

### **Rochford Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

Rochford District Council adopted the Rochford Allocations Document as a Development Plan Document on 25 February 2013.

This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

As an integral part of the preparation of the Rochford Allocations Document, and in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 19 (5), the Plan has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The SA process assesses the likely significant economic, social and environmental effects of the Plan.

The SA of the Rochford District Core Strategy fully incorporates the requirements of the European Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004), and has played an important role in the development of the Rochford Allocations Document.

In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, this statement addresses each of the following issues in relation to the Rochford Allocations Document:

- how sustainability considerations have been integrated into the development plan document;
- how the options and consultation responses received on the development plan document and sustainability appraisal reports have been taken into account;
- the reasons for choosing the development plan document in light of other reasonable alternatives; and
- monitoring measures.

Each of the above matters is considered in turn within this SA/SEA Statement.

### **How sustainability considerations have been integrated into the development plan document**

An overarching SA Scoping Report generic to all Rochford Development Plan Documents was produced as part of the preparation of the Rochford Core Strategy, and as such the overarching SA of the Council's planning policies is the Core Strategy SA Report. This was in accordance with government guidance which stated that the SA must be proportionate to the plan in question and it should not repeat the appraisal of higher level policy.

The Council's Core Strategy was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination (to be undertaken by the independent Inspector on behalf of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) on 14 January 2010.

The final SA Report for the Core Strategy Submission Document with an integrated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was produced in 2009. However, following the Forest Heath case (Save Historic Newmarket v. Forest Heath District Council) in March 2011

which provided an additional interpretation on undertaking SEA, the Council requested that the Inspector delay the issuing of a decision on the soundness of the Core Strategy to enable a review of the Core Strategy Submission SA to be undertaken. The Inspector accepted this request, and an addendum to the submitted Core Strategy SA was produced, and consulted upon in June/July 2011.

The addendum appraised in further detail the preferred general locations for housing and employment development and the reasonable alternatives. The addendum should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.

The Core Strategy was found sound, subject to changes and the Inspector's Report stated that the SA/SEA work undertaken, including the addendum, was adequate. The Core Strategy was adopted on 13 December 2011.

The SEA Baseline Information Profile for the District, which contains a wealth of environmental, economic and social information, and is appended to the SA Report for the Allocations Document was used to inform the appraisal of Plan.

The stages in the SA process for the Allocations Document were as follows:

Stage	Task
Stage A	SA Scoping Process
Stage B	Developing and refining options and assessing effects.
Stage C	Preparing the SA Report.
Stage D	Consulting on the Plan and the SA Report.
Stage E	Monitoring and implementing the Plan.

Each stage of the Allocations Document has been the subject of an SA which has been prepared alongside the appropriate document. The milestones for the preparation of the Allocations Document are set out below:

- Consultation with statutory bodies on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken between 5 March 2009 and 3 April 2009.
- Public consultation on the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document was undertaken between 17 March 2010 and 30 April 2010.
- Initial consultation on the Draft Sustainability Appraisal for the Discussion and Consultation Document was undertaken between 16 January 2012 and 27 February 2012.
- Additional consultation on the Updated Sustainability Appraisal for the Discussion and Consultation Document, and the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document itself was undertaken between 13 August 2012 and 10 September 2012.

- Pre-Submission Consultation.
- Submission to the Secretary of State.
- Examination in Public
- Schedule of Modifications
- Adoption.

The stages of the SA scoping process (Stage A) were as follows:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
A1: Reviewing Relevant Policies, Plans and Programmes	To identify other relevant plans, policies, programmes and sustainability objectives, and assess the context provided by them, in particular relevant environmental, social and economic objectives and requirements.
A2: Collecting baseline information	To provide the basis to predict and monitor effects and help to identify sustainability problems and alternative ways of dealing with them.
A3: Identifying the sustainability issues and the appraisal objectives	To define key issues for the DPD and develop sustainability plan objectives and options to link to evidence by reference to baseline information.
A4: Considering options and alternatives	To identify the effects of 'reasonable alternatives' as set out in the SEA Directive, as appropriate. However, there is no need to devise alternatives simply to comply with the Directive.
A5: Developing the SA Framework	To identify SA Objectives, where possible to be expressed in the form of targets and sustainability indicators. The issues to be covered in the SA Framework and the level of detail should be such that they are relevant and proportionate to the plan.
A6: Consultation on Scope of the SA	Statutory, specific and general stakeholders.

The key sustainability issues for the District are identified in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. It was considered that this list is of relevance to the Allocations DPD. These issues were used in developing the objectives and policies of the document, as detailed below under Task A5. The key sustainability issues for the District are as follows:

Key sustainability Issues/ opportunities identified for Rochford District
The provision of quality and affordable housing to meet housing needs in the Districts settlements.
Improving services and connectivity to the sparsely populated eastern part of the district.
Taking account of environmental and physical constraints when accommodating new housing.
The protection of the District's biodiversity and landscape qualities; including opportunities for green infrastructure networks.
High levels of car ownership and limited public transport in many areas.
High levels of out-commuting to other districts and difficulties in competing with economies in neighbouring areas.
Opportunity to stimulate the local economy, including the rural economy, whilst recognising difficulties in competing with economies in neighbouring areas.
Opportunities to incorporate good practice sustainable design into new development, and minimise the carbon footprint of the District.

An SA Framework used to appraise the policies set out in the Allocations Submission Document was produced. The decision-aiding questions of the SA Framework were adapted from that of the Core Strategy Submission Document to reflect the differing perspectives and scales of the Development Plan Document, where appropriate. The SA Framework was developed having regard to consultation response, and the final SA Framework used was as follows:

	SA Objective	Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?
	<b>Balanced Communities</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health, Material Assets)	
1	To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the phasing of infrastructure, including community facilities to meet ongoing and future needs?</li> <li>● Will it ensure the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural and urban communities?</li> <li>● Will it ensure equal opportunities and that all sections of the community are catered for?</li> </ul>

	SA Objective	Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it meet the needs of an ageing population?</li> <li>Will the policies and options proposed seek to enhance the qualifications and skills of the local community?</li> <li>Will income and quality-of-life disparities be reduced?</li> </ul>
<b>Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health)		
2	Create <b>healthy and</b> safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it ensure the delivery of high quality, safe and inclusive design?</li> <li>Will it improve health and reduce health inequalities?</li> <li>Will it promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles?</li> <li>Will green infrastructure (non-vehicular infrastructure routes and links) and networks be promoted and/or enhanced?</li> <li>Will it minimise noise pollution?</li> <li>Will it minimise light pollution?</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health)		
3	To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?</li> <li>Will a mix of housing types and tenures be promoted?</li> <li>Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</li> <li>Does it promote high quality design?</li> <li>Is there sustainable access to key services?</li> <li>Does it meet the resident's needs in terms of sheltered and lifetime homes or those that can be easily adapted so?</li> </ul>
<b>Economy &amp; Employment</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health, Material Assets)		
4	To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it promote and enhance existing centres by focusing development in such centres?</li> <li>Will it improve business development?</li> </ul>

	SA Objective	Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?
	promote town centre vitality/viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it enhance consumer choice through the provision of a range of shopping, leisure, and local services to meet the needs of the entire community?</li> <li>• Does it promote mixed use and high density development in urban centres?</li> <li>• Does it promote a wide variety of jobs across all sectors?</li> <li>• Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District?</li> <li>• Will it aid the realisation of London Southend Airport’s economic potential?</li> </ul>
<b>Accessibility</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health, Air, Climatic Factors)		
5	To promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and moving freight ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase the availability of sustainable transport modes?</li> <li>• Will it seek to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation other than the private car, including walking and cycling?</li> <li>• Will it contribute positively to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>• Does it seek to encourage development where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located in sustainable accessible locations?</li> <li>• Does it enable access for all sections of the community, including the young, the socially deprived, those with disabilities and the elderly?</li> <li>• Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District, and for out-commuting to be reduced?</li> <li>• Does it enable access to green infrastructure and the wider natural environment to all sections of the community?</li> </ul>

	SA Objective	Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?
	<b>Biodiversity</b> (SEA topic: Fauna & Flora)	
6	To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats, including the District's distinctive estuaries and salt marshes?</li> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to protected species and priority species?</li> <li>• Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?</li> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance sites of geological significance?</li> <li>• Does land use allocation reflect the scope of using brownfield land for significant wildlife interest where viable and realistic?</li> <li>• Does new development integrate within it opportunities for new habitat creation, particularly where they could facilitate species movement and colonisation in relation to climate change pressures on biodiversity and its distribution?</li> </ul>
	<b>Cultural Heritage</b> (SEA topic: Cultural Heritage, Landscape)	
7	To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?</li> <li>• Will it support locally-based cultural resources and activities?</li> </ul>
	<b>Landscape &amp; Townscape</b> (SEA topic: Landscape, Cultural Heritage)	
8	To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it seek to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces?</li> <li>• Will it contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?</li> </ul>

	SA Objective	Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it conserve (as preservation is neither realistic or desirable) the landscape character areas of the plan area?</li> <li>Will it preserve and/or enhance townscape character and value?</li> </ul>
<b>Climate Change &amp; Energy</b> (SEA topic: Climatic Factors)		
9	To reduce contributions to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?</li> <li>Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources?</li> <li>Does it adapt to and provide for the consequences of climate change in a largely low-lying area?</li> </ul>
<b>Water</b> (SEA topic: Water, Fauna & Flora)		
10	To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it improve the quality of inland water?</li> <li>Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?</li> <li>Will it provide for an efficient water conservation and supply regime?</li> <li>Will it provide for effective wastewater treatment?</li> <li>Will it require the provision of sustainable drainage systems in new development?</li> <li>Will it reduce the risk of flooding?</li> <li>Will it integrate sustainable flood management which works with natural processes, presents habitat enhancement opportunities and is landscape character sensitive?</li> </ul>
<b>Land &amp; Soil</b> (SEA topic: Soils)		
11	To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it ensure the re-use of previously-developed land and urban areas in preference to Greenfield sites, as far as is practicable given the characteristics of the District?</li> <li>Will higher-density development be promoted where appropriate?</li> </ul>



	SA Objective	Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will soil quality be preserved?</li> <li>• Will it promote the remediation of contaminated land?</li> <li>• Will the best and most versatile agricultural land be protected?</li> </ul>
<b>Air Quality</b> (SEA topic: Air, Climatic Factors)		
12	To improve air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will air quality be improved through reduced emissions (e.g. through reducing car travel)?</li> <li>• Will it direct transport movements away from AQMAs and/or potentially significant junctions?</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b> (SEA topic: Human Health, Material Assets, Climatic Factors, Fauna & Flora, Water, Air)		
13	To promote sustainable design and construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it ensure the use of sustainable design principles, e.g. encouraging a mix of uses?</li> <li>• Will climate proofing design measures be incorporated?</li> <li>• Will the local character/vernacular be preserved and enhanced through development?</li> <li>• Will it require the re-use and recycling of construction materials?</li> <li>• Will it encourage locally-sourced materials?</li> <li>• Will it require best-practice sustainable construction methods, for example in energy and water efficiency?</li> </ul>

The second stage in the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Allocations Document (Stage B) encompassed the development and refinement of policies and assessment of effects. The six main tasks were as set out below.

Stage	Task
B1	Testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework
B2	Developing the DPD options

Stage	Task
B3	Predicting the effects of the DPD
B4	Evaluating the effects of the DPD
B5	Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects
B6	Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD

A detailed assessment of the proposed policies and the alternative options against the SA objectives was undertaken as part of Stage C. A summary of the result was included in the SA Report, with the detailed assessment appended to the report. The results of this assessment were used to shape the Plan, including the selection and rejection of options.

The SA process also identified a number of recommendations to make the Plan more sustainable. The table appended to this document as **Appendix 1** demonstrates how the recommendations suggested at the Discussion and Consultation stage of the SA process was integrated into the Plan prior to finalisation of the draft policies. The appraisal of the draft Submission Document included recommendations embedded within it which were within the proposed policies, as an SA report for the Submission Document was produced alongside the Submission Document and informed its development.

Some of the key recommendations identified through the SA process include:

- Taking into account the relationship between potential alternative options when considering different land uses which are in proximity to one another
- Areas at risk of flooding should, if taken forward as part of a preferred option, be given over to public open space
- The preparation of Local Wildlife Site Management Plan where development of particular options has the potential to impact on neighbouring Local Wildlife Sites
- The inclusion of green buffers to mitigate impact on neighbouring sites of potential ecological value, areas subject to preservation orders or for landscape purposes

The recommendations identified throughout the SA process assisted in mitigating the potential impacts of the proposed policies and had a positive effect on the sustainability of the Plan. The SA report for the Allocations Submission Document found that overall there would be significant sustainability benefits in adopting the Plan as proposed.

Following the examination hearing sessions, and receipt of the Inspector's interim report on the soundness of the Allocations, a Schedule of Modifications was produced. These modifications were subject to sustainability appraisal, and an addendum to the SA Report was produced.

This SA addendum concluded that the majority of the proposed modifications to the Allocations Submission Document do not have a significant effect on the majority of the SA objectives. Where the proposed modifications to policies do impact on SA objectives, the impact – whilst there are some exceptions – is generally positive. The SA Addendum noted that SA of the Allocations Submission Document (April 2013) concluded that, overall, there were significant sustainability benefits to adopting the plan as proposed and stated that this will still be the case if the proposed modifications are incorporated into the plan.

### **How the options and consultation responses received on the development plan document and sustainability appraisal reports have been taken into account**

Statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) were consulted on the draft SA Framework for the Allocations DPD between 5 March 2009 and 3 April 2009 by letters dated 5 March 2009.

Responses were received from Natural England, which have been taken into account and a revised SA Framework was subsequently produced.

The initial stage of the Allocations DPD (the Discussion and Consultation Document) was consulted upon in March and April 2010 and elicited a considerable response from a wide range of stakeholders, including statutory bodies, parish councils, members of the public, developers, agents and landowners. In total 8,239 representations were received. A summary of the responses to the consultation, which includes the issues raised and officers' initial responses to these, was also published.

The draft SA Report was published in early 2012 and key stakeholders were consulted on this document (which included statutory consultees, developers and agents) for a six week period between 16 January 2012 and 27 February 2012. The document was also published on the Council's website. The issues raised and the responses to these are presented within Updated SA (July 2012) Appendix 12. These responses have been taken into account as appropriate.

Given the delay between the publication of the Discussion and Consultation Document and the draft SA Report it was considered appropriate to provide stakeholders with an additional opportunity to comment on both documents together, and in particular the implications of the SA Report for the initial stage of the Allocations DPD on the options within the Discussion and Consultation Document. Key stakeholders were invited to comment again on these documents for a four week period between 13 August 2012 and 10 September 2012. The issues raised and the responses to these are presented within Appendix 13 of the Updated SA (July 2012). These responses have been taken into account as appropriate.

The Submission Document and SA Report will be consulted on for a period of eight weeks between 29 November 2012 and 25 January 2013. The results of this were considered through the examination process, culminating in the modifications to the Plan as set out in the Schedule of Modifications and incorporated into the adopted Plan.

**The reasons for choosing the development plan document in light of other reasonable alternatives**

The inclusion of the effects of ‘reasonable alternatives’ is required by the SEA Directive. ‘Reasonable alternatives’ should form part of both the SA and the plan, and the guidance notes that within Development Plan Document this will take the form of options.

Options that were identified through the Allocations Discussion and Consultation Document were appraised. It should be noted that additional alternative options which did not form part of the Discussion and Consultation Document were also appraised within the updated SA (July 2012).

Other alternative options were identified during the preparation of the Allocation Submission Document, and subsequently appraised through the SA Report (April 2013).

The reasons for choosing the development plan document in light of other reasonable alternatives – rejecting or selecting options – is set out in **Appendix 2**.

**Monitoring measures**

The SA process identified suitable indicators to monitor the SA Framework objectives. These are as follows:

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
<b>1. Balanced Communities</b>	<p>To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Changing educational attainment at GCSE Level</li><li>• Proportion of persons in the local population with a degree level qualification.</li><li>• Parishes with a GP, post office, play area, pub, village hall</li><li>• Percentage of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centre</li><li>• Mix of housing tenure within settlements</li><li>• Provision of new youth and community facilities secured through new developments</li><li>• Provision of open space secured through new developments</li></ul>
<b>2. Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</b>	<p>Create healthy and safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Monitor the number of domestic burglaries, violent offences, vehicle crimes, vandalism and all crime per 1,000 population.</li></ul>

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Percentage of residents surveyed who feel ‘fairly safe’ or ‘very safe’ during the day whilst outside in their Local Authority.</li> <li>● Indexes of Multiple Deprivation throughout the District.</li> <li>● Monitor the type and number of applications permitted in the greenbelt.</li> <li>● Life expectancy</li> <li>● Hectares of new greenspace created</li> <li>● Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard</li> <li>● Death rates from circulatory disease, cancer, accidents and suicide</li> <li>● Residents description of Health</li> <li>● Obesity levels</li> <li>● Provision of open space secured through new developments</li> </ul>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Housing</b></p> <p>To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings.</li> <li>● Indices of Multiple Deprivation – Housing and Services Domain</li> <li>● Percentage of households rented from the Council or in Housing Association/Registered Social Landlords properties</li> <li>● Percentage of new housing which is affordable</li> <li>● Average house price compared with average earnings</li> <li>● Number of housing Completions</li> <li>● Percentage of Lifetime Homes</li> </ul>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Economy &amp; Employment</b></p> <p>To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and promote town centre vitality/viability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The changing diversity if main town centre uses (by number, type and amount of floorspace)</li> <li>● The changing density of development</li> <li>● Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area</li> <li>● Percentage of employees commuting out of the District to work</li> <li>● Amount of land developed for employment (by type)</li> <li>● Retail health checks/economic prosperity of smaller towns and villages</li> <li>● Number of jobs created through new developments</li> </ul>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Accessibility</b></p>

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
	<p>To promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and moving freight ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in the travel to work mode of transport</li> <li>• Indices of Multiple Deprivation most notably the Housing and Services Domain</li> <li>• Car ownership</li> <li>• Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major health centre</li> <li>• Kilometres of cycle routes and facilities for cyclists</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kilometres of new walking routes provided</li> <li>• Number of houses within a specified radius of services/facilities</li> <li>• Number of houses within a suitable distance of open space (based on Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards – ANGSt<sup>1</sup>)</li> </ul>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <p>To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net change in natural/ semi natural habitats</li> <li>• Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance</li> <li>• Condition of designated sites</li> <li>• Change in area of woodland</li> <li>• Proportion of new developments delivering habitat creation or restoration</li> <li>• Number of management plans for designated sites prepared and implemented</li> <li>• Proportion of new developments delivering habitat mitigation</li> <li>• Proportion of new developments delivering wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Areas of geological significance safeguarded and/or extracted</li> </ul>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Cultural Heritage</b></p> <p>To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buildings of Grade I and II at risk of decay</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards available from: [http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east\\_of\\_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandards/ngst.aspx](http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandards/ngst.aspx)

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Condition of Conservation Areas</li> <li>• Number of historic parks and gardens</li> </ul>
<b>8.</b>	<p><b>Landscape &amp; Townscape</b></p> <p>To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To monitor the number of parks awarded Green Flag Status</li> <li>• To monitor the number of landscape or built environment designations</li> <li>• Hectares of new development outside settlement boundaries</li> <li>• Hedgerow and/or veteran tree loss</li> <li>• Area of /change in landscape designations</li> <li>• Percentage of development on previously developed land</li> </ul>
<b>9.</b>	<p><b>Climate Change &amp; Energy</b></p> <p>To reduce contributions to climate change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in the travel to work mode of transport</li> <li>• Greenhouse gas emissions</li> <li>• Renewable energy capacity installed by type</li> <li>• Percentage of new development including renewable energy generation</li> <li>• Energy consumption</li> <li>• Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM compliance</li> <li>• Percentage of the tonnage of household waste arisings which have been recycled</li> <li>• Percentage of household waste sent by the Authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion</li> </ul>
<b>10.</b>	<p><b>Water</b></p> <p>To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing water quality</li> <li>• Groundwater levels</li> <li>• Percentage of new development incorporating water efficiency measures</li> <li>• Water consumption per household</li> <li>• Number of homes built against Environment Agency advice on flooding</li> <li>• Number and types of Sustainable Drainage Systems approved and implemented</li> </ul>
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>Land &amp; Soil</b></p>

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
	<p>To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use of previously developed land</li><li>• Density of new residential development</li><li>• Number of sites/hectares decontaminated as a result of new development</li></ul>
<b>12.</b>	<p><b>Air Quality</b></p> <p>To improve air quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• AQMA designations or threshold designations</li><li>• Growth in cars per household</li><li>• Growth in car trip generation</li><li>• Type of travel mode to work</li><li>• Percentage change in public transport patronage</li><li>• Number of days in the year when air quality is recorded as moderate or high for NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, CO and Ozone on average per site.</li></ul>
<b>13</b>	<p><b>Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b></p> <p>To promote sustainable design and construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Percentage of new development incorporating energy and water efficiency measures, and sustainable drainage systems</li><li>• Percentage of new development meeting BREEAM very good/excellent Standards</li><li>• Percentage use of aggregates from secondary and recycled sources</li></ul>



## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

The table below demonstrates how the recommendations suggested at the Discussion and Consultation stage of the SA process have been integrated into the document prior to finalisation of the draft policies.

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<b>Residential Allocations</b>		
<p>North of London Road</p>	<p>Option NLR5 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Cohesive development in this general location would depend upon the reallocation and redevelopment of Rawreth Industrial Estate which is situated to the east of most of the options for residential use.</p> <p>The relationship between the residential options and the options for employment land to the west of Rayleigh (primarily to the south of London Road) would need to be taken into consideration, in particular the impact on the highway network, landscape, the Green Belt, and the provision of a green buffer to the west of the residential options.</p> <p>The impact of areas at risk of flooding on the siting of residential development would need to be carefully considered, but residential development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</p> <p>The existing playing field to the south of the site is an established community facility which should be retained.</p>	<p>A variation of NLR5 has been proposed within Policy SER1.</p> <p>The policy has addressed potential scenarios for the delivery of development within SER1 and BFR4 (Rawreth Industrial Estate) and proposed potential mitigation measures such as green buffers.</p> <p>The policy has taken into consideration the location of proposed employment land to the south of London Road (NEL1), and in particular promotes the development of a multi-use junction to serve both developments.</p> <p>The site identified within Policy SER1 takes into account site constraints, including the area at risk of flooding and states that this area should be allocated as public open space.</p> <p><i>Although it was recommended that this facility be retained, it is proposed to be relocated as part of this policy. A new facility, around 340m from the existing facility, is promoted therefore there would be no net loss of facilities.</i></p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>A site made up of parts of options presented at the Discussion and Consultation stage (as opposed to one of the options in its entirety) may be preferable in terms of ensuring an appropriate density of development.</p>	<p>The site identified within Policy SER1 has built upon the options within the Discussion and Consultation Document. A larger area than the options presented in the Discussion and Consultation Document is proposed.</p>
West Rochford	<p>Option WR1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The impact of flood risk areas would need to be carefully considered, but development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</p> <p>There is potential for the provision of a bus service heading west from the options, towards the main routes into Southend and to proposed employment growth at Southend Airport.</p> <p>The design of any development coming forward would need to be carefully considered within the context of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>A variation of Option WR1 has been identified within Policy SER2.</p> <p>The area at risk of flooding within the site identified in Policy SER2 is proposed to accommodate public open space.</p> <p>The proposed policy includes reference to the provision of a western bus link to and from the site.</p> <p>The proposed policy recognises that importance of the site as forming the gateway into Rochford and the Conservation Area. Site specific design requirements have been included in the policy such as proposing that the frontage along Hall Road should comprise detached houses, set back from the road frontage, with green landscaping. A green buffer to the west of the site in the Green Belt is also promoted.</p>
West Hockley	<p>Option WH2 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. Option WH5 performs well, with the exception of including some greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available.</p> <p>An area of public open space may be provided within Options WH1 and WH4 to provide a natural buffer between any development and the Local Wildlife Sites.</p>	<p>A variation of Option WH5 (which also incorporates Option WH2) has been proposed within Policy SER3.</p> <p><i>Not applicable as these alternative options were not taken forward to the pre-submission stage.</i></p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	A management plan for the Local Wildlife Sites/Ancient Woodland may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the sites in the medium to long term.	<i>Not applicable as these alternative options this would apply to (Option WH1, WH3 and WH4) were not taken forward to the pre-submission stage.</i>
South Hawkwell	<p>Option SH2 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The impact of flood risk areas would need to be carefully considered, but development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</p>	<p>A combination of Option SH1 and SH2 has been proposed within Policy SER4.</p> <p>The area at risk of flooding within the site identified in Policy SER4 is proposed to accommodate public open space.</p>
East Ashingdon	<p>Option EA1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The provision of the list of requirements set out in the Core Strategy could take the form of offsite financial contributions for new facilities within the vicinity.</p>	<p>A variation of Option EA1 has been proposed within Policy SER5.</p> <p>The policy proposes that facilities that cannot be delivered on-site are provided on the site identified in Policy SER8 which is in proximity to the site in Policy SER5.</p>
South West Hullbridge	<p>Option SWH2 performs well against the sustainability objectives, however, Option SWH1 performs even stronger due to its potential lesser impact on landscape character.</p> <p>Pedestrian links to the east should be provided between the option taken forward and existing residential development rather than road connections to prevent an overburden on the village's existing highway network.</p>	<p>A slight variation of Option SWH1 has been proposed within Policy SER6.</p> <p>The proposed policy states that existing road links to the east should predominantly provide pedestrian and cycling access.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
South Canewdon	<p>Options SC1, SC2 and SC3 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>If Option SC3 is taken forward it should be amended to exclude the small site to the west of the road leading to St Nicholas Church to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained, and if possible extended northwards towards St Nicholas Church.</p> <p>Careful consideration would need to be given to the design of any development if Option SC3 is taken forward given its proximity to the Canewdon Church Conservation Area which also encompasses a Grade II* Listed Building (particularly if the option is extended northwards).</p>	<p>A combination of Option SC2 and SC3 has been proposed within Policy SER7.</p> <p>This arrangement was considered in the Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options (September 2012), and the inclusion of the area to the north has been further assessed within this SA report (see Appendix 4). However, there were particular concerns in respect of impact on the historic environment given its proximity to several Listed Buildings and its situation within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Option SC3 in addition to land to the west has been proposed within Policy SER7 to be allocated for residential development. Design of the development has been considered within the Concept Statement.</p>
South East Ashingdon	<p>Option SEA1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</p>	<p>A small variation of Option SEA1 is proposed within Policy SER8.</p> <p>Links to the neighbouring Local Wildlife Site to the east/south east of the site are proposed to be explored within the policy. It is proposed that a management plan be prepared for this site.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<p>West Great Wakering</p>	<p>Options WGW1 and WGW5 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Cohesive development in this general location of 'West Great Wakering' would depend upon the redevelopment of Star Lane Industrial Estate for residential use if Option WGW1 is taken forward.</p> <p>The relationship between Options WGW1 to WGW5 and the options for employment land to the south of Great Wakering would need to be taken into consideration, in particular the impact on the highway network, landscape and the Green Belt.</p> <p>The impact of different land levels in the locality on accessibility would also need to be considered.</p> <p>The site to the west of Alexandra Road (part of Option WGW3) could have ecological value, and plans/policies should account for this.</p> <p>The impact of any development on the Local Wildlife Site would need to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this site – a green buffer between the Local Wildlife Site and the site should be provided, and a management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</p>	<p>A combination of WGW1, WGW2 and WGW5 has been proposed within Policy SER9.</p> <p>The second site for the proposed policy in this general location (SER9b) has taken into consideration different scenarios for the delivery of development in this location.</p> <p>The policy has taken into consideration the location of proposed employment land to the south of London Road (NEL3), and in particular promotes the development of a multi-use junction to serve both developments.</p> <p>The policy acknowledges the different land levels in relation to SER9b and states that this should be considered further at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The proposed policy recognises that part of area to the east of the site between Alexandra Road could have ecological value, and that it should be treated sensitively. A buffer is also suggested along the eastern boundary of the site to avoid disturbance.</p> <p>The presence of the Local Wildlife Site adjacent to SER9b is acknowledged, and a green buffer and the preparation of a management plan are proposed within the policy.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>If an option may not be able to accommodate the number of dwellings at an appropriate density then an allocation comprising parts of options presented at the Discussion and Consultation stage (as opposed to one of the options in its entirety) may be preferable. In this case, ecological protection may need to be weighed against landscape protection.</p>	<p>A combination of WGW1, WGW2 and WGW5 has been proposed within Policy SER9.</p>
<p>Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations</p>	<p>GT6, if allocated in its entirety, would entail the allocation of more Green Belt land than required.</p> <p>It is unlikely that additional sites would need to be allocated if Options GT1, GT2 or GT6 are taken forward.</p> <p>Highways access from GT6 would need to be negotiated carefully if taken forward.</p> <p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Sites/Ancient Woodland within Option GT4 and GT5 may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</p>	<p>A portion of the site has been identified in Policy GT1.</p> <p>A portion of the site has been identified in Policy GT1 to meet the pitch requirement set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>This site forms part of a wider allocation encompassing a proposed employment site.</p> <p><i>Not applicable as these alternative options were not taken forward to the pre-submission stage.</i></p>
<p><b>Employment Allocations</b></p>		
<p>Baltic Wharf</p>	<p><i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i></p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Swaines Industrial Estate</p>	<p><i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i></p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Purdeys Industrial Estate</p>	<p><i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i></p>	<p>-</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Riverside Industrial Estate	<i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i>	-
Rochford Business Park	Policies should accompany the allocation of Rochford Business Park which seek to improve links with new employment development in proximity to London Southend Airport, and to take advantage of transportation improvements to which this area will be subject.	<i>Allocation of new employment land and highway improvements will be deferred to the preparation of the emerging London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan.</i>
Imperial Park Industrial Estate	<i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i>	-
Brook Road Industrial Estate	<i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i>	-
Aviation Way Industrial Estate	Any development in this location should carefully consider the potential for surviving deposits beyond the boundary of the airport.	<i>Allocation of new employment land to the north of the airport has been deferred to the preparation of the emerging London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan.</i>
Star Lane Industrial Estate (northern section)	This option is currently in use for employment purposes. Any redevelopment of the site for residential development should be done in conjunction with the relocation of existing employment uses. Failure to provide alternative accommodation for existing employment uses will have a negative impact on sustainability objectives, particularly on terms of economy & employment.	Replacement employment land is proposed in Policy NEL3.

**Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1**

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'West Great Wakering' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further. Although the cumulative impact of development in the vicinity of the village would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>The impact of any redevelopment of this site on the Local Wildlife Site and historic environment would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>The proximity of this site to a Local Wildlife Site could impact on biodiversity, although this could be mitigated against. Public open space within any proposal for redevelopment of this site should be located to the eastern/south eastern section of the site to provide a buffer between residential development and the Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.</p> <p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</p>	<p>The Concept Statement within the draft policy ensures that development proposed in NEL3, SER9 and BFR1 is appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The Concept Statement takes into account the presence of the Local Wildlife Site to the east. Impact on the historic environment will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Concept Statement proposes the creation of a green buffer along the eastern boundary of the whole of the site (both the northern and southern sections).</p> <p>The Concept Statement requires a contaminated land study to be undertaken prior to development, and decontamination undertaken as required.</p> <p>The requirement for a Local Wildlife Site management plan is included within Policy BFR1 (and SER9).</p>



## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<p>Star Lane Industrial Estate (southern section)</p>	<p>Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'West Great Wakering' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further. Although the cumulative impact of development in the vicinity of the village would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>The impact of any redevelopment of this site on the Local Wildlife Site and historic environment would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>The proximity of this site to a Local Wildlife Site could impact on biodiversity, although this could be mitigated against. Public open space within any proposal for redevelopment of this site should be located to the eastern section of the site to provide a buffer between residential development and the Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Enhanced accessibility to local services and facilities would depend upon the northern section of the Industrial Estate coming forward for development prior to the southern section and the spatial relationship between any land allocated for residential development to the west of Great Wakering (which may have the potential to provide pedestrian links to the High Street).</p> <p>This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.</p>	<p>The Concept Statement within the draft policy ensures that development proposed in NEL3, SER9 and BFR1 is appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The Concept Statement takes into account the presence of the Local Wildlife Site to the east. Impact on the historic environment will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Concept Statement proposes the creation of a green buffer along the eastern boundary of the whole of the site (both the northern and southern sections).</p> <p>The potentially different timescales for the delivery of the northern and southern sections of the industrial estate is addressed within the Concept Statement.</p> <p>The Concept Statement requires a contaminated land study to be undertaken prior to development, and decontamination undertaken as required.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</p>	<p>The requirement for a Local Wildlife Site management plan is included within Policy BFR1 (and SER9).</p>
<p>Eldon Way Industrial Estate</p>	<p>Redevelopment of the site should incorporate employment generating uses in order to perform well against sustainability objectives.</p> <p>This option would act as an interim designation prior to the finalisation of the Hockley Area Action Plan. It may enable a wider scope of reasonable/appropriate options to be derived for the site.</p> <p>This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.</p>	<p><i>Allocation of Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate has been deferred to the preparation of the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Allocation of Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate has been deferred to the preparation of the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Allocation of Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate has been deferred to the preparation of the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.</i></p>
<p>Stambridge Mills</p>	<p>Concerns with this option include flood risk, its detachment from the existing residential area, and the impact of vehicular traffic from the site on the air quality in Rochford centre.</p> <p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</p>	<p>The Concept Statement requires that flood defences are implemented prior to any residential redevelopment, and it requires that a Transport Impact Assessment, including an assessment of air quality, must accompany any planning application to develop the site. The policy also proposes that links and enhancements to local pedestrian/cycling and bridleway network should also be provided, with a view to enabling the integration of the site with Rochford.</p> <p>The requirement for a Local Wildlife Site management plan is included within Policy BFR3.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<p>Rawreth Industrial Estate</p>	<p>This option is currently in use for employment purposes. Any redevelopment of the site for residential development should be done in conjunction with the relocation of existing employment uses. Failure to provide alternative accommodation for existing employment uses will have a negative impact on sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'North of London Road, Rayleigh' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further. The cumulative impact of development in this location would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>Although public transport links are available, the accessibility of local services along London Road may depend on the potential to provide an additional link (potentially a circular public transport route) with any comprehensive redevelopment in the general location 'North of London Road'.</p> <p>Public open space will be incorporated within any development coming forward on this site which may be provided to the south west of the site (where there is an area of flood zone 2).</p> <p>This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.</p>	<p>This is addressed within the Concept Statement.</p> <p>The Concept Statement within the draft policy ensures that development proposed in BFR4 and SER1 is appropriately addressed.</p> <p>A public transport route linking London Road and Rawreth Lane is proposed within Policy SER1.</p> <p>The Concept Statement requires that greenspace is provided to the south west of the site where there is a small area at risk of flooding.</p> <p>The Concept Statement requires a contaminated land study to be undertaken prior to development, and decontamination undertaken as required.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<b>Additional Employment Land to be Allocated</b>		
<p>West of Rayleigh</p>	<p>Option E13 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. Options E14, E15, E16 and E17 perform well against these objectives, with the notable exception that these options encompass varying degrees of greenfield land in addition to the brownfield site.</p> <p>Two areas to the west of Rayleigh could be allocated for employment use:</p> <p>Option E13 could be allocated for employment use, but this could be limited to light industry/office use due to the proximity of these sites to residential development to the east. The size of the site taken forward would therefore depend on the amount of such uses required for this general location.</p> <p>A proportion of Option E18 could be allocated for employment use (depending on the amount of heavier employment development required for this general location).</p> <p>Any impact on hedgerows to the north, east and west of Option E18 would need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The relationship between Options E13 to E17 and the options for use to the north of London Road would need to be taken into consideration, in particular the impact on the highway network, landscape, the Green Belt, and the provision of a green buffer to the west of the residential options.</p>	<p>An area encompassing brownfield and greenfield land to the south of London Road (including the area of Option 13) has been identified within Policy NEL1.</p> <p>Two sites for employment land are identified in the Submission Document.</p> <p>An area encompassing brownfield and greenfield land to the south of London Road (including the area of Option 13) has been identified within Policy NEL1. This land is proposed to be allocated for employment use but limited to office and light industrial use.</p> <p>The majority of the site identified as Option E18 has been proposed to be allocated for employment use (specifically heavy industrial and a recycling centre) within Policy NEL2.</p> <p>The proposed policy requires that these hedgerows be retained and strengthened.</p> <p>The proposed policies for new employment land to the south of London Road and the residential options to the north of London Road in Rayleigh have been considered in conjunction. In particular a multi-use junction along London Road to serve both developments is proposed.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<p>South of Great Wakering</p>	<p>Options E19 and E22 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared against the alternatives.</p> <p>The general location to the south of Great Wakering is not considered to be an appropriate location for a large employment site – a smaller employment site to accommodate businesses displaced from the development of Star Lane Brickworks would be a more sustainable approach.</p> <p>The size of Option E19 is considered to be appropriate for this general location, but the arrangement of the site may not facilitate a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary. It is recommended that the eastern boundary of Option E19, if taken forward, should be extended further to the east towards the defined field boundary and the southern boundary is moved northwards. This would create a similar site arrangement as per Option E22 but with a site area akin to Option E19.</p> <p>The options may have significant implications on the highway network at certain locations; therefore this impact would need to be considered. The cumulative impact of development in this location would need to be carefully considered.</p>	<p>A much smaller area than considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document has been proposed within the Submission Document (Policy NEL3). This is located to the south of Option E19 and E22 along Star Lane.</p> <p>A much smaller area than considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document has been proposed within the Submission Document (Policy NEL3). This area of new employment land would compensate for the loss of northern section of the industrial estate which is currently in use.</p> <p>The site identified in Policy NEL3 has a similar arrangement to Option E19 but it is smaller and is located further to the south away from the Local Wildlife Site. Landscaped green buffers along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries and proposed within the policy to enhance the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>The Concept Statement within the draft policy ensures that development proposed in NEL3, SER9 and BFR1 is appropriately addressed. It proposes the creation of one access/egress point to serve these three developments. Improvements to the Star Lane/Poynters Lane junction are specifically referred to.</p>

**Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1**

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>The relationship between residential development (on the reallocated Industrial Estate and Brickworks) and employment land within the recommended employment allocation (particularly with Options E19, E20 and E22) would need to be carefully considered. The cumulative impact of development in this location would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>The relationship between new employment land and the options for residential use to the west of Great Wakering would need to be taken into consideration, in particular the impact on the highway network, landscape, and the Green Belt.</p> <p>Options E19 and E22 are in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this site. The proximity of this site to a Local Wildlife Site could impact on biodiversity, although this could be mitigated against.</p> <p>A green buffer should be provided to the north and/or east of Options E19, E20, E21 and E22 if taken forward.</p> <p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</p>	<p>Impact on the historic environment will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Concept Statement within the draft policy ensures that development proposed in NEL3, SER9 and BFR1 is appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The Concept Statement within the draft policy ensures that development proposed in NEL3, SER9 and BFR1 is appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The site identified in NEL3 is not in close proximity to the Local Wildlife Site. In addition landscaping is proposed to the along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of the proposed site. The Concept Statement also requires this green area to be of ecological value as a wildlife corridor.</p> <p>As above, a buffer along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries is proposed.</p> <p>As the site is not in close proximity to the Local Wildlife Site which is located to the north east, a management plan to be prepared along the development of the employment site is not required.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<b>Environment</b>		
Local Wildlife Sites	<p>The option to allocate the 39 identified Local Wildlife Sites performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>New development which would impact on Local Wildlife Sites should prepare a management plan to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</p>	<p>The Local Wildlife Sites are proposed to be allocated within Policy ELA1.</p> <p>Local Wildlife Site management plans are proposed to be prepared alongside development in BFR1, BFR3, SER8 and SER9.</p>
Upper Roach Valley	The option to allocate the Upper Roach Valley performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives.	The Upper Roach Valley is proposed to be allocated within Policy ELA3.
Coastal Protection Belt	The option to allocate the Coastal Protection Belt performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives.	The Coastal Protection Belt (as amended) is proposed to be allocated within Policy ELA2.
<b>Community Facilities – Education</b>		
Site North of London Road Rayleigh	<i>N/A – a new primary school will be provided as part of the development proposed in Policy SER1</i>	-
Site to the West of Rochford	<i>N/A – a new primary school will be provided as part of the development proposed in Policy SER2</i>	-

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<p>King Edmund School</p>	<p>All of the options perform strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of providing for local education needs and enabling to school to expand as appropriate, although Option KES2 and KES3 may force potential residential development in the general location of East Ashingdon further to the north and may have an impact on the provision of improved access to the school from Brays Lane.</p> <p>A proportion of the existing playing fields which are not required for expansion would retain their Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment. In effect a proportion of the existing playing fields, in addition to new playing fields would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt.</p> <p>Option KES1 should not be accessed from Oxford Road as it would not relate well to existing or additional school buildings (if provided on the current site). It is also a narrow residential road and the provision of access along this road would have a negative impact on community cohesion in this locality.</p> <p>Improved access to the school should be provided from the north along Brays Lane.</p> <p>The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered with any development.</p>	<p>A site in the location of Option KES1 has been proposed within Policy EDU3.</p> <p>The existing playing field will not retain its Green Belt designation as this land is required to enable the appropriate expansion of the secondary school. However, the new playing field will have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt.</p> <p>The policy states that access should not be provided from Oxford Road.</p> <p>The area identified in Policy SER5 will provide improved access to King Edmund School.</p> <p>Impact on the historic environment will be considered at the planning application stage.</p>



## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Great Wakering	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
Barling	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
Canewdon	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
Rochford	The existing playing field for Waterman Primary should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.	The schools identified have been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
King Edmund School (existing)	The existing or new playing field would retain a Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. This would depend on the option taken forward for the expansion of King Edmund School (Options KES1, KES2 or KES3).	King Edmund School (Policy EDU4) plus the area set aside for the expansion (identified in Policy EDU3) will be allocated for educational use. Only the area for expansion will have a dual designation of education and Green Belt to enable the expansion of this secondary school.
Ashingdon	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
Greensward Academy, Hockley	<i>N/A – this is an existing secondary school within the existing residential area, and will be allocated within Policy EDU4.</i>	-
The Westerings Primary School, Hawkwell	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt and to protect the character of the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
Hockley Primary School, Hockley	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Riverside Junior and Infant School, Hullbridge	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt and to protect the character of the Coastal Protection Belt.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
St. Nicholas C of E Primary School, Rayleigh	<i>N/A – this is an existing primary school within the existing residential area, and will be allocated within Policy EDU4.</i>	-
Our Lady Of Ransom Primary School, Rayleigh	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
Sweyne Park School, Glebe Junior School	<i>N/A – this is an existing primary school within the existing residential area, and will be allocated within Policy EDU4.</i>	-
Down Hall Primary School	<i>N/A – this is an existing primary school within the existing residential area, and will be allocated within Policy EDU4.</i>	-
Edward Francis Junior and Infant School	<i>N/A – this is an existing primary school within the existing residential area, and will be allocated within Policy EDU4.</i>	-

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Fitzwimarc Secondary School	<i>N/A – this is an existing secondary school within the existing residential area, and will be allocated within Policy EDU4.</i>	-
Wyburns Primary School	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
Grove Wood Primary School, Rayleigh	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.
Stambridge Primary School	The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.	The school has been allocated for educational use within Policy EDU4, and as expressed within the policy, the existing developed area of those schools residing within the Green Belt will not retain their Green Belt designation to enable the appropriate expansion of the school. The playing fields will have a dual designation.

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<b>Community Facilities</b>		
Open Space	<p>Option OS1 to allocate existing areas of public open space performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>All areas of public open space as identified in the Open Space Study 2009 should be included within the open space designation.</p>	<p>Existing areas of open space are proposed to be allocated within Policy OSL1. New public open space is also proposed within Policy OSL2.</p> <p>The Submission Document proposes that the sites included in the Open Space Study are also allocated with Policy OSL1.</p>
Rayleigh Leisure Centre	<p>Option LF1 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>It was noted that the playing pitches to the rear of Rayleigh Leisure Centre have now been completed. These should be included within the designated area of Rayleigh Leisure Centre to ensure that these are protected through the planning process.</p>	<p>Rayleigh Leisure Centre is proposed to be allocated within Policy OSL3.</p> <p>Rayleigh Leisure Centre, including the playing pitches to the rear, is proposed to be allocated within Policy OSL3.</p>
Clements Hall Leisure Centre	<p>Option LF2 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and leisure use to prevent unnecessary encroachment.</p>	<p>Clements Hall Leisure Centre is proposed to be allocated within Policy OSL3.</p> <p>The existing playing field is proposed to be allocated as open space and leisure use within the Green Belt. However, the existing developed area of the leisure centre will be allocated for leisure use but will not be allocated as Green Belt.</p> <p>The adjacent Spencer's Park is currently allocated as Green Belt, however, the reallocation of the developed part of Clements Hall Leisure Centre would create an island of Green Belt. As such Spencer's Park will be longer be allocated as Green Belt as shown on the Proposals map, but will continue to be protected through Policy OSL1 of the Allocations Submission Document.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Great Waking Leisure Centre	<p>Option LF3 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Great Waking Leisure Centre became unviable to run and was closed in October 2011. It may therefore not be appropriate to allocate Option LF3 for leisure use. This site, which encompasses both the leisure centre and the playing field, may retain its existing public open space designation. However, the allocation of the existing developed part of the site may need to be reviewed in light of these recent changes.</p>	<p>Great Waking Leisure Centre is not proposed to be allocated for leisure use within Policy OSL3 (see below).</p> <p>Great Waking Leisure Centre is not proposed to be allocated for leisure use within Policy OSL3. Instead this area is proposed to be allocated as open space within Policy OSL1.</p>
Community Facilities	<p>Whilst there would be benefits to allocating community facilities for community use, it is not considered to be practical to identify and allocate all buildings/structures in community use, as there is potential that some facilities could be missed, or despite being of importance, are too small to warrant a land-use allocation.</p> <p>A general policy supporting the retention of all community facilities would also be a sustainable approach. It is noted that Policy CLT6 of the Core Strategy would provide overarching protection for all community facilities in the District.</p>	<p>The Allocations Submission Document does not include an additional policy to allocate community facilities. Policy CLT6 is considered to be sufficient to protect existing facilities.</p> <p>The Allocations Submission Document does not include an additional policy to allocate community facilities.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<b>Town Centres</b>		
Rayleigh – Town Centre Boundary	<p>The existing town centre boundary in Option TC1 performs more strongly against the sustainability objectives than the smaller area identified in Option TC2.</p> <p>The Rayleigh town centre boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Rayleigh Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction with other proposals within the Area Action Plan.</p>	<p>The Submission Document proposes to allocate the town centre boundary as existing within Policy TCB1.</p> <p>The proposed policy acknowledges that amendments may be proposed within the emerging Rayleigh Area Action Plan.</p>
Rochford – Town Centre Boundary	<p>Whilst the options generally perform well against the sustainability objectives, Option TC5 performs more strongly.</p> <p>Whilst Option TC5 encompasses much less residential development than the existing town centre boundary (Option TC3) and includes the new retail development to the north of the Market Square, it does not include some potentially key opportunity sites for redevelopment.</p> <p>The boundary defined in Option TC5 could be extended northwards along North Street towards Weir Pond Road to include potential redevelopment sites in this area.</p>	<p>A variation of Option TC5 has been proposed within Policy TCB2 of the Submission Document.</p> <p>The boundary proposed in the Submission Document is similar to TC5 with the exception that it extends further along the eastern and western side of North Street, the northern and southern section of West Street, the eastern section of South Street and the southern section of East Street to encompass more commercial/business premises.</p> <p>The boundary proposed in the Submission Document is similar to TC5 with the exception that it extends further along the eastern and western side of North Street, the northern and southern section of West Street, the eastern section of South Street and the southern section of East Street to encompass more commercial/business premises.</p>

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>The boundary defined in Option TC5 could be extended westwards along West Street and southwards along South Street towards Bradley Way to include the area encompassing Locks Hill, the health centre facilities and Back Lane car park.</p> <p>The Rochford town centre boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Rochford Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction with other proposals within the Area Action Plan.</p>	<p>The Rochford town centre boundary will be reviewed during the production of the Rochford Area Action Plan, which will supersede Policy TCB2.</p> <p>The proposed policy acknowledges that amendments may be proposed within the emerging Rayleigh Area Action Plan.</p>
Hockley – Town Centre Boundary	<p>Option TC8, which encompasses a slightly smaller area than existing, performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>This boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Hockley Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction with other proposals within the Area Action Plan.</p>	<p><i>The allocation of the town centre boundary of Hockley is deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.</i></p> <p>Policy TCB3 acknowledges that the town centre boundary will be determined in the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.</p>
Reallocation of Hockley as a District Centre	<p>The option to reallocate Hockley as a District Centre does not perform well against the sustainability objectives, as retail and other business opportunities may be directed to Rayleigh and Rochford town centres which would have a significant negative impact against a range of sustainability objectives.</p>	<p><i>The allocation of the town centre boundary of Hockley is deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.</i></p>



## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Rayleigh – Primary Shopping Area	<p>The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC11 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.</p>	<p>The primary shopping area/primary shopping frontage as existing is proposed within Policy TCB1.</p> <p>The existing secondary shopping area/secondary shopping frontage is proposed to be allocated in Policy TCB1.</p>
Rochford – Primary Shopping Area	<p>The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC13 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.</p>	<p>The primary shopping area/primary shopping frontage as existing is proposed within Policy TCB2.</p> <p>The existing secondary shopping area/secondary shopping frontage is proposed to be allocated in Policy TCB2.</p>
Hockley – Primary Shopping Area	<p>The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC15 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.</p>	<p><i>The allocation of the primary shopping area/primary shopping frontage for Hockley is deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The allocation of the secondary shopping area/secondary shopping frontage for Hockley is deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.</i></p>
<b>Alternative Options</b>		
Option ALT1	Although Option ALT1 is previously developed land, it does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.	This option was rejected.

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Option ALT2	<p>Option ALT2 performs well against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>This option would not be able to accommodate the full housing requirements for the general location of 'West Rochford' which may lead to fragmented development.</p>	This option was rejected.
Option ALT3	<p>Option ALT3 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>This option would create fragmented development in the general location of 'West Rochford'.</p> <p>Areas at risk of flooding could accommodate public open space, however, this would significantly reduce the capacity of the site to accommodate residential development.</p>	<p>This option was rejected.</p> <p>The area at risk of flooding within Policy SER2 is proposed to be allocated for public open space.</p>
Option ALT4	<p>Option ALT4 generally performs well against the sustainability objectives compared to other West Hockley alternatives, with the exception that it promotes the development of greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available in the general location of 'West Hockley'.</p> <p>There is potential to provide access to the existing highway network.</p> <p>Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to the Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>An area of public open space may be provided within this option to provide a natural buffer between any development and the Local Wildlife Site (Folly Wood).</p>	This option was rejected.

**Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1**

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</p>	
Option ALT5	<p>Option ALT5 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The impact of providing access near to the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardeners Lane would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward on this site.</p> <p>A management plan for one of the Local Wildlife Sites may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</p> <p>Option ALT6 performs well against the sustainability objectives.</p>	This option was rejected.
Option ALT6	<p>Any development on this site would either have to be at a high density or additional land would be required to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. This has the potential to lead to fragmented development with limited opportunities for providing additional infrastructure.</p> <p>The impact of providing access near to the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardeners Lane given this site's location would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward on this site.</p>	This option was rejected.

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>A link may be provided outside of the site but this would require additional Green Belt land potentially to the east/north east.</p> <p>A management plan for one of the Local Wildlife Sites may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</p>	
Option ALT7	<p>Option ALT7 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Additional land potentially in the Green Belt would be required to meet the shortfall in housing and infrastructure provision in the general location of 'South Hawkwell'. This has the potential to impact negatively on community cohesion through the creation of fragmented development.</p> <p>If this site is taken forward then surrounding dwellings should be allocated as residential development. However, the development of this site may subject adjacent areas to development pressure and thus undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in the locality.</p> <p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Sites may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the sites in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the sites.</p>	This option was rejected.

## Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Option ALT8	<p>Option ALT8 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Due to the scale of the site, it may not be able to accommodate the full pitch requirement for the District.</p> <p>The lack of enclosure on three sides of this site and the creation of an isolated allocated area of land in the Green Belt raises concerns regarding the potential to ensure a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary in the locality if this site were allocated.</p> <p>There are high voltage power lines running across the site with a mast in close proximity to the eastern boundary, and there are also high voltage power lines to the west of the site. As the lines run through the site, they would have the potential to have a negative impact on health. It is unlikely to be viable to move these obstructions given the proposed land use.</p> <p>There may be some impact on the A1245, and highways access from this site will need to be negotiated carefully.</p>	This option was rejected.
Option ALT9	<p>Option ALT9 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>This option would secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District as any allocation to the west of Purdeys Industrial Estate would be designated in addition to the strategic locations identified in the Core Strategy Submission Document, and appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process.</p>	This option was rejected.

**Allocations Document SA/SEA Adoption Statement Appendix 1**

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>Although it would ensure access to jobs in this area, it has the potential to detract from future employment opportunities to the west of Rayleigh, south of Great Wakering and to the north of London Southend Airport.</p> <p>Whilst this option would be able to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, it would result in the loss of Green Belt land in the District where no justification for such loss is evidenced and would impact on the local landscape and openness of the area.</p> <p>There are physical barriers between the site and the airport.</p> <p>There is potential to create a public open space buffer between this option and existing communities.</p> <p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</p>	

The tables below summarise the options / reasonable alternatives considered for the Allocation DPD, with an outline of the reasons for rejection / selection of these in the adopted Plan.

### **Brownfield Residential Land Allocations**

Four brownfield sites were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document to be reallocated for residential use (E9-12). This is in accordance with the Core Strategy.

These employment sites (Star Lane Industrial Estate, Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate, Stambridge Mills and Rawreth Industrial Estate) have been included within the Submission Document to be reallocated for residential use. As such no options were rejected.

### **Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (North of London Road, Rayleigh)**

Five different options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document (NLR1-5).

NLR5 performed most strongly against the SA objectives. NLR1-4 were rejected primarily because they would not enable the creation of a public transport link between London Road and Rawreth Lane without encroaching further into the adjacent Green Belt. Each would also have a greater negative impact on accessibility, landscape character and the Green Belt than NLR5.

Each proposed option was rejected, although a variation of NLR5, which extends further west but retains the potential to connect to both London Road and Rawreth Lane, has been proposed in the Submission Document.

Policy SER1 is well related to the Districts transport network. It has the potential to provide good access to Rawreth Lane and London Road, which allow access to shops, services and community facilities. There is also access to existing public transport, in the form of bus links to areas including Rayleigh town centre. SER1 has the potential to link to one of the District's proposed Greenways as well as a proposed Sustrans cycle route located further to the north/north east of the site.

Policy SER1 performs well against the sustainability criteria in relation to the existing residential area, and regarding the integrity of the Green Belt in particular. However, it would result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land.

### **Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Rochford)**

Four different options were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document (WR1-4).

WR1 performed the strongest against the sustainability objectives, in particular through impact on the Green Belt, accessibility, landscape impact, and sustainable transport promotion. WR2-4 were rejected for a number of reasons.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Rochford)**

WR2 and WR4 were found to be the least sustainable as they would adjoin ribbon development to the west of Hall Road, provide poor access to services and facilities situated in Rochford town centre, and undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this area.

WR1 and WR3 were found to be well related to the existing residential development to the north of Hall Road and would ensure access to services and facilities in the town centre and existing public transport routes. However, WR3 would have a greater impact on the Green Belt in particular than WR1.

WR1-4 were rejected as preferred options. However, a variation of WR1 has been proposed in the Submission Document. This option extends further west along Hall Road to meet the natural field boundary.

The allocation of the site in West Rochford (Policy SER2) performs well against the sustainability criteria. The site has the capacity to ensure balanced communities because it has strong access to shops, services and community facilities located within the main settlement of Rochford as well as accommodating a new primary school.

Policy SER2 performs well in terms of accessibility. However, the development of SER1 will incur the loss of grade 1/2 agricultural land.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Rochford) – other alternative options that were considered**

Two alternative options to those included within the Discussion and Consultation for West Rochford (ALT2-3) were appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

ALT2 was rejected as the appraisal found that whilst it performed well against the sustainability objectives, particularly in terms of promoting development in an accessible location and promoting sustainable methods of travel, it would not be able to accommodate the full housing requirements for this general location which could lead to fragmented development. It is also situated within the Rochford Conservation Area and has potential to have a direct impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings.

In contrast ALT3 did not perform well against the sustainability objectives. The areas at risk of flooding on site could significantly constrain the capacity of the site, and have negative implications for the delivery of housing and associated infrastructure in particular. Accessibility and the potential for fragmented development were also concerns. This alternative option was rejected.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Hockley)**

Five alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document (WH1-5).



**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Hockley)**

WH2 was found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives. The assessment observed that although there may be a short term impact on local employment, this option would promote the development of previously developed land, and have a lesser impact on the Green Belt and areas of ecological importance than other options.

WH5 was also found to perform well, similarly to WH2, with the exception that it includes some greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available.

WH1, 3 and 4 performed less well against the sustainability objectives. These options were rejected as they have the potential to impact on Local Wildlife Sites/Ancient Woodland, given their location. Ensuring accessibility to local services and facilities, the highway network and public transport links was also found to likely be challenging for these options. In addition, as there is existing previously developed land in the locality, it was considered that these options would have a greater negative impact on the open, rural nature of the area than the alternatives.

Consequently a variation of WH5 has been proposed within the Submission Document. The proposed site does not extend as far northwards along Church Road but extends further eastwards along Folly Lane to encompass some gardens areas.

Policy SER3 is well related to the rest of Hockley and is largely enclosed by existing residential development, particularly to the north and east of the site. The site performs well against the sustainability criteria as it is primarily situated on brownfield land.

Some greenfield land would be allocated under Policy SER3 however it's loss would be less significant than that caused by other alternative sites in the same general location.

The brownfield land identified in Policy SER3 supports existing employment uses, which will be lost if the development of the site goes ahead. However, this part of the site is not allocated as employment land.

Policy SER3 performed well against the sustainability criteria compared to other sites in the general location.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Hockley) – other alternative options that were considered**

One alternative option to those included within the Discussion and Consultation for West Hockley (ALT4) were appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

This option was considered to generally performs well against the sustainability objectives when compared to other West Hockley alternatives. It was found to relate very well to existing residential development and a primary school, with the potential to provide access to the existing highway network. However, the appraisal noted that this option promotes the development of greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available in this general location. This alternative option is also located adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and it was noted that potentially it would be challenging to create a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary with this option.

ALT4 was therefore rejected.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Hockley) – other alternative options that were considered**

Two other alternative options were considered following further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012). However, these have not been further appraised as they encompass a slightly greater site area than those already assessed, These options are Pond Chase Nursery (reference: 54) and land at Folly Chase (reference: 69; 179; 216).

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Hockley) – other options that were not considered to be realistic**

Another two alternative options were identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012) for 'West Hockley'.

The option referred to as land adjoining Marylands Avenue, Merryfields Avenue, Brackendale Close and Plumberow Avenue (reference: 30) is not considered to be a realistic alternative option as it would not have the capacity to accommodate the full dwelling requirement for the general location of 'West Hockley'. This site is in proximity to a local nature reserve, local wildlife site and an area of Ancient Woodland. It is also subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). This site was therefore rejected as a realistic alternative option.

The option referred to as land to the east of Folly Chase (reference: EFC1) was identified in the assessment as additional land that would need to be allocated should an option such as WH4 presented in the Discussion and Consultation Document, or a variation of this (for example ALT4), be taken forward. In addition, this site would not have the capacity to accommodate the full dwelling requirement for the general location of 'West Hockley'. This option was not considered as a realistic alternative option, and was therefore rejected.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South Hawkwell)**

Four alternative options (SH1-4) were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document for consideration.

SH2 was found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives, in terms of its relationship with the existing residential area, ability to promote cohesion and its potential to retain parts of the wooded area within this location, when compared to the other options for this general location.

SH1 and SH2 were found to have a better relationship with existing residential development than SH3 and SH4. However, SH1 extends further north than Option SH2 to encompass more of the wooded area in the locality to the north of Rectory Road, whereas Option SH2 extends further to the west to adjoin existing employment land along Thorpe Road.

SH3 and SH4 were primarily rejected as they proposed sites which are severed from each other, which may potentially negatively impact on community cohesion, when alternative options are available. These options therefore scored poorly in the SA from this perspective.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South Hawkwell)**

The Submission Document proposes a combination of SH1 and SH2. It identifies land to the east and west of Thorpe Road but, similar to SH1, extends further northwards.

Policy SER4 performs well against several of the sustainability criteria. Notably the site is situated between the existing residential development within the general location of South Hawkwell and as such it will have a significantly reduced impact on the openness of the Green Belt as well as being able to support the creation of a robust Green Belt boundary. The location of the site ensures that there will be no loss of agricultural land.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South Hawkwell) – other alternative options that were considered**

One alternative option (ALT7) that was not included within the Discussion and Consultation Document was appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

The appraisal noted that although has an existing use as a garden centre and adjoining dwelling, it is not previously developed land. Whilst it was found to perform reasonably well against the sustainability objectives, it was rejected for a number of reasons including the fact that it would extend the allocated residential area to the south of Main Road, and would potentially create an island of allocated residential development within the Green Belt. The appraisal also noted that additional land potentially in the Green Belt would be required to meet the shortfall in housing and infrastructure provision in this general location. Concern was also noted regarding the potential for allocation of the site to subject adjacent areas to development pressure.

ALT7 was therefore not taken forward.

Another alternative option was identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012). Thorpe Road Industrial Estate (reference: TRIE1) was identified for residential development in the general location of 'South Hawkwell'. However, this site is already allocated in the 2006 Replacement Local Plan as proposed residential development and would not require reallocation for residential use. This site has also been included within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2012) and has therefore not been appraised further.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South Hawkwell) – other options that were not considered to be realistic**

Another four alternative options were identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012) for 'South Hawkwell'.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South Hawkwell) – other options that were not considered to be realistic**

The options referred to as Ivanhoe Nursery (reference: 158), land off Ironwell Lane near Rectory Road (reference: 166), land north of Ironwell Lane (reference: 217), and land south of Ironwell Lane (reference: 41) are not considered as realistic alternative options as if allocated on their own they would create an island of residential development in the Green Belt, which could undermine its defensibility. In addition they would also encourage piecemeal development. These options were therefore rejected.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (East Ashingdon)**

Three alternative options were set out in the Discussion and Consultation Document for consideration (EA1-3).

EA1 was found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for this general location in terms of its location adjacent to King Edmund School, its potential to provide improved access to this facility, and its less significant impact on the Green Belt and landscape character.

However, EA2 was primarily rejected as it would not facilitate improved access to King Edmund School (as required in Appendix H1 of the Core Strategy).

EA3 combines both EA1 and EA2. Whilst it would enable access to King Edmund School, this option was rejected as it would have a greater impact on landscape character than EA1, and would encroach unnecessarily into Green Belt land to the north of Brays Lane. It would be less able to provide a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary to the north of Brays Lane, and would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than EA1.

A variation of EA1 has been proposed within the Submission Document. A small area of greenfield land to the east of the site has also been included.

Policy SER5 performs well against several sustainability criteria. It is well related to King Edmund School and the Concept Statement requires that improvements be made in terms of access/egress from Brays Lane to further capitalise on this. As the site does not project northwards of Brays Lane it will ensure that there is no unnecessary loss of Green Belt land.

The scale of Policy SER5 means that it is unable to accommodate the required community facilities. However, Policy SER5 is considered to perform well against the sustainability compared to the other sites for this general location.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (East Ashingdon) – other alternative options that were considered**

Another two alternative options were identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012).

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (East Ashingdon) – other alternative options that were considered**

The option referred to as land north of Brays Lane (reference: 56a) has not been further appraised as it encompasses a slightly greater site area than that already assessed (Option EA2 and part of EA3).

The option referred to as land to the rear of Golden Cross Road, Nelson Road and Brays Lane (reference: 213) was identified in the assessment as additional land that would need to be allocated should a variation of option EA2 or EA3 presented in the Discussion and Consultation Document be taken forward. Part of this option has also been assessed as part of the appraisal for Options EA2 and EA3. In addition, this site would not have the capacity to accommodate the full dwelling requirement for the general location of 'East Ashingdon'. This option was therefore rejected.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (East Ashingdon) – other options that were not considered to be realistic**

Another alternative option was identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012) for 'South Hawkwell'.

The option referred to as land adjacent to Brayside and Little Brays (reference: 198) is not considered as a realistic alternative option as if allocated on its own it would create an island of residential development in the Green Belt, which could undermine its defensibility. In addition, this site would not have the capacity to accommodate the full dwelling requirement for the general location of 'East Ashingdon' and it would encourage piecemeal development. This option was therefore rejected.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South West Hullbridge)**

Four alternative options (SWH1-4) were considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The Updated SA (July 2012) noted that both SWH1 and SWH2 have a similar arrangement and are well related to the existing residential area and the local services and facilities situated within the village centre. However, it was found that SWH2 may have a greater impact on landscape character than SWH1 in terms its projection further to the west, which would potentially have a greater visual impact in the locality from the roads to the south.

Consequently, whilst the were considered to have comparable sustainability implications, and SWH2 was found to perform well against the sustainability objectives, SWH1 performed even stronger due to its potential lesser impact on landscape character. SWH2 was therefore rejected.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South West Hullbridge)**

SWH3 was found to be located within the Coastal Protection Belt to the greater extent than the other options as it extends further westwards away from the village centre. It does not connect to Lower Road and it was found to be less well related to the existing residential settlement compared to SWH1 and SWH2, which raised concerns particularly in terms of access and equal opportunities. SWH3 was therefore rejected.

Although SWH4 was found to avoid the Coastal Protection Belt, the appraisal expressed concern in relation to the potential expose of the field to the north of Malyons Farm (which is designated Coastal Protection Belt) to development pressure, and the wider impact on the defensibility and openness of the Green Belt. Whilst SWH4 was considered to have good links with the existing settlement, the appraisal noted that the severance between the sites may impact on community cohesion. SWH4 was therefore rejected for a number of reasons.

A slight variation of SWH1, which includes the small area to the south west of the site along Lower Road, has been proposed within the Submission Document.

Policy SER6 performs well against the sustainability criteria. In particular it ensures good access to local shops and services as it is located within the general pedestrian zone of Hullbridge. The site follows the existing boundaries of Hullbridge, ensuring that there is a minimum amount of extension into the Green Belt.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South West Hullbridge) – other alternative options that were considered**

An alternative option for South West Hullbridge not included within the Discussion and Consultation Document (ALT1) was appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

This option, however, does not accord with the strategic approach outlined in the Core Strategy as it is located to the south east of Hullbridge.

The appraisal found that although ALT1 is previously developed land situated in the Green Belt, it does not perform well against the sustainability objectives in terms of the relationship with the existing residential area, accessibility, and the impact on the Green Belt in this location.

ALT1 was considered to project into the Green Belt, create fragmented development and potentially undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this location. It is also not located within the general location of 'South West Hullbridge'. This option was therefore rejected.

ALT10 was found to be isolated from the main settlement and existing services and facilities and would not ensure equal opportunities in terms of access to such facilities, particularly for those without the use of private cars. The site also projects into the Green Belt and performed negatively against the sustainability criteria for landscape and townscape in particular. This option was also rejected.

### Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South Canewdon)

Four alternative options (SC1-4) were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document and appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

SC1, SC2 and SC3 were found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives as opposed to SC4 due to their relatively less significant impact on landscape character and the Green Belt.

SC4 proposes three small detached sites which have different relationships with the existing residential development and would have a negative impact on the sustainability of any development through encouraging piecemeal development on the edge of the village and presenting a much less defensible Green Belt boundary as opposed to SC1 and SC2. SC4 was therefore rejected.

SC1 is not located in the Coastal Protection Belt, however, the appraisal noted that whilst it could accommodate the housing requirements for this general location, it would extend the designated residential area further to the south. SC1 was primarily rejected for this reason.

The location of SC2 to the west of the road leading north towards St Nicholas Church would extend Canewdon further to the west. It would also create an isolated area of designated residential development and may require adjacent dwellings to the east (which encompasses SC3) and west to be designated as existing residential development. This option is entirely located within the Coastal Protection Belt.

The location of SC3 was found to likely to have less of a visual impact on the rural character of the area as opposed to the other options for 'South Canewdon' as it is situated to the north of Anchor Lane and is primarily adjacent to existing residential development. It was noted, however, that the displacement of two dwellings within this option, and the severance of the two sites by the road leading north to St Nicholas Church, however, would have a negative impact on community cohesion.

A combination of SC2 and SC3 was proposed within the Submission Document. The proposed allocation to the west of the road leading to the church, however, does not extend as far north as the site identified in SC2. This option was amended following examination to lessen the impact on the setting of the St Nicholas Church.

Another two alternative options were identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012) for 'South Canewdon'.

ALT11 is situated to the south of existing residential development to the south of Canewdon. The severance between this option and the existing residential development to the north by Anchor Lane could have an impact on community cohesion. It would also project into the Green Belt to the south of Anchor Lane. However, this option has good access to existing local services in the village. This option was therefore rejected.

ALT12 is adjacent to the existing residential development of Canewdon and would allow the integration of the site into the existing community. However, the site was found to have the potential to negatively impact the cultural heritage and visual character of the general location. This would have a negative impact on the

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South Canewdon)**

Canewdon Church Conservation area, which ALT12 overlaps. This option was also rejected.

The proposed site for Policy SER7 performs well against the sustainability criteria. It is well related to the existing settlement of Canewdon following the natural boundaries along the approach to St Nicholas Church and not projecting northward of the existing development to the west of the site to the north of Lark Hill Road.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South Canewdon) – other alternative options that were considered**

Two alternative options (ALT5 and ALT6) not included within the Discussion and Consultation Document have been appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

The appraisal found that ALT5 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives in terms of impact on the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardeners Lane, and the Green Belt. This option would also extend the residential area to the south of Anchor Lane. The defensibility of the Green Belt boundary was also raised as a concern.

ALT6 was found to perform well against the sustainability objectives as it could provide housing and associated infrastructure and could provide a defensible Green Belt boundary. However, it is debatable as to whether this site could be considered commensurate within the general location of 'South Canewdon'. Concern was raised in relation to the potential for the site to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy, the separation from the main residential area to the west, and highway access.

Both ALT5 and ALT6 were rejected for the aforementioned reasons.

Another alternative option was identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012) for 'South Canewdon'. The option referred to as land to south of Canewdon (reference: 165) has not been further appraised as it encompasses a slightly greater site area than that already assessed (Option SC1).

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South East Ashingdon)**

Three alternative options (SEA1-3) were considered for this general location in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

SEA1 was found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for this general location of 'South East Ashingdon'. It was also found to have the potential to provide more equal and sustainable access to local services and facilities, and would be able to create a more defensible Green Belt boundary compared to the other options.

The Updated SA (July 2012) found that although SEA2 does relate well with existing development, it extends further to the east and north than SEA1 and subsequently may constrain any future expansion of King Edmund School given its arrangement.

Both SEA2 and SEA3 extend further to the east away from Ashingdon Road, and



**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (South East Ashington)**

would have a greater impact on the Green Belt than SEA1.

SEA3 on the other hand was found to extend further to the east than SEA1 and would not relate as well with the existing residential area as opposed to Options SEA1 and SEA2. SEA2 and SEA3 were therefore rejected.

The Submission Document proposes a small variation of SEA1. The proposed site extends further to the south west than SEA1 to adjoin The Drive.

Policy SER8 performs well against a number the sustainability criteria. It is well connected to the existing settlement and would ensure a strong green buffer to the east. However, the development of this site will result in the loss of grade 2 agricultural land.

Policy SER8 is large enough to accommodate the community facilities which are required by Policy SER5 as these cannot be accommodated on the site itself.

There is potential for the existing bus route along Ashington Road to be diverted onto the site to serve the development. This would provide better access to community facilities and local shops.

Alternative modes of transport will be necessary in this site as vehicular routes are not considered to be acceptable in this location. The Concept Statement identifies the opportunity presented by this site to encourage a modal shift from private vehicle use to walking and cycling.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Great Wakering)**

Five options to the West of Great Wakering (WGW1-5) were set out in the Discussion and Consultation Document and appraised in the Updated SA (July 2012).

WGW1 and WGW5 were found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options. These options promote development on one site which is well related to the existing residential settlement and have the potential to promote a defensible Green Belt boundary.

WGW1 is adjoined to the existing settlement, the west of the site is bounded by Star Lane Industrial Estate. Cohesive development will therefore depend upon the redevelopment of this employment land for residential use.

WGW2 and WGW3 identify several sites on the edge of the village. The site to the west of Little Wakering Road and the site to the south of the High Street identified within WGW2 have a good relationship with existing residential development in the village, whereas the sites within WGW3 do not have a good relationship.

The separation of the sites in WGW2 and WGW3 were found to have a negative impact on the sustainability of any development through encouraging piecemeal development and presenting a much less defensible Green Belt boundary compared to WGW1, WGW4 and WGW5 for example. It was also noted that the site to the west of Alexandra Road (part of Option WGW3) could have ecological value.

All of the options were considered to have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt in the area than Option WGW1. WGW1-4 are in proximity to a Local

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Great Wakering)**

**Wildlife Site.**

WGW3 and WGW4 are not well related to the existing residential area of Great Wakering and would promote coalescence with Shoebury to the south, WGW4 also does not bound existing residential development. WGW3 and WGW4 were therefore rejected.

A combination of WGW1, WGW2 and WGW5 has been proposed within the Submission Document. The site to the west of Little Wakering Road in WGW2 (which is smaller than WGW5) and the site to the south of the High Street in WGW1 have been proposed.

Policy SER9 is well related to the existing settlement with access to significant amounts of public open space, Greenway 20 and a Local Wildlife Site. It is also in close proximity to a primary school and shops and services within Great Wakering itself.

Policy SER9 is split into two separate sites within the general location. This segregation of the sites will have a negative impact on the access to community facilities, and potentially the provision of other infrastructure.

The development of this site will result in the loss of grade1 agricultural land. However, in general Policy SER9 performed well against the sustainability criteria.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (West Great Wakering) – other alternative options that were not considered to be realistic**

Another alternative option was identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012).

The option referred to as land south of the High Street and west of Alexandra Road (reference: SHS1) was identified in the assessment as additional land that would need to be allocated should Option WGW3 presented in the Discussion and Consultation Document, or a variation of this option, be taken forward. However, the area adjacent to this alternative option was acknowledged within the previous assessment (Updated SA July 2012) as potentially having ecological value. This option was therefore not considered to be a realistic alternative option and was therefore rejected.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation)**

Seven alternative options (GT1-7) were considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The Updated SA (July 2012) found that GT1, GT2, GT3, GT6 and GT7 are situated within the western part of the District which accords with the Core Strategy Submission Document. GT4 and GT5 were primarily rejected as they do not accord with the Core Strategy.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation)**

GT1 and GT2 were noted as encompassing an existing, if unauthorised, Gypsy and Traveller site, and performed strongly against the sustainability objectives. GT2 is within an area at risk of flooding, and GT1 is in proximity to these areas. These options were rejected.

GT3 was found to perform reasonably well against the sustainability objectives, however, the Updated SA (July 2012) noted that high voltage power lines run through this option site and are unlikely to be viable to move given the scale of the potential development. This option is also located within the proposed new employment land allocation (NEL1) and has been rejected.

The Updated SA (July 2012) noted that if GT6 was allocated in its entirety, then this would entail the allocation of more Green Belt land than required. It was found to be located in a relatively remote location in terms of sustainable access, although it is well related to the strategic highway network. This option is located on degraded former agricultural land.

GT7 would not accommodate the full pitch requirement and an additional site would need to be allocated elsewhere in the Green Belt. This option also may not enable the creation of a defensible Green Belt boundary. GT7 was therefore rejected.

The Submission Document proposes a portion of GT6 located to the south west of the site be allocated.

Policy GT1 does not perform particularly well against the sustainability criteria in terms of the allocation of a Gypsy and Traveller, however, there are several key points on which it performs well. For example the site fully meets the Districts requirements for Gypsy and Traveller pitches up until 2018 and due to the size of the site there is flexibility to meet potential additional demand post 2018. The site is also described as degraded greenfield land and is not under any cultivation. As such it ensures that more valuable greenfield sites are left unharmed and that no usable agricultural land is lost.

**Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation) – other options that were considered**

An alternative option (ALT8) which was not included within the Discussion and Consultation Document was appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

The appraisal found that ALT8 did not perform well against the sustainability objectives in terms of its impact on the Green Belt and landscape character, implications for accessibility and potential effect on health (primarily due to the presence of masts and powerlines). This option was therefore rejected.

**Existing Employment Land Allocations – Existing Employment Land around Rochford**

Four existing employment sites were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document to continue to be allocated for employment use (E2-E5). This is in accordance with the Core Strategy.

These employment sites (Swaines Industrial Estate, Riverside Industrial Estate, Purdeys Industrial Estate and Rochford Business Park) have been included within the Submission Document to be allocated for employment use.

Although E8 (Aviation Way Industrial Estate) is an existing employment site which was found to perform strongly against the economy & employment sustainability objective in particular in the Updated SA (July 2012), this options lies within the area covered by the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan, and will therefore be considered further within this Development Plan Document.

Consequently no options for employment land around Rochford were rejected as such.

**New Employment Land Allocations – Existing Employment Land around Rochford – other options that were considered**

One alternative option (ALT9) which was included within the Discussion and Consultation Document, was appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

This option was found to perform reasonably well against the sustainability objectives in terms of enhancing local employment opportunities in proximity to Rochford town centre. However, it notes that this option is not situated within a strategic location identified within the Core Strategy for additional employment land.

It was acknowledged that although ALT9 would ensure access to jobs in this area, it has the potential to detract from future employment opportunities to the west of Rayleigh, south of Great Wakering and to the north of London Southend Airport. It would be an addition to the strategic locations identified in the Core Strategy.

Furthermore the Updated SA (July 2012) also noted that whilst the allocation of this site would be able to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, it would result in the loss of Green Belt land in the District where no justification for such loss is evidenced and would impact on the local landscape and openness of the area.

Consequently this option was rejected.

**Existing Employment Land Allocations – Existing Employment Land around Rayleigh**

Two existing employment sites were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document to continue to be allocated for employment use (E6-E7). This is in accordance with the Core Strategy.

These employment sites (Imperial Park Industrial Estate and Brook Road Industrial Estate) have been included within the Submission Document to be allocated for employment use. As such no options were rejected.

**Existing Employment Land Allocations – Existing Employment Land on Wallasea Island**

One option for employment land on Wallasea Island (E1) was considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document and appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

This option was found to be situated in a relatively inaccessible location and is located on the banks of the river Crouch, and may continue to impact on this area of ecological importance around the river Crouch. However, the appraisal noted that it is an existing employment site which performs well against the balanced communities and economy & employment sustainability objectives in particular.

However, this option has been extended to include the adjacent Essex Marina, which was allocated in the 2006 Replacement Local Plan.

**New Employment Land Allocations – South of London Road, Rayleigh; West of A1245, Rayleigh**

Six alternative options (E13-E18) were considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document and appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

E13 was found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of utilising previously developed land, its proximity to the existing residential area and residential options to the north of London Road, its accessibility and impact on landscape character (given that it is already developed).

The Updated SA (July 2012) also found that E14, E15, E16 and E17 perform well against these objectives, with the notable exception that these options encompass varying degrees of greenfield land in addition to the brownfield site. Concern was raised in relation to the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary with E15; this option was rejected.

E17 was found to perform reasonably well against the sustainability objectives, with the notable exception of it being on greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available. It was noted that this option would be entirely situated on agricultural land and would therefore encroach unnecessarily into open countryside. This option also would not be consistent with the adopted Core Strategy, and was therefore rejected.

E18 was found to generally perform well against these objectives, although it is less accessible, in terms of sustainable access this option performs less well than the other options.

The Updated SA (July 2012) recommended that, given the different types of employment land, two sites should be allocated.

A combination of E13, E14 and E16 has been proposed to the south of London Road within the Submission Document. The site encompasses E13, and extends as far eastwards as E14. However, it extends slightly further south as per E16 but does not extend as far westwards.

The Submission Document also identifies the majority of E18 (west of the A1245) for employment use.

**New Employment Land Allocations – South of London Road, Rayleigh;  
West of A1245, Rayleigh**

Although Policy NEL1 of the Submission Document is detached from the existing residential area to the east by a green buffer, the site is well related to the existing settlement and the proposed residential development to the north of London Road (Policy SER1). It encompasses both brownfield land and greenfield land. Consequently the policy would result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land. This option was included in the Submission Document, but subsequently deleted following examination, through which it was found to be undeliverable and therefore ineffective. Removing this site from the Plan was considered to be sound and consistent with the Core Strategy.

Policy NEL1 of the adopted Plan generally performs well against the sustainability objectives, as it has good links to the highway network (A127 and A1245) and can accommodate a significant proportion of employment land without impacting on residential amenity or the local highway network.

The site is detached from existing residential areas and the policy proposes that it be allocated to accommodate heavy industrial uses relocated from Rawreth Industrial Estate (Policy BFR4) and a recycling centre. Relocating such uses away from the existing residential areas would have a positive impact in terms of air quality and amenity.

It is located on an area of degraded countryside. The site also has the potential to create a defensible Green Belt boundary and may preserve the character and openness of Green Belt in other locations.

**New Employment Land Allocations – South of Great Wakering**

Six options for employment land to the south of Great Wakering (E19-E24) were set out in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The Updated SA (July 2012) found that E19 and E22 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared against the alternatives, in terms of the lesser impact on the landscape & townscape and land & soil in particular.

E20, E21, E23 and E24 were found to promote coalescence between the settlements of Great Wakering and Shoebury. These options were rejected.

E19 and E22, although smaller than some of the other options, would promote the development in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site. These options as proposed were therefore rejected.

The Submission Document proposes a much smaller site (akin to the section of the industrial estate currently in use) further to the south along Star Lane.

**New Employment Land Allocations – South of Great Wakering**

The allocation of this site identified in Policy NEL3 would compensate for the loss of employment land through the reallocation of Star Lane Industrial Estate (Policy BFR1). The site would enable the development of a new employment area to serve Great Wakering, whilst avoiding coalescence with Shoebury to the south/south east. However, the allocation of this site would necessitate the loss of grade 1 agricultural land.

The detachment of the site and the fact that it does not follow natural boundaries along its northern, southern and eastern boundaries impacts on the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary, which would have negative sustainability implications. However, the separation of the site would ensure residential amenity for the neighbouring proposed residential development (Policy BFR1) and would have a positive effect through minimising the impact on the Local Wildlife Site.

A substantial green buffer to the north, east and south would positively impact on the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary, residential amenity and the nearby Local Wildlife Site.

**New Employment Land Allocations – North of London Southend Airport**

The Updated SA (July 2012) noted that the area to the north of London Southend Airport for additional employment uses will be undertaken during the preparation of the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan.

The Submission Document proposes that the Joint Area Action Plan Area that lies within Rochford District be allocated.

**Ecological and Landscape Allocations – Local Wildlife Sites**

Local Wildlife Sites identified in the 2007 Local Wildlife Sites Review were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document and appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

The option to allocate these sites was found to perform very strongly against the sustainability objectives through encouraging the retention of local biodiversity which could have wider positive, long term implications.

Consequently this option was not rejected.

**Ecological and Landscape Allocations – Coastal Protection Belt**

An option to allocate the Coastal Protection Belt was considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The Updated SA (July 2012) found that this option performed very strongly against the sustainability objectives through seeking to protect the character of the undeveloped coastline and limit development in sensitive areas.

The Coastal Protection Belt (with minor amendments) has been proposed within the Submission Document.

### Ecological and Landscape Allocations – Upper Roach Valley

An option to allocate the Upper Roach Valley was set out in the Discussion and Consultation Document and appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).

This option was found to perform very strongly against the sustainability objectives through protecting and potentially enhancing the landscape character, soil quality and biodiversity of this area.

This option has been taken forward and proposed in the Submission Document.

### Educational Land Allocations – North of London Road, Rayleigh

As acknowledged within the Updated SA (July 2012) the sustainability of allocating a single-form entry primary school to the north of London Road, Rayleigh depends on the specific site allocated for residential development (see Policy SER1).

### Educational Land Allocations – North of London Road, Rayleigh

As acknowledged within the Updated SA (July 2012) the sustainability of allocating a new primary school to the west of Rochford depends on the specific site allocated for residential development (see Policy SER2).

### Educational Land Allocations – King Edmund School

Three options for the extension of King Edmund School were considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document (KES1-3).

The Updated SA (July 2012) found that all of the options perform strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of providing for local education needs and enabling to school to expand as appropriate, although KES2 and KES3 may force potential residential development in the general location of East Ashingdon further to the north and may have an impact on the provision of improved access to the school from Brays Lane. KES2 and KES3 were therefore rejected.

A specific site within the area identified in KES1 has been proposed within the Submission Document.

Policy EDU3 performs well against the sustainability criteria. It is well placed to serve the needs of the community in terms of educational requirements as well as by providing recreational facilities to the wider community. It is well related to the proposed residential developments in east Ashingdon (Policy SER5) and south east Ashingdon (Policy SER8).

### Educational Land Allocations – Existing Primary and Secondary Schools

A total of nineteen options were set out in the Discussion and Consultation Document (EDU1-19) for the allocation of primary and secondary schools and were appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012).



### **Educational Land Allocations – Existing Primary and Secondary Schools**

It was found that all of the options as presented within the document performed strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of these schools in locations that are, on the whole, accessible to the local population.

The options identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document have been proposed within the Submission Document. However, two additional sites; Plumberow Primary School and Rayleigh Primary School have been allocated separately within the Submission Document.

### **Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations – Existing Open Space**

Two alternative options were considered with regard to existing open space in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The Updated SA (July 2012) found that OS1, to allocate existing areas of public open space, performed strongly against the sustainability objectives, in terms of promoting the protection of areas accessible to local communities, promoting healthy and safe communities, and safeguarding areas of ecological value.

OS2 was therefore rejected.

The Submission Document proposes that, as recommended in the Updated SA (July 2012), the sites included in the Open Space Study are also allocated.

### **Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations – New Open Space**

This is a new proposal in the Submission Document that was not included within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

However Option OSL2 follows the principles set out in Policy CLT5 of the adopted Core Strategy, and states which areas new open space will be promoted in. The detailed assessment for Policy CLT5 in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report should be referred to.

### **Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations – Existing Leisure Facilities**

Three alternative options were considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document and appraised in the Updated SA (July 2012).

LF1 and LF2 were found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives through safeguarding these existing facilities which are accessible to the local population and promote health communities.

Although LF3 was also found to perform strong against the sustainability objectives, however, the appraisal noted that the leisure centre had closed in October 2011 and it may therefore not be appropriate to allocate this facility. Consequently LF3 was rejected.

LF1 (including the playing pitches to the rear) and LF2 have been proposed to be allocated within the Submission Document.

**Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations – other options that were not considered realistic**

The Discussion and Consultation Document also included two alternative options relating to the allocation of community facilities in the District (CF1 and CF2).

The Updated SA (July 2012) noted that whilst there would be benefits to allocating community facilities for community use, it is not considered to be practical to identify and allocate all buildings/structures in community use, as there is potential that some facilities could be missed, or despite being of importance, are too small to warrant a land-use allocation.

Although CF1 was found to perform well against sustainability objectives in terms of safeguarding facilities which are accessible to the local population, the Updated SA (July 2012) considered that the general Core Strategy policy (Policy CLT6) would provide overarching protection for all community facilities in the District.

Therefore both options for the allocation of community facilities were rejected in the preparation of the Submission Document.

**Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations – Rayleigh**

Two alternative options were considered for the designation of Rayleigh town centre (TC1 and TC2) in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The existing town centre boundary in TC1 was found to perform more strongly against the sustainability objectives than the smaller area identified in TC2. TC1 would positively contribute to ensure the appropriate mix of town centre uses, promote accessibility, facilitate residential development and support business development in particular.

TC2 was rejected. The Submission Document proposes to allocate the town centre boundary as existing.

In addition two alternative options for the allocation of the primary shopping area (TC11 and TC12) were identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The Primary Shopping Area defined within TC11 was found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of focusing primary retail uses within the town centre. This area is smaller than the town centre boundary for Rayleigh (TC1), which performed better against sustainability objectives than Option TC2.

TC12 was rejected, and the primary shopping area/primary shopping frontage as existing is proposed within the Submission Document. The existing secondary shopping frontage is also proposed to be allocated.

**Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations – Rochford**

Four alternative options for the designation of Rochford town centre were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document (TC3-6).

The Updated SA (July 2012) found that whilst the options generally perform well against the sustainability objectives, TC5 performs more strongly in terms of the potential to promote mixed, high density residential development within Rochford and ensuring access to services without being too widely drawn (like TC3 and TC4) or not wide enough (TC6).

TC3, 4 and 6 were rejected.

The boundary proposed in the Submission Document is similar to TC5 with the exception that it extends further along the eastern and western side of North Street, the northern and southern section of West Street, the eastern section of South Street and the southern section of East Street to encompass more commercial/business premises.

Additionally two alternative options for the allocation of the primary shopping area (TC13 and TC14) were identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The Primary Shopping Area defined within TC13 was found to perform strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of focusing primary retail uses within the town centre. This area is smaller than the town centre boundary for Rochford (TC5 with minor amendments) which performed better than Options TC3, TC4 and TC6.

TC14 was rejected, and the primary shopping area/primary shopping frontage as existing is proposed within the Submission Document. The existing secondary shopping frontage is also proposed to be allocated.

The boundary identified in Policy TCB1 is similar to the boundary proposed for Option TC5 with the exception that it extends further along eastern and western side of North Street, the northern and southern section of West Street, the eastern section of South Street and the southern section of East Street to encompass more commercial/business premises.

This boundary performs well in terms of the potential to promote mixed, high density residential development within Rochford and ensuring access to services without being too widely drawn.

**Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations – Hockley**

Three alternative options for the Hockley town centre were considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document (TC7-9).

An option relating to potential reallocation of Hockley as a District centre (TC10) was proposed within the Discussion and Consultation Document. This option did not perform well against the sustainability objectives, as retail and other business opportunities may be directed to Rayleigh and Rochford town centres which would have a significant negative impact against a range of sustainability objectives. Option TC10 was therefore rejected.

**Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations – Hockley**

Two alternative options for the allocation of the primary shopping area (TC15 and TC16) were identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

However, the Submission Document defers the allocation of the town centre and shopping areas to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan.