

# EXAMINATION OF RAYLEIGH AREA ACTION PLAN SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

## HEARING AGENDA – WEDNESDAY 4 MARCH

1. Preliminary, procedural or legal matters
  - (i) Confirmation of the Plan under examination – Submission Document of November 2013 (SUBDOC2)
  - (ii) Duty to co-operate – any “strategic matters”?
  - (iii) Air Quality Management Area Order
2. **Issue 1:** Is the overall framework for development within the RAAP area sound having regard to its needs and demands; the relationship with other plans, national policy and Government objectives and the evidence base and preparatory processes?
  - (i) What are the aims and objectives of the RAAP?
  - (ii) What is the Plan period? Is this stated?
  - (iii) In promoting community facilities in line with Policy RTC4 of the Core Strategy should uses of this kind be accepted within the defined shopping frontages under Policy 3?
3. **Issue 2:** Are the policy and proposals for movement justified and deliverable? Would they achieve the aims in the RAAP area framework?
  - (i) What was the justification for the improvements and works in Table 1 and Figure 8?
  - (ii) What is the rationale for the proposed modifications? Is this the best option?
  - (iii) What is the purpose of additional modelling work?
  - (iv) Is the RAAP sufficiently flexible to accommodate its findings?
  - (v) How are pedestrian linkages to the railway station, car parks and other adjoining areas including historic assets to be improved?
  - (vi) Does criterion 4 of Policy 1 refer to pedestrian routes?
  - (vii) What provision is likely to be made for public funding of the environmental improvement and highway schemes in Table 1? Is it realistic to expect developer contributions to assist given the absence of allocated sites? In the absence of a specific policy how would developer contributions be secured? What is the position in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy? Should any of the schemes be prioritised?

4. **Issue 3:** Are the policies for retail development clear, justified and consistent with national policy? Would they achieve the aims in the RAAP area framework?
- (i) On what basis were the revised primary and secondary shopping frontages determined?
  - (ii) What are the existing proportions of Class A1 use within the revised primary and secondary frontages?
  - (iii) Are there adequate provisions within Policy 3 to properly consider hot food takeaways?
  - (iv) Does Policy 3 take sufficient account of permitted development rights in Class D of Part 4 and Classes CA and IA of Part 3 of the General Permitted Development Order (as amended) and the provisions for prior approval?
  - (v) In the absence of specific allocations are there adequate opportunities for new retail-led development within Rayleigh town centre given the floorspace projection of around 6,800 sq m to 2034 in the Retail and Leisure Update?
5. **Issue 4:** Are the policies relating to the character of Rayleigh clear, justified and consistent with national policy? Would they achieve the aims in the RAAP area framework?
- (i) What is meant by criterion 4 of Policy 6 and criterion 2 of Policy 8 in relation to the development of building backs? Are they sufficiently clear?

Representors in attendance:

National Trust Rayleigh Mount Local Committee (as requested)  
Mr Krolkowski (as requested)  
Essex County Council Highways (as invited)