

ROCHFORD ALLOCATIONS SUBMISSIONS DOCUMENT

ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

Issue 1

Is the overall strategy for the allocation of housing, traveller and employment sites sound having regard to the needs and demands of the District identified in the Core Strategy; the relationship with national policy and Government objectives and the evidence base and preparatory processes?

Questions:

- i) Have the consultation procedures undertaken been adequate and in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012?
- ii) Are the policies in an appropriate form and should there be reference to the use of Masterplans or site briefs?
- iii) Would a 5 year housing land supply be achieved having regard to paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework?
- iv) Do the proposed allocations allow for sufficient flexibility?
- v) How would the supply of sites be monitored and managed?
- vi) Would post 2021 sites be reviewed in the next Core Strategy?
- vii) Is the 5% 'cap' on additional housing justified?
- viii) Are there alternative sites that would have avoided the loss of Green Belt land?
- ix) Have there been any material changes in circumstances since the adoption of the Core Strategy?
- x) To what extent has the Council considered sites outside those identified in the Core Strategy?
- xi) Has the overall impact on highway capacity across the District been adequately addressed?

Issue 2

Are the allocated housing and employment sites listed below (both brownfield and settlement extensions) justified, deliverable within the plan period and consistent with national policy?

Great Wakering

BFR1 Star Lane Industrial Estate, Great Wakering
SER9 West Great Wakering
NEL3 South of Great Wakering

Rayleigh

BFR4 Rawreth Industrial Estate, Rayleigh
SER1 North of London Road, Rayleigh
NEL1 South of London Road, Rayleigh
NEL2 West of A1245, Rayleigh

Hullbridge

SER6 South West Hullbridge

Canewdon

SER7 South Canewdon

Others

BFR2 Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate, Hockley

BFR3 Stambridge Mills, Rochford

SER2 West Rochford

SER4 South Hawkwell

SER8 South East Ashingdon

Questions (for all sites/locations):

- i) Is the site selected justified when compared to other reasonable alternatives?
- ii) Is the proposed development deliverable over the plan period having regard, amongst other things, to land ownership issues and infrastructure constraints?
- iii) Are the detailed site boundaries appropriate?
- iv) Is the detail about the form, scale, access and quantum of development appropriate having regard to policies in the Core Strategy?
- v) Are the requirements for public open space and play space justified for brownfield sites given the likely development costs?
- vi) If any of the specific sites/locations are found to be unsound, then what are the alternative options?

Questions for specific sites/locations:

Great Wakering

- i) Is it realistic to anticipate that existing industrial uses would re-locate to the new employment site?
- ii) If either Sites SER9a or 9b are found unsound, would the sites at Poyntens Lane (Representation 29003) and land west of Alexandra Road included in Option WGW3 (Representation 28791) be sound?
- iii) If Site NEL3 is found unsound, would the land on the western side of Tithe Park included in Options E23 and E24 (Representation 28826) be sound?

Rayleigh

- i) In the absence of a specific promoter is it realistic to assume that site BFR4 will come forward and are the expectations for site density justified given its location?
- ii) Is there sufficient detail about replacement and additional playing field and sporting facilities in Policy SER1?

Hullbridge

- i) Have the consultation procedures undertaken been adequate and in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the

Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012?

- ii) Is it reasonable to sub-divide the allocated area so that the second phase on SER6b is prevented until after 2021?
- iii) Can the necessary highway and other infrastructure be provided having regard to flooding along Watery Lane, drainage and sewage?
- iv) How will the development be integrated into Hullbridge?
- v) If Site SER6 is found unsound, would Site 17 (Representations 28689 and 29006) be sound?

Canewdon

- i) Have the consultation procedures undertaken been adequate and in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012?
- ii) Would development of Site SER7 conserve the heritage asset of St Nicholas Church in a manner appropriate to its significance? How could this be achieved by design?
- iii) Is the allocation contrary to the Policy H2 of the Core Strategy which refers to "South Canewdon" whereas at least part of the site lies to the west?
- iv) If Site SER7 is found unsound, would Option SC17 (Representation 28760) be sound?

Issue 3

Is the allocated traveller site GT1 at West Rayleigh justified, deliverable within the plan period and consistent with national policy?

Questions:

- i) Is the site selected justified when compared to other reasonable alternatives?
- ii) Is the proposed development deliverable over the plan period having regard, amongst other things, to ownership issues and infrastructure constraints?
- iii) Can the site be developed independently of Site NEL2?
- iv) Are the detailed site boundaries appropriate bearing in mind neighbouring uses?
- v) Can satisfactory highway access be devised?
- vi) If Site GT1 is found unsound, would 'swapping' the traveller site with the allocated employment site NEL1 (Representation 28693) be sound?

Issue 4

Are the existing employment, ecological and landscape, educational, open space and leisure facilities, town centre and primary shopping area boundary allocations justified, likely to be effective and consistent with national policy?

Issue 5

Has the Plan clear and effective mechanisms for implementation, delivery and monitoring?

David Smith

INSPECTOR

29 May 2013