

## Local Development Framework

# Allocations Submission Document (Post Pre-Submission Consultation)

Sustainability Appraisal – Non-technical Summary  
(Evidence Base Document)



**LDF  
Evidence Base**

**Contents**

1	Introduction .....	2
2	Sustainability Appraisal Methodology.....	6
3	Sustainability Appraisal – Matrices and Summaries.....	9
4	Consultation on the Allocations DPD and the SA Report .....	43
5	How the Plan has Incorporated SA Recommendations .....	44
6	Implementation and Monitoring.....	44
7	Conclusion and Next Steps.....	51

**If you would like this information in large print, Braille or another language, please contact 01702 318111.**

## **1 Introduction**

### **Purpose of the Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD)**

- 1.1 Rochford District Council is at the final stage of preparing the Allocations DPD, which will form part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF).
- 1.2 The Allocations DPD sits below the Core Strategy in the LDF. The Core Strategy sets out the broad policies to guide the future development of the District, addressing a range of issues including housing, employment, open spaces and community facilities. Broad locations for the allocation of new housing and employment development for example are identified within the Core Strategy.
- 1.3 In turn, the Allocations DPD will set out site specific policies for the different land uses in accordance within the Core Strategy. It will address a number of issues such as housing (including Gypsy and Traveller site options), employment land, environmental and landscape designations, educational, community and leisure facilities, open space and town centre allocations.
- 1.4 The initial stage of the Allocations DPD, called the Discussion and Consultation Document, was published for public consultation in March/April 2010. The purpose of this document was to set out a number of options for the specific issues it seeks to address, for example, it identified a number of potential sites within each of the general locations for housing development.
- 1.5 The final stage of the Allocations DPD, called the Allocations Submission Document, has been prepared taking into account a plethora of evidence base documents (as detailed within the Submission Document). This document identifies specific sites for a range of uses, such as residential and employment land, and sets out detailed policies to support these allocations.

### **Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal**

- 1.6 In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Allocations DPD has been the subject of, and has been produced in conjunction with, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). European and UK legislation require that the LDF is also subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), a process that considers the effects of development planning on the environment. Government guidance advises that these two processes should be carried out together and outlines a number of stages of SA work that need to be carried out as the LDF is being prepared. Government guidance, as detailed further below, also states that SA work should not repeat that carried out at a higher level. As such, this SA incorporates the requirements of SEA and does not repeat the SA/SEA work undertaken on the Rochford District Core Strategy. This SA should be read in conjunction with the SA/SEA of the Rochford District Core Strategy, including addendums to such work.

- 1.7 The purpose of the SA is to ensure that wider sustainability issues, encompassing environmental, economic and social implications of options or policies proposed, are taken into consideration throughout the preparation of Development Plan Documents.
- 1.8 This document combines the initial Scoping Report for the SA which has informed the preparation of the full SA Report for both stages of the Allocations DPD. It has been produced in-house to ensure that the SA process is as integrated with the plan making process as possible.

### **Vision and Objectives**

- 1.9 The SA for the Core Strategy (September 2009) recognises that the Core Strategy includes an overarching Vision and Objectives for the District.

#### ***Spatial Vision:***

*To make Rochford District a place which provides opportunities for the best possible quality of life for all who live, work and visit here.*

#### ***Key Planning Objectives:***

*To support the vision, the Council has four main corporate objectives. These are:*

- *Making a difference to our people*
- *Making a difference to our community*
- *Making a difference to our environment*
- *Making a difference to our local economy*

- 1.10 The Core Strategy is structured around a number of themes that have individual visions and objectives that all contribute to the overall vision for the District. The Core Strategy includes the following themes:

- Housing
- Character of Place
- The Green Belt
- Upper Roach Valley and Wallasea Island
- Environmental Issues
- Community Infrastructure, Leisure and Tourism
- Transport

- Economic Development
- Retail and Town Centres

1.11 The Allocations DPD seeks to deliver key aspects of the Core Strategy in relation to these themes, and the Allocations Submission Document sets out how these relate to one another (see Table 1 of the Allocations Submission Document).

### **Summary of Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations**

1.12 The SEA Regulations set out certain requirements for reporting the SEA process, and specify that if an integrated appraisal is undertaken (i.e. SEA is subsumed within the SA process, as for the SA of the Rochford LDF), then the sections of the SA Report that meet the requirements set out for reporting the SEA process must be clearly signposted. The requirements for reporting the SEA process are set out in Appendix 1 and within each relevant section of this SA Report, as appropriate. This SA Report should also be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.

1.13 This SA report has been produced in-house to ensure that the SA process is as integrated with the plan making process as possible. To ensure the preparation of a robust and compliant report, a compliance review of the previous SA (July 2012) for the Discussion and Consultation Document was undertaken by independent consultants, Enfusion.

1.14 In general the SA was found to be in compliance with the SEA Directive, although some deficiencies were identified due to the early stage of the SA process. The following outstanding tasks were identified to be addressed within the Submission SA:

- The reasoning for the selection and elimination of strategic alternatives; and
- Reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted.

1.15 The reasons for the selection and rejection of the numerous alternative options considered throughout the preparation of the Allocations Document are addressed within Task A4, Task B2, and at paragraph 6.3 of this report. This clearly sets out the range of alternative options that were identified and appraised through the SA process, including some 'unreasonable' alternatives, and why they were rejected in favour of the proposed policies.

1.16 The justification for choosing the proposed policies within the plan is detailed within the tables at paragraph 6.3.

### **Habitats Regulations Assessment**

1.17 A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) must be undertaken to assess the impacts of land-use plans on sites of European importance, in accordance with the European Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), as set out in the UK amended Habitats Regulations (2007).

1.18 The Core Strategy, which sets out the broad policies for the future development of the District, has been subject to a HRA.

1.19 A HRA Advice Note for the Discussion and Consultation Document was prepared by Enfusion in February 2012 and concluded that:

“The majority of broad interest areas proposed in the Core Strategy are within or adjacent to existing settlements and are at a distance that is unlikely to result in significant effects on European sites alone. This along with the mitigation provided by Core Strategy policies means that the impacts of development at the different site specific options – outlined area in the Consultation and Discussion Document – are unlikely to vary from each other significantly. **The result is that from an HRA perspective there is no preferred site specific option for the following interest areas:**

(a) North of London Road, Rayleigh

(a) West Rochford

(b) West Hockley

(c) South Hawkwell

(d) East Ashingdon

(e) South Canewdon

(f) South East Ashingdon

(g) West Great Wakering”

In summary, European sites are unlikely to be a determining factor in the allocation of specific sites for development within the above general locations.

1.20 However, the HRA recommended that Option SWH3 for South West Hullbridge should not be considered the preferred option for this general location **“as this is closer to the European sites than the other three options and is also further outside the boundary of the settlement.”**

1.21 The proposed policies within the Allocations Submission Document, in general, do not differ greatly from those proposed in the Discussion and Consultation Document, and in any case, proposed residential development to the south west of Hullbridge does not extend as far northwards as Option SWH3.



## **2 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology**

- 2.1 The SA Report has been produced alongside the Allocations Submission Document, and as such has been undertaken in accordance with the advice set out in the guidance on the preparation of SAs for Development Plan Documents published in 2005<sup>1</sup>. This guidance has since been superseded (in September 2009) by the CLG Plan Making Manual<sup>2</sup>, which continues to refer to guidance on undertaking Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) published in 2005<sup>3</sup>. This SA Report will combine the SEA guidance with the advice within the Plan Making Manual.
- 2.2 An overarching LDF Scoping Report generic to all LDF Development Plan Documents has already been prepared. This was produced during the preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Document and as such the overarching SA of the Council's LDF is the Core Strategy Submission 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.
- 2.3 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.
- 2.4 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (November 2005) available from:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/sustainabilityappraisal>

<sup>2</sup> 'CLG Plan Making Manual' available at: <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pagelid=109798>

<sup>3</sup> 'A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2005)' available from: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/practicalguidesea.pdf>

2.5 The SEA Baseline Information Profile for the District, which contains a wealth of environmental, economic and social information, is produced by Essex County Council and updated on a regular basis. This will therefore enable a consistent methodology and approach to all LDF documents, and a wide ranging set of information has been included to ensure the full appraisal of individual documents. The 2009-2010 SEA Baseline Information Profile, which is available in Appendix 17, has been used in the appraisals. The evidence base supporting the development of the Core Strategy has also been drawn upon, as appropriate.

1.22 The stages of the SA process are outlined in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 – Stages of the SA Process**

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.

2.6 A number of plans, policies and programmes relevant to the production of the LDF generally have been identified and reviewed in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. This is available to view in Appendix 16 of this report. To account for changes since the Core Strategy Submission SA Report in September 2009, a list of new or updated key plans and programmes is also available in Appendix 16.

1.23 The 2009-2010 SEA Baseline Information Profile has been used as part of the appraisal process, where appropriate. This document is available in Appendix 17 of this report. The previous SEA Baseline Information Profile documents can be found on the Council’s website at [www.rochford.gov.uk](http://www.rochford.gov.uk).

1.24 The baseline conditions for the District, described in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report, are set out within Appendix 18.

1.25 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies the sustainability characteristics for the District, and these are detailed within Appendix 18. The key sustainability issues for the District are also identified in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. It is 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 within Task A5. The key sustainability issues for the District are set out in Table 2 below.



<b>Table 2 – Key sustainability Issues/ opportunities identified for Rochford District</b>
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.

- 2.7 The SA Framework was refined during the preparation of the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report. The final SA Framework used to appraise the development of the Core Strategy DPD is set out in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report, and can be found in Appendix 18.
- 1.26 The SA Framework used in the appraisal of the Allocations Submission Document was adapted from that of the Core Strategy Submission Document to reflect the differing perspectives and scales of the Development Plan Document, where appropriate. Three statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) were consulted on the draft SA Framework, and the final framework was amended to reflect the responses received, as appropriate.

**Table 3 – SA Objectives**

<b>SA Objective Headings</b>	
1. Balanced Communities	8. Landscape & Townscape
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	9. Climate Change & Energy
3. Housing	10. Water
4. Economy & Employment	11. Land & Soil
5. Accessibility	12. Air Quality
6. Biodiversity	13. Sustainable Design & Construction
7. Cultural Heritage	

2.8 Each option included within the Discussion and Consultation Document and the additional alternative options identified through the consultation on this document, and those included in the Submission Document and further alternatives, have been appraised against the SA Framework, where appropriate. A broad assessment of whether effects are likely to be cumulative, short, medium and long-term, temporary or permanent has been included, where possible, in relation to the SA objectives are detailed within the main Sustainability Appraisal.

### **3 Sustainability Appraisal – Matrices and Summaries**

3.1 The following section provides a summary of the detailed assessment of the proposed policies and the alternative options against the SA objectives. Matrices in Appendices 3-11 to the document set out the detailed assessment themselves of the proposed policies and the alternative options against the SA objectives and accompanying decision-aiding questions.

3.2 Each of the alternative options and the proposed policies have been given an impact category according to the table below.

**Table 4 – Categories of Sustainability Effects**

<b>Colour</b>	<b>Impact</b>
++	Major Positive
+	Positive
+/-	Positive/Negative
0	No Impact
?	Uncertain
-	Negative
--	Major Negative

3.3 A scoring summary of the proposed policies and the reasonable alternative options considered is set out in the table below.

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
<b>Brownfield Residential Land Allocations</b>													
Policy BFR1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 3.												
Policy BFR2	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 3.												
Policy BFR3	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 3.												
Policy BFR4	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 3.												
<b>Settlement Residential Extension Land Allocations</b>													
<b>North of London Road</b>													
Policy SER1	++	++	++	+	++	++	+	-/+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
Option NLR1	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	++/-	+	+	+/-/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
Option NLR2	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-/-	+	+/-	+/-/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
Option NLR3	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-/-	+	+/-/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
Option NLR4	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	0/-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option NLR5	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	0/-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+
<b>West Rochford</b>													
Policy SER2	++	++	++	++/-	++	+	+	++/-	++	+	-	+/0	+
Option WR1	++	++	++	++	++	+	+/-	++/-	++	+	-	+/0	+
Option WR2	+/-	+/-/-	++	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	++/-	++	+	-/-	+	+/-
Option WR3	+/-	+/-	++	++	+/-	+	+/-/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-/-	+/-	+
Option WR4	+/-	0/-	+	+/-/-	+/-/-	+	+/-	-	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option ALT2	+/-	+	+	+	++/-	?	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
Option ALT3	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	?	+/-	+/-/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
<b>West Hockley</b>													
Policy SER3	+	++	++/-	+/-	++/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option WH1	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-/-	+	+	-	+	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option WH2	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	0/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-
Option WH3	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option WH4	+	+/-	+	+/-/-	+/-/-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option WH5	+	++	++/-	+/-	++/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option ALT4	++	++	+	+	+/-	-	+	+/-/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+
<b>South Hawkwell</b>													
Policy SER4	+	+	++	++/-	+	++/-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+/-
Option SH1	+/?	+/-	+	++/-	+/-	+/-	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
Option SH2	+	+	++	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	++	+	+
Option SH3	+/-	+/-/-	++	++/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
Option SH4	+	+/-	+	++	++	+/-	-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
Option ALT7	+/-	+	+	++	+/-	-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
<b>East Ashingdon</b>													
Policy SER5	++/?	+	++	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option EA1	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option EA2	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option EA3	++	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
<b>South West Hullbridge</b>													
Policy SER6	++	++	+	++	+/-	+/-	-	++/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option SWH1	+	++/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option SWH2	++	++	+	+	+	0/-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option SWH3	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	0/-	-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
Option SWH4	++/-	++/-	+	+	+	-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option ALT10	+/-/-	+/-/-	++	+	-	+/-	+/-	-	+	+/-	-	-	-



## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
<b>South Canewdon</b>													
Policy SER7	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	++/-	+	0	+/-	+/-	+
Option SC1	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	++/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option SC2	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option SC3	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option SC4	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option ALT5	+	+	+	+	+/-	?	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option ALT11	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+/-	-	+	+
Option ALT12	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	-	+	+
<b>South East Ashingdon</b>													
Policy SER8	++	++	+	++	++	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option SEA1	++	++	+	++	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	+/-	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option SEA2	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option SEA3	+	+/-	+	++	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
<b>West Great Wakering</b>													
Policy SER9	+/-	++	+	++/-	+/-	++	-	++	+	+	-	+	+
Option WGW1	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+
Option WGW2	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option WGW3	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option WGW4	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option WGW5	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
<b>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation</b>													
Policy GT1	+/-	+/-	++/-	-	+/-	+/-	?	+/-	0	+	+/-	-	0
Option GT1	++/-	+/-	+/-	0	-	0	-/?	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	-	0

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option GT2	00/-	+/-	+/-	0	-	0	-/?	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	-	0/-
Option GT3	+/-	+/-	+/-	0	0	?	?	+/-	0	+/-	+/?	0	0
Option GT6	++/-	+/-	+	0	+/-	0	-/?	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	-	0
Option GT7	+	+/-	+	0	+	-	-/?	-/-	0	0/-	-/-	0	0
Option ALT8	+/-	+/-/-	+	0	+/-	?	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0/-	+
<b>Existing Employment Land Allocations</b>													
Policy EEL1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 6.												
Policy EEL2	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 6.												
Policy EEL3	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 6.												
<b>New Employment Land Allocations</b>													
Policy NEL1	++	0	0	+	+/-	+	+	+/0	+	+	+/-	0	+
Policy NEL2	-	+/-	0	+	+/-	-	-	?	0	0	+/-	0/-	++

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option E13	+	+/?	0	+/-	+/-	+/?	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E14	+	?	0	+	+	+/?	0	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E15	+	+/?	0	+	+/-	+/?	0	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E16	+	+/?	0	+	+/-	+/?	0	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E18	+/-	0/?	0	++/-	+/-/-	+/-	0	++/-	+	+/-	+/-/-	+/-	+
Policy NEL3	++/-	+/-	0	+	+/-	+	+	0/+	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option E19	+	0/?	0	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E20	+/-	0/?	0	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E21	+/-	-/?	0	+	+/-/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E22	+/-	-/?	0	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E23	-	-/?	0	+/-	+-	?/+	+	-	+	+/-	-/?	-	+
Option E24	+/-	-/?	0	+	+/-	?/+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Policy NEL4	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 7.												
<b>Ecological and Landscape Allocations</b>													
Policy ELA1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 8.												
Policy ELA2	-	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0
Policy ELA3	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 8.												
<b>Educational Land Allocations</b>													
Policy EDU1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 9.												
Policy EDU2	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 9.												
Policy EDU3	+/0	+	0	+	+	0	-	++	0	0	-	+	+
Option KES1	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	+	0	+	+	0	+
Option KES2	+	+	-	+	+/-	0	-	+/-	0	+/-	+	0	+
Option KES3	+	+	-	+	+/-	0	+/-	+	0	+	+	0	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Policy EDU4	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 9.												
<b>Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations</b>													
Policy OSL1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 10.												
Policy OSL2	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 10.												
Policy OSL3	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 10.												
<b>Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations</b>													
Policy TCB1	+	+	+	+	++	+/?	?	+	+	+	++/?	+/-	+
Option TC1	+	+	+	+	+	+/?	?	+	+	+	+/-/?	+/-	+/-
Option TC2	+/-	0/-	-/-	-	+/-	-/?	?	+/-	-	+/-	-/-/?	-	+
Option TC11	+	0	0	+	+	0	?	+	+	+	++	+/-	+
Option TC12	-	0	0	-	-/?	0	?	+	-	+	++	-	-
Policy TCB2	+	+	-	++/-	+	?	+/-	++/+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+
Option TC3	-	0	+	-/+	-/?	+/?	-/?	+	-	-	++/-	+/-	+



## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option TC4	+	+	-	+	+	?	?	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+
Option TC5	+	+	-	+	+	?	+/-	++	+	+/-	+	+/-	+
Option TC6	+/-	+	-	+/-	-/?	-/?	?	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option TC13	+	0	0	+	+	0	?	+/-	+	+/-	++	+/-	+
Option TC14	-	0	0	-	-/?	0	-/?	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+/-	-

- 3.4 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 Submission Document. It should be noted that whilst the SA findings are considered by the Council in its selection of options and form part of the evidence supporting the Allocations DPD, the SA findings are not the sole basis for a decision; planning and feasibility factors play a key role in the decision-making process.

#### **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.

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).

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.

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.

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.



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

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’.

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.

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

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 option were 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 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.

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.

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

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.

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

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 has been 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.

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 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.

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

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 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.



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

There is potential for the existing bus route along Ashingdon 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 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.

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

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 WG3 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.

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.



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

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.

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

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.

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

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

Although Policy NEL1 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.

The site does not follow natural boundaries along its western and southern boundaries, which would have negative sustainability implications in terms of the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this location. However, the Concept Statement proposes the creation of sizeable green buffers in the Green Belt to the west and south of the site to enhance this defensibility.

Policy NEL2 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.

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

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.

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.

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

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



### **Educational Land Allocations – King Edmund School**

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).

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.



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

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.

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

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.

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.

## **4 Consultation on the Allocations DPD and the SA Report**

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 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 (forming Stage D). 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.
- 4.3 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. These responses have been taken into account as appropriate.

- 4.4 The Submission Document and SA Report will be consulted on for a period of eight weeks between 29 November 2012 and 25 January 2013.

## **5 How the Plan has Incorporated SA Recommendations**

- 5.1 An explanation of how the Allocations Submission Document has incorporated the SA recommendations for mitigation and enhancement at the Discussion and Consultation stage is provided in Appendix 12.

- 5.2 The appraisal of the draft Submission Document has recommendations embedded within it which have been addressed within the proposed policies, as this SA report has been produced alongside the Submission Document and has informed its development. The detailed assessment of the proposed policies should be referred to.

- 5.3 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

## **6 Implementation and Monitoring**

- 6.1 Indicators and targets are important tools to help monitor the sustainability effects of the LDF (forming Stage E). Targets and/or indicators for each sustainability objective have been identified (from the SA Framework) within Section 8 of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report to provide a suggested list for discussion, and refined further to consider the significant sustainability effects of the plan as required by the SEA Directive.

- 6.2 Monitoring of the LDF will take place through the publication of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Guidance on the proposed LDF monitoring strategy for the District identified in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report is detailed below.

- 6.3 The proposed LDF monitoring strategy should:

- Clearly set out who is responsible for the monitoring, as well as it's timing, frequency and format for presenting results;
- By collecting new information, update and strengthen original baseline data, rectifying any deficiencies, and thereby provide an improved basis for the formulation of future plans;
- Establish a mechanism for action to enhance positive effects of the plan, mitigate any negative ones and assess any areas that were originally identified as containing uncertainty. The aim should be to keep the LDF working at maximum effectiveness for the benefit of the community; and,
- Empower all of the community by providing a clear and easily understandable picture of how actual implementation of the LDF is affecting the District. Is it moving the area towards or away from the more sustainable future we intended? Are any significant effects identified actually happening? Are any unforeseen consequences being felt? Are any mitigation measures that were proposed operating effectively?

6.4 Indicators aim to measure all relevant aspects of life in the District social and economic as well as environmental. These are drawn from:

- Objectives and targets set out in the LDF - these will mostly be quantitative and may be expressed as maps, graphs, diagrams or percentages (e.g. Percentage of new housing built on brownfield land, target of 10% of energy on major new developments to be provided by renewables etc.);
- Indicators already identified and used in the SA process, again mostly likely to be quantitative;
- Measures drawn from the baseline data collected during the early stages of the LDF or from the previous Local Plan (e.g. air quality, extent of wildlife habitats, need for affordable housing); and,
- Any other measures suggested by the community. These might be more qualitative (e.g. quality of life) and could be useful in enriching understanding and giving people a sense of ownership of the LDF.

6.5 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies potential indicators for monitoring which relate to the SA Framework objectives. The Allocations DPD is a key component to deliver the Core Strategy. The potential indicators for monitoring the Allocations DPD are set out in the table below. Suggested amendments have been highlighted.

## Potential Indicators

### 1. **Balanced Communities**

To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work

- Changing educational attainment at GCSE Level
- Proportion of persons in the local population with a degree level qualification.
- Parishes with a GP, post office, play area, pub, village hall
- Percentage of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centre
- Mix of housing tenure within settlements
- Provision of new [youth and](#) community facilities secured through new developments
- [Provision of open space secured through new developments](#)

### 2. **Healthy & Safe Communities**

Create healthy and safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion

- Monitor the number of domestic burglaries, violent offences, vehicle crimes, vandalism and all crime per 1,000 population.
- Percentage of residents surveyed who feel 'fairly safe' or 'very safe' during the day whilst outside in their Local Authority.
- Indexes of Multiple Deprivation throughout the District.
- Monitor the type and number of applications permitted in the greenbelt.
- Life expectancy
- Hectares of new greenspace created
- Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard
- Death rates from circulatory disease, cancer, accidents and suicide
- Residents description of Health
- Obesity levels
- [Provision of open space secured through new developments](#)

## Potential Indicators

### 3. Housing

To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home

- Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings.
- Indices of Multiple Deprivation – Housing and Services Domain
- Percentage of households rented from the Council or in Housing Association/Registered Social Landlords properties
- Percentage of new housing which is affordable
- Average house price compared with average earnings
- Number of housing Completions
- [Percentage of Lifetime Homes](#)

### 4. Economy & Employment

To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and promote town centre vitality/viability

- The changing diversity of main town centre uses (by number, type and amount of floorspace)
- The changing density of development
- Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area
- Percentage of employees commuting out of the District to work
- Amount of land developed for employment (by type)
- Retail health checks/economic prosperity of smaller towns and villages
- [Number of jobs created through new developments](#)

### 5. Accessibility

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

- Changes in the travel to work mode of transport
- Indices of Multiple Deprivation most notably the Housing and Services Domain
- Car ownership

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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 <u><a href="#">open space (based on Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards – ANGSt<sup>4</sup>)</a></u></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>• <u><a href="#">Number of management plans for designated sites prepared and implemented</a></u></li> <li>• <u><a href="#">Proportion of new developments delivering habitat mitigation</a></u></li> <li>• <u><a href="#">Proportion of new developments delivering wildlife corridors</a></u></li> <li>• <u><a href="#">Areas of geological significance safeguarded and/or extracted</a></u></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>4</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>• <u>Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM compliance</u></li> <li>• <u>Percentage of the tonnage of household waste arisings which have been recycled</u></li> <li>• <u>Percentage of household waste sent by the Authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion</u></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> </ul>



<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>● <a href="#"><u>Number and types of Sustainable Drainage Systems approved and implemented</u></a></li> </ul>
<b>11. Land &amp; Soil</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. Air Quality</b>	<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 Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b>	<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>

## **7 Conclusion and Next Steps**

- 7.1 The SA report has appraised the residential, employment, environment, community facilities and town centre options set out in the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document, additional alternative options identified through the SA process, and the proposed policies within the Allocations Submission Document. The potential cumulative, short, medium and long-term, temporary or permanent effects, have also been identified where possible.
- 7.2 Each of the proposed residential and employment policies to deliver the requirements of the Rochford District Core Strategy have different implications for the sustainability objectives in terms of site level effects, however, in general the proposed policies would have a range of short term negative impacts on local communities through their construction, primarily due to the relationship between the sites identified and existing residential areas, impacts on the local and wider highway network and air quality. Over the longer term, these options would in general have negative impacts on landscape whilst having positive effects on housing/employment objectives in terms of providing housing/employment and associated infrastructure on land currently designated Green Belt.
- 7.3 The retention of existing employment land (in accordance with the Core Strategy), in general would have long term positive effects on economy and employment. The ecological and landscape policies would have long term positive impacts on biodiversity and landscape. The policies to retain existing schools and extend King Edmund School, protect existing open spaces and leisure centres (where appropriate) would likely have a long term positive impact on balanced communities and accessibility. The identification of Rochford and Rayleigh town centre boundaries and primary shopping areas would likely have positive effects on housing, the local economy and employment, landscape and townscape, and balanced communities in the longer term. However, in the short term, redevelopment within the town centres would have an impact on communities, in terms of the proximity of construction to the existing residential area, highways, and air pollution.
- 7.4 Throughout the SA report has made a number of recommendations in relation to various alternative options and the proposed policies. The SA report, alongside consultation responses received, has been used to inform the preparation of the pre-submission Allocations Document. The recommendations identified throughout the SA process have assisted in mitigating the potential impacts of the proposed policies and had a positive effect on the sustainability of the plan.
- 7.5 Overall there are significant sustainability benefits in adopting the plan as proposed.



**Rochford District Council**  
Council Offices South Street  
Rochford Essex SS4 1BW  
Phone: 01702 546366  
customerservices@rochford.gov.uk  
Website: www.rochford.gov.uk



**INVESTORS  
IN PEOPLE** | Gold