

EXAMINATION OF THE ROCHFORD ALLOCATIONS SUBMISSION DOCUMENT

INSPECTOR'S FURTHER QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS TO THE COUNCIL

The Council has responded to my initial questions of 17 May 2013 following my preliminary examination of the Rochford Allocations Submissions Document (RASD). I am grateful for those answers and for the additional information provided and also note that the Council is proposing a number of minor changes to the Plan.

The matters that are critical to the soundness and legal compliance of the Document are set out in the final version of my issues and questions. These should be addressed by the Council in its hearing statements which are due to be submitted by **Friday 16 August 2013**. However, in the meantime, there are some matters arising from the Council's answers that prompt further questions on my part which would be helpfully addressed in the interim period.

As they 'follow-up' questions previously asked I will adopt the original numbering system and there are two further questions arising from the proposed schedule of changes and the current planning position (Qs 19 & 20). In certain instances I will give an initial view where the Council's answer invited this although this may be subject to change following the hearings. The absence of further questions should not be taken to mean that soundness or legal compliance has been demonstrated since these will be covered in the hearings sessions starting on **Tuesday 3 September 2013**.

Further answers should be concise and should be sent to the Programme Officer by **Friday 19 July 2013**.

2. a) It is indicated that masterplans/brief will be expected for "many" of the allocated sites but are the proposed minor changes necessary for Sites SER3 and SER7 where the quantum of development is quite small and for Sites SER4 and SER5 where development has already commenced following the grant of planning permission?
2. b) Although setting out expectations in one place the wording of the concept statements results in duplication with Policies in the Core Strategy. However, my initial view is that the substantial revisions that would be required to remove unnecessary text are not justified.
8. If the purpose of Policy BFR2 is to highlight that the site is no longer to be retained in employment uses and that housing development, amongst other things, will be supported then should not a statement to this effect be included?

10. My view is that all land affected by the site allocation should be included on the site map whether or not it is within the existing settlement boundary.
13. So is the answer to my original question 'no'?
14. c) From my inspection it appears that Old School Meadow may be a private road and, moreover, that it would not be physically possible to connect to Site SER9a because intervening land is used for parking. Whilst there are no highway objections the reference to possible access to the south therefore appears unlikely to be practical unless further land is incorporated. Does the Council and/or Highway Authority have any further comments in this regard?
17. Given the stance of the Highway Authority further evidence will be required to demonstrate soundness.
18. The intention is understood but in order to link Site NEL3 an internal access road would be required across land outside the development area and across the track to the Local Wildlife Site. Is this practical or should the site map be adjusted to suit?
19. In relation to page 40 and para 3.42 of the Plan there is reference to a Statement of Common Ground in the proposed schedule of changes. Could this be provided to me and made generally available?
20. What are the "outstanding matters" affecting the determination of the planning application at Stambridge Mills (Ref:11/00494/FUL)?

David Smith

INSPECTOR

26 June 2013