the road a single lane, unsuitable for increased traffic.</p> <p>Several comments noted plans for housing growth on the Southend side of the boundary, which risked compounding issues around loss of Green Belt, strain on infrastructure and environmental harm, as well as the possible coalescence of the villages.</p> <p>One response felt only building on plots along the line of the existing roads should be permitted, and that fields should be kept open.</p> <p>The small number of comments in support of this question were largely from agents promoting development sites, although one respondent</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---

						<p>felt some of the sites may be suitable for providing additional school/healthcare facilities, as well as allotments in Little Wakering/Barling, which did not currently have any. Another highlighted the potential for underused or previously-developed sites for providing homes and employment whilst not disturbing the environment.</p> <p>A comment felt there was too little employment available in the Wakering area for the amount of housing proposed, leaving many with little choice but to drive elsewhere.</p> <p>A couple of responses felt it was unhelpful/misleading to list sites for Barling and the Wakerings and Stonebridge &amp; Sutton on separate maps, given parts of Barling would be affected by development to the East and many residents consider the area listed as 'Stonebridge' to be part of Barling Magna.</p> <p><b>Comments Relating to Specific Sites</b></p> <p>The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) commented on sites within the MOD Shoeburyness Safeguarding Zone, which was designated to safeguard its capacity as a military technical/explosive storage area. Part or all of sites CFS065; CFS070; CFS011; CFS257; CFS057 and CFS056 fell within this zone and the DIO requested the Council consider policies to ensure the operational sites are not adversely impacted by other development proposed in the area, in addition to ensuring neighbouring sites are not adversely impacted by MOD activities within the zone.</p> <p>Sites in the Stonebridge/Sutton/Shopland area (to the West of Little Wakering) attracted widespread opposition from Wakering residents for the following reasons:</p> <p>Impact on the road network, which was seen as having negative impact on problematic roads such as Sutton Road and Ashingdon Road.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Loss of rural hamlet identities as the area became subsumed into Rochford.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Increased risk of surface flooding.</p> <p>A comment opposing the development of the sites in this area proposed a need for tackling congestion through an upgrade of the local road network to make it far safer and easier to cycle, highlighting both the health and congestion reduction benefits, along with the benefit this would have on encouraging people to shop and spend locally.</p> <p>CFS004: Several comments objected/cites concerns, comprising:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land, and concern that the site assessment only rated the site a '2' for Green Belt harm.</p> <p>Increased risk of surface flooding and drainage.</p> <p>Gas and water pressure.</p> <p>Capacity of narrow local roads (Barrow Hall Road, Barling Road and Shopland Road, with the latter having particular issues due to the narrow bridge at Butlers Farm).</p> <p>Few local facilities for residents.</p> <p>Pressure on overstretched local GP and schools.</p> <p>Developing the site would impact negatively on the rural character, which local residents cherished.</p> <p>Poor frequency of public transport to Barling and Little Wakering.</p> <p>Some responses were also concerned by the increase in traffic on narrow rural roads which would make it unsafe for families to walk and cycle in the local area. It was also suggested the narrow lanes would be unsafe for heavy construction traffic.</p> <p>A view that there may be space for a few houses as an extension of the existing ribbon development along the road, but that the numbers proposed on the site were too high for the local roads and that the land to the rear would be better suited as a wildflower meadow or woodland.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>A further comment that site may be better suited as an extension or parking for Barling School, which was noted to create traffic congestion issues at drop-off and pick-up times.</p> <p>CFS011: It was noted by the DIO that this site falls within the MOD Shoeburyness Safeguarding Zone, which may restrict the types of uses which can safely be accommodated within the zone.</p> <p>CFS056: An objection considered this to be overdevelopment which would result in loss of habitats, biodiversity, green space, green fields, nature and agricultural land; and be detrimental to mental and physical health. It was noted by the DIO that this site falls partly within the MOD Shoeburyness Safeguarding Zone, which may restrict the types of uses which can safely be accommodated within the zone.</p> <p>CFS057: Supporting this site’s allocation for residential development, the agent highlighted its suitability and potential to provide a wide range of market, affordable and specialist housing for the needs of the local community, including providing specialist accommodation for the elderly. Pointed to developer’s track record of collaborating with local authorities to deliver affordable and specialist housing in this way, and it was stated the site could be important in helping the District address its housing delivery targets. The site was noted to be in walking distance to local amenities and with good proximity to bus routes, cycling and walking options, along with the wider road network.</p> <p>In developing the site, it was also proposed to deliver the employment land allocation set out in the 2014 Allocations Plan, providing local employment; extend the pavement along the Eastern edge of Star Lane; and to provide two new access points to the main road.</p> <p>In terms of Green Belt, the agent stated the site has a stronger relationship with urban areas to the North and East than with the wider countryside, whilst the proposal to deliver a large volume of affordable housing units would tilt the balance in its favour. They also proposed the site would include a significant landscaping buffer to the South and West provide a strong new Green Belt boundary and prevent Great Wakering coalescing with Shoeburyness. Also supported by a different housebuilder as being suitable, available, and deliverable and, along</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>with CFS070, could contribute up to 800 homes towards the District's housing needs.</p> <p>The site attracted a significant number of objections and comments expressing concern, with issues including:</p> <p>A lack of existing infrastructure, with local schools being at capacity and few local play facilities available for children.</p> <p>The limited number of roads accessing the village, meaning more congestion and difficulty in evacuating the village in the case of an emergency.</p> <p>Impact on biodiversity on the site, along with existing wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Presence of protected species (i.e., badgers) on the site.</p> <p>Increased risk of surface flooding as a result of open land being developed.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Impact on physical and mental health from loss of open spaces and public rights of way.</p> <p>Unsuitability of Alexandra Road as an access to the site.</p> <p>A comment that there strong evidence that part of the site contained a Roman Road and villa, something which would need to be excavated and conserved.</p> <p>Suggestion that housing here would be detrimental to Star Lane Pits Local Wildlife Site, as the recent Taylor Wimpey development has already negatively affected water quality and fish, leading to the involvement of the Environment Agency. Respondents felt this should be factored into any assessment of CFS057, ensuring that the western part of the land is kept free from development.</p> <p>Some consultees felt the western end of this site should be allocated as a Local Wildlife Site, country park, part of the proposed regional</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>park, or other protected green space, considering its proximity to the existing Star Lane Pits Local Wildlife Site. A further comment considered part of the site could be used for a new secondary school on Star Lane, whilst the North-East corner of the suite might be suited to playing fields, retaining some openness on the site if developed.</p> <p>It was noted by the DIO that this site falls partly within the MOD Shoeburyness Safeguarding Zone (small part of the South-Eastern corner), which may restrict the types of uses which can safely be accommodated within the zone.</p> <p>CFS060: Objections on basis of the cumulative effect of developing small sites such as this would place too great a strain on local schools and surgeries; potential for congestion and safety issues on narrow, winding rural roads; and consideration that overdevelopment would result in loss of habitats, bio-diversity, green space, green fields, nature; agricultural land; and detriment to mental and physical health.</p> <p>CFS065: The agent promoting this site supported its allocation for housing, noting it could make a significant contribution towards the objectively-assessed need. Disagreed with the assessment of the Green Belt Study, considering instead that the site has clearly defined boundaries and that Green Belt openness would continue to be maintained if it was developed. They also noted the sustainable location of the site in terms of its location close to amenities and lack of ecological constraints. The agent highlighted the intention to use modular construction methods to deliver more sustainable, low-carbon homes and affordable units.</p> <p>It was noted by the DIO that this site falls partly within the MOD Shoeburyness Safeguarding Zone, which may restrict the types of uses which can safely be accommodated within the zone.</p> <p>CFS070: Supported by a housebuilder as being as suitable, available, and deliverable. Along with CFS057, could contribute up to 800 homes towards the District’s housing needs.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>An objection considered this to be overdevelopment which would result in loss of habitats, bio-diversity, green space, green fields, nature; agricultural land; and be detrimental to mental and physical health.</p> <p>It was noted by the DIO that this site falls partly within the MOD Shoeburyness Safeguarding Zone, which may restrict the types of uses which can safely be accommodated within the zone.</p> <p>CFS071: Comments in opposition included the following reasons:</p> <p>The cumulative effect of small sites such as this would place too great a strain on local schools and surgeries, along with causing congestion and safety issues on narrow, winding rural roads.</p> <p>More traffic on the roads to take children to schools outside the area, leading to a negative impact on carbon emissions.</p> <p>Inappropriate development in Green Belt and loss of open space.</p> <p>Harmful to the setting of listed buildings (i.e., Barrow Hall Farm).</p> <p>Harmful visual impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Incompatible with existing local design.</p> <p>Threat to public rights of way.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Loss of prime agricultural land and traditional field patterns.</p> <p>Inadequate local sewerage system.</p> <p>CFS097: Promoting this site, the agent focused on the potential of the site to both deliver a wide range of homes to accommodate local needs, in addition to providing a site for a new secondary school (including SEND provision). This is currently lacking in the Wakering area, meaning local children have to attend school in Rochford.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Noted the site’s potential to provide new green/blue infrastructure (including open spaces) by extending Friars Park in Shoeburyness; to secure biodiversity net gain; enhance existing public rights of way; potential to provide community infrastructure; good bus links; lack of flood risk issues, heritage sensitivity, site topography issues and ecological designations. The agent also emphasised the site’s limited Green Belt contribution, with Poynters Lane forming a strong new Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>In opposition, a response considered this to be overdevelopment which would result in loss of habitats, biodiversity, green space, green fields, nature; agricultural land; and be detrimental to mental and physical health.</p> <p>CFS103: Comments in opposition included the following reasons:</p> <p>The cumulative effect of small sites such as this would place too great a strain on local schools and surgeries, along with causing congestion and safety issues on narrow, winding rural roads.</p> <p>More traffic on the roads to take children to schools outside the area, leading to a negative impact on carbon emissions.</p> <p>Air pollution from increased volume of traffic.</p> <p>Inappropriate development in Green Belt and loss of open space.</p> <p>Harmful to the setting of listed buildings (i.e., Barrow Hall Farm).</p> <p>Harmful visual impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Incompatible with existing local design.</p> <p>Threat to public rights of way.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Loss of prime agricultural land and traditional field patterns.</p> <p>Inadequate local sewerage system.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Loss of trees/hedgerows.</p> <p>The possibility of 95 dwellings on the site was considered unrealistic, as it would leave insufficient space for parking, meaning excess cars would need to park on the road or pavement.</p> <p>CFS142: Objections for the following reasons:</p> <p>The cumulative effect of small sites such as this would place too great a strain on local schools and surgeries, along with causing congestion and safety issues on narrow, winding rural roads.</p> <p>More traffic on the roads to take children to schools outside the area, leading to a negative impact on carbon emissions.</p> <p>Increased air pollution from the volume of traffic.</p> <p>Inappropriate development in Green Belt, visual landscape impact and loss of open space.</p> <p>Loss of high-quality agricultural land and traditional field patterns.</p> <p>Harmful to the setting of listed buildings (i.e., Barrow Hall Farm).</p> <p>Incompatible with existing local design.</p> <p>Threat to public rights of way.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Loss of prime agricultural land and traditional field patterns.</p> <p>Likely difficulty of vehicular access to the site.</p> <p>Inadequate local sewerage system.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>CFS153: Objection centred around this land being in an area at risk of flooding and which was needed as a soak-away to protect surrounding streets. Also noted to be a popular wildlife haven and corridor, linking to the nearby Wakering Common.</p> <p>CFS192: Attracted a number of responses objection on the following basis:</p> <p>The cumulative effect of sites such as this would place too great a strain on local schools and surgeries, along with causing congestion and safety issues on narrow, winding rural roads.</p> <p>It would also lead to more traffic on the roads to take children to schools outside the area, leading to a negative impact on carbon emissions.</p> <p>Poor public transport, leading to increased car dependence and traffic on rural roads.</p> <p>Poor access onto Little Wakering Road via very narrow lane alongside Castle pub.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land (the loss of which would result in the highest possible level of harm) and equestrian activities.</p> <p>Mains gas pipeline running through site.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land and existing stables business.</p> <p>Loss of trees.</p> <p>Lack of any local employment except farming.</p> <p>Limited shops and lack of social facilities (apart from 1 pub).</p> <p>Impact on nearby Saxon church.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>The potential for flooding in the area and the state of sewers and pumping stations, with one comment urging that Anglian Water be consulted.</p> <p>Poor gas and water pressure; capacity of narrow local roads. Nearby waste site and access road.</p> <p>Barrow Hall Road is too narrow for volumes of traffic that would be generated. Large amount of wildlife in hedgerows and fields.</p> <p>CFS257: It was noted by the DIO that this site falls within the MOD Shoeburyness Safeguarding Zone, which may restrict the types of uses which can safely be accommodated within the zone.</p> <p>CFS258: Responses felt the cumulative effect of small sites such as this would place too great a strain on local schools and surgeries, along with causing congestion and safety issues on narrow, winding rural roads. It would also lead to more traffic on the roads to take children to schools outside the area, leading to a negative impact on carbon emissions.</p> <p>CFS260A-Z: A landowner wrote in support, highlighting the potential of this large swathe of land in meeting the housing needs of both the District and Southend Borough, with the scale being sufficient to deliver significant new transport improvements for the area, whilst the sites' proximity to major employment sites such as Purdeys, Temple Farm and Southend Airport would be an advantage in allowing people to live near to places of work.</p> <p>Southend Borough Council also considered Option 3b (concentrated growth North of Southend) to be a good way of delivering a wide range of community infrastructure, transport improvements and provision of a large amount of new public open space.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>General comments in opposition to these sites in their entirety were as follows:</p> <p>Inappropriate development in Green Belt and loss of open space.</p> <p>Harmful to the setting of listed buildings (i.e., Barrow Hall Farm).</p> <p>Harmful visual impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Incompatible with existing local design.</p> <p>Threat to public rights of way.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Loss of prime agricultural land and traditional field patterns.</p> <p>Inadequate local sewerage system.</p> <p>Risk of increased traffic congestion and pollution.</p> <p>CFS260D: Comments cited issues of concern such as:</p> <p>Impact on the wider road network, which was seen as having negative impact on problematic roads such as Sutton Road and Ashingdon Road.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Loss of rural hamlet identities as the area became subsumed into Rochford.</p> <p>Risk of surface flooding and drainage issues, with local sewers and pumping station considered inadequate.</p> <p>Gas and water pressure.</p> <p>Capacity and safety of narrow local roads, with many homes lacking off-street parking, making the road narrower.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Poor access onto Little Wakering Road.</p> <p>Few local community facilities or shops for residents, including play facilities for young people and children.</p> <p>Pressure on overstretched local GP and schools.</p> <p>Comments doubted contributions made by developers would be sufficient to properly improve infrastructure.</p> <p>Nearby waste site and access road.</p> <p>Barrow Hall Road is too narrow for volumes of traffic that would be generated.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure in the village.</p> <p>Limited sewerage in the village.</p> <p>Large amount of wildlife in hedgerows and fields.</p> <p>Loss of trees.</p> <p>CFS260F: Responses felt this to be an inappropriate development of Green Belt land which, when combined with development in Southend around Fossetts Farm and surrounding CFS260 sites, would transform the area between Rochford and Barling into one large housing estate with insufficient infrastructure and enormous strain on the roads. This was felt to fundamentally impact on the connectivity of the Southend/Rochford area by adding further traffic to the A127. Also noted were:</p> <p>Impact on the wide range of wildlife found in the area.</p> <p>The lack of mains utilities (sewers and gas).</p> <p>Insufficient school places in the area.</p> <p>Minimal public transport in the area, with very infrequent bus service.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>Loss of agricultural land, reducing the UK' s self-sufficiency post-Brexit and threatening food security.</p> <p>No pavements alongside roads, increasing car dependence.</p> <p>No local shops, necessitating driving.</p> <p>Proximity to former rubbish dump.</p> <p>CFS260O:</p> <p>Poor access onto Little Wakering Road.</p> <p>Large amount of wildlife in hedgerows and fields.</p> <p>Barrow Hall Road is too narrow for volumes of traffic that would be generated.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure in the village.</p> <p>Limited sewerage in the village.</p> <p>Risk of surface flooding and drainage issues, with local sewers and pumping station considered inadequate.</p> <p>Loss of productive agricultural land.</p> <p>CFS260T: Considered an inappropriate development of Green Belt land which, when combined with development in Southend around Fossetts Farm and surrounding CFS260 sites, would transform the area between Rochford and Barling into one large housing estate with insufficient infrastructure and enormous strain on the roads. This was felt to seriously impact on the connectivity of the Southend/Rochford area by adding further traffic to the A127. Also noted were:</p> <p>Impact on the wider road network, which was seen as having negative impact on problematic roads such as Sutton Road and Ashingdon Road.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt/agricultural land.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>Loss of rural hamlet identities as the area became subsumed into Rochford.</p> <p>Risk of surface flooding and drainage issues, with local sewers and pumping station considered inadequate.</p> <p>Gas and water pressure.</p> <p>Capacity and safety of narrow local roads, with many homes lacking off-street parking, making the road narrower.</p> <p>Few local community facilities or shops for residents, including play facilities for young people and children.</p> <p>Pressure on overstretched local GP and schools.</p> <p>Comments doubted contributions made by developers would be sufficient to properly improve infrastructure.</p> <p>Nearby waste site and access road.</p>
	<p>Q59c. Are there areas in the Wakerings and Barling that development should generally be presumed appropriate? Why these areas?</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>A number of comments felt more housing was needed in the area, although this needed to be sympathetic to the locality, with one comment calling for any future homes to have better design that included solar panels, good insulation and sufficient parking.</p> <p>Several comments felt the most, or only, appropriate sites for development were brownfield land or vacant industrial sites, to preserve the Green Belt.</p> <p>One view felt additional housing should be provided in Barling to proportionately match development proposals elsewhere, although another response felt Barling, with its limited road infrastructure, was not suitable for any further development.</p> <p>Some comments felt new infrastructure and community facilities could be developed in the area and that new development could deliver the</p>

						<p>required infrastructure, but there was scepticism this would be delivered to the level required.</p> <p>One response considered only small infill developments (of up to 5 dwellings) would be suitable, given the scale of development that has already taken place.</p> <p>A view that the only use suitable for the areas shaded blue was agriculture, given the need for the UK to be more self-sufficient due to Brexit and climate change concerns.</p> <p>In support of CFS057 (Land east of Star Lane and north of Poynters Lane) being allocated for residential development, the agent promoting the site highlighted its suitability and potential to provide a wide range of market, affordable and specialist housing for the needs of the local community, including providing specialist accommodation for the elderly. The site was noted to be in walking distance to local amenities and with good proximity to bus routes, cycling and walking options, along with the wider road network. In developing the site, it was also proposed to deliver the employment land allocation set out in the 2014 Allocations Plan, providing local employment; extend the pavement along the Eastern edge of Star Lane; and to provide two new access points to the main road. The agent also proposed the site would include a significant landscaping buffer to the South and West to prevent Great Wakering coalescing with Shoeburyness.</p> <p>Promoting site CFS097 (Tithe Park, Poynters Lane), the agent focused on the site’s potential to both deliver a wide range of homes to accommodate local needs, in addition to providing a site for a new secondary school (including SEND provision), something currently lacking in the Wakering area, where local children have to attend school in Rochford. They noted the site’s potential to provide new green/blue infrastructure (including open spaces) by extending Friars Park in Shoeburyness; to secure biodiversity net gain; enhance existing public rights of way; potential to provide community infrastructure; good bus links; lack of flood risk issues, heritage sensitivity, site topography issues and ecological designations. The agent also emphasised the site’s limited Green Belt contribution, with Poynters Lane forming a strong new Green Belt boundary.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

						<p>A sizeable number of comments disagreed that any sites were suitable, with commonly cited reasons including the loss of Green Belt land; capacity of the single carriageway road network; strain on existing infrastructure; limited local education facilities; limited public transport; flood risk to low-lying land; detrimental impact on the existing community; loss of rural village character; and lack of local employment opportunities.</p> <p>Some comments particularly concerned that development could lead to the village(s) merging with nearby Southend, especially if the promoted sites prefixed CFS260 were developed, leading to a loss of identity.</p> <p>Some consultees felt that sites currently under construction (Star Lane and Barrow Hall Lane) were sufficient for the area's future needs, but that the necessary community and transport infrastructure to support these homes had not yet been sufficiently addressed, although one response felt that development had improved opportunities for local businesses.</p>
	<p>Q59d. Are there areas that require protecting from development? Why these areas?</p>	61	42	4	15	<p>Many of the comments entered in this section were similar or identical to responses people gave against particular sites in Q58b. Comments below focus on reasons for protecting the sites, rather than general arguments against their development (e.g., traffic impact or infrastructure concerns), which are covered in 58b. They are divided between general comments and site-specific ones.</p> <p><b>General comments</b></p> <p>Protecting sites from development was seen as important to preserve the villages' sense of openness, tranquillity and rural character, as well as mitigating carbon emissions. Many responses felt that all, or the vast majority, of promoted sites would need to be protected from development to uphold this character and identity. It was not felt the draft vision for the Wakerings and Barling in the Document, which focused on retaining rural village character and a sense of relative tranquillity, would sit comfortably with the housing numbers proposed.</p> <p>Many comments considered the villages themselves should be protected from development, to retain their character and way of life. Many stated that they moved to the area for the peace, views and</p>

						<p>proximity to nature, and accepted that the trade-off for this was relatively fewer facilities and infrastructure. It was not considered that providing these would mitigate the effect of developing more housing.</p> <p>This sense of openness was considered widely to be important to residents' physical and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>Numerous comments stated all Green Belt land should be protected.</p> <p>One of the main reasons given for protecting all open and Green Belt land was concern over the loss of habitat and wildlife corridors for a range of wildlife, including protected species such as badgers and hedgehogs.</p> <p>Similarly, several responses considered all agricultural land in the area in need of protection, due to its importance for food security/self-sufficiency, maintaining the rural character of the area and its biodiversity value.</p> <p>Many general comments mentioned the often-cited reasons against development explored in more detail in other sections of this question (i.e. lack of adequate infrastructure, traffic/road safety issues, insufficient parking, impact on existing community etc).</p> <p>Little Wakering/Barling considered as areas that should not see any major development.</p> <p>Flood plains and areas at risk of flooding were deemed important to retain to protect communities in the area.</p> <p>The broad area of farmland west of Little Wakering comprising the sites under CFS260, along with sites such as CFS060; CFS071; CFS103; CFS142; and CFS192; was frequently mentioned as being vitally in need of protection, due to its important role in maintaining productive agricultural land; important contributions to openness and Green Belt principles; its network of public rights of way; its hedgerows and its biodiversity.</p> <p>Although in favour of developing areas North of Southend to support SSO 3b, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council noted this needed to be</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>planned with great care to prevent the coalescence of Great and Little Wakering with Southend.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Sites</b></p> <p>CFS004: Reasons for its protection included the need to retain Green Belt land and preserve the rural/village character and tranquillity of Barling.</p> <p>CFS057: Development of the western part of this site in particular was felt to risk a negative impact on the Star Lane Pits Local Wildlife Site. It was claimed that recent development has altered underground water courses and led to depletion of existing fish stocks, leading to involvement of the Environment Agency. Respondents feared further development would worsen this situation. It was therefore suggested that this part of the site should be protected under a designation such as Regional Park, Local Wildlife Site or Green Belt, which could be used to extend the existing habitat at Star Lane Pits and result in significant biodiversity net gain. Site home to species such as badgers and bats.</p> <p>There was also a concern that the removal of brick earth had led to this land being significantly lower than surroundings and at risk of surface flooding, something which new development on Star Lane had to mitigate against through trenches/ditches which are now at risk of becoming overgrown. Comments felt the site should be maintained as open space to protect surrounding properties from increased flood risk.</p> <p>CFS060: Adjoining the public open space, responses felt this site was important to preservation of Little Wakering’s rural/village character, and key Green Belt land that preserved openness.</p> <p>CFS071; CFS103; CFS142: Reasons given for protection included:</p> <p>The need to retain agricultural land for food security and to support the local rural character through retention of field patterns.</p> <p>Preservation of the village’s character and tranquillity.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>The need to preserve wildlife habitats, hedgerows and wildlife corridors.</p> <p>The presence of a cluster of Grade II-listed buildings on the site (Barrow Hall Farm).</p> <p>The importance of preserving Green Belt and open spaces, and considering the impact on the local community’s physical and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>The need to preserve important trees and vegetation.</p> <p>The need to protect existing public rights of way.</p> <p>Protecting the existing landscape character.</p> <p>CFS153: Considered in need of protection as a natural soak-away to protect surrounding streets, given past instances of surface flooding caused by paving over of nearby gardens. It was also noted to be a popular wildlife haven and corridor, linking to the nearby Wakering Common.</p> <p>CFS192: Reasons given in favour of the site being protected included:</p> <p>The need to retain Green Belt and open space, which helps to preserve Little Wakering’s rural and village character.</p> <p>Site contains a range of wildlife, including green woodpeckers, pheasants, partridges; foxes; badgers; wrens and hedgehogs. The site enables these to move around through wildlife corridors such as hedgerows, which contain a significant amount of biodiversity.</p> <p>The need to preserve habitats for insects, particularly bees and other pollinators.</p> <p>Importance of the site for a stabling business, which would be lost if developed.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>The site provides a pleasant outlook for adjoining properties along Little Wakering Road.</p> <p>Site acts as an important soak-away for rainwater, preventing surface water flooding on adjoining properties.</p> <p>Importance of preserving public right of way.</p> <p>CFS258: Adjoining the public open space, some responses felt this site to be important to preservation of Little Wakering’s rural/village character, and a key Green Belt site that preserved openness.</p> <p>CFS260 (all sites): Felt to be a vital swathe of workable agricultural land which also provided an important green buffer that prevented settlements merging into Southend. Reasons for its protection included:</p> <p>The need to retain agricultural land for food security and to support the local rural character through retention of field patterns.</p> <p>The need to preserve wildlife habitats, hedgerows and wildlife corridors.</p> <p>The need to preserve habitats for insects, particularly bees and other pollinators.</p> <p>The importance of these sites for intercepting and preventing surface water flooding, protecting neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The presence of a cluster of Grade II-listed buildings on/near the site (Barrow Hall Farm).</p> <p>The importance of preserving Green Belt and open spaces, and considering the impact on the local community’s physical and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>The need to preserve important trees and vegetation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>The need to protect existing public rights of way.</p> <p>Protecting the existing landscape character.</p> <p>CFS260B: Noted that a number of Grade II-listed buildings were adjacent to the field, and the site should therefore be protected to preserve their character and setting. Also noted to be Green Belt land that deserved to be retained.</p> <p>CFS260F: Considered an important site contributing to the area's rural character, providing habitats and corridors for a wide range of wildlife, including pheasants, moorhens, newts, frogs, blackbirds, sparrows, sparrow hawks, gold finches, woodpeckers, owls, foxes, rabbits, mice, bats, dragonflies, squirrels, magpies and most importantly butterflies and insects. Also considered an important agricultural site, contributing to food security.</p> <p>WD01: Felt to be inappropriate due to its location in a Conservation Area.</p>
	<p>Q59e. Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 47 hold local significance? Are there any other open spaces that hold particular local significance?</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>7</p> <p>Respondents generally agreed that the sites shown in the figure were locally significant, with Wakering Recreation Ground, Wakering Common and Little Wakering Road Open Space all listed as important sites for recreation and/or wildlife.</p> <p>Residents were proud of the open spaces in their village and their role for local wildlife, particularly the Common, maintained by the local community.</p> <p>A view that local green spaces outlined were crucial for sport and recreation. Many facilities in the area are privately-owned and not easily accessible, so more sporting clubs and facilities need to be provided in public areas to help young families engage with active lifestyles.</p> <p>Several respondents felt all green space in the area, including all Green Belt land, was locally significant and worthy of protection, with its removal being detrimental. Reasons for this included for recreation and exercise; places for enjoyment and relaxation; the opportunity for</p>

						<p>people to engage with nature; and for the preservation of biodiversity and wildlife.</p> <p>The area’s open spaces were also felt important for attracting visitors into the area and were also very significant for many people in Southend, where there was far less open space for recreation and enjoyment.</p> <p>A desire to preserve areas of open land, including agricultural land, in order to preserve the rural village character of the Wakerings and Barling. Development threatened to transform the area into a town.</p> <p>There was some concern about proposed development sites eroding the open spaces and transforming the character of the village as a result.</p> <p>Some comments felt promoted sites should not be developed, but instead protected or repurposed for public open space. Site CFS004 was suggested as being a potentially suitable site for a pocket park to provide more public open space in the Barling Area.</p> <p>A comment considered the entire sea wall, with its footpath, to be locally significant and an important place for recreation.</p> <p>The Defence Infrastructure Organisation, regarding Foulness Island, did not consider it appropriate that any sites on the island were subject to formal Local Green Space designation, given the restrictions that exist on the MOD estate.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities						
	Q60a. Do you agree with our vision for Hullbridge? Is there anything you feel is missing? [Please state reasoning]	59	6	34	19	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No, support the Parish Council Vision.</p> <p>No. Should include the following – <i>“Hullbridge will have expanded on its already self-reliant nature, boasting impressive local businesses and amenities – providing a perfect space for those who wish to enjoy their retirement as well as those with young families. Through small, localized and respectable developments, the thriving community and riverside aesthetic of the village remains as strong as ever; all of this has been achieved through the transparency and openness of different local authorities, residents, businesses and developers on any and all developments going forward.”</i></p> <p>No, does not reflect the Hullbridge community and what their vision for Hullbridge is.</p> <p>No, community need to be consulted on a Vision.</p> <p><b>Transport / Active Travel</b></p> <p>Agree about being more self-sufficient, but concern for roads e.g., Watery Lane – flooding and narrowness.</p> <p>Unsure of practicality of river access to Hullbridge. May cause damage to the river’s environmental importance.</p> <p>Major renovation required to existing pavements to enable more walking.</p> <p>No, a large area of Hullbridge is not accessible by walking or public transport.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>The river front does not need to be developed as would be detrimental to the rural coastal village outlook and the Hullbridge Foreshores.</p> <p>No, as no consultation with community – the vision should be for Hullbridge to remain a village with an improved public transport system, and keeping the coastline as it is for residents and visitors.</p> <p><b>Housing</b></p> <p>More housing required for older people (not all sheltered).</p> <p>Needs to include provision of secure and affordable housing for young families.</p> <p>Broadly support the draft vision, it should be acknowledged that the aims of meeting housing needs and Hullbridge becoming self-sufficient are interlinked. Growth of service provision would be supported by new housing and new customers, which would encourage new businesses as well as supporting the vitality of existing businesses. The vision should be expanded to incorporate <i>“the needs of young families and parishioners seeking local and affordable housing to ensure a diverse and sustainable settlement can be maintained.”</i></p> <p>No, your proposed housing will make the “village” a town.</p>
<p>Q60b. With reference to Figure 48 and your preferred Strategy option, do you think any of the promoted sites should be made available for any of the following uses? How could that improve the completeness of Hullbridge?</p> <p>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</p> <p>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retail, other]</p>	85	6	65	14	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>It already has a housing estate that is struggling to sell houses, the only land left is greenbelt which should never be built on.</p> <p>Hullbridge is pretty complete. More development of any kind will not enhance the quality of life for anyone. More houses require more amenities, roads/buildings/traffic. The village disappears and the character of the area is forever lost.</p> <p>CFS006 and CFS149 moderate high to high green belt harm and unsustainable for development.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</p>					<p>Green belt land should be kept as it is as the village has been overdeveloped already and I think any more construction will exacerbate an already stressed flood plain.</p> <p>Please stick to brownfield sites;</p> <p>East of Hullbridge has more opportunity for development less green belt harm and better linkages to services.</p> <p>Many sites lay within the projected 2040 flood plains, consideration of commercial or community infrastructure, such as youth services, care facilities, or local businesses would equally need to be subject to the same discussion and scrutiny.</p> <p>These sites must be removed from the local plan due to the potential number of houses - which the surrounding roads and local infrastructure cannot support:</p> <p>CFS099 - Land to the west of Hullbridge – inadequate infrastructure, designated flood plain.</p> <p>CFS149 - Lane Field and Hullbridge Hill, Watery Lane, Hullbridge.</p> <p>CFS172 - Land At Cracknells Farm, Hullbridge - Critical Drainage Risk, Green Belt Harm, Impact on Agricultural (grade 1) Land, inadequate infrastructure.</p> <p>CFS265 – object.</p> <p>CFS163 – object.</p> <p>CFS128 – object due to wildlife.</p> <p>CFS151 (history of Japanese Knot Weed, bridleway and public footpath), CFS128, CFS172 (history of Japanese Knot Weed, bridleway and public footpath), CFS265 - have a large number of very old oak and ash trees bordering the land that should not be destroyed but have the potential of being so if the sites are developed.</p>
	<p>4. Other</p>					

						<p>CFS006; 015; 033; 041; 042 – object due to Over-development: meaning loss of habitats, biodiversity, green space, green fields, nature; agricultural land; detrimental to one's mental and physical health.</p> <p>CFS190 - object due to wildlife, limited access.</p> <p>Proposals to build on Green belt between Keswick Avenue, Pooles Lane and Long Lane would also cause distress to [PERSONAL DETAILS] who suffers from a neurological disorder which is exacerbated by vibration, which would be caused by building works.</p> <p>Development to the West of Hullbridge will effectively join it to Rawreth - this goes against the Impact Assessment position to avoid creating a metropolis.</p> <p>There are more favourable sites for large scale development in the district such as alongside Sutton Road in Rochford (near the airport) which, if a requirement to improve the Purdeys Estate roundabout was included, would actually allow a reduction in pollution levels, have close mass transport links (within minutes of a mainline station and good bus routes) and close to Southend shops and amenities and also secondary school provision in Rochford.</p> <p>Harm to the Green Belt and Coastal Protection Belt, critical Flood and drainage risks (there's a high possibility that a significant proportion of this Village will be below sea level by 2040), impact on natural habitats, lack of accessible open spaces and amenities, loss of footpaths or Bridle ways, impact on Agricultural Land, existing Community Infrastructure constraints-poor road links; few sustainable transport options; education; medical services; public transport; youth services; leisure facilities.</p> <p>Character of village will be lost.</p> <p>A full infrastructure study required.</p> <p>On the South side of the village there are no recreation areas and a lack of pavement and crossings, which with the increase in vehicles</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>due to the current development and lack of speed restrictions has made it more dangerous for pedestrians than it was before.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Uses</b></p> <p><i>Housing</i></p> <p>We do not need any more housing, stop ruining our village. We need green protected sites.</p> <p>Severe traffic congestion making lives miserable for residents, little or no facilities in Hullbridge. We need to be able to access adjoining areas without the misery of sitting in traffic jams – needs addressing. More houses in Hullbridge are totally unacceptable, no senior school, oversubscribed junior school and lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>Present infrastructure cannot support existing housing.</p> <p>Any further housing should be affordable and for the elderly.</p> <p>More houses will cause air pollution and severe disruption to wildlife. There will be fewer public footpaths and bridleways.</p> <p>CFS151 borders housing already, no flooding issues, has drainage and electricity attached and supplied by its own private road, ideal to extend affordable housing for expanding family populations, also there has not yet been any development on the East side of Hullbridge whereas on the West, development has already taken place.</p> <p>CFS 100 should be allocated for residential development as a rural exception site, contribution to the greenbelt and greenbelt boundary is extremely limited.</p> <p>CFS100 - This land was part of the old NSEC site and must be contaminated land.</p> <p>CFS 015 has previously been identified by the Secretary of State (2005) as a site within the current greenbelt boundary that should be released for residential development, due to the very limited</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>contribution the paddock makes to the overall purpose/ function of the wider greenbelt and the defensible boundary.</p> <p>Development to the East of Hullbridge will be on an area where previous flooding has occurred. Building houses will increase the surface run-off and greatly increase flood risks to both these new houses and all the existing houses nearby.</p> <p>Nevendon Salvage - 190 Lower Road, Hullbridge. The site is highly sustainable being on a major bus route and within a five-minute walk of a major food store, A primary school is a 15-minute walk and secondary education is within easy access. In addition, Rayleigh town is also within easy reach either by bus or by walking. The site is also well served by open space and parks are within a 5-minute walk.</p> <p>CFS190 Land South of Pooles Lane - supports Growth Strategy Option 2b, would provide a medium-sized housing scheme, and is exceptionally well placed. It would adjoin the north-western boundary of Hullbridge and lead to the natural extension of this sustainable settlement. The site is incredibly well related to existing services as illustrated on the walking completeness score. Offers the potential to increase permeability within this part of the village, improving access for existing residents located north of Pooles Lane.</p> <p>Although I think the number is high, the proposed site CFS222 looks like a better option with limited harm to existing villages.</p> <p><i>Commercial</i></p> <p>Lubards Farm area could be expanded for further employment.</p> <p>We have enough of everything other than jobs.</p> <p>CFS100 - small business park for offices and light industrial uses on the West side of Burlington Gardens as that is a brownfield site, albeit in greenbelt.</p> <p><i>Community / Transport / Water / Communications Infrastructure</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p><b>Option 3</b> open space.</p> <p>Decent roads, access to train lines, and space at the doctor surgery.</p> <p>The shops barely sell essentials, public transport is shocking – irregular and unreliable buses and no train station. Doctors are full, no NHS dentist, no senior school, junior school at full capacity - this directly disadvantages children and those with disabilities/elderly - not acceptable under an Equality Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Traffic congestion is horrendous, we feel trapped in Hullbridge.</p> <p>Open space is adequate now but if some of the possible sites shown on your map i.e., land along Long Lane and Pooles Lane are built on the resulting housing estates will greatly diminish this valuable natural open space.</p> <p>West of Hullbridge should be protected for green infrastructure regional parkland;</p> <p>Water pressure is already borderline too low and significant investment in water supply and sewerage infrastructure is required if any additional house building is to occur.</p> <p>RDC need to take into account further carbon emissions, overcrowding, traffic congestion, flooding, and further drains on the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Mobile phone masts – associated health risks.</p>
	<p>Q60c. Are there areas in Hullbridge that development should generally be presumed appropriate? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]</p>	32	3	15	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No, does not have supporting infrastructure.</p> <p>None – too many houses, road congestion, lack of public transport.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Green belt should be protected.</p> <p>None, as Hullbridge is losing its identity as a village.</p> <p>Only for community infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Specific Areas / Locations / Sites where Development Presumed Appropriate</b></p> <p>CFS190 – housing for elderly, would have less impact on green belt and provide opportunities for linkages.</p> <p>Infill and brownfield sites only as growth strategy should be on Tier 1 and 2 settlements.</p> <p>CFS151 Land Junction Hullbridge Road / Lower Road – has a long planning history relevant to the Local Plan process. Does not meet the objectives of the Green Belt. Site is highly sustainable being on a major bus route and within a 5-minute walk of a major food store, 15-minute walk from a primary school, and within easy access of secondary education.</p> <p>CFS222 – better option with limited harm to existing villages.</p> <p>Near to the riverside, between Hockley and Hullbridge.</p> <p>Brownfield site – a previous scrap yard.</p> <p>Vandabilt Avenue for housing as it is “Plot Land”.</p> <p>Any areas that are within the current green belt boundary, bounded by existing residential development as this land would be unable to perform the 5 purposes of the green belt.</p>
Q60d. Are there areas that require protecting from development? Why these	68	41	10	17	<p><b>Areas / Locations / Sites Requiring Protection from Development</b></p> <p>CFS151, 172 Cracknells Farm (if developed would reduce the ground’s ability to absorb water causing risks of flash flooding to Burnham Road), 033, 128, 265 (next to Sheepcotes Farm as this space is used</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>areas? [Please state reasoning]</p>				<p>to access the footpath), as full of wildlife and natural springs that run to the river.</p> <p>Sites east of Ferry Road – CFS128, 265, 151, 172,042,041,243,237 and 100 – green belt, natural environmental impact, bridleways, public footpaths.</p> <p>CFS006, 149, 256 and 163 would result in moderate or moderate high green belt harm and insufficient road infrastructure to support development, flooding.</p> <p>Hullbridge - poor existing infrastructure.</p> <p>West of Hullbridge should be protected to support green infrastructure, including the Central Woodlands Arc and prevent joining to Rawreth.</p> <p>East of Hullbridge – previous flood area.</p> <p>Existing green belt areas should be preserved for future generations. Development would destroy nature of the area, landscape, residents' welfare. Flood issues also, and would reduce green belt distance between Hullbridge and Rayleigh/Hockley.</p> <p>CFS099 – coastal protection land, and recreational footpaths, insufficient road infrastructure to support development, and flooding.</p> <p>CFS190 – wildlife, limited access.</p> <p>All river bank areas apart from essential sea wall restoration. Especially the nature reserves as uncommon alongside a river.</p> <p>Hullbridge Meadows and Hullbridge Foreshores – wildlife and geological and specific scientific interest.</p> <p>River side, areas around Kendal Park.</p> <p>Areas that lie north of Lower Road.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>Northerly sites due to proximity to River Crouch.</p> <p>Land within flood zone 3 or high performing green belt sites.</p> <p>Vineyard.</p>
Q60e. Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 48 hold local significance? Are there any other open spaces that hold particular local significance? [Please state reasoning]	15	3	2	10	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Agree, essential for the wellbeing of the local community.</p> <p><b>Other open spaces</b></p> <p>The old footpath going through CFS193 is frequently used as a green walk towards the river.</p> <p>Kendal Park – residents are passionate about as seen on social media posts.</p> <p>The playing field and playground are always in use and important as gives villagers access to outdoor recreational activity.</p> <p>Footpaths across Cracknell’s Farm and other fields are significant.</p> <p>Footpath down Long Lane to Pooles Lane and from Keswick Avenue to Pooles Lane link to the recreation ground, and the riverside walk to Kendal Park and Brandy Hole are significant.</p> <p>All green belt sites are significant.</p> <p>Rose Garden and banks of the River Crouch, as well as the new green space and Memorial gardens at the Malyons Farm development are also significant.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<b>SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities</b>	Q61a. Do you agree with our vision for Canewdon? Is there anything you feel is missing? [Please state reasoning]	15	3	2	10	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>The challenge is to balance need against development. Retaining the compact nature of the village is important. The Saxon layout should not be compromised, suggesting development to the east of the village.</p> <p>Support retaining the character and village feel is something that residents support, development should be proportional.</p> <p><b>Wildlife / Landscape Areas</b></p> <p>Does not mention that north of Lambourne Hall Road is designated Crouch Valley land, and the importance to wildlife and preservation.</p> <p><b>Community Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Needs to include provision of amenities for the outlying dwellings, e.g., bus route along Lark Hill Road needs reinstating. Development at Lark Hill will help many of the forgotten parishioners, stimulating demand for a reinstated bus route.</p>
	<p>Q61b. With reference to Figure 49 and your preferred Strategy Option, do you think any of the promoted sites should be made available for any of the following uses? How could that improve the completeness of Canewdon?</p> <p>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</p> <p>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retails, other]</p>	15	3	6	6	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Housing is key, commercial development is questionable and community infrastructure is sufficient.</p> <p>Opportunities for mixed retail, commercial and housing could be achieved with some sympathetic development in Canewdon.</p> <p>No further development.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Uses</b></p> <p><i>Community Infrastructure</i></p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</p> <p>4. Other</p>					<p>Community infrastructure is needed (more shops, GP surgery, vets, eatery and facilities for the younger population).</p> <p><i>Housing</i></p> <p>CFS058 suitable for housing and lowest environmental impact.</p> <p>Small amount of housing is needed. Site (but only a limited portion) north of Lambourne.</p> <p>Hall Road, east of the village hall has some limited support for residential development.</p> <p>CFS043 Land at Bolt Hall Farm (Lark Hill) should have a higher assessment score, does not fall in Coastal Protection Belt, is not remote, existing dwellings would benefit from a development – sewage connections, public transport, green open space, walking infrastructure alongside Lark Hill Road, creation of bridleways.</p> <p>CFS094 Land West of Ash Green is considered suitable to provide appropriate number of additional homes to support vitality of the village.</p>
	<p>Q61c. Are there areas in Canewdon that development should generally be presumed appropriate? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>5</p>	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Infrastructure first.</p> <p><b>Specific Areas / Locations / Sites that Development Presumed Appropriate</b></p> <p>None that are green belt.</p> <p>Site North of Lambourne Hall Road, east of the Village Hall could provide a limited amount of residential development, which would not impact unreasonably on the surrounding area, but views northwards towards the river must be protected.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>CFS062 would be preferred, but the site should be reduced so as not to extend northwards any further than the adjacent development in Althorne Way, and in phases i.e., future Local Plan reviews.</p> <p>CFS043 Land at Bolt Hall farm (Lark Hill) – is not considered as “too remote”. Would attract community infrastructure benefits.</p>
Q61d. Are there areas that require protecting from development? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]	10	4	1	5	<p><b>Areas / Locations / Sites Requiring Protection From Development</b></p> <p>CFS075 – does not have good existing access as stated in assessment, poor access to health care and public transport, and wildlife needs to be protected (Butts Hill Pond – crested newts).</p> <p>CFS062 (within Crouch Valley) and CFS061 – adjoin wildlife areas, impacts on green belt, landscape, local habitats, safeguarded minerals, agricultural land.</p> <p>All green belt sites.</p> <p>Development should only be considered within or adjacent to the existing village envelope.</p> <p>CFS094 Land West of Ash Green.</p>
Q61e. Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 49 hold local significance? Are there any other open spaces that hold particular local significance? [Please state reasoning]	7	3	1	3	<p><b>General comments</b></p> <p>Agree.</p> <p><b>Other Open Spaces that Hold Particular Local Significance</b></p> <p>Woodland Trust area next to CFS062 holds significance.</p> <p>Agree, but all green belt sites hold significance.</p> <p>All green spaces hold local significance due to recreation and community value, and to prevent urban sprawl.</p>

SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities	Q62a. Do you agree with our vision for Great Stambridge? Is there anything you feel is missing? [Please state reasoning]	37	4	26	7	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Agree, but by allowing development on land surrounding the village, this directly contradicts the vision. There are not a “good” number of community facilities, existing infrastructure would not serve further development. “Relative tranquility” will be eroded.</p> <p>Disagree – as any future development will contradict causing traffic issues.</p> <p>Agree it is an independent village, but disagree to further development.</p> <p>Community infrastructure is inadequate (school, doctors).</p> <p>Do not believe that significant development would achieve the vision aims.</p> <p><b>Community / Identity</b></p> <p>Needs to include reference to children, school, roads, scenery, village feel.</p> <p>Support the vision, but it would benefit from making specific reference to ensure existing facilities and service in the village are sustained, enhanced and the vitality of community is supported.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<p>Q62b. With reference to Figure 50 and your preferred Strategy option, do you think any of the land edged blue should be made available for any of the following uses?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</li> <li>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retails, other]</li> <li>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</li> <li>4. Other</li> </ol>	31	3	20	8	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No. Will lose identity as a village.</p> <p>No. Environment and community infrastructure impacts.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Uses</b></p> <p><i>Community Infrastructure</i></p> <p>CFS141 Land at Stewards Elm Farm could be used to increase woodland, open space, and a children’s playground in the village, providing multiple benefits – wildlife habitats, store carbon to mitigate climate change and soak up water to mitigate flooding. Bridle paths and footpaths could be added to support health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Only for community infrastructure e.g., Drs surgery.</p> <p><i>Housing</i></p> <p>CFS141 Land at Stewards Elm Farm is a logical extension to the settlement. It should be utilized to provide new market and affordable homes to meet identified needs and maintain the vitality of the rural area.</p> <p><i>Commercial</i></p> <p>CFS104 /BFR3 Stambridge Mills, Mill Lane – SPC agree with the proposed site development as is brownfield with no constraints, but not suitable for employment.</p>
<p>Q62c. Are there areas in Great Stambridge that development should be presumed appropriate? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]</p>	18	0	14	4	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No, impact on environment (countryside and wildlife), insufficient road and community infrastructure.</p> <p>Acceptable development would be wind / solar farms, agriculture or wildlife / nature reserves.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p>New forests and biodiversity only as no infrastructure for new housing.</p> <p><b>Specific Areas / Locations / Sites that Development Presumed Appropriate</b></p> <p>Using sites like the old mill which is empty and abandoned would be suitable.</p>
Q62d. Are there areas in Great Stambridge that require protecting from development? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]	21	6	7	8	<p><b>Areas / Locations / Sites Requiring Protection From Development</b></p> <p>All of Stambridge should be protected for historical and countryside value to residents and visitors.</p> <p>All of village should be protected due to lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>All protected - character of village.</p> <p>All marsh and meadowland in and around Stambridge need to be protected to protect environment and habitats.</p> <p>Farming landscape.</p> <p>The meadows behind the allotment provide great walking and important views for residents in Stambridge Meadows.</p>
Q62e. Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 50 hold local significance? Are there any other open spaces that hold particular local significance? [Please state reasoning]	17	7	3	7	<p><b>Other Open Spaces that Hold Particular Local Significance</b></p> <p>All green belt.</p> <p>Areas immediately surrounding the village hold local significance as supports the essence of a rural village and community.</p> <p>All of the village and natural surroundings hold significance due to historical significance as well as abundance of protected species in this area.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<b>SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities</b>	Q63a. Do you agree with our vision for Rawreth? Is there anything you feel is missing? [Please state reasoning]	14	1	8	5	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No, as housing proposals have negative impacts on green belt, agricultural land and infrastructure.</p>
	<p>Q63b. With reference to Figure 51 and your preferred Strategy option, do you think any of the promoted sites should be made available for any of the following uses? How could that improve the completeness of Rawreth?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</li> <li>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retails, other]</li> <li>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</li> <li>4. Other</li> </ol>	15	1	10	4	<p><b>Reference to Specific Uses</b></p> <p>The cross-boundary (CFS222 and CFS239) opportunity east of Wickford should be recognized and allocated as part of the new Local Plan under whichever strategy option is taken forward. Would present opportunities – new walkable neighbourhood (1,500 homes), employment, primary school and local centre. A new defensible green belt boundary would be established to the west of the A130 and north of the railway line.</p> <p>CFS238,223,226,227 and 230 could deliver compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining green belt, including new and improved sports pitches (e.g., CFS222 and CFS226/The Warren), biodiversity net gain, improved walking/cycle links and strategic landscaping.</p> <p>Sustainable development along the north side of the A127, accessed by a new slip road off the A127, land adjoining or close to the A130 in the south Rawreth area (CFS146, 147, 167, 144, 168, 145, 137, 055, 121) sufficient development could take place in conjunction with Basildon and Southend to absorb dwelling numbers, and sustain education facilities, healthcare, small retail and supermarkets etc., alongside leisure and sports. Good access is afforded to A130, A127 and A13, Rayleigh Station.</p>
	Q63c. Are there areas in Rawreth that development should generally be presumed appropriate? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]	12	7	2	3	<p><b>Specific Areas / Locations / Sites that Development Presumed Appropriate</b></p> <p>CFS146, 147,167,144,168,145 and 137 are more suitable due to better access, better transport, divert traffic away from existing congested areas of Hockley and Hawkwell.</p> <p>CFS146, 147,167,144,168,145,137,055 and 121 all have far easier access, room for infrastructure and housing.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					Sites close to A130 and Rawreth Lane / London road have space for large development, infrastructure and transport links – CFS146, 147, 167, 144, 168, 145, 137, 055,121. Would protect existing communities and infrastructure in Rochford, Hockley, Hullbridge and Stambridge, reducing through traffic and pollution.
Q63d. Are there areas in Rawreth that require protecting from development? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]	11	3	3	5	<p><b>Areas / Locations / Sites Requiring Protection From Development</b></p> <p>CFS225 as used for farming and horses.</p> <p>Church Road should be protected due to flooding which would be made worse if more development.</p> <p>Green belt areas as act as a buffer to wildlife, rural scene for locals and walkers.</p> <p>Rawreth needs protecting as development will enable urban sprawl merging Wickford to Rayleigh.</p>
Q63e. Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 51 hold local significance? Are there any other open spaces that hold particular local significance? [Please state reasoning]	5	3	0	2	<p><b>Other Open Spaces that Hold Particular Local Significance</b></p> <p>Agree, but also maintain all the green areas as is used by many local residents for recreation, and have community value.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<b>SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities</b>	Q64a. Do you agree with our vision for Paglesham? Is there anything you feel is missing? [Please state reasoning]	8	0	1	7	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Paglesham is an area that should retain its green belt to retain its character.</p>
	<p>Q64b. With reference to Figure 52 and your preferred Strategy option, do you think any of the land edged blue should be made available for any of the following uses? How could that improve the completeness of Paglesham</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</li> <li>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retails, other]</li> <li>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</li> <li>4. Other</li> </ol>	6	0	3	3	<p><b>Reference to Specific Uses</b></p> <p>No development on green belt land.</p> <p>CFS0166-Paglesham Church End not suitable as Employment land–greenfield / green belt / Coastal protection Belt area (agricultural land), flood risk, telegraph poles, Special Landscaped Area, listed buildings / Conservation Area in proximity.</p>
	Q64c. Are there areas in Paglesham that development should generally be presumed appropriate? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]	4	1	1	2	<p><b>Specific Areas / Locations / Sites that Development Presumed Appropriate</b></p> <p>None that are green belt.</p> <p>Those proposed seem appropriate subject to local knowledge and support.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

	<p>Q64d. Are there areas that require protecting from development? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]</p>	5	2	1	2	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No development without adequate infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Areas / Locations / Sites Requiring Protection From Development</b></p> <p>CFS090 – would be over-development, loss of habitats, biodiversity, green space, nature, agricultural land and detrimental to wellbeing (if developed).</p> <p>CFS0166-Paglesham Church End not suitable as Employment land–greenfield / green belt / Coastal protection Belt area (agricultural land), flood risk, telegraph poles, Special Landscaped Area, listed buildings / Conservation Area in proximity.</p> <p>All green belt sites should be protected to stop damage to environment. The District is at capacity.</p> <p>Areas liable to flooding, no building near the waterfront to protect charm and history.</p>
	<p>Q64e. Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 53 hold local significance? Are there any other open spaces that hold particular local significance? [Please state reasoning]</p>	4	2	0	2	<p><b>Other Open Spaces that Hold Particular Local Significance</b></p> <p>Yes, especially those used for recreation and have community value, but also need to add all green belt sites edged in blue to this category.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

SECTION 14: Planning for Complete Communities	Q65a. Do you agree with our vision for Sutton and Stonebridge? Is there anything you feel is missing? [Please state reasoning]	20	1	9	10	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>No, residents should have been consulted on vision.</p> <p>No – majority of people have no interest in “improving the completeness of existing communities”. The area should remain rural.</p> <p>Improvements to connectivity would be welcome, e.g., a cycle lane along Sutton road and improved pavements.</p> <p>Stonebridge should remain an independent hamlet with its own character and sense of community.</p> <p>Yes, areas should remain low key but have better access to services.</p>
	<p>Q65b. With reference to Figure 54 and your preferred Strategy option, do you think any of the land edged blue should be made available for any of the following uses? How could that improve the completeness of Sutton and Stonebridge?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Housing [market, affordable, specialist, traveller, other]</li> <li>2. Commercial [offices, industrial, retails, other]</li> <li>3. Community infrastructure [open space, education, healthcare, allotments, other]</li> <li>4. Other</li> </ol>	23	3	13	7	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>None as all detract from living in a hamlet.</p> <p>No further development on green belt land.</p> <p>No further development unless necessary infrastructure is in place.</p> <p><b>Reference to Specific Uses</b></p> <p>Housing – a completely new town makes sense as will enable infrastructure, removing strain on existing towns.</p> <p>CFS260 (including the linked lettered site) Land North of Southend is supported as would provide a large tranche of new development that is required for housing and employment for both RDC and SBC. Would contribute to infrastructure, improve accessibility to east of Rochford District and east Southend, proximity to Temple Farm and Pudeys Industrial estates as well as airport.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					<p><b>Option 3b</b> concentrated growth north of Southend would provide community infrastructure, transport and access improvements and public open green space.</p> <p>New growth location south east of Rochford and north of Southend as will deliver services, community infrastructure for future and existing residents. Masterplan designed to ensure existing developments retain identity.</p>
Q65c. Are there areas in Sutton and Stonebridge that development should generally be presumed appropriate? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]	7	1	4	2	<p><b>Specific Areas / Locations / Sites that Development Presumed Appropriate</b></p> <p>Only for nature reserve / woodland etc.</p> <p>None that are greenbelt.</p> <p>The Sutton Parish holds potential for a Garden Village site which could join onto main access roads and nearby facilities. Sites that should be considered:</p> <p>CFS155, 260Z, 260AE, 260H, 260AK, 071, 260G.</p>
Q65d. Are there areas that require protecting from development? Why these areas? [Please state reasoning]	15	6	4	5	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Development will destroy the individuality of the hamlets.</p> <p><b>Areas / Locations / Sites Requiring Protection From Development</b></p> <p>CFS260T, 260L, 260F – fields as you go west along Barrow Hall Road to the right, green belt and agricultural land should not be developed.</p> <p>CFS260C – footpath, additional pollution – air quality will be poorer.</p> <p>CFS103 – Old Mummery site – increased risk of surface water flooding on junction Barrow Hall road and the brook which floods regularly.</p> <p>CFS260K and CFS260B – increased surface water flooding.</p>

						<p>All areas should be protected – all green belt, all in flood plain, would lose village / hamlet identity.</p> <p>CFS260B, 260H, 260C, 260J, 260F, 260L, 260T, 260K, 260I, 071,103, 260G, 260AH, 260AF, 260AE, 260AB, 260AD – object to due to critical drainage areas, high harm to green belt, medium capacity category for accommodating development, mineral safeguarding areas, Grade1 agricultural land, impacts on archaeology and built heritage, poor public transport accessibility, impact on identity and character of Stonebridge hamlet.</p> <p>CFS260O, 260D, 260A, 260M, 260K, 260T, 260L, 260F, 260C, 260B, 260H, 260I, 260G, 260AK, 260AF, 260AH, 260AE, 260AB, 260AD, 260AC, 260Z, 260AG, 142, 071, 103 – impacts on local environment and community.</p> <p>All areas prefixed CFS260 are key to maintaining the rural nature of east Rochford. This area is essential to the view from Southend across the Roach Valley. It is important to maintain the separation of these areas from Great Wakering and Southend.</p> <p>CFS071, 075, 076 as overdevelopment, loss of habitats, biodiversity, green space, nature, agricultural land, impact on wellbeing.</p> <p>CFS076 Land North of Sutton Road and CFS071 Barling Road – inadequate infrastructure, connectivity and accessibility, traffic congestion, impacts on wildlife, flood risk, greenfield / greenbelt area, Special Landscaped Area, Flood Risk 1 and 2.</p> <p>CFS260T, CFS260K and CFS260B – lack of existing infrastructure and increase risk of flooding.</p> <p>The area around Prittle Brook is on a flood plain.</p> <p>The whole of Stonebridge and surrounding areas should be protected – it is a hamlet.</p> <p>All woodland, farm land and green belt should be protected.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

					CFS103 as was rejected for planning less than two years ago and should not be included again.
Q65e. Do you agree that the local green spaces shown on Figure 54 hold local significance? Are there any other open spaces that hold particular local significance? [Please state reasoning]	7	2	1	4	<p>Other open Spaces that hold particular local significance highlighted, including the old Mummeries site could be turned into a usable country park.</p> <p>All these sites should be protected, all the green belt sites edged blue need to be protected for local significance.</p> <p>CFS260T, 260L and 260F fields along Barrow Hall Road hold local significance – green belt and agricultural land.</p> <p>Green belt borders are significant as prevent urban sprawl.</p>
Q66. Do you agree that our rural communities do not require individual vision statements? Are there communities that you feel should have their own vision? [Please state reasoning]	9	2	3	4	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>Disagree, they require own visions as are very unique and should be protected.</p> <p>Important community links between Canewdon, Pagelsham and Stambridge.</p> <p>No, all communities should have their own individual, locally determined vision statements, especially the more rural ones. Each settlement has its own distinct character, and the vision statement would serve to aid the planning process in safeguarding their individual character.</p> <p>At this time, yes. They should have some consideration in the future to protect them. It should be before the communities to decide their vision statements.</p>

## Rochford District Council New Local Plan – Spatial Options Feedback Report 2021

<p>Q67. Do you agree with our vision for our rural communities? Is there anything you feel is missing? [Please state reasoning]</p>	9	3	0	6	<p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>We should be prioritizing protection of wildlife and farming land.</p> <p>The vision should re-iterate what the individual character and uniqueness of our communities needs to be, and that it will be safeguarded.</p>
<p>Q68. Are there any other courses of action the Council could take to improve the completeness of our rural communities?</p>	10	0	1	9	<p><b>Specific Course of Action the Council Could Take to Improve Completeness</b></p> <p>Community consultation to engage all residents outside of working hours, to see what needs are, and empower Parish and Town Councils to take relevant local actions.</p> <p>To keep green belt for future generations.</p> <p>Look at other ways to meet housing demand so that the District can keep some of its uniqueness.</p> <p>Look to add more footpaths, byways and bridleways etc. to promote good health and wellbeing. Explore other good practice etc.</p> <p>Utilise pubs to provide services and meeting environments for local communities.</p> <p>Ensure a green belt buffer that would actively prevent communities merging into one conglomeration.</p> <p>Create a country park to the west of Hullbridge.</p> <p>Improve village roads, transport, educational and utility infrastructure, e.g., sewerage system in Hullbridge.</p>