

Appendix 7 – New Employment Land Allocations

One option considered in the Discussion and Consultation Document was included, prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy, to the north of London Road in Rayleigh (E17). Consequently the inclusion of E17 would not accord with the adopted Core Strategy which identifies that land will be allocated to the south of London Road for new employment land. Although it may be argued that E18 is not located to the south of London Road, it has been included in line with the recommendations of the previous SA (July 2012).

An alternative option (ALT8) was appraised within the previous SA, but has not been included within this SA as it does not accord with the adopted Core Strategy.

South of London Road, Rayleigh

Policy NEL1

SA Objective	Policy NEL1 – Commentary	Score
1. Balanced Communities	<p>Development on this site will ensure that local employment opportunities are maintained. It provides good access to existing strategic transport routes from London Road. It is well related to Rayleigh, which is the largest settlement in the District. As such it has considerable potential to encourage the regeneration of existing communities.</p> <p>NEL1 relates well to the proposed residential development site SER1 to the north of London Road, providing employment opportunities for both it and the existing settlement of Rayleigh. The location of this site could have a positive impact on equal opportunities.</p> <p>It will also ensure that a number of the uses present in BFR4 can be relocated to more suitable location.</p>	++
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>Whilst NEL1 is relatively close to a primary school located on Little Wheatley Chase, as per option E14, the Concept Statement stipulates that office use and compatible light industrial uses, such as storage, would be appropriate for this site. Contrary to the previous SA, therefore, it is unlikely that this site would become a 'bad neighbour' use to the surrounding residential area. The type of uses permitted onsite would be managed through the development management process.</p> <p>The proposals to link this site to the Greenway 13 and providing green buffers around the site could potentially help to mitigate any negative impacts NEL1 might have, particularly in terms of its impact on traffic and amenity.</p>	0

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL1 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future. However, office use and compatible light industrial uses would have a lesser impact on the generation of noise and light pollution, than heavier industrial uses.</p>		
3. Housing	No impact.	0	
4. Economy & Employment	<p>NEL1 has the potential to provide high quality employment land which is well related to the largest settlement in the District.</p> <p>It has the potential to provide beneficial employment opportunities which are accessible to the proposed residential area to the north of London Road (SER1). This relationship could potentially assist with the delivery of wider infrastructure provision and should help reduce social exclusion.</p> <p>There are several existing businesses on the site and these should be retained where possible. Additionally the site has the capacity to accommodate some of the current light industrial and office uses that are planned for relocation from Rawreth Industrial Estate (BFR4), as well as additional office uses</p>	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>NEL1 is well related to the existing settlement of Rayleigh and to the proposed residential development to the north of London Road (SER1). It also has a potential to link to Greenway 13.</p> <p>Although the site provides for the retention of local employment opportunities within the area of Rayleigh and the proposed residential location SER1, this does however create the potential for greater congestion along London road because of the additional access/ egress routes into SER1 combined with those needed for NEL1. Ideally the site should include only one junction providing access/egress to/from NEL1 and SER1 onto London Road. This will ensure that the impact on traffic flow is minimised.</p> <p>The location of the site means that people who do not own vehicles may find the site less accessible. This factor should be dealt with by improvements to public transport.</p> <p>Improvements to pedestrian footpaths will be required along the southern side of London Road as at present there are no footpaths in this location. Improvement to cycling would also be required.</p> <p>A Transport Impact Assessment should be carried out as part of any planning application for the site.</p>	+	–

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL1 – Commentary	Score	
6. Biodiversity	<p>The general location is not situated near to any of the Districts estuaries or salt marshes or important/ natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>Part of the site encompasses an area of previously developed land and would not result in the loss of any significant biodiversity value. The site is also situated on grade 3 agricultural land.</p> <p>There are several ponds, a watercourse and trees/hedgerows in the previously developed section of the site. These will need to be assessed for their biodiversity value prior to any development.</p>	+	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>NEL1 is situated in Historic Environment Character Zone 40. As such there may be some archaeological deposits. This will need to be considered before the site is developed.</p> <p>There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site.</p>	+	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>There is also a Tree Preservation Order area in proximity to the south western corner of the site which may need to be taken into consideration. Any trees lost should be replaced on a like for like basis.</p> <p>There are pylons to the south of the site as well as crossing the east of the site. These would need to be considered in any future planning application.</p> <p>The site does not follow any established natural boundary such as St Johns Drive. As such a green buffer will be required along the south and west of the site. This will ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary is created.</p> <p>The site does benefit from an existing green buffer to the east which will prevent development from coalescing with the existing residential area of Rayleigh to the east.</p> <p>This site will have a similar impact on the general area as option E14 but less of an impact than E13 which does not include any agricultural land.</p> <p>This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. This option encompasses an existing brownfield site with defined boundaries and would therefore promote a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary in the locality. The relationship between this option and residential options to the north of London Road could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the west of Rayleigh. This would need to be carefully considered at the development stage, although this option, given that it proposes a smaller area on existing previously developed land, would have less of an impact to the south of London Road than the other options.</p>	+	0

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL1 – Commentary	Score	
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings which meet the ‘very good’ BREEAM rating as required in the Concept Statement.</p> <p>Onsite renewables and low carbon energy technologies should be provided unless it can be demonstrated that they would render development unviable.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site is not at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Attenuated Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) can be accommodated in the development.</p> <p>The waste water treatment network for the site may need to be upgraded. This can be considered at the planning application stage.</p>	+	
11. Land and Soil	<p>The site covers an area of previously developed land so loss of soil quality will be minimal. However, some of the site occupies grade 3 agricultural land, which will be lost if the site is developed.</p> <p>Whilst the developed part of the site has the potential to be contaminated, the uses should be retained.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>The location of this site may not reduce the need to travel. However, there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality. The relationship between NEL1 and SER1 has the potential to encourage sustainable travel patterns.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	0	
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>The site should have a varied layout and should be able to accommodate a range of uses. Buildings should meet the requirements set out in the Core Strategy, that they should meet at least the ‘very good’ BREEAM rating and at least 10% of their energy requirements should be generated by onsite renewable and low carbon sources.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

Option E13

SA Objective	Option E13 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>Development on this site will ensure that local employment opportunities are maintained. It provides good access to existing strategic transport routes from London Road. It is well related to Rayleigh, which is the largest settlement in the District. As such it has considerable potential to encourage the regeneration of existing communities.</p> <p>E13 relates well to the proposed residential development site SER1 to the north of London Road, providing employment opportunities for both it and the existing settlement of Rayleigh. The location of this site could have a reasonably positive impact on equal opportunities.</p> <p>It will also enable a number of the uses present in BFR4 to be relocated to a more suitable location, although only a relatively small proportion of such uses. Such relocation would be entirely dependent on existing uses on the site being willing to vacate, as this site is occupied by existing businesses.</p>	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>This option is situated further away from the primary school located along Little Wheatley Chase compared to other options. The employment designation within this option therefore does not have the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which can have an impact on quality of life.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 13.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>	+	?
3. Housing	<p>No impact.</p>	0	
4. Economy & Employment	<p>Employment land in this general location would have the potential to assist with wider infrastructure provision and should help reduce social exclusion through increasing employment opportunities close to the District's residential population. The site has the potential to relate well to new residential development at SER1.</p> <p>The site is within an area identified in the Employment Land Study (2008) as being suitable for additional employment growth.</p> <p>The site is smaller than other potential options, and as such provides less employment development potential than alternatives</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E13 – Commentary	Score	
<p>5. Accessibility</p>	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along London Road and to link the site with Greenway 13.</p> <p>This option has good links to the strategic road network and is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh to the east. Nevertheless there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality. This option is particularly well related to Options NLR3 and NLR5 and SER1 which propose direct links onto London Road. This could encourage walking and cycling to local employment opportunities. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>It would ensure the retention of some local employment opportunities, whereas other options have a greater capacity to retain more employment opportunities to the west of the District. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs.</p> <p>This option is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh and may therefore not reduce the need to travel. This would mean that, as opposed to E14 and NEL1 which extend towards the existing residential area, this option is less likely to become a 'bad neighbour' employment site to any surrounding uses and furthermore there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>It is isolated from the existing residential development, however, it would seek to encourage development where large volumes of transport movements are located. Although isolated from existing residential development, this option is in proximity to the residential options to the north of London Road.</p> <p>This option to the west of Rayleigh has links with the neighbouring economic centres of Basildon and Chelmsford, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>	+	-
<p>6. Biodiversity</p>	<p>This general location to the west of Rayleigh is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>This option would not lead to a loss of biodiversity as this is a brownfield site which is currently in use. There are, however, several ponds on site which may have biodiversity value, and as such, potential disturbance or habitat loss would need to be mitigated against. Given the size of the site relative to the amount of land required to compensate for the de-allocation of existing employment land in the District, this option would not necessarily preserve other Green Belt land.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p>	+	?

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E13 – Commentary	Score	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 40 (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There may be some archaeological deposits within this area, although at present this is unknown due to the lack of archaeological field work undertaken. This will need to be taken into consideration. There are no Listed buildings in close proximity to this option.</p> <p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site to the west of Rayleigh which is not currently designated employment land as opposed to E17 which encompasses greenfield land.</p> <p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site to the west of Rayleigh which is not currently designated employment land as opposed to E17 which encompasses greenfield land.</p> <p>This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. It encompasses an existing brownfield site with defined boundaries and would therefore support a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary in the locality.</p> <p>The relationship between this option and residential options to the north of London Road could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the west of Rayleigh. This would depend on the options taken forward and would need to be carefully considered, although this option, given that it proposes a smaller area on existing previously developed land, would have less of an impact to the south of London Road than the other options.</p>	+	-
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site to the west of Rayleigh which is not currently designated employment land as opposed to E17 which encompasses greenfield land.</p> <p>This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. This option encompasses an existing brownfield site with defined boundaries and would therefore promote a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary in the locality. The relationship between this option and residential options to the north of London Road could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the west of Rayleigh. This would need to be carefully considered at the development stage, although this option, given that it proposes a smaller area on existing previously developed land, would have less of an impact to the south of London Road than the other options.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E13 – Commentary	Score	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation.</p> <p>An area to the north of this option is at risk of flooding. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>This option is previously developed land.</p> <p>A contaminated land study will be required prior to development of the site.</p> <p>This option is previously developed land, however, additional land would need to be provided within the District to compensate for existing employment land to be reallocated. It may not therefore ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>The isolation of this site from the existing residential area of Rayleigh may not reduce the need to travel, but there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>This option is particularly well related to residential options NLR3 and NLR5 and SER1 which propose direct links onto London Road. This could encourage sustainable travel patterns.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>There may be some constraints as the site is previously developed land, however, sustainable design and construction should still be viable and could be incorporated into the development.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

Option E14

SA Objective	Option E14 – Commentary	Score
<p>1. Balanced Communities</p>	<p>Development on this site will ensure that local employment opportunities are maintained. It provides good access to existing strategic transport routes from London Road. It is well related to Rayleigh, which is the largest settlement in the District. As such it has considerable potential to encourage the regeneration of existing communities.</p> <p>E14 relates well to the proposed residential development site SER1 to the north of London Road, providing employment opportunities for both it and the existing settlement of Rayleigh. Furthermore, the site, by projecting eastwards towards existing residential areas, the potential to integrate with such areas and be accessible from them. The location of this site could therefore have a positive impact on equal opportunities.</p> <p>It will also enable a number of the uses present in BFR4 to be relocated to a more suitable location, although only a proportion of such uses.</p>	<p>+</p>
<p>2. Healthy & Safe Communities</p>	<p>This option is situated in close proximity to a primary school situated along Little Wheatley Chase. The employment designation within this option has the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which may have an impact on quality of life in the locality.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 13.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>	<p>?</p>
<p>3. Housing</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>4. Economy & Employment</p>	<p>Employment land in this general location would have the potential to assist with wider infrastructure provision and should help reduce social exclusion through increasing employment opportunities close to the District's residential population. The site has the potential to relate well to new residential development at SER1.</p> <p>The site is within an area identified in the Employment Land Study (2008) as being suitable for additional employment growth.</p>	<p>+</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E14 – Commentary	Score	
<p>5. Accessibility</p>	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along London Road and to link the site with Greenway 13.</p> <p>This option has good links to the strategic road network and is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh to the east. Nevertheless there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality. This option is particularly well related to Options NLR3 and NLR5 and SER1 which propose direct links onto London Road. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>It would ensure the retention of some local employment opportunities, whereas other options have a greater capacity to retain more employment opportunities to the west of the District. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs.</p> <p>This option is separated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh by an existing green buffer to the east and the proximity of this option to the existing residential development has the potential to reduce the need to travel. This option is also situated on an existing bus route, and this service has the potential to be improved.</p> <p>It is situated to the west of Rayleigh with good access to the strategic road network. It would seek to encourage development where large volumes of transport movements are located. Although this option is in proximity to existing residential development, this option is also in proximity to the residential options to the north of London Road.</p> <p>This option to the west of Rayleigh has links with the neighbouring economic centres of Basildon and Chelmsford, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>	+	
<p>6. Biodiversity</p>	<p>This general location to the west of Rayleigh is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>This option would not lead to a loss of biodiversity as this is a brownfield site which is currently in use and also grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). There are, however, several ponds on site which may have biodiversity value, and as such, potential disturbance or habitat loss would need to be mitigated against. Given the size of the site relative to the amount of land required to compensate for the de-allocation of existing employment land in the District, this option would not necessarily preserve other Green Belt land.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p>	+	?

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E14 – Commentary	Score	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 40 (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There may be some archaeological deposits within this area, although at present this is unknown due to the lack of archaeological field work undertaken. This will need to be taken into consideration at the development stage. There are no Listed buildings in close proximity to this option.</p>	0	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site, which is not currently designated employment land, alongside agricultural land (designated Green Belt) to the west of Rayleigh, as opposed to E13 which encompasses just brownfield land.</p> <p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site, which is not currently designated employment land, alongside grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) to the west of Rayleigh, as opposed to E13 which encompasses just brownfield land.</p> <p>This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. This option encompasses an existing brownfield site and Green Belt land to the east. This option generally follows natural or existing boundaries and would therefore promote a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary in the locality. However, the land to the east which would provide a green buffer is currently designated Green Belt. The relationship between this option and residential options to the north of London Road could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the west of Rayleigh. This would need to be carefully considered at the development stage, although this option would have a greater impact to the south of London Road than Option E13.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E14 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>An area to the north of this option is at risk of flooding. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>		
11. Land and Soil	<p>Part of this option is previously developed land.</p> <p>Part of this option is previously developed land. The rest is grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) which is currently designated Green Belt. The impact on soil quality is unknown.</p> <p>This option encompasses previously developed land and grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile), however, additional land would need to be provided within the District to compensate for existing employment land to be reallocated. It may not therefore ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>The location of this site may not reduce the need to travel. However, there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>This option is particularly well related to residential options NLR3 and NLR5 and SER1 which propose direct links onto London Road. This could encourage sustainable travel patterns.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>There may be some constraints as part of this option is previously developed land, however, sustainable design and construction should still be viable and could be incorporated into the development.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

Option E15

SA Objective	Option E15 – Commentary	Score	
<p>1. Balanced Communities</p>	<p>Development on this site will ensure that local employment opportunities are maintained. It provides good access to existing strategic transport routes from London Road. It is well related to Rayleigh, which is the largest settlement in the District. As such it has considerable potential to encourage the regeneration of existing communities.</p> <p>E15 relates well to the proposed residential development site SER1 to the north of London Road providing employment opportunities for both it and the existing settlement of Rayleigh. The location of this site could have a reasonably positive impact on equal opportunities.</p> <p>It will also enable a number of the uses present in BFR4 to be relocated to a more suitable location, although only a proportion of such uses.</p>	+	
<p>2. Healthy & Safe Communities</p>	<p>This option is situated further away from the primary school located along Little Wheatley Chase compared to other options. The employment designation within this option therefore does not have the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which can have an impact on quality of life.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 13.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>	+	?
<p>3. Housing</p>	<p>No impact</p>	0	
<p>4. Economy & Employment</p>	<p>Employment land in this general location would have the potential to assist with wider infrastructure provision and should help reduce social exclusion through increasing employment opportunities close to the District's residential population. The site has the potential to relate well to new residential development at SER1.</p> <p>The site is within an area identified in the Employment Land Study (2008) as being suitable for additional employment growth.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E15 – Commentary	Score	
<p>5. Accessibility</p>	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along London Road and to link the site with Greenway 13.</p> <p>This option has good links to the strategic road network and is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh to the east. Nevertheless there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality. This option is particularly well related to Options NLR3 and NLR5 and SER1 which propose direct links onto London Road. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>It would ensure the retention of some local employment opportunities, whereas other options have a greater capacity to retain more employment opportunities to the west of the District. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs.</p> <p>This option is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh and may therefore not reduce the need to travel. This would mean that, as opposed to E14 and NEL1 which extend towards the existing residential area, this option is less likely to become a 'bad neighbour' employment site to any surrounding uses and furthermore there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>It is situated to the west of Rayleigh with good access to the strategic road network. It is isolated from the existing residential development, however, it would seek to encourage development where large volumes of transport movements are located. Although isolated from existing residential development, this option is in proximity to the residential options to the north of London Road.</p> <p>This option to the west of Rayleigh has links with the neighbouring economic centres of Basildon and Chelmsford, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>	+	-
<p>6. Biodiversity</p>	<p>This general location to the west of Rayleigh is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>This option would not lead to a loss of biodiversity as this is a brownfield site which is currently in use and grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). There are, however, several ponds on site which may have biodiversity value, and as such, potential disturbance or habitat loss would need to be mitigated against. Given the size of the site relative to the amount of land required to compensate for the deallocation of existing employment land in the District, this option would not necessarily preserve other Green Belt land.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p>	+	?

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E15 – Commentary	Score	
7. Cultural Heritage	This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 40 (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There may be some archaeological deposits within this area, although at present this is unknown due to the lack of archaeological field work undertaken. This will need to be taken into consideration at the development stage. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this option.	0	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site to the west of Rayleigh which is not currently designated employment land, and grade 3 agricultural land (which is designated Green Belt), as opposed to E17 which is situated entirely on greenfield land.</p> <p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site, which is not currently designated employment land, alongside grade 3 agricultural land (designated Green Belt) to the west of Rayleigh, as opposed to E13 which encompasses just brownfield land. This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. This option generally follows the existing boundary of the employment site, but extends further to the south, but does not follow a natural boundary. This may therefore impact on the strength and defensibility of the Green Belt in this locality. The relationship between this option and residential options to the north of London Road</p> <p>could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the west of Rayleigh. This would need to be carefully considered at the development stage, although this option would have less of an impact to the south of London Road than the Options E14 and E16 for example.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>An area to the north of this option is at risk of flooding. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E15 – Commentary	Score	
11. Land and Soil	<p>Part of this option is previously developed land.</p> <p>Part of this option is previously developed land. The rest is grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) which is currently designated Green Belt.</p> <p>A contaminated land study should be carried out prior to the development of this site.</p> <p>This option encompasses previously developed land and grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile), however, additional land would need to be provided within the District to compensate for existing employment land to be reallocated. It may not therefore ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>The isolation of this site from the existing residential area of Rayleigh may not reduce the need to travel, but there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>This option is particularly well related to residential options NLR3 and NLR5 and SER1 which propose direct links onto London Road. This could encourage sustainable travel patterns.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>There may be some constraints as part of this option is previously developed land, however, sustainable design and construction should still be viable and could be incorporated into the development.</p>	+	

Option E16

SA Objective	Option E16 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>Development on this site will ensure that local employment opportunities are maintained. It provides good access to existing strategic transport routes from London Road. It is well related to Rayleigh, which is the largest settlement in the District. As such it has considerable potential to encourage the regeneration of existing communities.</p> <p>E15 relates well to the proposed residential development site SER1 to the north of London Road providing employment opportunities for both it and the existing settlement of Rayleigh. The location of this site could have a reasonably positive impact on equal opportunities.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E16 – Commentary	Score	
	It will also enable a number of the uses present in BFR4 to be relocated to a more suitable location, although only a proportion of such uses. This option would ensure the retention of more local employment opportunities, as opposed to some of the other options to the west of Rayleigh due to its greater capacity.		
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>This option is situated further away from the primary school located along Little Wheatley Chase compared to other options. The employment designation within this option therefore does not have the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which can have an impact on quality of life.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 13.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>	+	?
3. Housing	No impact	0	
4. Economy & Employment	<p>Employment land in this general location would have the potential to assist with wider infrastructure provision and should help reduce social exclusion through increasing employment opportunities close to the District's residential population. The site has the potential to relate well to new residential development at SER1.</p> <p>The site is within an area identified in the Employment Land Study (2008) as being suitable for additional employment growth.</p>	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along London Road and to link the site with Greenway 13.</p> <p>This option has good links to the strategic road network and is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh to the east. Nevertheless there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality. This option is particularly well related to Options NLR3 and NLR5 and SER1 which propose direct links onto London Road. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>It would ensure the retention of more local employment opportunities, as opposed to some of the other options to the west of Rayleigh due to its greater capacity. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E16 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>This option is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh and may therefore not reduce the need to travel. This would mean that, as opposed to E14 and NEL1 which extend towards the existing residential area, this option is less likely to become a ‘bad neighbour’ employment site to any surrounding uses and furthermore there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>It is situated to the west of Rayleigh with good access to the strategic road network. It is isolated from the existing residential development, however, it would seek to encourage development where large volumes of transport movements are located. Although isolated from existing residential development, this option is in proximity to the residential options to the north of London Road.</p> <p>This option to the west of Rayleigh has links with the neighbouring economic centres of Basildon and Chelmsford, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>		
6. Biodiversity	<p>This general location to the west of Rayleigh is not in proximity to the District’s estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>This option would not lead to a loss of biodiversity as this is a brownfield site which is currently in use and grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). There are, however, several ponds on site which may have biodiversity value, and as such, potential disturbance or habitat loss would need to be mitigated against. Given the size of the site relative to the amount of land required to compensate for the de-allocation of existing employment land in the District, this option would not necessarily preserve other Green Belt land.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p>	+	?
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 40 (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There may be some archaeological deposits within this area, although at present this is unknown due to the lack of archaeological field work undertaken. This will need to be taken into consideration at the development stage.. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this option.</p>	0	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E16 – Commentary	Score	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site to the west of Rayleigh which is not currently designated employment land, and grade 3 agricultural land (which is designated Green Belt), as opposed to E17 which is situated entirely on greenfield land.</p> <p>This option would utilise an existing brownfield site, which is not currently designated employment land, alongside grade 3 agricultural land (designated Green Belt) to the west of Rayleigh, as opposed to E13 which encompasses just brownfield land.</p> <p>This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. This option generally follows the existing boundary of the employment site to the east, and is bounded by a road to the north and west. This may therefore ensure that a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained in this locality.</p> <p>The relationship between this option and residential options to the north of London Road could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the west of Rayleigh. This would need to be carefully considered at the development stage, although this option would have a greater impact to the south of London Road than Option E13.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. It is noted, however, that there is an area at risk further to the west of the site to the west of the A130. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E16 – Commentary	Score	
11. Land and Soil	<p>Part of this option is previously developed land.</p> <p>Part of this option is previously developed land. The rest is grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) which is currently designated Green Belt. The impact on soil quality is unknown.</p> <p>This option encompasses previously developed land and grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile), however, additional land would need to be provided within the District to compensate for existing employment land to be reallocated. It may not therefore ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>The isolation of this site from the existing residential area of Rayleigh may not reduce the need to travel, but there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>This option is particularly well related to residential options NLR3 and NLR5 and SER1 which propose direct links onto London Road. This could encourage sustainable travel patterns.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>There may be some constraints as part of this option is previously developed land, however, sustainable design and construction should still be viable and could be incorporated into the development.</p>	+	

West of the A1245, Rayleigh

Policy NEL2

SA Objective	Policy NEL2 - Commentary	Score	
<p>1. Balanced Communities</p>	<p>NEL2 is adjacent to GT1. The presence of heavy industrial employment and recycling facilities on the site has the potential to have a strong negative impact on the neighbouring Gypsy and Traveller site. As such it is recommended in the concept statement that sufficient land be allocated so that a strong Green Buffer can be created between the employment site and the Gypsy and Traveller site.</p> <p>The site is a significant distance from existing urban and rural communities and is unlikely to offer any benefits in terms of regeneration.</p> <p>The site is not well served by public transport and as such it is unlikely to ensure equal opportunities for people without access to public transport.</p>	-	
<p>2. Healthy & Safe Communities</p>	<p>NEL2 is close to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site (GT1). It is relatively well related to this site in that prevailing wind conditions will ensure that air and noise pollution will be reduced in the location of GT1. Some impact from air born pollutants and noise is expected however and appropriate mitigation measures should be included.</p> <p>There are electricity pylons to the north west and south west of the site as well as further to the east. These pylons should be taken into consideration before development commences. Units should be located at an appropriate safe distance from the pylons.</p>	+	-
<p>3. Housing</p>	<p>No impact.</p>	0	
<p>4. Economy & Employment</p>	<p>It is proposed that NEL2 should include both heavy industrial uses as well as a recycling centre as recommended in the previous SA. This will ensure the retention of existing employment within the district.</p> <p>The site is large enough to accommodate appropriate employment uses that have relocated from the industrial estate currently occupying BFR4.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL2 - Commentary	Score	
5. Accessibility	<p>NEL2 is located at a key junction of the A127 and A1245. As such access/egress routes for the site should be carefully considered. A Transport Impact Assessment should be carried out prior to the development of the site. The Transport Impact Assessment should also include an assessment of air quality.</p> <p>The site is well related to the districts highways network but is poorly related to existing public transport. The location of NEL2 means that people without access to private transport will have difficulty getting to the site as it is poorly served in terms of public transport. Some provision for alternative means of transport should be considered for the site.</p> <p>The site is situated near to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site (GT1). Development of NEL2 must ensure that GT1 is not affected to the extent that it is rendered unviable. To ensure that this does not occur adequate parking and manoeuvring space should be provided on the site.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that the road layout of the site ensures efficient and integrated movement of traffic from both GT1 and NEL2. Measures should also be included to ensure that traffic traveling to the NEL2 is not directed into the residential area of GT1.</p> <p>NEL2 is at a lower elevation than the area surrounding the site. Appropriate measures should be taken at the planning application stage to ensure that efficient access/egress points are provided for the site.</p>	+	-
6. Biodiversity	<p>The site is not located in close proximity to any of the District's estuaries or salt marshes. It is not in proximity to any Local Wildlife Sites or any areas of special biodiversity.</p> <p>NEL2 is located on Grade 3 agricultural land, however as this land is not under cultivation the site has the capacity to support some biodiversity.</p>	-	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>The site is located at a significant distance from the rest of the District's major settlements and is unlikely to have any significant impact on the cultural heritage of the District.</p> <p>This site is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 40 (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There may be some archaeological deposits within this area, although at present this is unknown due to the lack of archaeological field work undertaken. This will need to be taken into consideration.</p>	?	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL2 - Commentary	Score	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>Existing trees and hedgerows should be retained where possible with like for like replacement of those that cannot be retained. This will serve to fortify the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>The site (combined with the adjacent allocation of NEL2) has been described as degraded Green Belt and as such allocation of the site would reduce the need to allocate undeveloped greenfield sites elsewhere in the District.</p>		
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>The site is not located in any of the districts flood risk areas.</p> <p>At least 10% of the energy requirements of the buildings on the site should be generated by on-site renewable and low carbon sources, unless it can be demonstrated that this would render the development unviable.</p> <p>The site offers relatively few opportunities to mitigate the impact of climate change directly however the development of NEL2, which is described as 'degraded' Green Belt will ensure that more valuable Green Belt land does not need to be released.</p>	0	
10. Water	<p>The site is will need to be tied into the District's sewage system before it can be developed. Upgrades to the existing network may also be necessary.</p> <p>The sites location means that it may be necessary to model the site for wastewater treatment and transmission. This should be carried out at the application stage and issues should be discussed and resolved with Anglian Water.</p> <p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p>	0	
11. Land and Soil	<p>The site is located in Grade 3 agricultural land although it is not currently under cultivation. The land in this site is described as 'degraded' Green Belt and as such its use would ensure that other more valuable Green Belt land can be protected.</p> <p>It is possible that there is some degree of land contamination on the site. This should be investigated through a Contaminated Land Study prior to development.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>NEL2 is likely to have a negative impact on air quality within the site as a result of the proposed heavy industrial uses.</p> <p>The site is already bounded by major arterial roads which produce a degree of air pollution and as such the increased pollution from NEL2 may not have as significant affect on the general location.</p>	-	0

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL2 - Commentary	Score	
	<p>An assessment of the impact that NEL2 will have on air quality should be undertaken in order to ascertain its likely impact. Air quality assessments should be carried out as part of the proposed Transport Impact Assessment for the site.</p> <p>NEL2 is situated in close proximity to GT1. The location of GT1 ensures that prevailing wind conditions will carry pollutants away from the Gypsy and Traveler site.</p>		
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	The site can accommodate buildings which meet at least the 'very good' BREEAM rating. A minimum of 10% of the energy requirements should be generated by on-site renewable and low carbon sources, unless it can be demonstrated that this would render the development unviable.	++	

Option E18

SA Objective	Option E18 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option would be less accessible for those without access to private transport, compared with other options. As such would not be so positive in terms of promoting equal opportunities. However, the allocation of this site would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities which are well related to strategic transport routes.</p> <p>This option would be able to accommodate a considerable proportion of the businesses displaced from redeveloped 'bad neighbour' employment sites in the District. It is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh, which, although has accessibility implications, would ensure that this site does not become a 'bad neighbour' due to the lack of surrounding land uses.</p> <p>This option would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities to the west of Rayleigh, and has the greatest capacity of all the options identified for this general location to retain more employment opportunities to the west of the District</p>	+	-
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	This option is detached from the main settlement of Rayleigh and is isolated from these sites as it is situated at a major road junction and is enclosed by the National Express East Anglia train line to the north. The employment designation within this option therefore does not have the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which can have an impact on quality of life.	0	?

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E18 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>The allocation of this site is unlikely to encourage walking and cycling, and therefore it has limited potential to promote informal recreation and consequently, healthy active lifestyles.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>		
3. Housing	No impact.	0	
4. Economy & Employment	<p>Employment land in this general location would have the potential to assist with wider infrastructure provision. Whilst it would help increase employment opportunities for resident, it is not as well related to existing and proposed residential areas.</p> <p>The site is within an area identified in the Employment Land Study (2008) as being suitable for additional employment growth. The site is capable of supporting a significant quantum of employment development to meet future needs and to facilitate in the relocation of businesses displaced from other sites proposed to be redeveloped.</p>	++	-
5. Accessibility	<p>This option may not ensure sustainable access to key services given that it is detached from the main settlement of Rayleigh, and although there are existing bus routes in the locality along the London Road from Rayleigh town centre, the A1245 and part of the A127, at present these would not provide sustainable access to this site. As such this option is not well related to public transport routes. However, this site does have the potential to have particularly good access to the A127 and A1245 and the wider highway network.</p> <p>Although it is remote from local services there may be potential to improve sustainable transport provision in this locality. There is unlikely to be good access for all sections of the community, particularly those which do not have access to private transport.</p> <p>Due to the location of the site away from the main settlement of Rayleigh and the enclosure of the site to the south east and east by main routes (the A127 and the A1245 dual carriageways) and National Express East Anglia train line to the north, it is unlikely that alternative methods of transportation will be promoted at this site in terms of walking and cycling as it is not well related to any proposed Greenways or the proposed Sustrans route. However, given the proposed land use with this option, there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p>	+	--

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E18 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>This option would ensure the retention of more local employment opportunities, as opposed to the other options to the west of Rayleigh due to its greater capacity. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs.</p> <p>It is isolated from the existing residential development of Rayleigh, and is not well related to the residential options to the north of London Road. It may therefore not reduce the need to travel. This would mean that, as opposed to some of the other options for this general location such as E14 and NEL1, this option is less likely to become a 'bad neighbour' employment site.</p> <p>This option is situated to the west of Rayleigh and is well related to the strategic road network. It would seek to encourage development where large volumes of transport movements are located.</p> <p>This option has links with the neighbouring economic centres of Basildon and Chelmsford, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>		
<p>6. Biodiversity</p>	<p>This general location to the west of Rayleigh is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>Any impact on hedgerows to the north, east and west of the site, however, would need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p> <p>The Rochford District Replacement Local Plan 2006 Inspector's Report described the site as being "degraded countryside, an area that is no longer used for farming" (paragraph 4.33) and it may protect the openness of the Green Belt, agricultural land and landscape character of other areas in the locality. This site is not brownfield land but spoilt grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) which is not used as such. There is potential for this site to have ecological value given its largely disused nature.</p> <p>There is potential to retain habitats within any development and facilitate species movement provided that would not inadvertently conflict with the employment uses locating there. The scale of the site has the potential to promote new habitat creation, although this would need to be carefully considered with regard to the location of the site, and the fact that it is bounded by two main transport routes to the east and south east (the A1245 and the A127 respectively), a train line to the north and the A130 is situated further to the west.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E18 – Commentary	Score	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 40 (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There may be some archaeological deposits within this area, although at present this is unknown due to the lack of archaeological field work undertaken. This will need to be taken into consideration at the development stage. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this option.</p>	0	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>Although the allocation of this site has the potential to have an adverse impact on the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces as it is currently designated as Green Belt, the site has been described as degraded countryside. The allocation of this site would reduce the need to allocate undeveloped open greenfield sites, potentially with greater ecological value, elsewhere in the District. It is pertinent to note, however, that the site itself may have some ecological value as it is not used for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>The allocation of this site, due to its location away from the main settlement of Rayleigh, would not contribute to the effective management of land in the urban fringe <i>per se</i>. Allocating the site, however, would enable a more effective management process of the site. The site is currently allocated as Green Belt, although it has been described as degraded countryside and is no longer used for farming.</p> <p>Although it is currently allocated as Green Belt, the allocation of this site for employment use would utilise this land.</p> <p>This option is predominantly situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change. The landscape character is likely to be impacted if this site is allocated as the site is currently designated Green Belt, although there are some current unauthorised uses on site which have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the landscape character. This</p> <p>site was also recognised within the Replacement Local Plan 2006 Inspector's Report as being "degraded countryside, an area that is no longer used for farming" (paragraph 4.33) and thus it may preserve the character and openness of Green Belt in other locations. If this site were allocated, then it would be important to maintain a defensible Green Belt boundary. The site is bounded by two dual carriageways to the east and south east (the A1245 and the A127 respectively), a natural boundary to the south and west and a train line to the north. There is an opportunity to create a new defensible Green Belt boundary, albeit one which would create somewhat of an island of development within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The site is situated to the west of Rayleigh. It is therefore not located near to or within a townscape area.</p>	++	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E18 – Commentary	Score	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding. It is noted, however, that there is an area at risk further to the west of the site to the west of the A130. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>Although this site was recognised within the Replacement Local Plan 2006 Inspector's Report as being "degraded countryside, an area that is no longer used for farming" (paragraph 4.33), this option is not previously developed land. The site is greenfield land, albeit land which has been subject to a number of uses in recent times. The allocation of this site would therefore not ensure the re-use of previously developed land in preference to greenfield sites.</p> <p>This option is situated on degraded grade 3 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). The site has been described as degraded countryside so it is unlikely that the allocation of this site would have an adverse impact on soil quality.</p> <p>The site is currently not identified as contaminated land. This would need to be investigated prior to any development.</p> <p>This option is situated on degraded grade 3 agricultural land), albeit land which has already been subject to some development, and, given its size compared to the other options for additional employment land to the west of Rayleigh, this option would ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected as far as practicable.</p>	+	- -
12. Air Quality	<p>This option is situated away from the existing residential area of Rayleigh and is not well related to the residential options to the north of London Road. It would therefore not reduce car travel. There is, however, potential to enhance the public transport link between this option and Rayleigh town centre given the proposed land use with this option.</p> <p>This site is not in immediate proximity to any AQMAs and its allocation would not direct traffic away from significant junctions given its location. There may be some impact on the A1245, and highways access from this site may need to be negotiated carefully.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>There may be some constraints as the site has the potential to be contaminated, however, sustainable design and construction should still be viable and could be incorporated into the development.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

Policy NEL3

SA Objective	Policy NEL3 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	The designation of this site will ensure the retention of local employment opportunities although the site will also accommodate employment uses displaced from other employment sites in the District. The site is not well related to the transport infrastructure network however it provides access to local employment opportunities which will be beneficial to the community.	++	-
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>The employment land proposed is in proximity to the existing residential area of Great Wakering to the north. The employment site here will accommodate the relocation of the Star Lane Industrial estate. This will allow the Star Lane site to be reallocated for residential uses, and will ensure a healthy and safe community in that area.</p> <p>Although the site is close to the existing residential area of Great Wakering it has the potential to be connected to the existing highways network although it is not well related to the strategic network. Improvements to footpaths, pedestrian/cycle links and green travel networks will need to be incorporated into the design of any development.</p>	+	-
3. Housing	No impact.	0	
4. Economy & Employment	<p>The site ensures the retention of local employment opportunities for the residents of Great Wakering.</p> <p>The relationship between NEL3 and the residential development planned for west Great Wakering (particularly SER9b) must be considered.</p>	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>The site can connect to the local highway network (Star Lane) and has the potential to have good access to the A127 and A1245. There is an access route to the site to the north of NEL3 providing vehicular access to the Local Wildlife Site. In the interest of reducing the traffic impact on Star Lane it is suggested that there should be one access/egress route linking Star Lane to this site, BFR1 and SER9b, as well as the Local Wildlife Site, This will mean that the access route to NEL3 will run through the green buffer between the site and BFR1, which could have negative effect on the integrity and character of the buffer. However, measures must be set in place to prevent vehicles from entering the Wildlife Site inadvertently while attempting to access NEL3.</p> <p>A new roundabout at the junction of Star Lane and Poynters Lane further to the south is also proposed.</p> <p>Improvements to footpaths, pedestrian/cycle links and green travel networks will need to be incorporated into the design of any development.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL3 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>Development of other sites adjoining Star Lane such as SER9b should be carefully planned in order to ensure that there are as few access/egress routes to the sites as possible. This will help to prevent an unnecessary build up of traffic on Star Lane.</p> <p>NEL3 has the potential to reduce the need to travel as it may provide employment for local residents and residents of nearby settlements. This would be dependent on improvements to the bus routes and public transport networks.</p> <p>A Transport Impact Assessment, including an assessment of air quality, must accompany any planning application to develop the site.</p>		
6. Biodiversity	<p>This general location is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries, or salt marshes.</p> <p>The site will be located a sufficient distance away from the site from the southern boundary of the Local Wildlife site. This will help to avoid and mitigate any negative impact on the biodiversity on the Local Wildlife Site from the development of NEL3.</p> <p>NEL3 is located in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site. Serious consideration should be given to any development on NEL3 to ensure that there is no negative impact on the Local Wildlife Site. Relevant bodies should be consulted on how best to deal with the additional recreational pressures on the site. The development of SER9b BFR1 and NEL3 should be considered in relation to one another as the development of these sites are likely to have a cumulative impact on the site in terms of recreational pressure.</p> <p>The proposed green 136 meter green buffer to the north of NEL3 has the potential to provide additional habitats which could enhance species movement and colonisation.</p>	+	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>NEL3 is located within Historic Environment Character Zone 7. This encompasses a large area of brick earth covered gravel terrace that is mostly cultivated. It contains a variety of archaeological deposits with a high likelihood of archaeological survival outside of the quarry areas. The historic landscape has been significantly altered by the quarrying process. Consideration should be given to the potential impact on the historic environment before any development takes place.</p>	+	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>NEL3's close proximity to the Local Wildlife Site put the site at risk from increased use. In order to mitigate this, the existing trees along the sites northern boundary should be retained and enhanced to provide a significant green buffer of 136 meters between the site and NEL3.</p>	0	+

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL3 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>The site is general open and expansive in nature. As such appropriate landscaping will be needed along the north, east and south of NEL3 in order to ensure that there is a strong Green Belt Boundary.</p> <p>As the allocation of the site would form an isolated island of development within the Green Belt there is a need for significant landscaping of the site, particularly to minimize the visual impact of the site from the south along Star Lane and east along Poynters Lane. This should be achieved through the creation of substantial green buffers/open space along the southern, northern and eastern boundaries.</p> <p>NEL3 is within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area. NEL3 has the least impact on this landscape character area as it is the smallest site proposed for this general location.</p> <p>The site's location 140 metres to the south of existing development in Great Wakering, allows for an adequate separation of industrial uses and residential uses to ensure residential amenity. However, with open fields to the north, south, and west there is no existing features which provide defensible Green Belt boundaries in these directions. As such, development of the site must be accompanied by landscaping to the north, south and east, creating a new Green Belt boundary.</p>		
9. Climate Change and Energy	Buildings in the site should meet the 'very good' BREEAM rating. At least 10% of the energy requirements should be generated by on-site renewable and low carbon sources unless it can be demonstrated at the planning application stage that this would render the development unviable.	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage systems (SUDs).</p> <p>The foul sewage network would need to be upgraded for development of the site.</p>	+	
11. Land and Soil	<p>NEL3 is situated on Grade 1 agricultural land and the development of the site will result in the loss of the land.</p> <p>Although NEL3 is located on Grade 1 agricultural land. The site is smaller than the other employment land options proposed for this area and will result in a smaller loss of high quality agricultural land.</p>	-	
12. Air Quality	<p>There are a range of local services located in proximity to SER9 along the High Street, and there is an existing bus route nearby providing sustainable access to the Districts town centres. This reduces the need to use private transport. All of these factors would have a positive impact on reducing air pollution.</p> <p>NEL3 has the capacity to reduce the There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy NEL3 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>The development of employment uses on this site is likely to have some impact on the air quality of the area, particularly in relation to the Local Wildlife site.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to the site.</p> <p>An air quality impact assessment should be carried out as part of the Transport Impact Assessment.</p>		
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	Sustainable design and construction on this site can be accommodated. The concept statement for NEL3 indicates that buildings on the site should meet the 'very good' BREEAM rating.	+	

Option E19

SA Objective	Option E19 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option proposes an area generally equal to that of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate, which is proposed to be redeveloped for housing. Whilst retaining local employment opportunities, this option would ensure that adequate provision of employment land towards the western end of the District which is better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes is provided.</p> <p>The designation of this site would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities, displaced by the reallocation of Star Lane Industrial Estate to the north of this option. Although this site is not well related to strategic transport routes, it is important to retain accessible employment land for the sustainability of the local community. A new employment site which is versatile and accessible has the potential to ensure the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities, provided that it does not become a 'bad neighbour' to any surrounding uses.</p> <p>The site is well related to the existing settlement, enabling ease of access to employment opportunities for all, thus promoting equal opportunities.</p>	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	The employment land is proposed in proximity to proposed residential development to the north on the existing Industrial Estate therefore there may be some impact on the local community. However, the allocation of an employment site of this scale would be an asset to the local community and contribute to wider sustainability objectives. If this site were brought forward for employment use, the impact on the options for residential development on Star Lane Industrial Estate and in SER9 would need to be carefully considered and managed through the development management process.	0	?

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E19 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 20.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>		
3. Housing	No impact.	0	
4. Economy & Employment	<p>The site has the potential to relate well to existing and proposed residential areas in Great Wakering. The provision of good quality, flexible employment land in this locality would provide local employment opportunities to the east of the District. It would thus potentially help reduce social exclusion through increasing employment opportunities close to the residential population and enable the retention of workers within the District, and supply a range of jobs across a variety of sectors as recognised in the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along the High Street and Star Lane and this option has the potential to link with Greenway 20 to the west.</p> <p>This option is situated to the south of Great Wakering and extends away from the village towards Shoebury. The site has links to Star Lane and the wider highway network, and the centre of Great Wakering village is located to the north. There is a public transport route along Star Lane and the High Street although the situation of this option may discourage the use of alternative modes of transportation. There is also potential to improve public transport in this locality.</p> <p>It encompasses part of the residential options WGW3 and WGW4. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by existing employment land, although Star Lane Industrial Estate to the north of the site is proposed for residential development.</p> <p>This general location is not strategically well located for employment land in comparison with the other general locations identified for employment land (i.e. to the west of Rayleigh and the north of London Southend Airport), but would continue to provide local employment opportunities to the east of the District in proximity to the village centre.</p> <p>The south of Great Wakering has links with the neighbouring economic centre of Southend, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E19 – Commentary	Score	
6. Biodiversity	<p>This general location to the south of Great Wakering is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries, or salt marshes. This option is, however, in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site (R35. Star Lane Pits), which is situated to the north east. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this Local Wildlife Site. A green buffer may be provided along the northern boundary to mitigate any development of this option, if taken forward.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p> <p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile).</p> <p>The provision of a green buffer between any development of this option, proposed residential development and the Local Wildlife Site has the potential to create new habitats in the locality which could facilitate species movement and colonisation.</p>	+	-
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 7 which encompasses an extensive area of brickearth covered gravel terrace that is mostly cultivated. Large parts comprise restored landscape following brickearth quarrying. It is characterised by a rectilinear pattern of land boundaries of ancient origin and contains extensive archaeological deposits of multi-period date (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is likely to be good below ground archaeological survival outside the quarried areas. The areas not quarried have a high sensitivity to change for below grounds deposits, however, the extensive quarrying has significantly altered the historic landscape. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered at the development stage.</p> <p>There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site, and Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated to the north east.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impact s of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	+	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and is not on the urban fringe <i>per se</i>. It would therefore not contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe.</p>	+	--

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E19 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>This option is situated on greenfield land and would therefore not reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land.</p> <p>This site is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change. This option has the smallest area as opposed to the other options for employment land in this general location. It is enclosed by Star Lane to the west and Star Lane Brickworks (the southern section of Star Lane Industrial Estate) to the north. The site, however, does not follow a natural field boundary this may make the creation of a defensible Green belt boundary difficult. As opposed to some of the other options for this general location such as E20 it would still preserve the undeveloped area between Great Wakering and Shoebury to the south. This option would have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this area. All of the options would have some impact on the openness of the area, however, this option would have less of an impact than other options for employment land to the south of Great Wakering.</p> <p>The relationship between this option and residential options to the west of Great Wakering could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the south and west of Great Wakering. This would need to be carefully considered at the development stage.</p>		
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation. However, there would need to be infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades to the foul sewerage network.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>This option is not within an area at risk of flooding, although there are areas of flood zone 2 and 3 to the north east and south east of this area. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E19 – Commentary	Score	
11. Land and Soil	<p>This option is situated on greenfield land and does not seek to reuse previously developed land.</p> <p>This option is on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). Therefore there would be an impact on soil quality.</p> <p>Greenfield land is not thought to be contaminated.</p> <p>This option is grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and would therefore not ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected. Protection of agricultural land in the locality, however, needs to be balanced against the retention of local employment opportunities and the sustainability of the community.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by existing employment land, although this is proposed to be reallocated for residential use.</p> <p>This option encompasses part of the residential options WG3 and WG4. Depending on the residential option taken forward, this could encourage sustainable travel patterns. However, there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.	+	

Option E20

SA Objective	Option E20 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>The area proposed is more than double the capacity of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate (which includes the disused Brickworks site to the south of this designated area) and would involve a substantial increase in the quantum of employment land available in this location.</p> <p>The site is well related to the existing settlement, enabling ease of access to employment opportunities for all, thus promoting equal opportunities.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E20 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>However, whilst retaining local employment opportunities, this option would provide a surplus of employment land in the eastern area of the District, as opposed to the west of Rayleigh and north of London Southend Airport which are better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes. Such a surplus of employment land in this location may be of harm to balanced communities and regeneration in both Great Wakering and elsewhere in the District.</p>		
<p>2. Healthy & Safe Communities</p>	<p>The employment land is proposed in proximity to proposed residential development to the north on the existing Industrial Estate therefore there may be some impact on the local community. If this site were brought forward for employment use, the impact on the options for residential development on Star Lane Industrial Estate and in SER9 would need to be carefully considered and managed through the development management process.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 20.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>?</p>
<p>3. Housing</p>	<p>No impact</p>	<p>0</p>	
<p>4. Economy & Employment</p>	<p>The site has the potential to relate well to existing and proposed residential areas in Great Wakering. The provision of good quality, flexible employment land in this locality would provide local employment opportunities to the east of the District. It would thus potentially help reduce social exclusion through increasing employment opportunities close to the residential population and enable the retention of workers within the District, and supply a range of jobs across a variety of sectors as recognised in the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	<p>+</p>	
<p>5. Accessibility</p>	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along the High Street and Star Lane and this option has the potential to link with Greenway 20 to the west.</p> <p>This option is situated to the south of Great Wakering and extends away from the village towards Shoebury. The site has links to Star Lane, Poynters Lane and the wider highway network, and the centre of Great Wakering village is located to the north, although the size of the site and its extension to the south away from the village may encourage use of the private car. There is a public transport route along Star Lane and the High Street although the situation of this option may discourage the use of alternative modes of transportation. There is also potential to improve public transport in this locality.</p> <p>It encompasses part of the residential options WGW3 and WGW4. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>-</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E20 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>This option would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs. However, this option is situated in a relatively inaccessible location to the east of the District in comparison with the other general locations identified for employment land (to the west of Rayleigh and the north of London Southend airport) and is not considered appropriate as a large strategic employment site.</p> <p>It should be a small scale employment site which should seek to meet the needs of the local community providing an accessible, sustainable and flexible site. Such a large employment site would likely have a significant impact on the local highway network to the detriment of the local community and wider sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The relationship between this option, proposed residential development on Star Lane Industrial Estate, and the residential options to the west of Great Wakering could positively impact on social inclusion.</p> <p>This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by existing employment land although Star Lane Industrial Estate to the north of the site is proposed for residential development.</p> <p>It would continue to provide local employment opportunities to the east of the District in proximity to the village centre. However, this option extends further to the south than E19, for example, and would provide an excessive amount of employment land in this non-strategic location. Such a large employment site would likely have a significant impact on the local highway network to the detriment of the local community and wider sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The south of Great Wakering has links with the neighbouring economic centre of Southend, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>		
<p>6. Biodiversity</p>	<p>This general location to the south of Great Wakering is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries, or salt marshes. This option does, however, bound a Local Wildlife Site (R35. Star Lane Pits), which is situated to the north east. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this Local Wildlife Site. A green buffer may be provided along the northern boundary to mitigate any development of this option, if taken forward.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p> <p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile).</p> <p>The provision of a green buffer between any development of this option, existing and proposed residential development and the Local Wildlife Site has the potential to create new habitats in the locality which could facilitate species movement and colonisation.</p>	<p>+</p>	<p>-</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E20 – Commentary	Score	
<p>7. Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 7 which encompasses an extensive area of brickearth covered gravel terrace that is mostly cultivated. Large parts comprise restored landscape following brickearth quarrying. It is characterised by a rectilinear pattern of land boundaries of ancient origin and contains extensive archaeological deposits of multi-period date (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is likely to be good below ground archaeological survival outside the quarried areas. The areas not quarried have a high sensitivity to change for below grounds deposits, however, the extensive quarrying has significantly altered the historic landscape. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered at the development stage. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site, and Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated to the north east.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	+	
<p>8. Landscape & Townscape</p>	<p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and is not on the urban fringe <i>per se</i>. It would therefore not contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe.</p> <p>This option is situated on greenfield land and would therefore not reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land.</p> <p>This site is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change. This option proposes one of the largest areas for employment land in this non-strategic location. It is enclosed by Star Lane to the west, Poynters Lane to the south, a natural field boundary to the east and Star Lane Brickworks (the southern section of Star Lane Industrial Estate) to the north. This option would be able to create a defensible Green belt boundary, however, it would encourage the coalescence between Great Wakering and Shoebury to the south, which would have a negative impact on the landscape character of the area. This option would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this area.</p> <p>However, this option would have a greater impact than other options for employment land to the south of Great Wakering. The relationship between this option and residential options to the west of Great Wakering could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the south and west of Great Wakering. This would need to be carefully considered at the development stage.</p>	+	--

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E20 – Commentary	Score	
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation. However, there would need to be infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades to the foul sewerage network.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>This option is not within an area at risk of flooding, although there are areas of flood zone 2 and 3 to the north east and south east of this area. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>This option is situated on greenfield land and does not seek to reuse previously developed land.</p> <p>This option is on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). Therefore there would be an impact on soil quality.</p> <p>Greenfield land is not thought to be contaminated.</p> <p>This option is grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and would therefore not ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected. Protection of agricultural land in the locality, however, needs to be balanced against the retention of local employment opportunities and the sustainability of the community. As opposed to E19, this option would unnecessarily encroach further on to grade 1 agricultural land in the locality.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E20 – Commentary	Score	
		+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by existing employment land, although this is proposed to be reallocated for residential use.</p> <p>This option encompasses part of the residential options WGW3 and WGW4. Depending on the residential option taken forward, this could encourage sustainable travel patterns. However, there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.	+	

Option E21

SA Objective	Option E21 – Commentary	Score	
		+	-
1. Balanced Communities	<p>The area proposed is approximately a third bigger than that of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate. Whilst retaining local employment opportunities, this option would ensure that adequate provision of employment land towards the western end of the District which is better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes is provided, although it is still greater than existing.</p> <p>The site is reasonably well related to the existing settlement, enabling reasonable ease of access to employment opportunities for all, thus promoting equal opportunities.</p> <p>However, whilst retaining local employment opportunities, this option would provide a surplus of employment land in the eastern area of the District, as opposed to the west of Rayleigh and north of London Southend Airport which are better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes. Such a surplus of employment land in this location may be of harm to balanced communities and regeneration in both Great Wakering and elsewhere in the District.</p>	+	-
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>This option is adjacent to existing residential development to the east. The employment designation within this option has the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which may have an impact on quality of life in the locality. The impact on the options for residential development in the area to the west of Great Wakering would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 20</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>	-	?

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E21 – Commentary	Score
3. Housing	No impact	0
4. Economy & Employment	The site has the potential to relate well to existing and proposed residential areas in Great Wakering. The provision of good quality, flexible employment land in this locality would provide local employment opportunities to the east of the District. It would thus potentially help reduce social exclusion through increasing employment opportunities close to the residential population and enable the retention of workers within the District, and supply a range of jobs across a variety of sectors as recognised in the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.	+
5. Accessibility	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along the High Street and Star Lane and this option has the potential to link with Greenway 20 to the west.</p> <p>This option is situated to the south of Great Wakering and extends away from the village towards Shoebury. The site only has the potential to link to Poynters Lane which given the size of the site may have significant implications on the highway network at this point.</p> <p>Another road link could be provided to Star Lane but this would be on additional Green Belt land and may undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this locality.</p> <p>There is a public transport route along Star Lane which is situated away from this site and may therefore discourage the use of alternative modes of transportation</p> <p>This option is adjacent to part of residential options WGW3 and WGW4. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>This option would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs.</p> <p>However, this option is situated in a relatively inaccessible location to the east of the District in</p>	+/-/-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E21 – Commentary	Score
	<p>comparison with the other general locations identified for employment land (to the west of Rayleigh and the north of London Southend airport) and is not considered appropriate as a large strategic employment site as opposed to E19.</p> <p>It should be a small scale employment site which should seek to meet the needs of the local community providing an accessible, sustainable and flexible site. The scale and location of this employment site would likely have a significant impact on the local highway network to the detriment of the local community and wider sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The relationship between this option, proposed residential development on Star Lane Industrial Estate, and the residential options to the west of Great Wakering could positively impact on social inclusion, although this would depend on the options taken forward.</p> <p>This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by a Local Wildlife Site to the north and extends further to the south than some of the other options for this general location although it is situated to the west of Alexandra Road and Star Lane Industrial Estate to the north west of the site is proposed for residential development.</p> <p>This option extends further to the south than E19, for example, and would provide an excessive amount of employment land in this non-strategic location. The scale and location of this employment site would likely have a significant impact on the local highway network, particularly as this option would only have the potential to link to Poynters Lane without encroaching further into the Green Belt, to the detriment of the local community and wider sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The south of Great Wakering has links with the neighbouring economic centre of Southend, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E21 – Commentary	Score	
6. Biodiversity	<p>This general location to the south of Great Wakering is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries, or salt marshes. This option does, however, bound a Local Wildlife Site (R35. Star Lane Pits), which is situated to the north east. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this Local Wildlife Site. A green buffer may be provided along the northern boundary to mitigate any development of this option, if taken forward.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p> <p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile).</p> <p>The provision of a green buffer between any development of this option, existing residential development and the Local Wildlife Site has the potential to create new habitats in the locality which could facilitate species movement and colonisation.</p>	+	-
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 7 which encompasses an extensive area of brickearth covered gravel terrace that is mostly cultivated. Large parts comprise restored landscape following brickearth quarrying. It is characterised by a rectilinear pattern of land boundaries of ancient origin and contains extensive archaeological deposits of multi-period date (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is likely to be good below ground archaeological survival outside the quarried areas. The areas not quarried have a high sensitivity to change for below grounds deposits, however, the extensive quarrying has significantly altered the historic landscape. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered at the development stage. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site, and Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated to the north / north east.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	+	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 7 which encompasses an extensive area of brickearth covered gravel terrace that is mostly cultivated. Large parts comprise restored landscape following brickearth quarrying. It is characterised by a rectilinear pattern of land boundaries of ancient origin and contains extensive archaeological deposits of multi-period date (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is likely to be good below ground archaeological survival outside the quarried areas. The areas not quarried have a high sensitivity to change for below grounds deposits, however, the extensive quarrying has significantly altered the historic landscape. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E21 – Commentary	Score	
	carefully considered at the development stage. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site, and Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated to the north / north east.		
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation. However, there would need to be infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades to the foul sewerage network.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>This option is not within an area at risk of flooding, although there are areas of flood zone 2 and 3 to the north east and south east of this area. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>This option is situated on greenfield land and does not seek to reuse previously developed land.</p> <p>This option is on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). Therefore there would be an impact on soil quality.</p> <p>Greenfield land is not thought to be contaminated.</p> <p>This option is grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and would therefore not ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected. Protection of agricultural land in the locality, however, needs to be balanced against the retention of local employment opportunities and the sustainability of the community. As opposed to E19, this option would unnecessarily encroach further on to grade 1 agricultural land in the locality and encourage coalescence between Great Wakering and Shoebury.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by existing employment land although it is situated to the west of Alexandra Road and Star Lane Industrial Estate to the north	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E21 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>west of the site is proposed for residential development.</p> <p>This option is adjacent to part of the residential options WGW3 and WGW4. Depending on the residential option taken forward, this could encourage sustainable travel patterns. However, there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>		
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.	+	

Option E22

SA Objective	Option E22 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>The area proposed is nearly double the capacity of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate (which includes the disused Brickworks site to the south of this designated area) and would involve a substantial increase in the quantum of employment land available in this location. However, whilst retaining local employment opportunities, this option would provide a surplus of employment land in the eastern area of the District, as opposed to the west of Rayleigh and north of London Southend Airport which are better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes.</p> <p>The site is well related to the existing settlement, enabling ease of access to employment opportunities for all, thus promoting equal opportunities.</p> <p>However, whilst retaining local employment opportunities, this option would provide a surplus of employment land in the eastern area of the District, as opposed to the west of Rayleigh and north of London Southend Airport which are better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes. Such a surplus of employment land in this location may be of harm to balanced communities and regeneration in both Great Wakering and elsewhere in the District.</p>	+	-
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>This option is adjacent to existing residential development to the east. The employment designation within this option has the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which may have an impact on quality of life in the locality. The impact on the options for residential development in the area to the west of Great Wakering would need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 20</p>	-	?

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E22 – Commentary	Score	
	The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.		
3. Housing	No impact	0	
4. Economy & Employment	The site has the potential to relate well to existing and proposed residential areas in Great Wakering. The provision of good quality, flexible employment land in this locality would provide local employment opportunities to the east of the District. It would thus potentially help reduce social exclusion through increasing employment opportunities close to the residential population and enable the retention of workers within the District, and supply a range of jobs across a variety of sectors as recognised in the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along the High Street and Star Lane and this option has the potential to link with Greenway 20 to the west.</p> <p>This option is situated to the south of Great Wakering and extends east from Star Lane towards Alexandra Road. As opposed to some of the other options for this general location such as E20, this option does not extend as far south to encourage coalescence between Great Wakering and Shoebury.</p> <p>The site only has the potential to provide a road link to Star Lane which given the size of the site may have significant implications on the highway network at this point. Another road link could be provided to Poynters Lane but this would be on additional Green Belt land and may undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this locality.</p> <p>The arrangement of this option may discourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>This option encompasses part of residential options WG3 and WG4. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>This option would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs. However, this option is situated in a relatively inaccessible location to the east of the District in comparison with the other general locations identified for employment land (to the west of Rayleigh and the north of London Southend Airport) and is not considered appropriate as a large strategic employment site.</p> <p>It should be a small scale employment site which should seek to meet the needs of the local community providing an</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E22 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>accessible, sustainable and flexible site. Such a large employment site would likely have a significant impact on the local highway network to the detriment of the local community and wider sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The relationship between this option, proposed residential development on Star Lane Industrial Estate, and the residential options to the west of Great Wakering could positively impact on social inclusion, although this would depend on the options taken forward.</p> <p>This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by existing employment land and a Local Wildlife Site although it is situated to the west of Alexandra Road and Star Lane Industrial Estate to the north of the site is proposed for residential development.</p> <p>The south of Great Wakering has links with the neighbouring economic centre of Southend, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>		
6. Biodiversity	<p>This general location to the south of Great Wakering is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries, or salt marshes. This option does, however, bound a Local Wildlife Site (R35. Star Lane Pits), which is situated to the north. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this Local Wildlife Site. A green buffer may be provided along the northern boundary to mitigate any development of this option, if taken forward.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p> <p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile).</p> <p>The provision of a green buffer between any development of this option, existing and proposed residential development and the Local Wildlife Site has the potential to create new habitats in the locality which could facilitate species movement and colonisation.</p>	+	-
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 7 which encompasses an extensive area of brickearth covered gravel terrace that is mostly cultivated. Large parts comprise restored landscape following brickearth quarrying. It is characterised by a rectilinear pattern of land boundaries of ancient origin and contains extensive archaeological deposits of multi-period date (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation</p> <p>Project). There is likely to be good below ground archaeological survival outside the quarried areas. The areas not quarried have a high sensitivity to change for below grounds deposits, however, the extensive quarrying has significantly altered the historic landscape. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E22 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered at the development stage. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site, and Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated to the north/north east.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>		
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and is not on the urban fringe <i>per se</i>. It would therefore not contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe.</p> <p>This option is situated on greenfield land and would therefore not reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land.</p> <p>This site is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change. This option proposes one of the smaller areas for employment land in this non-strategic location. It is enclosed by a Local Wildlife Site to the north, Star Lane to the west, and existing residential development to the east. The site, however, does not follow a natural field boundary and would make the creation of a defensible Green Belt boundary difficult. As opposed to some of the other options for this general location such as E20 would still preserve the undeveloped area between Great Wakering and Shoebury to the south. All of the options would have some impact on the openness, however, this option would potentially have less of an impact than others. The relationship between this option and residential options to the west of Great Wakering could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the south and west of Great Wakering. This would need to be carefully considered at the development stage.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E22 – Commentary	Score	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation. However, there would need to be infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades to the foul sewerage network.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>This option is not within an area at risk of flooding, although there are areas of flood zone 2 and 3 to the north east and south east of this area. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>This option is situated on greenfield land and does not seek to reuse previously developed land.</p> <p>This option is on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). Therefore there would be an impact on soil quality.</p> <p>Greenfield land is not thought to be contaminated.</p> <p>This option is grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and would therefore not ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected. Protection of agricultural land in the locality, however, needs to be balanced against the retention of local employment opportunities and the sustainability of the community. As opposed to E19, this option would unnecessarily encroach further on to grade 1 agricultural land in the locality.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by existing employment land although it is situated to the west of Alexandra Road and Star Lane Industrial Estate to the north of the site is proposed for residential development.</p> <p>This option encompasses part of the residential options WGW3 and WGW4. Depending on the residential option taken forward, this could encourage sustainable travel patterns. However, there is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

Option E23

SA Objective	Option E23 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>The area in this option is nearly four times the capacity of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate (which includes the disused Brickworks site to the south of this designated area) which would involve a significant increase in the quantum of employment land available in this location. The size of this site is also much greater than the quantum of employment land to be provided to compensate for the deallocation of existing employment land in the District. Whilst retaining local employment opportunities, this option would provide a surplus of employment land in the eastern area of the District, as opposed to the west of Rayleigh and north of London Southend Airport which are better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes. Such a surplus of employment land in this location may be of harm to balanced communities and regeneration in both Great Wakering and elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>This option is not well related to the existing residential areas of Great Wakering, but instead it borders the existing residential area of Shoebury, limiting the benefits of the development to Great Wakering – the community the new employment land within this general location is intended to serve.</p>	-	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>This option is adjacent to existing residential development to the north, south and west. The employment designation within this option has the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which may have an impact on quality of life in the locality. The relationship between this option and the residential options to the west of Great Wakering would also need to be considered, although this option is less well related to some of the residential options than other options.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 20.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>	-	?
3. Housing	No impact	0	
4. Economy & Employment	The provision of good quality, flexible employment land in this locality would provide local employment opportunities to the east of the District. However the site is less well related to existing residential areas in Great Wakering than other options. This is particularly relevant when it is considered that the site is intended to accommodate existing businesses on an employment site adjacent to Great Wakering, which will be displaced by the development of this site for residential uses.	+	-
5. Accessibility	There is potential to improve public transport links along the High Street and Star Lane and this option has the potential to link with Greenway 20 to the west.	+/-	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E23 – Commentary	Score
	<p>This option is situated to the south of Great Wakering and extends east from Star Lane towards Alexandra Road. As opposed to some of the other options for this general location such as E20, this option does not extend as far south to encourage coalescence between Great Wakering and Shoebury.</p> <p>The site only has the potential to provide a road link to Star Lane which given the size of the site may have significant implications on the highway network at this point. Another road link could be provided to Poynters Lane but this would be on additional Green Belt land and may undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this locality.</p> <p>The arrangement of this option may discourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>This option encompasses part of residential options WGW3 and WGW4. The cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>This option would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs. However, this option is situated in a relatively inaccessible location to the east of the District in comparison with the other general locations identified for employment land (to the west of Rayleigh and the north of London Southend Airport) and is not considered appropriate as a large strategic employment site.</p> <p>It should be a small scale employment site which should seek to meet the needs of the local community providing an accessible, sustainable and flexible site. Such a large employment site would likely have a significant impact on the local highway network to the detriment of the local community and wider sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The relationship between this option, proposed residential development on Star Lane Industrial Estate, and the residential options to the west of Great Wakering could positively impact on social inclusion, although this would depend on the options taken forward.</p> <p>This option may not reduce the need to travel as it is somewhat isolated from the residential area of Great Wakering by existing employment land and a Local Wildlife Site although it is situated to the west of Alexandra Road and Star Lane Industrial Estate to the north of the site is proposed for residential development.</p>	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E23 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>The south of Great Wakering has links with the neighbouring economic centre of Southend, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>		
<p>6. Biodiversity</p>	<p>This general location to the south of Great Wakering is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries, or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi natural habitats.</p> <p>This site is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile), however, it does bound an area of parkland to the south which may have ecological value. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this site.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p> <p>The provision of a green buffer between any development of this option and existing residential development has the potential to create new habitats in the locality which could facilitate species movement and colonisation.</p>	<p>?</p>	<p>+</p>
<p>7. Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 7 which encompasses an extensive area of brickearth covered gravel terrace that is mostly cultivated. Large parts comprise restored landscape following brickearth quarrying. It is characterised by a rectilinear pattern of land boundaries of ancient origin and contains extensive archaeological deposits of multi-period date (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is likely to be good below ground archaeological survival outside the quarried areas. The areas not quarried have a high sensitivity to change for below grounds deposits, however, the extensive quarrying has significantly altered the historic landscape. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered at the development stage. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site, and Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated further to the north.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impact s of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the</p>	<p>+</p>	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E23 – Commentary	Score	
	Core Strategy.		
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) on the urban fringe of Shoebury. It therefore has the potential to contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe.</p> <p>This option is situated on greenfield land and would therefore not reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land.</p> <p>This site is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change. This option proposes the largest area for employment land in this non-strategic location to the south of Poynters Lane. The site is enclosed by existing residential development and Poynters Lane and a dwelling to the north, residential development to the south west and west, parkland to the south and it follows a natural field boundary to the east. This option would be able to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, however, it proposes a large scale employment site in a non-strategic location which is not well related to Great Wakering. It would also encourage the coalescence between Great Wakering and Shoebury. This option would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this area. The relationship between this option and residential options to the west of Great Wakering could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the south and west of Great Wakering. This option is not as well related to some of these options compared to other employment options such as Option E19.</p>	-	
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There would need to be infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades to the existing Waste Water Treatment Works and the foul sewerage network to accommodate the scale of the proposed employment allocation in this location.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>The site is not within an area at risk of flooding although it is acknowledged that there is an area of flood zone 2 further to the east. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E23 – Commentary	Score	
	SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.		
11. Land and Soil	<p>This option is situated on greenfield land and does not seek to reuse previously developed land.</p> <p>This option is on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). Therefore there would be an impact on soil quality.</p> <p>Greenfield land is not thought to be contaminated.</p> <p>This option is grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and would therefore not ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected. This option proposes a significant quantum of employment land in this non-strategic location to the east of the District, and therefore as opposed to some of the other options for this general location it would unnecessarily encroach onto an excessive quantum of grade 1 agricultural Green Belt land in the locality. It is noted, however, that the agricultural land classification for this option has been disputed through a consultation response to the draft Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	-	?
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would not reduce the need to travel as it is not well related to the residential area of Great Wakering.</p> <p>This option is not as well related to some of the residential options as opposed to other employment options. However, depending on the residential option taken forward, this could encourage sustainable travel patterns. There is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	-	
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

Option E24

SA Objective	Option E24 – Commentary	Score	
		+	-
1. Balanced Communities	<p>The area proposed is double the capacity of the existing Star Lane Industrial Estate (which includes the disused Brickworks site to the south of this designated area) which would involve a substantial increase in the quantum of employment land available in this location. However, whilst retaining local employment opportunities, this option would provide a surplus of employment land in the eastern area of the District, as opposed to the west of Rayleigh and north of London Southend Airport which are better related to the strategic road network as well as public transport routes. Such a surplus of employment land in this location may be of harm to balanced communities and regeneration in both Great Wakering and elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>This option is not well related to the existing residential areas of Great Wakering, but instead it borders the existing residential area of Shoebury, limiting the benefits of the development to Great Wakering – the community the new employment land within this general location is intended to serve.</p>	+	-
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>This option is adjacent to existing residential development to the north and west. The employment designation within this option has the potential to become a 'bad neighbour' which may have an impact on quality of life in the locality. The relationship between this option and the residential options to the west of Great Wakering would also need to be considered, although this option is less well related to some of the residential options than other options.</p> <p>This option has the potential to link with Greenway 20.</p> <p>The impact on noise and light pollution is uncertain and will depend on the types of businesses locating on the site in the future, and the detailed design of development on the site.</p>	-	?
3. Housing	No impact	0	
4. Economy & Employment	The provision of good quality, flexible employment land in this locality would provide local employment opportunities to the east of the District. However, the site is less well related to existing residential areas in Great Wakering than other options. This is particularly relevant when it is considered that the site is intended to accommodate existing businesses on an employment site adjacent to Great Wakering, which will be displaced by the development of this site for residential uses.	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E24 – Commentary	Score	
<p>5. Accessibility</p>	<p>There is potential to improve public transport links along Star Lane and this option has the potential to link with Greenway 20 to the west.</p> <p>As this option is situated to the south of Poynters Lane it is situated further away from Great Wakering village centre and thus would not have a good relationship with the settlement of Great Wakering in comparison to the options north of Poynters Lane. The site has the potential to link to Poynters Lane and possibly Star Lane, however, the centre of Great Wakering village is situated further to the north. The poor relationship with the existing residential area of Great Wakering may encourage use of the private car, but there is potential to improve public transport in this locality. Such a large employment site in this location would have a significant impact on the local highway network to the detriment of the local community and wider sustainability objectives.</p> <p>This option is less well related to some of the residential options than other employment options. Depending on the residential option taken forward, this could encourage walking and cycling to local employment opportunities. However, the cumulative impact on the highway network would need to be carefully considered in this general location.</p> <p>It would ensure the retention of local employment opportunities. It has the potential to positively contribute to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs. However, this option is situated in a relatively inaccessible location to the east of the District in comparison with the other general locations identified for employment land (to the west of Rayleigh and the north of London Southend Airport) and is not considered appropriate as a large strategic employment site.</p> <p>The relationship between this option, proposed residential development on Star Lane Industrial Estate, and the residential options to the west of Great Wakering may have the potential to positively impact on social inclusion, although this would depend on the options taken forward.</p> <p>This site is situated in a nonstrategic location to the east of the District and is not well related to the existing residential area of Great Wakering as it is situated to the south of Poynters Lane. Furthermore the south of Great Wakering has links with the neighbouring economic centre of Southend, which is recognised in the Core Strategy. This relationship may therefore not reduce out-commuting.</p>	+	-
<p>6. Biodiversity</p>	<p>This general location to the south of Great Wakering is not in close proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi natural habitats.</p> <p>This site is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p>	?	+

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E24 – Commentary	Score
	<p>The provision of a green buffer between any development of this option and existing residential development has the potential to create new habitats in the locality which could facilitate species movement and colonisation.</p>	
<p>7. Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 7 which encompasses an extensive area of brickearth covered gravel terrace that is mostly cultivated. Large parts comprise restored landscape following brickearth quarrying. It is characterised by a rectilinear pattern of land boundaries of ancient origin and contains extensive archaeological deposits of multi-period date (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is likely to be good below ground archaeological survival outside the quarried areas. The areas not quarried have a high sensitivity to change for below grounds deposits, however, the extensive quarrying has significantly altered the historic landscape. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to this site, and Great Wakering Conservation Area is situated further to the north.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impact s of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>+</p>
<p>8. Landscape & Townscape</p>	<p>This option is situated on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) on the urban fringe of Shoebury. It therefore has the potential to contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe.</p> <p>This option is situated on greenfield land and would therefore not reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land.</p> <p>This site is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change. This option proposes one of the largest areas for employment land in this non-strategic location. It is enclosed by Poynters Lane and a dwelling to the north, existing residential development to the west and it follows a natural field boundary to the east. This site would, however, weaken the Green Belt boundaries in this locality, undermine the openness of the Green Belt on a wider scale and would thus not ensure a defensible Green Belt boundary to prevent further encroachment. This option would have a significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this area.</p>	<p>+</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E24 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>The relationship between this option and residential options to the west of Great Wakering could have a significant impact on the landscape character to the south and west of Great Wakering. This option is not as well related to some of these options compared to other employment options such as Option E19.</p>		
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This site has the potential to include buildings in the future which comply with the BREEAM standards which may help mitigate the impact of any future development in this location on the local climate.</p> <p>Onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies may be provided.</p> <p>This option is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The site has the capacity to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).</p> <p>There is capacity at the existing Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed employment allocation. However, there would need to be infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades to the foul sewerage network.</p> <p>This site has the capacity to incorporate SUDs to help mitigate any impact of development on surface water.</p> <p>The site is not within an area at risk of flooding although it is acknowledged that there is an area of flood zone 2 further to the east. A range of SUDs are available which can be used to manage excess surface water.</p> <p>SUDs can be used to manage excess surface water. This also has the potential to create new habitats.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>This option is situated on greenfield land and does not seek to reuse previously developed land.</p> <p>This option is on grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). Therefore there would be an impact on soil quality.</p> <p>Greenfield land is not thought to be contaminated.</p> <p>This option is grade 1 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile) and would therefore not ensure that the best and most versatile agricultural land will be protected. Protection of agricultural land in the locality, however, needs to be balanced against the retention of local employment opportunities and the sustainability of the community. As opposed to E19, this option would unnecessarily encroach on an excessive quantum of agricultural land in the locality. It is noted, however, that the agricultural land classification for this option has been disputed through a consultation response to the draft Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option E24 – Commentary	Score
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would not reduce the need to travel as it is not well related to the residential area of Great Wakering.</p> <p>This option is not as well related to some of the residential options as opposed to other employment options. However, depending on the residential option taken forward, this could encourage sustainable travel patterns. There is potential to improve public transport links in the locality.</p> <p>There are no AQMAs in proximity to this site.</p>	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.</p>	+

Policy NEL4

Land to the north of London Southend Airport, as identified in the Submission Document (Policy NEL4), will be addressed through the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan, and will therefore be appraised separately.

Appendix 8 – Ecological and Landscape Allocations

The option to allocate Local Wildlife Sites and the Upper Roach Valley was considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document, and assessed within the previous SA (July 2012). These sites are proposed to be allocated within the Submission Document (Policy ELA1 and ELA3 respectively) and do not differ from the previous version of the Allocations Document. The detailed assessments for the Local Wildlife Sites and the Upper Roach Valley are contained within Appendix 8 of the previous SA.

Coastal Protection Belt

Policy ELA2

SA Objective	Policy ELA2 – Commentary	Score
1. Balanced Communities	This designation would have a positive effect on high quality sustainable communities by directing development away from coastal areas towards existing developed areas, which may also contribute to their regeneration.	--
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	This designation would have a positive effect on healthy and safe communities by directing development away from coastal areas towards existing developed areas, which may also contribute to their regeneration.	+
3. Housing	No impact	0
4. Economy & Employment	This option would potentially have indirect positive benefits for local economy.	+
5. Accessibility	No impact	0
6. Biodiversity	<p>This designation would help protect the wildlife and heritage qualities of the coastline, have positive long-term effects for biodiversity and have positive benefits for geological diversity. By directing development away from the coast, there would be significant positive effects for the District's very distinctive coastal landscape.</p> <p>Although this designation is a landscape quality designation rather than an indication of ecological value, the Coastal Protection Belt encompasses the Crouch and Roach estuaries and adjacent areas which are designated Ramsar Sites, Special Protection Areas, and Sites of Special Scientific Interest amongst other nature conservation designations (SEA Baseline Information Profile). This designation may therefore have positive long-term effects for biodiversity.</p>	+ +

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Policy ELA2 – Commentary	Score
	<p>There are likely to be significant benefits for biodiversity through seeking to maintain, restore and enhance sites of nature conservation importance through the designation of the District's distinctive landscape.</p> <p>This designation may have positive benefits for geological diversity.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal recognises that such a designation would assist in building resilience in an area particularly susceptible to the effects of climate change.</p>	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option would ensure significant positive effects for the District's very distinctive coastal landscape, which encompasses numerous different historic environment character zones, and associated archaeological potential and sensitivity to change (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project).</p>	+
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This designation would continue to protect the character of the undeveloped coastline within the District.</p> <p>However, it is notable that this designation has recently been updated to exclude the areas identified as being within Policy SER6 (South West Hullbridge) and Policy SER7 (South Canewdon).</p>	+
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>The Core Strategy Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal recognises that such a designation would assist in building resilience in an area particularly susceptible to the effects of climate change.</p>	+
10. Water	<p>There is potential for positive long-term effects for water quality, particularly coastal water and for land and soil, through seeking to limit development in sensitive coastal areas.</p> <p>This designation would direct development away from coastal areas towards existing developed areas, which are generally at a lower risk of flooding.</p>	0
11. Land and Soil	<p>This option would have a positive impact on soil quality through directing development away from undeveloped coastal areas towards existing developed areas.</p>	0
12. Air Quality	<p>No impact.</p>	0
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>No impact.</p>	0

Appendix 9 – Educational Land Allocations

Two new primary schools are identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document and the Submission Document (Policy EDU1 and EDU2) within the sites to the North of London Road, Rayleigh (Policy SER1) and West Rochford (Policy SER2). The appraisals for these sites should be referred to.

King Edmund School

Policy EDU3

SA Objective	Policy EDU3 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This policy would have a positive impact on equal opportunities, providing qualifications and skills to people in the community without distinction.</p> <p>EDU3 as well as other proposed educational site extensions should be considered in conjunction with the need for educational facilities that will potentially be generated by the development of sites such as SER5 and SER8. EDU3 is well placed to support the increased demand that may arise for educational facilities within the District.</p> <p>This policy, as with the other options KES1, KES2 and KES3, will provide long term benefits to equal opportunities within the community.</p>	+	0
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	This option has the potential to provide additional playing field capacity which may promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles, particularly if accessible to the local community.	+	
3. Housing	The location of the site to extend the school would have no impact on housing in the area.		0
4. Economy & Employment	This site has the potential to provide additional educational capacity for children of secondary school age, as well as additional adult community learning facilities. The playing fields may also be accessible to the local community.	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>This site has the potential to provide additional educational capacity for children of secondary school age, as well as additional adult community learning facilities. The playing fields may also be accessible to the local community. This option has the potential to enable access for all sections of the community.</p> <p>This site would not impact on appropriate residential development in other sites such as SER5 and SER8. The location of EDU3 is well related to both the existing urban area and to the proposed sites for SER5 and SER8.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy EDU3 – Commentary	Score
6. Biodiversity	<p>This site is not in proximity to any of the District’s estuaries or salt marshes or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>The site is located on Grade 2 agricultural Land. As such the land is not located in immediate proximity to any areas of ecological importance.</p>	0
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This site is situated in Historic Environment Character Zone 13. The historic settlement and overall structure of field tracks and roads survives well. There have been a limited number of investigations leading to a low level of recorded historical assets. The potential impact on archaeological deposits in the site will need to be considered with any development.</p> <p>There are Listed Buildings in the vicinity of Doggetts Farmhouse to the east of this option, although they are not immediately adjacent.</p>	-
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>The majority of playing fields on the site would retain their Green Belt designation. There is sufficient space on EDU3 to accommodate the expansion of the school without having a detrimental impact on the existing playing fields serving the school.</p> <p>The addition of playing pitches to the east of the existing school envelope ensures that there is a green corridor from the eastern end of Oxford Road. This means that the site has the potential to link with the greenway proposed for SER8. This is beneficial in terms of providing access to the site by means of pedestrian and cycle routes.</p> <p>This site is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. It has the potential to provide compensatory playing fields to the east of the existing school site, which may be designated as both educational use and Green Belt as playing fields / pitches are an acceptable form of development in the Green Belt. This site would ensure that a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained in this locality.</p>	++
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>Any new building on the site must comply with the ‘very good’ BREEAM standard as set out in the Concept Statement.</p>	0

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Policy EDU3 – Commentary	Score
10. Water	The site is not in proximity to an area at risk of flooding. The site is capable of accommodating Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs), which have the potential to mitigate the impact of expanding the school on the local environment.	0
11. Land and Soil	The expansion of the school site will involve the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land.	-
12. Air Quality	No impact.	+
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	There are no discernible constraints to sustainable design and construction being incorporated into the development of the site.	+

Option KES1

SA Objective	Option KES1 – Commentary	Score
1. Balanced Communities	This option would afford the opportunity to develop part of the current school site for additional buildings which would be well related to the existing buildings. The additional land to the east could therefore provide additional playing field capacity for the school. The provision of additional land to enable an increase in the capacity of school buildings in proximity to the existing cluster of buildings would enable equal opportunities through ensuring that the ongoing and future educational needs of the local community can be met. This school, whilst providing secondary education, also provides educational opportunities for adults in the community. There is potential to expand this offer in the future, therefore all sections of the community may be catered for.	+
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	This option has the potential to provide additional playing field capacity which may promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles, particularly if accessible to the local community.	+
3. Housing	This option, as opposed to KES2 and KES3, would not encroach into potential residential development allocation to the north of the school which affords the opportunity of improving access to and from this educational facility.	0
4. Economy & Employment	This option has the potential to provide additional educational capacity for children of secondary school age, as well as additional adult community learning facilities, which will have long-term benefits for the economy and employment.	+

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option KES1 – Commentary	Score
5. Accessibility	<p>This option would not impinge on potential residential development allocations to the east of Ashingdon, as opposed to KES2 and KES3 which could force the residential allocation further to the north. This option would therefore enable the provision of improved access to the school from Brays Lane which may reduce the pressure on minor residential roads currently used for access. Option KES1 should not be accessed from Oxford Road as it would not relate well to existing or additional school buildings (if provided on the current site). As noted in the document, this is a narrow residential road and the provision of access along this road would have a negative impact on community cohesion in this locality. Improved access should be provided from the north along Brays Lane.</p> <p>This option has the potential to provide additional educational capacity for children of secondary school age, as well as additional adult community learning facilities. The playing fields may also be accessible to the local community. This option has the potential to enable access for all sections of the community.</p>	+
6. Biodiversity	<p>This option is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>This option is on grade 2 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p>	0
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 13 which is characterised by a gently undulating landform and arable fields north of the Roach and east of Rochford and Ashingdon (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). The historic settlement and overall structure of fields, tracks and roads survives well. Limited investigations have resulted in low level of recorded historic assets which probably does not reflect the true situation. There is potential for extensive archaeological deposits in this zone, which will need to be considered at the development stage. The coherence of the dispersed settlement and structure of historic landscape together with potential buried deposits would suffer if significant change occurred. There are Listed Buildings in the vicinity of Doggetts Farmhouse to the east of this option, although they are not immediately adjacent. The potential impact on any archaeological deposits would need to be considered with any development.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option KES1 – Commentary	Score
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>The development of compensatory playing pitches to the east of the existing school site would be an appropriate use of land on the urban fringe. This option would also enable a dual allocation whereby it is designated both as educational use whilst retaining its existing Green Belt allocation thus ensuring the necessary expansion of the school without unnecessarily encroaching further into the Green Belt to the east.</p> <p>This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. It has the potential to provide compensatory playing fields to the east of the existing school site, which may be designated as both educational use and Green Belt as playing fields / pitches are an acceptable form of development in the Green Belt. This option would ensure that a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained in this locality.</p>	+
9. Climate Change and Energy	No impact. The site is not in proximity to an area at risk of flooding.	0
10. Water	<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) may be integrated into the development to mitigate the impact of expanding the capacity of the school on the local environment.</p> <p>The site is not in proximity to an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+
11. Land and Soil	This option will have little impact on the quality of land and soil however it is situated on grade 2 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile).	+
12. Air Quality	No impact.	0
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.	+

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

Option KES2

SA Objective	Option KES2 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option affords the opportunity to develop additional land which is well related to the existing buildings to provide additional educational capacity in the locality, which would have a positive impact on the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities.</p> <p>The provision of additional land to enable an increase in the capacity of school buildings in proximity to the existing cluster of buildings would enable equal opportunities through ensuring that the ongoing and future educational needs of the local community can be met. This school, whilst providing secondary education, also provides educational opportunities for adults in the community. There is potential to expand this offer in the future, therefore all sections of the community may be catered for.</p>	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	This option has the potential to provide additional playing field capacity which may promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles, particularly if accessible to the local community.	+	
3. Housing	This option would encroach into the proposed residential allocation (SER5), limiting the number of dwellings that could be provided there.	-	
4. Economy & Employment	This option has the potential to provide additional educational capacity for children of secondary school age, as well as additional adult community learning facilities, which will have long-term benefits for the economy and employment.	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>This option would impinge on potential residential development allocations to the east of Ashingdon, as opposed to KES1, which could force the residential allocation further to the north. This option would, however, enable the provision of improved access to the school from Brays Lane which may reduce the pressure on minor residential roads currently used for access.</p> <p>This option has the potential to provide additional educational capacity for children of secondary school age, as well as additional adult community learning facilities. The existing playing fields have the potential to also be accessible to the local community. This option has the potential to enable access for all sections of the community.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option KES2 – Commentary	Score	
6. Biodiversity	<p>This option is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>This option is on grade 2 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p>	0	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This general location is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 13 which is characterised by a gently undulating landform and arable fields north of the Roach and east of Rochford and Ashingdon (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). The historic settlement and overall structure of fields, tracks and roads survives well. Limited investigations have resulted in low levels of recorded historic assets which probably does not reflect the true situation. There is potential for extensive archaeological deposits in this zone, which will need to be considered at the development stage. The coherence of the dispersed settlement and structure of historic landscape together with potential buried deposits would suffer if significant change occurred. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to the site. The potential impact on any archaeological deposits would need to be considered with any development.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impact s of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	-	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option has the potential to provide playing fields accessible to the local community.</p> <p>This option has the potential to force proposed residential development to the north of Brays Lane.</p> <p>This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. This option has the potential to force proposed residential development to the north of Brays Lane. This option would have a greater impact on the landscape designation in the locality and the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary to the north of Brays Lane.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>No impact. The site is not in proximity to an area at risk of flooding.</p>	0	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option KES2 – Commentary	Score	
10. Water	<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) may be integrated into the development to mitigate the impact of expanding the capacity of the school on the local environment.</p> <p>The site is not in proximity to an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	This option will have little impact on the quality of land and soil however it is situated on grade 2 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile).	+	
12. Air Quality	No impact.	0	
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.	+	

Option KES3

SA Objective	Option KES3 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option would afford the opportunity to develop part of the current school site for additional buildings which would be well related to the existing buildings. The additional land to the east could therefore provide additional playing field capacity for the school.</p> <p>The provision of additional land to enable an increase in the capacity of school buildings in proximity to the existing cluster of buildings would enable equal opportunities through ensuring that the ongoing and future educational needs of the local community can be met. This school, whilst providing secondary education, also provides educational opportunities for adults in the community. There is potential to expand this offer in the future, therefore all sections of the community may be catered for.</p>	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	This option has the potential to provide additional playing field capacity which may promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles, particularly if accessible to the local community.	+	
3. Housing	This option would encroach into the proposed residential allocation (SER5), limiting the number of dwellings that could be provided there.	-	

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option KES3 – Commentary	Score	
4. Economy & Employment	This option has the potential to provide additional educational capacity for children of secondary school age, as well as additional adult community learning facilities, which will have long-term benefits for the economy and employment.	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>This option would impinge on potential residential development allocations to the east of Ashingdon, as opposed to KES1, which could force the residential allocation further to the north. This option may also force development further to the east along the south side of Brays Lane which has the potential to create an isolated area of residential development with the school situated between potential residential development and existing residential development. This option would, however, enable the provision of improved access to the school from Brays Lane which may reduce the pressure on minor residential roads currently used for access.</p> <p>This option has the potential to provide additional educational capacity for children of secondary school age, as well as additional adult community learning facilities. The existing playing fields have the potential to also be accessible to the local community. This option has the potential to enable access for all sections of the community.</p>	+	-
6. Biodiversity	<p>This option is not in proximity to the District's estuaries or salt marshes, or other important natural/semi-natural habitats.</p> <p>This option is on grade 2 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile). The site is not located in immediate proximity to any areas designated for their ecological importance.</p> <p>There will be no impact on known sites of geological significance.</p>	0	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This general location is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 13 which is characterised by a gently undulating landform and arable fields north of the Roach and east of Rochford and Ashingdon (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). The historic settlement and overall structure of fields, tracks and roads survives well. Limited investigations have resulted in low level of recorded historic assets which probably does not reflect the true situation. There is potential for extensive archaeological deposits in this zone, which will need to be considered at the development stage. The coherence of the dispersed settlement and structure of historic landscape together with potential buried deposits would suffer if significant change occurred. There are no Listed Buildings in close proximity to the site. The potential impact on any archaeological deposits would need to be considered with any development.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impact s of development.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Option KES3 – Commentary	Score	
	The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.		
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option has the potential to provide playing fields accessible to the local community.</p> <p>This option has the potential to force proposed residential development to the north of Brays Lane.</p> <p>This option is situated within the Crouch and Roach Farmland landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium to high sensitivity to change. This option has the potential to force proposed residential development to the north of Brays Lane. This option would have a greater impact on the landscape designation in the locality and the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary to the north of Brays Lane. This option also</p> <p>has the potential to force proposed residential development further to the east along the south side of Brays Lane which has the potential to create an isolated area of residential development with the school situated between potential residential development and existing residential development.</p>	+	
9. Climate Change and Energy	No impact. The site is not in proximity to an area at risk of flooding.	0	
10. Water	<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) may be integrated into the development to mitigate the impact of expanding the capacity of the school on the local environment.</p> <p>The site is not in proximity to an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	
11. Land and Soil	This option will have little impact on the quality of land and soil however it is situated on grade 2 agricultural land (SEA Baseline Information Profile).	+	
12. Air Quality	No impact.	0	
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	The lack of constraints on site mean that sustainable design and construction will be viable and can also be incorporated into the development.	+	

All of the educational options set out in the Discussion and Consultation Document (EDU1-EDU19) were assessed in the previous SA. 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. All of the sites perform similarly well in terms of their capacity to retain the existing proportion of playing fields and to ensure the fields will retain their Green Belt designation.

However, it is worth noting that Plumberow Primary School and Rayleigh Primary School have been allocated separately within the Submission Document. Both these schools are located within the existing residential area and as such would not intrinsically differ from other assessments.

The assessments (EDU1-EDU19) are not repeated here, but detailed assessments for these sites can be found in Appendix 9 of the Updated SA (July 2012).

Appendix 10 – Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations

Open Space

The options considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document (Option OS1-OS2). Option OS1 closely relates to Policy OSL1 in the Allocations Submission 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. These assessments are not repeated here, but detailed assessments for these options can be found in Appendix 8 of the Updated SA (July 2012).

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 appraisal of the Policy CLT5 in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report (page 42) found that:

“Green infrastructure is an important factor in the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work. Linked network of green spaces will assist in integrating communities. The policy will have a positive effect on the health of communities through the provision of open space that can be used for recreation and sport. Green links can also provide people with the opportunity to use alternative modes of transport other than the private car, such as walking and cycling, which also have associated health benefits. The policy will have a positive effect on biodiversity as areas of open space are multi functional - they can provide havens and habitats for flora and fauna and provide green links that act as habitat corridors. It is recommended the policy include reference to the Greengrid Strategy for Thames Gateway South Essex.”

The detailed assessment for Policy CLT5 in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report is not repeated here and should be referred to.

Leisure Facilities

Options to allocate the existing leisure centres were presented in the Discussion and Consultation Document (Option LF1-3) and assessed in detail within the previous SA. In the Submission Document, both Rayleigh Leisure Centre and Clements Hall Leisure Centre have been allocated (Policy OSL3), although Rayleigh Leisure Centre now includes the playing fields as per the recommendation within the previous SA. These assessments are not repeated here, but the detailed assessments for these options can be found in Appendix 8 of the Updated SA (July 2012). Great Wakering Leisure Centre has also not been allocated as per the previous SA.

Appendix 11 – Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations

Rayleigh

Policy TCB1

SA Objective	Policy TCB1– Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	This option would promote and enhance the existing centre of Rayleigh and ensure a range of shops and other appropriate town centre uses including residential and leisure uses throughout the area. Potentially this option would ensure that the ongoing and future needs of communities can be met within the town centre. Furthermore the Retail and Leisure Study (2008) suggests that the town centre boundary is appropriate and should remain as existing, ensuring that all sections of the community are catered for through encouraging a mix of uses within the appropriate area.	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	Promoting this town centre boundary would ensure that leisure uses as well as shops and residential units can be accommodated within this central area of Rayleigh which would have the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	
3. Housing	Adopting this town centre boundary would ensure that a greater proportion, tenure and affordability of housing can be provided within the existing urban area through encouraging high density development appropriate to a town centre location.	+	
4. Economy & Employment	This option would promote and enhance the existing centre of Rayleigh and ensure a range of shops and other appropriate town centre uses including residential and leisure uses throughout the area.	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>There are existing bus routes running through the town centre and Rayleigh train station is accessible to the north. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality.</p> <p>The proposed primary shopping area is in an accessible location which may encourage access for all sections of the community and encourage alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>This option would ensure access to services for those without access to private transport through providing a concentration of services and sustainable transport modes within a wider area than TC2. This option therefore has the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality.</p>	+	+

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Policy TCB1– Commentary	Score	
6. Biodiversity	By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve greenfield sites elsewhere in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre.	+	?
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This town centre boundary is encompassed by much of the Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 39 which encompasses the historic core of Rayleigh which includes the castle, windmill and the church (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). The castle and medieval street pattern reflecting the original market place together with buried archaeological deposits are all particularly sensitive. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rayleigh Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	?	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>The boundary includes derelict, degraded or underused land available within the town centre for example along Websters Way and the southern end of the High Street including the police station. These areas have been identified in initial work for the Rayleigh Town Centre Area Action Plan as potential areas for improvement. It is therefore likely to promote the enhancement of such underused previously developed land within this key location in preference to greenfield sites.</p> <p>Rayleigh town centre as existing is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p> <p>This option would preserve the existing townscape character and it is encompassed by the Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character.</p>	+	
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>The boundary is appropriate in size to accommodate town centre uses which would enhance the viability and vitality of the town through ensuring adequate space for businesses, thus it potentially reduces energy consumption through balancing the supply and demand of town centre uses.</p> <p>The existing town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Policy TCB1– Commentary	Score	
10. Water	<p>The existing town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p> <p>This option would potentially reduce energy consumption through concentrating retail development.</p>	+	
11. Land and Soil	<p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve greenfield sites elsewhere in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre.</p> <p>This option would encourage higher density development over a much wider area than TC2.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the existing town centre boundary is unknown.</p> <p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve agricultural land elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated within the primary shopping area and town centre thus enhancing natural surveillance throughout the day and potentially preserving other greenfield sites outside the existing residential envelope.</p>	++	?
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would ensure access to services for those without access to private transport through providing a concentration of services and sustainable transport modes within a wider area. This option therefore has the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality which may therefore have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a recognised issue with air quality within the town centre and monitoring is on going in the area.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>This expansive town centre boundary in comparison to the other option for Rayleigh (TC2) would ensure a mix of uses over a much wider area.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

Option TC1

SA Objective	Option TC1– Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	This option would promote and enhance the existing centre of Rayleigh and ensure a range of shops and other appropriate town centre uses including residential and leisure uses throughout the area. Potentially this option would ensure that the ongoing and future needs of communities can be met within the town centre. Furthermore the Retail and Leisure Study (2008) suggests that the town centre boundary is appropriate and should remain as existing, ensuring that all sections of the community are catered for through encouraging a mix of uses within the appropriate area.	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	Promoting the existing town centre would ensure that leisure uses as well as shops and residential units can be accommodated within this central area of Rayleigh which would have the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	
3. Housing	Retaining the existing town centre boundary would ensure that a greater proportion, tenure and affordability of housing can be provided within the existing urban area through encouraging high density development appropriate to a town centre location.	+	
4. Economy & Employment	This option would promote and enhance the existing centre of Rayleigh and ensure a range of shops and other appropriate town centre uses including residential and leisure uses throughout the area.	+	
5. Accessibility	There are existing bus routes running through the town centre and Rayleigh train station is accessible to the north. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality. This option would ensure access to services for those without access to private transport through providing a concentration of services and sustainable transport modes within a wider area than TC2. This option therefore has the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality.	+	
6. Biodiversity	By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve greenfield sites elsewhere in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre.	+	?
7. Cultural Heritage	This town centre boundary is encompassed by much of the Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 39 which encompasses the historic core of Rayleigh which includes the castle, windmill and the church (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). The castle and medieval street pattern reflecting the original market place together with buried archaeological deposits are all particularly sensitive. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rayleigh Conservation Area.	?	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC1– Commentary	Score		
	<p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>			
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>The boundary includes derelict, degraded or underused land available within the town centre for example along Websters Way and the southern end of the High Street including the police station. These areas have been identified in initial work for the Rayleigh Town Centre Area Action Plan as potential areas for improvement. It is therefore likely to promote the enhancement of such underused previously developed land within this key location in preference to greenfield sites.</p> <p>Rayleigh town centre as existing is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p> <p>This option would preserve the existing townscape character and it is encompassed by the Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character.</p>	+		
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>The boundary is appropriate in size to accommodate town centre uses which would enhance the viability and vitality of the town through ensuring adequate space for businesses, thus it potentially reduces energy consumption through balancing the supply and demand of town centre uses.</p> <p>The existing town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+		
10. Water	<p>The existing town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+		
11. Land and Soil	<p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve greenfield sites elsewhere in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre.</p> <p>This option would encourage higher density development over a much wider area than TC2.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the existing town centre boundary is unknown.</p> <p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve agricultural land elsewhere in the District.</p>	-	+	?

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC1– Commentary	Score	
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would ensure access to services for those without access to private transport through providing a concentration of services and sustainable transport modes within a wider area. This option therefore has the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality which may therefore have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a recognised issue with air quality within the town centre and monitoring is on going in the area.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	This expansive town centre boundary in comparison to the other option for Rayleigh (TC2) would ensure a mix of uses over a much wider area.	-	+

Option TC2

SA Objective	Option TC2 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	This option would promote and enhance the centre of Rayleigh and would ensure the concentration of a range of shops and other appropriate town centre uses including residential and leisure uses, but within a significantly smaller area than at present. Thus this option may be detrimental to the regeneration and enhancement of the urban communities. The narrow focus of this smaller town centre boundary option would limit the range of uses within the central area, and may therefore not ensure equal opportunities and that all sections of the community are catered for.	+	-
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	Promoting the existing town centre would ensure that leisure uses as well as shops and residential units can be accommodated within this central area of Rayleigh which would have the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities. However, the potential benefits may be limited in a smaller town centre, as leisure uses may be restricted due to competition from other town centre uses within such a confined area.	-	0
3. Housing	Although high density development appropriate to a town centre location would be encouraged, a smaller town centre boundary would limit opportunities for higher density development in Rayleigh centre, and result in fewer dwellings being provided within the central area of Rayleigh.	-	-
4. Economy & Employment	<p>This option would help promote and enhance the centre of Rayleigh by ensuring a concentration of a range of shops and other appropriate town centre uses including residential and leisure uses, but within a significantly smaller area than at present.</p> <p>Rayleigh is the largest town within the District and as such it is important that the town centre boundary is drawn widely enough to encompass a range of town centre uses to try and prevent the leakage of retail expenditure to other areas outside the District, which the Retail and Leisure Study (2008) suggests is an issue at present. The restricted extent of this boundary may therefore not be appropriate for the size of Rayleigh. It may force businesses/uses out of the town thus potentially having a detrimental impact on the vitality and vibrancy of the town. This option may therefore have a negative impact on business development.</p>	-	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC2 – Commentary	Score	
5. Accessibility	<p>There are existing bus routes running through the town centre and Rayleigh train station is accessible to the north. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality.</p> <p>This option would ensure access to services for those without access to private transport through providing a concentration of services and sustainable transport modes in a central location, although this would be over a much smaller area than TC1. This option may therefore not reduce the need to travel.</p>	+	-
6. Biodiversity	<p>This option would concentrate services and development within this area and promote residential development at higher densities, however, this would be over a much smaller area and thus may not preserve greenfield sites elsewhere in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre.</p>	-	?
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This town centre boundary would be encompassed by much of the Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 39 which encompasses the historic core of Rayleigh which includes the castle, windmill and the church (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). The castle and medieval street pattern reflecting the original market place together with buried archaeological deposits are all particularly sensitive. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rayleigh Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	?	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>The boundary includes some derelict, degraded or underused land available within the town centre for example along Websters Way, however, it does not encompass the area to the southern end of the High Street, for example, which has been identified in initial work for the Rayleigh Town Centre Area Action Plan as a potential area for improvement.</p> <p>The identified area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p> <p>This option, although it encompasses a smaller area than TC1, would preserve the existing townscape character and it is encompassed by the Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC2 – Commentary	Score	
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>The boundary is not considered to be an appropriate size to accommodate town centre uses and may potentially have a negative impact on the viability and vitality of the town through not ensuring adequate space for businesses. This option may therefore increase energy consumption through potentially failing to balance the supply and demand of town centre uses.</p> <p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	-	
10. Water	<p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	-	+
11. Land and Soil	<p>Whilst the boundary encompasses some previously developed land which may benefit from development, it would not promote the efficient use of land within this location through restricting the range of uses and land available for dense residential development. Therefore it is unlikely to ensure the re-use of brownfield land within the urban area in preference to greenfield sites.</p> <p>This option would encourage higher density development over a much smaller area than TC1.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the proposed town centre boundary is unknown.</p> <p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities but over a much smaller area than TC1, may not preserve agricultural land elsewhere in the District.</p>	- -	?
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would ensure access to services for those without access to private transport through providing a concentration of services and sustainable transport modes, although this would be over a much smaller area than at present. This option may therefore potentially not reduce the need to travel and consequently may have a detrimental impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a recognised issue with air quality within the town centre and monitoring is on going in the area.</p>	-	
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>This proposed town centre boundary in comparison to the other option for Rayleigh (TC1) would ensure a mix of uses over a much smaller area.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

Option TC11

SA Objective	Option TC11– Commentary	Score
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option would continue to focus retail development within the existing centre whilst enhancing consumer choice outside this core area. It therefore has the potential to have a positive impact on the provision of infrastructure to meet ongoing and future needs.</p> <p>Through focusing retail uses within the existing primary shopping area of Rayleigh and providing a greater mix of appropriate town centre uses outside this core area, this option has the potential to ensure the regeneration and enhancement of the urban community.</p> <p>This option would continue to focus retail development within the existing centre whilst enhancing consumer choice outside this core area which may have a positive impact on equal opportunities.</p>	+
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	No impact	0
3. Housing	No significant impact	0
4. Economy & Employment	This option would focus retail uses within the existing primary shopping area of Rayleigh and providing a greater mix of appropriate town centre uses outside this core area. It would continue to focus retail development within the existing centre whilst enhancing consumer choice outside this core area.	+
5. Accessibility	<p>This option would preserve and potentially increase the availability of sustainable transport modes through providing a public transport hub around the retail core.</p> <p>The proposed primary shopping area is in an accessible location which may encourage access for all sections of the community and encourage alternative modes of transportation.</p> <p>There would be sustainable access to key services given the concentration of primary activities with a greater degree of flexibility and diversity outside this area as at present, where other appropriate town centre activities such as health care, community facilities and offices can be accommodated.</p>	+
6. Biodiversity	No impact.	0

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC11– Commentary	Score
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This defined area is encompassed by Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 39 which encompasses the historic core of Rayleigh which includes the castle, windmill and the church (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). The castle and medieval street pattern reflecting the original market place together with buried archaeological deposits are all particularly sensitive. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rayleigh Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impact s of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	?
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option includes underutilised land to the rear of the High Street fronting Webster's Way which has been identified in initial work for the Rayleigh Town Centre Area Action Plan as having potential for improvement.</p> <p>The defined area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p>	+
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This option would potentially reduce energy consumption through concentrating retail development.</p> <p>The defined area is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+
10. Water	<p>The defined area is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+
11. Land and Soil	<p>High density residential development can be accommodated within the primary shopping area thus enhancing natural surveillance throughout the day and potentially preserving other greenfield sites outside the existing residential envelope.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated both within the identified primary shopping area, and the town centre (depending on the future designated boundary).</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the defined area is unknown.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated both within the identified primary shopping area, and the town centre (depending on the future designated boundary) which has the potential to protect agricultural land.</p>	++

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC11– Commentary	Score	
12. Air Quality	<p>Retail will be focused within the identified core area which is well related to sustainable transport hubs. This may therefore have a positive impact on air quality.</p> <p>There is a recognised issue with air quality within Rayleigh town centre and monitoring is on going in the area.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	This option would encourage a focus of retail within a core area. Other appropriate town centre uses would be encouraged outside this area.	+	

Option TC12

SA Objective	Option TC12 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option has the potential to dilute the existing concentration of core retail uses along the High Street and Eastwood Road which would have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre. It therefore has the potential to have a negative impact on the provision of infrastructure to meet ongoing and future needs.</p> <p>The extension of this option away from the central area may impinge on the accessibility of essential facilities and potentially reduce the quantum of other appropriate town centre uses through encouraging a greater proportion of retail uses. This therefore has the potential to have a negative impact on the regeneration and enhancement of the urban communities.</p> <p>The extension of this option away from the central area may potentially reduce the quantum of other appropriate town centre uses through encouraging a greater proportion of retail uses which may have a negative impact on equal opportunities through impinging on the accessibility of some services to the local community.</p>	-	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	No impact.	0	
3. Housing	No significant impact.	0	
4. Economy & Employment	The extension of this option away from the central area may is not recommended by the Retail and Leisure Study (2008) and the dilution of retail within the central area may have a negative impact on the vitality and vibrancy of the town centre.	-	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC12 – Commentary	Score	
5. Accessibility	<p>This option is well related to sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>The proposed primary shopping area is in an accessible location which may encourage access for all sections of the community and encourage alternative modes of transportation. The dispersal of uses may however reduce accessibility for some.</p> <p>Access to key services would be less sustainable than the other option for Rayleigh given the dispersal of primary activities throughout the town centre and it could lead to a reduction in consumer choice. This option may therefore not reduce the need to travel.</p>	-	?
6. Biodiversity	<p>No impact.</p>	0	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This defined area is encompassed by much of the Rayleigh Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 39 which encompasses the historic core of Rayleigh which includes the castle, windmill and the church (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project).The castle and medieval street pattern reflecting the original market place together with buried archaeological deposits are all particularly sensitive. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rayleigh Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	?	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option includes underutilised land to the rear of the High Street fronting Webster's Way and towards the southern end of the High Street which have been identified in initial work for the Rayleigh Town Centre Area Action Plan as having potential for improvement.</p> <p>The defined area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC12 – Commentary	Score
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This option would potentially increase energy consumption through dispersing retail development throughout the town centre and reducing accessibility.</p> <p>The defined area is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	-
10. Water	<p>The defined area is not situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	+
11. Land and Soil	<p>High density residential development can be accommodated within the primary shopping area thus enhancing natural surveillance throughout the day and potentially preserving other greenfield sites outside the existing residential envelope.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated both within the identified primary shopping area, and the town centre (depending on the future designated boundary).</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the defined area is unknown.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated both within the identified primary shopping area, and the town centre (depending on the future designated boundary) which has the potential to protect agricultural land.</p>	+ +
12. Air Quality	<p>Unlike TC11 and TCB1, retail uses will not be focused within an identified core area but are likely to be diluted over a much wider area. This may therefore have a detrimental effect in terms of accessibility which may impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a recognised issue with air quality within Rayleigh town centre and monitoring is on going in the area.</p>	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>This option has the potential to encourage a dilution of retail uses within Rayleigh town centre.</p>	-

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

Rochford

Policy TCB2

SA Objective	Policy TCB2– Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	This boundary is more focused around existing retail development, along West Street, North Street, South Street and part of East Street. It is likely to continue to promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities through focusing development in these core areas and providing access to services to those without access to private transport.	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	This option can continue to provide a range of retail, leisure and local services to meet the needs of the local community, and promote mixed use and high density development throughout the core area, which would have the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	
3. Housing	Although high density development appropriate to a town centre location would be encouraged, a smaller town centre boundary would limit opportunities for higher density development in Rayleigh centre, and result in fewer dwellings being provided within the central area of Rochford.	-	
4. Economy & Employment	<p>This option would promote and enhance the town centre of Rochford, focusing town centre appropriate development in a more concentrated area than option TC3, as recommended by the Retail and Leisure Study (2008). This would help support the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre.</p> <p>TCB2 would have a slightly greater positive impact on the economy of the district than TC5 as it includes more retail along primary and secondary frontage.</p>	++	-
5. Accessibility	<p>There is an existing bus route running through the town centre and Rochford train station is accessible to the west/south west. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality.</p> <p>This option would ensure access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west). This option therefore has the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality.</p>	+	
6. Biodiversity	The concentration of services and development over a smaller area than at present may potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value, whilst balancing this against other appropriate town centre uses. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.	?	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Policy TCB2– Commentary	Score	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west) which may have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>The boundary of this site differs from TC5 in that it encompasses comparatively more of the potential opportunity areas identified in initial work for the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan, for example along North Street and West Street and it may therefore promote more efficient re-use of derelict, degraded or underutilised land within the town centre.</p> <p>The identified area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p> <p>This option would preserve the existing townscape character and it is encompassed by the Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character.</p>	++	+
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This boundary may be appropriate in size to accommodate town centre uses which would enhance the viability and vitality of the town through ensuring adequate space for businesses, thus it potentially reduces energy consumption through balancing the supply and demand of town centre uses.</p> <p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area at risk to the west/south west.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 to the west/south west.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>The concentration of services and development over a smaller area than at present may potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value, whilst balancing this against other appropriate town centre uses. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p> <p>This option would encourage higher density development over a smaller area than TC3.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the existing town centre boundary is unknown.</p> <p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve agricultural land elsewhere in the District.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Policy TCB2– Commentary	Score	
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west) which may have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	This town centre boundary in comparison to TC3 would encourage a concentrated mix of uses over a much smaller area.	+	

Option TC3

SA Objective	Option TC3– Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	This boundary may be too widely drawn in that it encompasses much residential development, and town centre uses can become dispersed and the retail focus diluted. This may have a negative impact on regeneration, and equal opportunities in terms of accessibility of services and facilities.	-	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	Promoting the existing town centre would ensure that leisure uses as well as shops and residential units can be accommodated within this central area of Rochford although this may be diluted which could reduce the positive impacts on health and reduce health inequalities	0	
3. Housing	Retaining the existing town centre boundary would ensure that a greater proportion, tenure and affordability of housing can be provided within the existing urban area through encouraging high density development appropriate to a town centre location.	+	
4. Economy & Employment	The option would support the provision of a range of town centre appropriate uses in the centre of Rochford, including retail development. However, this option encompasses a much wider area than other options for Rochford – and wider than recommended by the Retail and Leisure Study (2008) – and has the potential to dilute the retail focus within the centre, thus potentially harming the vitality and vibrancy of the town.	-	+

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC3– Commentary	Score	
5. Accessibility	<p>There is an existing bus route running through the town centre and Rochford train station is accessible to the west/south west. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality.</p> <p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west).</p> <p>The present town centre boundary may be too widely drawn in that it encompasses much residential development, and town centre uses can become dispersed and the retail focus diluted. This may have a negative impact on accessibility.</p> <p>This boundary may be too widely drawn in that it encompasses much residential development, and town centre uses can become dispersed and the retail focus diluted. This may therefore not reduce the need to travel.</p>	-	?
6. Biodiversity	<p>The concentration of services and development including high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations over a large area would potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p>	+	?
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This town centre boundary is encompassed by Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 22 which encompasses the historic core of Rochford town located on an area of complex glacial and post glacial deposits overlying London Clay and Claygate Beds (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is high potential for surviving deposits below ground and for better understanding of the existing built heritage and the street pattern, road frontages, buildings and below ground deposits are highly sensitive to change. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rochford Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impact s of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	-	?

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC3– Commentary	Score	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>The existing boundary encompasses potential opportunity areas identified in initial work for the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan, for example along North Street and West Street and would therefore promote the re-use of derelict, degraded or underutilised land within the town centre.</p> <p>Rochford town centre as existing is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p> <p>This option would preserve the existing townscape character and it is encompassed by the Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character.</p>	+	
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This boundary may be too widely drawn in that it encompasses much residential development, and town centre uses can become dispersed and the retail focus diluted. This may therefore have a negative impact on energy consumption.</p> <p>An area to the west/south west of the existing town centre boundary is situated within an area at risk of flooding.</p>	-	
10. Water	<p>An area to the west/south west of the existing town centre boundary is within flood zone 2 and/or 3.</p>	-	
11. Land and Soil	<p>The concentration of services and development including high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations over a large area would potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value than brownfield land in the town centre. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p> <p>This option would encourage higher density development over a much wider area than other options for the centre of Rochford, however, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the existing town centre boundary is unknown.</p> <p>By concentrating services and development over a large area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve agricultural land elsewhere in the District. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p>	++	-

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC3– Commentary	Score	
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west) which may have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	Promoting the existing town centre would ensure that a mix of retail and leisure uses are provided within the centre but over a much wider area than some of the other options for Rochford. The existing boundary encompasses much residential development which may dilute the retail focus and other complementary uses. This may be contrary to sustainable design principles.	+	

Option TC4

SA Objective	Option TC4 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	This option would promote and enhance the town centre of Rochford encompassing less residential development than at present (compared to option TC3). This would ensure a range of shops and other appropriate town centre uses including residential and leisure uses throughout the area which has the potential to ensure that the ongoing and future needs of communities can be met within the town centre. This option encompasses new retail development to the north of the Market Square and existing retail use along Weir Pond Road. It is likely to continue to promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities through focusing development in core areas and providing access to services to those without access to private transport.	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	Promoting this town centre boundary would ensure that leisure uses as well as shops and residential units can be accommodated within this central area of Rochford which would have the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+	
3. Housing	Although high density development appropriate to a town centre location would be encouraged, a smaller town centre boundary would limit opportunities for higher density development in Rayleigh centre, and result in fewer dwellings being provided within the central area of Rochford.	-	
4. Economy & Employment	This option would promote and enhance the town centre of Rochford, focusing town centre appropriate development in a more concentrated area than option TC3, as recommended by the Retail and Leisure Study (2008). This would help support the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre.	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC4 – Commentary	Score
5. Accessibility	<p>There is an existing bus route running through the town centre and Rochford train station is accessible to the west/south west. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality.</p> <p>This option would ensure access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west). This option therefore has the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality.</p>	+
6. Biodiversity	<p>The concentration of services and development over a smaller area than at present would potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value, whilst balancing this against other appropriate town centre uses. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p>	?
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This town centre boundary is encompassed by Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 22 which encompasses the historic core of Rochford town located on an area of complex glacial and post glacial deposits overlying London Clay and Claygate Beds (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is high potential for surviving deposits below ground and for better understanding of the existing built heritage and the street pattern, road frontages, buildings and below ground deposits are highly sensitive to change. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rochford Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	?

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC4 – Commentary	Score	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option encompasses some of the potential opportunity areas identified in initial work for the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan, for example along North Street but does not include sites for example towards the western end of West Street. It may therefore encourage some re-use of derelict, degraded or underutilised land within the town centre.</p> <p>The identified area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p> <p>This option would preserve the existing townscape character and it is encompassed by the Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character.</p>	+	
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This boundary may be appropriate in size to accommodate town centre uses which would enhance the viability and vitality of the town through ensuring adequate space for businesses, thus it potentially reduces energy consumption through balancing the supply and demand of town centre uses.</p> <p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area at risk to the west/south west.</p>	+	
10. Water	<p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 to the west/south west.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>The concentration of services and development over a smaller area than at present would potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value, whilst balancing this against other appropriate town centre uses. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p> <p>This option would encourage higher density development over a smaller area than TC3.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the existing town centre boundary is unknown.</p> <p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve agricultural land elsewhere in the District.</p>	+	
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west) which may have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC4 – Commentary	Score
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	This town centre boundary in comparison to TC3 would encourage a concentrated mix of uses over a much smaller area.	+

Option TC5

SA Objective	Option TC5 – Commentary	Score
1. Balanced Communities	This boundary is more focused around existing retail development, along West Street, North Street, South Street and part of East Street. It is likely to continue to promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities through focusing development in these core areas and providing access to services to those without access to private transport.	+
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	This option can continue to provide a range of retail, leisure and local services to meet the needs of the local community, and promote mixed use and high density development throughout the core area, which would have the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities.	+
3. Housing	Although high density development appropriate to a town centre location would be encouraged, a smaller town centre boundary would limit opportunities for higher density development in Rayleigh centre, and result in fewer dwellings being provided within the central area of Rochford.	-
4. Economy & Employment	This option would promote and enhance the town centre of Rochford, focusing town centre appropriate development in a more concentrated area than option TC3, as recommended by the Retail and Leisure Study (2008). This would help support the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre.	+
5. Accessibility	<p>There is an existing bus route running through the town centre and Rochford train station is accessible to the west/south west. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality.</p> <p>This option would ensure access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west). This option therefore has the potential to reduce the need to travel for some in the locality.</p>	+

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC5 – Commentary	Score	
6. Biodiversity	The concentration of services and development over a smaller area than at present may potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value, whilst balancing this against other appropriate town centre uses. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.	?	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west) which may have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>The boundary of this site does not encompass potential opportunity areas identified in initial work for the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan, for example along North Street and West Street and it may therefore not promote the efficient re-use of derelict, degraded or underutilised land within the town centre. Whilst this option encompasses less residential development than Option TC3 and TC4, but encompasses a wider area than Option TC6</p> <p>there is potential for the boundary to be extended northwards along North Street towards Weir Pond Road to include potential redevelopment sites in this area. The boundary could also be extended westwards along West Street and southwards along South Street towards Bradley Way to include the area encompassing Locks Hill, the health centre facilities and Back Lane car park. This option could therefore be extended to encompass potential opportunity sites.</p> <p>The identified area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p> <p>This option would preserve the existing townscape character and it is encompassed by the Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character.</p>	+ +	
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This boundary may be appropriate in size to accommodate town centre uses which would enhance the viability and vitality of the town through ensuring adequate space for businesses, thus it potentially reduces energy consumption through balancing the supply and demand of town centre uses.</p> <p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area at risk to the west/south west.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC5 – Commentary	Score	
10. Water	The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 to the west/south west.	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>The concentration of services and development over a smaller area than at present may potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value, whilst balancing this against other appropriate town centre uses. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p> <p>This option would encourage higher density development over a smaller area than TC3.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the existing town centre boundary is unknown.</p> <p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve agricultural land elsewhere in the District.</p>	+	
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west) which may have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	This town centre boundary in comparison to TC3 would encourage a concentrated mix of uses over a much smaller area.	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

Option TC6

SA Objective	Option TC6 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option would promote and enhance the town centre of Rochford encompassing less residential development than at present. This option does not, however, encompass the new retail development to the north of the Market Square. It would provide a concentrated retail focus, but it encompasses the smallest area of the four options and may therefore have less potential to ensure that the ongoing and future needs of communities can be met within the town centre.</p> <p>It may have the potential to continue to promote the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities through focusing development in these core areas and providing access to services to those without access to private transport, although this may be to a less extent than TC5 for example</p>	+	-
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	<p>This option can continue to provide a range of retail, leisure and local services to meet the needs of the local community, and promote mixed use and high density development throughout the core area, which would have the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+	
3. Housing	<p>Although high density development appropriate to a town centre location would be encouraged, a smaller town centre boundary would limit opportunities for higher density development in Rayleigh centre, and result in fewer dwellings being provided within the central area of Rochford.</p>	-	
4. Economy & Employment	<p>This option would promote and enhance the town centre of Rochford, focusing town centre appropriate development in a more concentrated area than option TC3, as recommended by the Retail and Leisure Study (2008). This would help support the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre.</p> <p>Although, the Retail and Leisure Study (2008) recommends that the town centre boundary be rationalised, this option would exclude existing retail in the town centre area, giving rise to the concern that it is too tightly drawn. The restricted extent of this boundary may therefore not be appropriate for the size of Rayleigh. It may force businesses/uses out of the town thus potentially having a detrimental impact on the vitality and vibrancy of the town. This option may therefore have a negative impact on business development</p>	+	-
5. Accessibility	<p>There is an existing bus route running through the town centre and Rochford train station is accessible to the west/south west. There is potential to improve public transport provision in the locality.</p> <p>This option would ensure access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west).</p>	-	?

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC6 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>This option can continue to provide a range of retail, leisure and local services to meet the needs of the local community, and promote mixed use and high density development within the core area. It would provide a concentrated retail focus, but over a much smaller area than at present which may have a detrimental impact on social inclusion.</p> <p>This option can continue to provide a range of retail, leisure and local services to meet the needs of the local community, and promote mixed use and high density development within the core area. This option may therefore increase the need to travel for some in the locality.</p>		
6. Biodiversity	<p>The concentration of services and development over a much smaller area than at present may potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value, whilst balancing this against other appropriate town centre uses. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford and the restricted extent of the boundary potentially limits opportunities for development.</p>	-	?
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>This town centre boundary is encompassed by Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 22 which encompasses the historic core of Rochford town located on an area of complex glacial and post glacial deposits overlying London Clay and Claygate Beds (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is high potential for surviving deposits below ground and for better understanding of the existing built heritage and the street pattern, road frontages, buildings and below ground deposits are highly sensitive to change. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rochford conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	?	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC6 – Commentary	Score	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option does not encompass potential opportunity areas identified in initial work for the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan, for example along North Street and West Street and it may therefore discourage the re-use of derelict, degraded or underutilised land within the town centre.</p> <p>The identified area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p> <p>This option would preserve the existing townscape character and it is encompassed by the Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>The restricted extent of this boundary may not be appropriate for the size of Rochford. It may force businesses/uses out of the town thus potentially having a detrimental impact on the vitality and vibrancy of Rochford. It may also increase energy consumption.</p> <p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area at risk to the west/south west.</p>	-	
10. Water	<p>The proposed town centre boundary is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 to the west/south west.</p>	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>The concentration of services and development over a much smaller area than at present may potentially preserve other greenfield sites in the District which may be of more ecological value, whilst balancing this against other appropriate town centre uses. Although this includes high density residential development appropriate for town centre locations, it is important to acknowledge the presence of numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford and the restricted extent of the boundary potentially limits opportunities for development.</p> <p>This option would encourage higher density development over a smaller area than the other options for Rochford, and may therefore present less opportunity to redevelop brownfield sites at an appropriate density for a town centre location.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the existing town centre boundary is unknown.</p> <p>By concentrating services and development within this area and promoting residential development at higher densities, this would also potentially preserve agricultural land elsewhere in the District.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC6 – Commentary	Score	
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate services and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west) which may have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	This town centre boundary in comparison to TC3 would encourage a concentrated mix of uses over a much smaller area than the other options for Rochford.	+	

Option TC13

SA Objective	Option TC13 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option encompasses the existing primary shopping frontage for Rochford which is focused predominantly around the Market Square and along West Street. This would maintain the concentration of retail uses around this core area with appropriate non-retail uses residing within the rest of the town centre boundary (depending on the future designated boundary). Therefore this option has the potential to have a positive impact on the provision of infrastructure to meet ongoing and future needs.</p> <p>This option would continue to focus retail development within the existing centre whilst enhancing consumer choice outside this core area which may have a positive impact on equal opportunities.</p>	+	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	No impact.	0	
3. Housing	No significant impact.	0	
4. Economy & Employment	This option would continue to focus retail development within the existing centre whilst enhancing consumer choice outside this core area.	+	
5. Accessibility	<p>This option would encourage provision of public transport to and from the centre.</p> <p>The proposed primary shopping area is in an accessible location which may encourage access for all sections of the community and encourage alternative modes of transportation.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC13 – Commentary	Score	
	<p>There would be sustainable access for all sections of the community to key services given the concentration of primary activities with a greater degree of flexibility and diversity outside this area as at present, where other appropriate town centre activities such as health care, community facilities and offices can be accommodated. This option therefore has the potential to positively impact on reducing social exclusion, and may reduce the need to travel.</p>		
6. Biodiversity	No impact.	0	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>The identified area is encompassed by the Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 22 which encompasses the historic core of Rochford town located on an area of complex glacial and post glacial deposits overlying London Clay and Claygate Beds (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is high potential for surviving deposits below ground and for better understanding of the existing built heritage and the street pattern, road frontages, buildings and below ground deposits are highly sensitive to change. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rochford Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impacts of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	?	
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option does not include previously developed land which has been identified in initial work for the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan as having potential for improvement.</p> <p>The identified area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This option would potentially reduce energy consumption through concentrating retail development.</p> <p>The defined area is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 in immediate proximity to the west/south west.</p>	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC13 – Commentary	Score	
10. Water	The defined area is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 in immediate proximity to the west/south west.	+	-
11. Land and Soil	<p>High density residential development can be accommodated within the primary shopping area, as appropriate (although there are numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford), thus enhancing natural surveillance throughout the day and potentially preserving other greenfield sites outside the existing residential envelope.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated within the primary shopping area, as appropriate (although there are numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford).</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the defined area is unknown.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated within the primary shopping area, as appropriate (although there are numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford) which has the potential to protect agricultural land.</p>	+ +	
12. Air Quality	<p>This option would provide access to services to those without access to private transport through continuing to concentrate retail uses and sustainable transport modes in the town centre (for example the numerous bus stops throughout the town centre with the train station to the west/south west) which may have a positive impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	This option would encourage a focus of retail within a core as opposed to TC14. Other appropriate town centre uses would be encouraged outside this area.	+	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

Option TC14

SA Objective	Option TC14 – Commentary	Score	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>This option for Rochford encompasses the existing primary and secondary shopping frontages which extend further along West Street and North Street and along South Street and East Street. The secondary shopping frontage whilst not extensive in size would increase the floorspace available for predominant retail use across the town centre (depending on the future designated boundary). However, it has the potential to create an overabundance of retail uses within the town centre thereby restricting the presence of other non-retail, complementary uses which could impact on the vitality and vibrancy of the town centre. This option therefore has the potential to have a negative impact on the provision of infrastructure to meet ongoing and future needs.</p> <p>This option could restrict appropriate non-retail uses within the centre. The potential dilution of retail uses and reduction of other complementary town centre uses may have a negative impact on equal opportunities as all sections of the community may not be catered for.</p>	-	
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	No impact.	0	
3. Housing	No significant impact.	0	
4. Economy & Employment	This option would restrict the proportion of non-retail uses within a wide area across the town centre. It has the potential to reduce consumer choice through forcing out other complementary town centre uses for retail floorspace, regardless of the level of demand.	-	
5. Accessibility	<p>This option would encourage provision of public transport to and from the centre.</p> <p>The proposed primary shopping area is in an accessible location which may encourage access for all sections of the community and encourage alternative modes of transportation. The dispersal of uses may however reduce accessibility for some.</p> <p>The proposed primary shopping area may encourage access for all sections of the community to the primary shopping area. However, an overabundance of retail use would have a negative impact on the vibrancy and viability of the town centre and reduce the accessibility of other essential facilities. This may therefore have a negative impact on social exclusion and may impact on the need to travel for some in the community.</p>	-	?
6. Biodiversity	No impact.	0	

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC14 – Commentary	Score	
7. Cultural Heritage	<p>The identified area is encompassed by the Rochford Conservation Area which seeks to protect the local character of the historic urban environment. This option is situated within Historic Environment Character Zone 22 which encompasses the historic core of Rochford town located on an area of complex glacial and post glacial deposits overlying London Clay and Claygate Beds (Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project). There is high potential for surviving deposits below ground and for better understanding of the existing built heritage and the street pattern, road frontages, buildings and below ground deposits are highly sensitive to change. There are numerous Listed Buildings situated within Rochford Conservation Area.</p> <p>It is worthwhile noting that Conservation Areas are protected under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 and that the Core Strategy is committed to ensuring that appropriate regard is given to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and sites where the historic character is susceptible to the impact s of development.</p> <p>The impact of development on the area has the potential to generate both a positive and negative effect depending on the nature of development. This issue should be considered during the development phase, giving regard to Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	-	?
8. Landscape & Townscape	<p>This option does not include previously developed land which has been identified in initial work for the Rochford Town Centre Area Action Plan as having potential for improvement.</p> <p>The identified area is situated within the South Essex Coastal Towns landscape character area (SEA Baseline Information Profile), which has a medium sensitivity to change.</p>	+	-
9. Climate Change and Energy	<p>This option would potentially increase energy consumption through dispersing retail development throughout the town centre and reducing accessibility.</p> <p>The defined area is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 in immediate proximity to the west/south west.</p>	-	
10. Water	<p>The defined area is not situated within an area at risk of flooding, although there is an area of flood zone 2 and 3 in immediate proximity to the west/south west.</p>	+	-

Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Allocations Submission Document

SA Objective	Option TC14 – Commentary	Score	
11. Land and Soil	<p>High density residential development can be accommodated within the primary shopping area, as appropriate (although there are numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford), thus enhancing natural surveillance throughout the day and potentially preserving other greenfield sites outside the existing residential envelope.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated both within the identified primary shopping area and the town centre (depending on the future designated boundary), as appropriate, although it is pertinent to note that there are numerous Listed Buildings within the historic centre of Rochford.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land within the defined area is unknown.</p> <p>High density residential development can be accommodated both within the identified primary shopping area, and the town centre (depending on the future designated boundary) which has the potential to protect agricultural land.</p>	+	-
12. Air Quality	<p>Unlike TC13 and TCB2, retail uses will not be focused within an identified core area but are likely to be diluted over a much wider area. This may therefore have a detrimental effect in terms of accessibility to some appropriate town centre uses which may impact on local air quality.</p> <p>There is a potential issue with air quality within the town centre which is being monitored.</p>	+	-
13. Sustainable Design and Construction	<p>This option has the potential to encourage a dilution of retail uses within Rochford town centre.</p>	-	

Policy TCB3

No preferred approach for Hockley has been included within the Submission Document (Policy TCB3) as the detailed allocation of the centre has been deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan. However, the detailed assessments for the options included in the Discussion and Consultation Document (TC7-TC8 and TC15-TC16) can be found in Appendix 10 of the Updated SA (July 2012).

Appendix 12 – Allocations Policy Progression

Allocations option/policy changes are marked in red and underlined (additions) and ~~strikethrough~~ (deletions).

Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document 2010	Allocations Submission Document 2012
Residential Allocations	Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations
North London Road, Rayleigh – Options NLR1-5	North London Road, Rayleigh – Policy SER1
West Rochford – Option WR1-4	West Rochford – Policy SER2
West Hockley – Option WH1-5	West Hockley – Policy SER3
South Hawkwell – Option SH1-4	South Hawkwell – Policy SER4
East Ashingdon – Option EA1-3	East Ashingdon – Policy SER5
South West Hullbridge – Option SWH1-4	South West Hullbridge – Policy SER6
South Canewdon – Option SC1-4	South Canewdon – Policy SER7
South East Ashingdon – Option SEA1-3	South East Ashingdon – Policy SER8
West Great Wakering – Option GW1-5	West Great Wakering – Policy SER9
Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations – Option GT1-7	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation – Policy GT1
Employment Allocations	Existing Employment Land Allocations
Baltic Wharf – Option E1	Existing Employment Land on Wallasea island – Policy EEL3
Swaines Industrial Estate – Option E2	Existing Employment land around Rochford – Policy EEL1
Purdeys Industrial Estate – Option E3	Existing Employment land around Rochford – Policy EEL1
Riverside Industrial Estate – Option E4	Existing Employment land around Rochford – Policy EEL1
Rochford Business Park – Option E5	Existing Employment land around Rochford – Policy EEL1
Imperial Park Industrial Estate – Option E6	Existing Employment land around Rayleigh – Policy EEL2
Brook Road Industrial Estate – Option E7	Existing Employment land around Rayleigh – Policy EEL2

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document 2010	Allocations Submission Document 2012
Aviation Way Industrial Estate – Option E8	<i>Allocation deferred to the emerging London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan</i>
Employment Allocations	Brownfield Residential Land Allocations
Star Lane Industrial Estate – Option E9	Star Lane Industrial Estate, Great Wakering – Policy BFR1
Eldon Way Industrial Estate – Option E10	Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate, Hockley – Policy BFR2 <i>(Allocation deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan)</i>
Stambridge Mills – Option E11	Stambridge Mills, Rochford – Policy BFR3
Rawreth Industrial Estate – Option E12	Rawreth Industrial Estate, Rayleigh – Policy BFR4
Additional Employment Land to be Allocated	New Employment Land Allocations
West of Rayleigh – Option E13-E18	South of London Road, Rayleigh – Policy NEL1 West of A1245, Rayleigh – Policy NEL2
North of London Southend Airport	North of London Southend Airport – Policy NEL4 <i>(Allocates the area encompassing the Joint Area Action Plan area within Rochford District)</i>
South of Great Wakering – Option E19-E24	South of Great Wakering – Policy NEL3
Environment	Ecological and Landscape Allocations
Local Wildlife Sites	Local Wildlife Sites – Policy ELA1
Upper Roach Valley	Upper Roach Valley – Policy ELA3
Coastal Protection Belt	Coastal Protection Belt – Policy ELA2
Community Facilities – Education	Educational Land Allocations
Site North of London Road Rayleigh	North of London Road, Rayleigh – Policy EDU1 <i>(A new primary school will be provided as part of the development proposed in Policy SER1)</i>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document 2010	Allocations Submission Document 2012
Site to the West of Rochford	West Rochford – Policy EDU2 (<i>A new primary school will be provided as part of the development proposed in Policy SER2</i>)
King Edmund School – Option KES1-3	King Edmund School – Policy EDU3
Great Wakering – Option EDU1	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Barling – Option EDU2	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Canewdon – Option EDU3	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Rochford – Option EDU4	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
King Edmund School (existing) – Option EDU5	King Edmund School – Policy EDU3 Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Ashingdon – Option EDU6	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Greensward Academy, Hockley – Option EDU7	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
The Westerings Primary School, Hawkwell – Option EDU8	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Hockley Primary School, Hockley – Option EDU9	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Riverside Junior and Infant School, Hullbridge – Option EDU10	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
St. Nicholas C of E Primary School, Rayleigh – Option EDU11	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Our Lady Of Ransom Primary School, Rayleigh – Option EDU12	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Sweyne Park School, Glebe Junior School – Option EDU13	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Down Hall Primary School – Option EDU14	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Edward Francis Junior and Infant School – Option EDU15	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Fitzwimarc Secondary School – Option EDU16	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Wyburns Primary School – Option EDU17	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Grove Wood Primary School, Rayleigh – Option EDU18	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4
Stambridge Primary School – Option EDU19	Existing Primary and Secondary Schools – Policy EDU4

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document 2010	Allocations Submission Document 2012
Community Facilities	Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations
Open Space – Option OS1-2	Existing Open Space – Policy OSL1 New Open Space – Policy OSL2
Rayleigh Leisure Centre – Option LF1	Existing Leisure Facilities – Policy OSL3
Clements Hall Leisure Centre – Option LF2	Existing Leisure Facilities – Policy OSL3
Great Wakering Leisure Centre – Option LF3	<i>The Updated SA (July 2012) noted that the leisure centre had closed in October 2011 and that it may not be appropriate to allocate this facility</i>
Community Facilities – Option CF1-2	<i>The Updated SA (July 2012) suggested that the overarching Policy CLT6 of the Core Strategy would provide adequate protection for all community facilities in the District</i>
Town Centres	Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations
Rayleigh Town Centre Boundary – Option TC1-2	Rayleigh – Policy TCB1
Rochford Town Centre Boundary – Option TC3-6	Rochford – Policy TCB2
Hockley Town Centre Boundary – Option TC7-9	Hockley – Policy TCB3 (<i>Allocation deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan</i>)
Reallocation of Hockley as a District Centre – Option TC10	<i>The town centre boundary allocation of Hockley is deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan</i>
Rayleigh Primary Shopping Area – Option TC11-12	Rayleigh – Policy TCB1
Rochford Primary Shopping Area – Option TC13-14	Rochford – Policy TCB2
Hockley Primary Shopping Area – Option TC15-16	Hockley – Policy TCB3 (<i>Allocation deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan</i>)

Inclusion of SA Recommendations in Policy Progression

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

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>If an option may not be able to accommodate the number of dwellings at an appropriate density then an allocation comprising parts of options presented at the Discussion and Consultation stage (as opposed to one of the options in its entirety) may be preferable. In this case, ecological protection may need to be weighed against landscape protection.</p>	<p>A combination of WG1, WG2 and WG5 has been proposed within Policy SER9.</p>
<p>Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations</p>	<p>GT6, if allocated in its entirety, would entail the allocation of more Green Belt land than required.</p> <p>It is unlikely that additional sites would need to be allocated if Options GT1, GT2 or GT6 are taken forward.</p> <p>Highways access from GT6 would need to be negotiated carefully if taken forward.</p> <p>A management plan for the Local Wildlife Sites/Ancient Woodland within Option GT4 and GT5 may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</p>	<p>A portion of the site has been identified in Policy GT1.</p> <p>A portion of the site has been identified in Policy GT1 to meet the pitch requirement set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>This site forms part of a wider allocation encompassing a proposed employment site.</p> <p><i>Not applicable as these alternative options were not taken forward to the pre-submission stage.</i></p>
Employment Allocations		
<p>Baltic Wharf</p>	<p><i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i></p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Swaines Industrial Estate</p>	<p><i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i></p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Purdeys Industrial Estate</p>	<p><i>N/A – this is an existing employment site</i></p>	<p>-</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

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

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Initial Options/ Draft Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Community Facilities		
Open Space	<p>Option OS1 to allocate existing areas of public open space performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>All areas of public open space as identified in the Open Space Study 2009 should be included within the open space designation.</p>	<p>Existing areas of open space are proposed to be allocated within Policy OSL1. New public open space is also proposed within Policy OSL2.</p> <p>The Submission Document proposes that the sites included in the Open Space Study are also allocated with Policy OSL1.</p>
Rayleigh Leisure Centre	<p>Option LF1 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>It was noted that the playing pitches to the rear of Rayleigh Leisure Centre have now been completed. These should be included within the designated area of Rayleigh Leisure Centre to ensure that these are protected through the planning process.</p>	<p>Rayleigh Leisure Centre is proposed to be allocated within Policy OSL3.</p> <p>Rayleigh Leisure Centre, including the playing pitches to the rear, is proposed to be allocated within Policy OSL3.</p>
Clements Hall Leisure Centre	<p>Option LF2 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and leisure use to prevent unnecessary encroachment.</p>	<p>Clements Hall Leisure Centre is proposed to be allocated within Policy OSL3.</p> <p>The existing playing field is proposed to be allocated as open space and leisure use within the Green Belt. However, the existing developed area of the leisure centre will be allocated for leisure use but will not be allocated as Green Belt.</p> <p>The adjacent Spencer's Park is currently allocated as Green Belt, however, the reallocation of the developed part of Clements Hall Leisure Centre would create an island of Green Belt. As such Spencer's Park will no longer be allocated as Green Belt as shown on the Proposals map, but will continue to be protected through Policy OSL1 of the Allocations Submission Document.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

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

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

Appendix 13 – Summary of Responses to Consultation on the Updated SA and the Discussion and Consultation Document

As per the recommendation in the previous SA, given the delay between the publication of the Discussion and Consultation Document and the draft SA Report, a consultation on the updated SA and the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document took place for a period of four weeks between 13 August 2012 and 10 September 2012. Stakeholders were therefore provided 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.

The comments received during this consultation and officers' responses to these are set out below.

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>The Evidence Base of Site 17 (Land to the south east of the junction of Hullbridge Road and Lower Road, Hullbridge) in the draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012 – SHLAA Review is somewhat incomplete, via some important details which appear to have been overlooked.</p> <p>Additional information relating to 'Suitability Assessment, Planning Permission/History' and 'Site Map and Site Photo' submitted.</p>	<p>Noted. The information submitted will be considered in the finalisation of the 2012 SHLAA Review.</p>
<p>Option SWH4 should be taken forward, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would direct daily traffic away from the centre and reduce pressure on the highway to the north west of Ferry Road. • The bus route on the main road (Hullbridge Road and Lower Road) would be more accessible to the community than the alternative options. 	<p>Noted. The information submitted will be considered in the finalisation of the 2012 SHLAA Review.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The southern part of the site would facilitate improvements to the Watery Lane/Hullbridge Road/Lower Road junction and the proposed cycle network. 	
<p>Less drainage infrastructure would be required as the southern part of SWH4 (Site 17) contains the current main surface water drainage route from the higher ground to the east.</p>	<p>Noted. The information submitted will be considered in the finalisation of the 2012 SHLAA Review.</p>
<p>Option SWH4 could minimise the required improvements to Watery Lane, deferring more extensive improvements to a later date when the financial input from the locality has been consolidated.</p> <p>Other reasons for selecting this option over the alternatives have been previously submitted to the Council.</p>	<p>Noted. The information submitted will be considered in the finalisation of the 2012 SHLAA Review.</p>
<p>The Environment Agency commented that the report does not appear to reflect the flood risk concerns previously raised relating to option GT2. As gypsy and traveller sites are deemed to be 'highly vulnerable' by the NPPF, they are considered to be an inappropriate land use in Flood Zone 3. The SA should have picked up on this issue.</p>	<p>Disagree. The report acknowledged that the southern section of Option GT2 is located within flood zone 2 and 3 on page 717 of the Updated SA Report (July 2012) and quoted the Environment Agency accordingly:</p> <p>“The Environment Agency have stated that "This option encroaches into areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 and would therefore not be in line with PPS25 or the emerging Policy H7 of the Rochford Core Strategy. According to PPS25, gypsy and travellers sites are deemed to be 'highly vulnerable' and are therefore not appropriate in Flood Zone 3 and would require the Exception Test".” (Updated SA Report July 2012; page 717).</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Anglian Water commented that the findings of the South Essex Water Cycle Study, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Management Plan should be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The assessment for Option SEA1 should be amended to include reference to additional retail along the Ashingdon Road.</p>	<p>Noted. The assessment broadly identifies the nearest parade of shops, but does not seek to identify specific retail units by address.</p>
<p>Reference to the location of ‘south east Ashingdon’ in the assessment for Option SEA1 should be replaced with ‘north of Rochford (adjacent to Ashingdon)’.</p>	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that Options SEA1 to SEA3 are located to the north of Rochford, they are considered to be situated within the general location of ‘South East Ashingdon’.</p>
<p>Hullbridge Parish Council raised objections to any large development site to the South West of Hullbridge due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt • Insufficient infrastructure/facilities in Hullbridge including transport network, capacity at doctor’s surgery, lack of secondary school, sewerage network • Lack of community cohesion • Increased vehicle movements, including commuter traffic through lack of local jobs • Frequent flooding on the site and Watery Lane and concern that the flooding at the southern part of the area near Watery Lane has been underestimated • Impact to nearby existing properties with regard to flooding 	<p>Noted. However, the need to reallocate a minimal amount of Green Belt has been identified through the adopted Core Strategy (December 2011).</p> <p>Appropriate infrastructure is also required to accommodate new development as set out in Appendix H1 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>A wide range of issues such as community cohesion, the highway network and surface water flooding have been addressed within the Concept Statement for Policy SER6.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Hullbridge Parish Council commented that the dwelling allocation for Hullbridge within the Core Strategy is an unfair proportion compared with other parishes. They also commented that they understand that Hockley has only 50 new dwellings planned.</p>	<p>The strategic approach set out in the Core Strategy was found to be sound by an independent planning inspector, and whilst the Core Strategy does stipulate that the general location of West Hockley should a minimum of 50 dwellings (Policy H2), an area action plan is also being prepared for the centre of Hockley (Hockley Area Action Plan – Policy RTC6).</p>
<p>The representations submitted to the Allocations Development Plan Document: Discussion and Consultation Document in April 2010 in relation to land at Great Wheatleys, Rayleigh (Site 195) remain relevant and valid, and will, as understood, continue to be taken into account. The availability and suggested benefits of the site located to the south west of Rayleigh were reiterated.</p>	<p>Noted. This site is not situated within one of the general locations identified in the adopted Core Strategy (as set out in the Site Screening Report September 2012). It has therefore not been considered further in the development of the Allocations Document.</p>
<p>Infrastructure cannot cope with additional houses.</p>	<p>The infrastructure required to support the quantum of development identified for the general locations within the Core Strategy are set out within Appendix H1 of the document.</p>
<p>Rayleigh Town Council noted that comments originally submitted during the 2010 consultation are still valid and that it is not necessary to resubmit them.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Rayleigh Town Council commented that the former EON site and the present site of Timber Grove care home (which is proposed for redevelopment) should be incorporated into the proposals for Options NLR1 to NLR5.</p>	<p>Both these sites have been included in the 2012 SHLAA Review, as they are predominately located within the existing residential area. In addition the Green Belt part of the 'Timber Grove' site referred to has been included within Policy SER1 to facilitate the provision of a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
Rayleigh Town Council commented that with the demise of the East of England Regional Assembly, the requirement for the provision of gypsy and traveller sites must be revisited giving due weight to the differences in the needs of true Romany gypsies and Irish travellers.	The requirement within the adopted Core Strategy (Policy H7) accords with the East of England Plan 2008 which is still in place.
In relation to Option E6 Imperial Park Industrial Estate, Rayleigh town Council commented that there is very poor public transport provision with the likelihood of further cuts and/or cancellations to bus services in 2013.	The assessment acknowledges that there is an existing bus service along Rawreth Lane, and that there is potential to improve this provision (Updated SA Report July 2012; page 823).
Rayleigh Town Council commented in relation to Education Option EDU12 Our Lady of Ransom Primary School, that by its' nature as a catholic faith School there are limitations as to how effective expansion can be achieved serving the whole community.	Noted.
In relation to Education Option EDU14 Downhall Primary School, Rayleigh Town Council commented that this school has poor access being at the far end of a residential no through road.	Noted, however, this school can still serve the local community.
Rayleigh Town Council commented that they strongly support the recommendation regarding the playing pitches at Rayleigh Leisure Centre.	Noted.
It was noted that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been published following the delay since the publication of the Allocations Discussion and Consultation Document, back in March 2010. There appear to be very little changes in terms of the overall direction and support of the previously published and consulted upon Allocations DPD.	Noted. Stakeholders were provided with an additional opportunity to comment on both the original Discussion and Consultation Document (February 2010) and the Updated SA Report (July 2012) together.

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Comments in relation to the availability and suggested benefits of Site 86 (Land at Poyntens, Rayleigh) located to the south west of Rayleigh were reiterated. It was commented that representations have been made during the 2012 SHLAA consultation, the 2011 Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Addendum consultation and the 2010 Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document.</p>	<p>Noted. This site is not situated within one of the general locations identified in the adopted Core Strategy (as set out in the Site Screening Report September 2012). It has therefore not been considered further in the development of the Allocations Document.</p>
<p>Comments were made criticising the assessment of the general locations identified in the Core Strategy, specifically in relation to the SA and sites such as Site 86. It was commented that the approach to considering options and alternatives has not been thorough or appropriate (a specific test to be satisfied).</p>	<p>The adopted Core Strategy was subject to a legal challenge which was heard in the High Court on 31 May and 1 June 2012. This challenge sought to quash certain policies namely; H1, H2, H3 and paragraphs 4.1 to 4.31 in the Core Strategy which relate to Housing. On 21 September, the Judge ruled in favour of Rochford District Council.</p>
<p>Natural England commented that they are pleased to note that a number of changes to the SA and in particular the additional decision aiding questions within the revised SA framework were made in response to our earlier advice.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Natural England also notes that fewer amendments appear to have been made in light of their most recent consultation response (27 February 2012). The Council may wish to consider whether there is further scope to take account of those comments.</p>	<p>Natural England's comments have been addressed within Appendix 12 of the Updated SA Report (July 2012) and amendments have been made to the report as appropriate.</p>
<p>The additional decision aiding questions under accessibility, biodiversity, landscape and townscape and water in the Revised SA Framework (Table 5) are all supported by Natural England.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Natural England commented that they also welcome the addition to a definition for green infrastructure under healthy and safe communities in the Revised SA Framework (Table 5) but would question whether this is sufficiently clear and descriptive of the range of assets concerned. They recommend use of the definition in the National Planning policy Framework (NPPF) (page 52) or Natural England Green Infrastructure Guide.</p>	<p>Noted. The definition of green infrastructure in the NPPF has been included within the Submission SA report.</p>
<p>The addition of reference to provision of open space secured through new developments under Balanced Communities and Healthy and Safe Communities in the Potential Indicators section is welcome. Natural England promotes standards for Accessible Natural Greenspace (ANGSt) in view of the particular ecosystem services and health and wellbeing benefits that these provide for communities. Natural England encourage the Council to consider the inclusion of ANGSt or similar as a potential indicator.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference has been made to Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) in the potential indicators section.</p>
<p>The additional potential biodiversity and geodiversity indicators in the Potential Indicators section are also supported by Natural England and are appropriate in light of the weight that these matters are afforded in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>On biodiversity in the Potential Indicators section, Natural England point out that habitat mitigation should only be necessary where avoidance of impact is not possible and so this is not necessarily a straightforward measure of success. They recommend that the Council considers separating the proportion of new developments delivering habitat mitigation from the proportion of new developments delivering wildlife corridors.</p>	<p>Noted. The suggested amendment has been made accordingly in the pre-submission SA report.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>With regard to geodiversity in the Potential Indicators section Natural England would appreciate clarification as to the purpose of areas of geological significance “extracted” as an indicator.</p>	<p>This relates to the preservation of geological diversity, and is considered to be an appropriate indicator to be included within the Report.</p>
<p>The addition of a proposed indicator relating to the number and types of Sustainable Drainage Systems approved and implemented is welcome. Natural England is supportive of such systems and in particular those that make use of natural processes and habitat creation to deliver amenity and water quality benefits in addition to flood attenuation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>None of the ‘North of London Road’ options seem satisfactory. A better option would be to provide the 550 ‘North of London Road’ by a combination of the Timber Grove proposal, the eoN site and the site suggested by Rawreth Parish Council. These locations are almost all brownfield sites. If there was any shortfall, a small development could be added on the southwestern boundary of the Rawreth Industrial Estate site (assuming that is developed).</p>	<p>As above, both these sites have been included in the 2012 SHLAA Review, as they are predominately located within the existing residential area. In addition the Green Belt part of the ‘Timber Grove’ site referred to has been included within Policy SER1 to facilitate the provision of a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>The option proposed by Rawreth Parish Council, in essence a new settlement to the north west of the District around the village of Rawreth, was considered at primarily at the Issues and Options stage in the development of the Core Strategy. The approach to the location of new residential development was found sound by an independent inspector and the document was adopted on 13 December 2011.</p>
<p>There is no mention of the impact on secondary school places for any of the NLR options within the general location to the ‘North of London Road’.</p>	<p>This is a strategic issue that has been addressed through the preparation of the Core Strategy (Policy CLT3).</p>
<p>NLR1 (page 149) – The cumulative impact on the highway network make NLR1 an unsuitable option.</p>	<p>The potential impact on the highway network has been considered as part of the assessment.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>NLR1, NLR4 and NLR5 – Community identity will be harmed. Many residents already living in housing off Rawreth Lane already feel detached from Rayleigh and may not often visit the town centre. NLR1 is even further away from the Town Centre and would disrupt the current very positive community identity of Rawreth.</p>	<p>Any development in the general location ‘North of London Road’ would be well related to the existing residential area of Rayleigh. Opportunities exist for improvements to public transport in particular to connect new development to the town centre.</p>
<p>NLR1 (page 151) although the document states that development here would avoid coalescence with the village of Rawreth, the land is inside the parish of Rawreth. Development here would not produce any sense of community identity.</p>	<p>Although located within the parish of Rawreth, any development in the general location ‘North of London Road’ would be well related to the existing residential area of Rayleigh.</p>
<p>NLR1 and NLR4 – there is no mention here of the archaeological discoveries in Priory Chase – the Anglo-Saxon burial site.</p>	<p>Noted. The appraisal has taken a consistent approach in using the 2006 Rochford District Historic Environment Characterisation Project when considering the cultural heritage objective for each of the proposed policies and alternative options.</p>
<p>NLR1, NLR2 and NLR4 should be avoided if possible because it uses a greenfield site.</p>	<p>The need to identify some Green Belt to meeting housing and associated infrastructure needs in the adopted Core Strategy was found to be a sound approach.</p>
<p>NLR 1 (page 158) it is an unsuitable option because of its impact on the landscape to the West of Rayleigh.</p>	<p>This issue has been assessed in detail with the Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options (September 2012) and has been addressed within the Concept Statement.</p>
<p>NLR2 (page 162) access to this site may depend on the redevelopment of the Rawreth Industrial Estate, which is by no means certain.</p>	<p>The potential accessibility issues with Options NLR2 are noted within the assessment.</p>
<p>NLR2 (page 165) this site is quite isolated, which makes it less suitable for development.</p>	<p>The isolation of Options NLR2 is acknowledged within the assessment.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
NLR2 (page 167) the site is likely to be well away from any bus routes.	The less accessible nature of this site to London Road and Rawreth Lane, and subsequently the existing bus routes is acknowledged within the assessment.
NLR3 (page 176) this is the worst of the NLR options because of the loss of the site of the Rayleigh Sports and Social Club.	Whilst the playing field is recommended to be retained within the Updated SA Report (July 2012). It is acknowledged that there is potential to reallocate this facility to the west of the site identified within Policy SER1. The proposed relocation of the playing field is considered further in the Concept Statement.
NLR4 – the cumulative impact on the highway network make NLR4 an unsuitable option.	The potential impact on the highway network has been considered as part of the assessment.
NLR4 – community identity will be harmed. Many residents already living in housing off Rawreth Lane already feel detached from Rayleigh and may not often visit the town centre. NLR4 is even further away from the Town Centre and would disrupt the current very positive community identity of Rawreth.	Any development in the general location ‘North of London Road’ would be well related to the existing residential area of Rayleigh. Opportunities exist for improvements to public transport in particular to connect new development to the town centre.
NLR5 (page 203) the playing field and premises of Rayleigh Sports and Social Club should be protected.	Whilst the playing field is recommended to be retained within the Updated SA Report (July 2012). It is acknowledged that there is potential to reallocate this facility to the west of the site identified within Policy SER1. The proposed relocation of the playing field is considered further in the Concept Statement.
GT1 and GT2 (page 698 and 709) this location has been examined by an inspector on an appeal and found to be unsuitable.	Noted.
GT6 – This site has good transport connections and would seem to be most suitable of the sites listed.	Noted.

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
GT7 – This site is small and unsuitable for this purpose. Infrastructure is poor.	Noted.
Canewdon Parish Council commented that throughout the document there are references to an existing bus service to Ashingdon, which really should be deleted, as it is only once per week. Also references to a Doctor’s Surgery, which has now closed and good access to pubs, whereas we only have 1 pub. The golf course is not in the village itself and private transport is needed to get there. If this is to remain in the report, then perhaps the Wetlands Site at Wallasea should also be mentioned.	Noted. The assessments for Canewdon have been amended as appropriate.
Canewdon Parish Council commented that walking and cycling are mentioned, but the roads are narrow, with no footways and are therefore quite dangerous for walkers and cyclists.	Noted. However, improvements to the local walking and cycling network may be required to accompany development of the site within the general location of South Canewdon. This is considered within the Concept Statement for Policy SER7.
Canewdon Parish Council noted that the Cultural Heritage Statement on pages 486 & 497 differs from that on pages 508 & 520. They questioned whether there is a reason for this and whether they should be combined.	Noted. Whilst both Options SC1 and SC2 are located within the same Historic Environment Character Zone, they are likely to have a varied impact on the Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings due to their different location in relation to these historic assets.
Canewdon Parish Council commented that archaeological digs have been done in the village by Rochford Hundred Field Archaeological Group and their findings may be useful to the report.	Noted.

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Canewdon Parish Council commented that the points made in the report regarding village cohesion and defensible Green Belt boundaries are considered to be well made. The Parish Council can see merit in not allowing development to the south of Anchor Lane or west of the lane leading to St. Nicholas Church, albeit that our preferred option was originally the land to the south of Anchor Lane, east of Scotts Hall Road. However, it is noted that a defensible Green Belt boundary could be defined for this site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that they were pleased to note that the potential ecological value of the site 'Land West of Alexandra Road' has been acknowledged within the Updated SA Report. However, there is no detail on how this would be progressed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The site to the west of Alexandra Road in Great Wakering should be considered as an extension to the adjacent wildlife site designation. The Essex Wildlife Trust also believes that this area should be designated a Local Wildlife site.</p>	<p>Noted. A review of the Local Wildlife Sites was undertaken in 2007 and forms part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework. This document has been used to inform the appraisal of each of the proposed policies and alternative options considered. The potential ecological value of the site has been acknowledged within the Allocations Submission Document.</p>
<p>This site 'Land West of Alexandra Road' gives the Council the opportunity to conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment by preserving this area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Site 7/202 Land South of the High Street – The SHLAA which is being reviewed suggests a reduction in density per hectare of dwellings. As only part of the south boundary abuts the wildlife site and because of the shape of the site it seems excessive to me to reduce the estimated density of the whole site by one third (i.e. reduced from 45 to 30).</p>	<p>Noted, this will be addressed within the SHLAA 2012 Review.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>The density calculations for Star Lane Industrial Estate (north) and the Star Lane Industrial Estate (south, former brickworks) were queried. It was suggested that the actual density per hectare achieved is greater than that used in the SHLAA. Therefore less land may be needed to achieve the number of dwellings required.</p>	<p>Noted, this will be addressed within the SHLAA 2012 Review.</p>
<p>Option LF3 – Great Wakering Leisure Centre – the centre was well supported, and it is needed in the village. The centre is closed and residents must commute elsewhere to exercise or don't take exercise. The existing centre could be demolished and a more sustainable building built in its place. This could be funded by developers. The centre should be designated a Leisure Facility.</p>	<p>Noted. However, as this facility is no longer in use and its future use is uncertain, it was considered appropriate to not allocate this as a leisure facility as detailed within Policy OSL3 of the Allocations Submission Document.</p>
<p>The relationship between the SHLAA and the Allocations SA documents is not very clear. Whilst the SHLAA (section 2.11) makes reference to the Allocations SA, the Allocations documents do not make references to the SHLAA.</p> <p>There is some confusion, as both documents refer to the same areas of land but at significantly different levels of detail and assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. Both the SHLAA and the SA are background documents that inform the development of the Allocations Document.</p> <p>The purpose of the SHLAA is to identify sufficient specific sites for housing in the District for the next 10-15 years. It is not a one-off study – an annual review of the schedule of sites in the SHLAA will be included within each successive AMR.</p> <p>In contrast, the purpose of the SA is to assess the environmental, economic and social implications of policies and options with development plan documents i.e. the each stage of the Allocations Document.</p>
<p>It was questioned which analysis (in the SHLAA or SA) takes precedence when identifying which Green Belt sites are to be allocated for residential housing development.</p>	<p>The identification of sites is based on a wide range of evidence, including the SA and the SHLAA.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Greater clarity of the relationship between the documents is needed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>It is not completely clear what density figure(s) is/are being used in arriving at the Recommendations / Key Observations made in the Updated SA Report, where references tend to be qualitative rather than quantitative. For example in considering the WGW options it is unclear how the SHLAA references to “<i>high density would not be recommended</i>” for those sites which are “<i>in close proximity to Local Wildlife site (R35)</i>” have been dealt with in the Allocations SA.</p> <p>This is particularly confusing given that the Star Lane Brickworks planning application (12/00252/FUL) had a density of 42 dwellings per hectare; this seems at odds with statement referred to above.</p> <p>Greater clarity is required as to what quantitative assumptions have been made regarding dwelling density in arriving at these recommendations.</p>	<p>The Updated SA Report has not considered actual figures <i>per se</i> but has acknowledged as appropriate, where higher density development is likely, given the size of the site proposed.</p> <p>The SHLAA does not set policy. It forms part of the evidence base of the Local Development Framework, alongside other documents that have been used to inform the development of the Allocations DPD.</p>
<p>Concern raised in respect of bullet 11 (page 48), that this adds to the uncertainty about what site will be allocated.</p>	<p>This point recommends that if the options in the document are not considered to be appropriate, for example in density terms, then a combination of options may be taken forward. As such two sites have been identified within the Allocations Submission Document (Policy SER9).</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Paragraph 6.68-6.79 – Suggest that in Recommendations/Key Observations (no 2) explicit reference is made to the Star Lane Brickworks site in addition to the existing reference to the Industrial Estate, especially as these are treated as two separate sites later in the report. It would also reflect the fact that planning application has already been made for the Brickworks whereas the other part of the industrial estate would need re-siting before it could become available for residential development.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the Allocations Submission Document takes into account the potential scenarios for the development of Policy SER9b, and the two sections of the industrial estate. This has been considered within the appraisal of the proposed policies.</p>
<p>The Recommendations/Key Observations (bullet 7; page 48) made in recognition of the ecological and biodiversity value of the site to the west of Alexandra Road (WGW3) are welcome.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The Recommendations/Key Observations (no 8; page 48) recognising of the value of the Local Wildlife Site, the need for careful management of the impacts of all developments in the WGW area (excluding WGW5) are also most welcome. Also the Recommendations/Key Observations page 76 regarding the importance of Local Wildlife Sites are endorsed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The Recommendations/Key Observations (bullet 9; page 48) regarding the need for a green buffer between the Local Wildlife Site and future development is noted. It will be interesting to see how this need for a buffer is interpreted in the case of the site to the west of Alexandra Road (WGW3) as this shares a common boundary with the LWS and already provides a supporting environment to the LWS.</p>	<p>Noted. The Concept Statement for Policy SER9 suggests that a green buffer between the eastern edge of SER9b and the adjacent land ('land west of Alexandra Road') would be beneficial as detailed within the Allocations Submission Document.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Both Option WGW2 and WGW3 require access to Great Wakering High Street. Given the current layout of this area there are limited options to achieve this access. In the case of the site to the west of Alexandra Road (WGW3) this could only be through Exhibition Lane. The Lane is completely inadequate for such use, and this would put at risk the character and buildings of the Lane. It is suggested that an explicit Recommendation/ Key Observation be made drawing attention to this aspect.</p>	<p>Detailed assessments have been undertaken of all the sites in the Discussion and Consultation Document, as well as those submitted through the 'Call for Sites' that conform to the Core Strategy. These are contained in the Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options (September 2012) document which forms part of the evidence base for the Allocations Document.</p> <p>Access has been addressed within the Concept Statement for Policy SER9.</p>
<p>Option E9 Star Lane Brickworks – It is suggested that an extra bullet point be inserted in this section (paragraph 6.122) to acknowledge that a planning application has already been submitted for this site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The Updated SA Report (paragraph 6.68) refers to the short-term detrimental effects of development on communities. However, the development proposed to the west and south of Great Wakering (residential and employment) is unlikely to be 'short-term' development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>It is noted that throughout the document reference is made to the need to "carefully consider" the cumulative impact of developments on WGW options and Great Wakering village. Clarification is required as to what practical form this consideration will take.</p>	<p>This issue is considered further within the Allocations Submission Document and SA.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Section 9 'Conclusion and Next Steps' really does not present any firm details or proposals as to how the impact and implications of this proposed scale of development in Great Wakering and the cumulative impact of development on the community will be monitored and managed by the Council. This section should provide much greater clarity in respect of this.</p>	<p>An implementation, delivery and monitoring section has been included within the Allocations Submission Document.</p>
<p>Questions were raised in previous representations in regard to matter of due process. Those questions remain unanswered and unjustified by RDC to date. We would appreciate confirmation therefore from RDC as to whether the issues raised have been taken into account as part of the SA process.</p>	<p>Issues raised during the previous consultation on the SA (in January/February 2012) have been addressed within the Updated SA Report (Appendix 12).</p>
<p>A number of matters raised have referred to the content of, or context provided by, Appendix 1 of the Allocations DPD Discussion and Consultation Document. It is clearly relevant to refer to information contained within the document to which the SA relates. In this instance, it appears that the distance of time between the two documents is the principal matter of concern rather than the efforts of consultees to reference comments between the two documents. Had the two documents accompanied each other, such matters could indeed have been raised at the same time.</p>	<p>The Updated SA Report assessed the options within the Discussion and Consultation Document, as opposed to the Appendix 1 of the Discussion and Consultation Document which provided an assessment of the sites that were put forward for consideration through the 'Call for Sites'. Comments in relation to Appendix 1 should have been raised during the initial 2010 consultation, or the later July/August 2012 consultation when both documents were considered together.</p>
<p>The continued deference to the matters considered during the preparation of the Core Strategy should be treated with caution prior to the judgement on the soundness of the Core Strategy. This judgement will have significant implications for the Allocations DPD and its accompanying Sustainability Appraisals (SA).</p>	<p>On 21 September 2012 the Judge ruled in favour of Rochford District Council.</p>

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>The delay between the production of the Discussion and Consultation Document in 2010 and the publication of the draft SA in January 2012 fails to accord with the requirements of the SEA Directive for it to accompany the plan and for it to be carried out during the preparation of the plan – in this case the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document.</p> <p>Consultees have been deprived of an early and effective opportunity within appropriate timeframes to express an opinion on the plan and accompanying SA.</p> <p>The publication of a further SA six months later does nothing to improve the ability of the SA to address the requirements of the SEA Directive.</p>	<p>SA is an iterative process, and the results of the SA work undertaken has been integrated into the development of the final document. The previous SA acknowledged the delay between the publication of Discussion and Consultation Document in 2010, and the publication of the draft SA in January 2012. It recommended that stakeholders should be provided with an additional opportunity to comment on the finalised Updated SA and the Discussion and Consultation Document together. Consequently an additional consultation (to which these comments have been submitted) has been undertaken.</p> <p>How the recommendations within the Updated SA Report (July 2012) have been integrated into the preparation of the Allocations Submission Document are detailed within Appendix 12 of this report.</p> <p>A 'Critical friend/ compliance review of <i>Rochford Allocations DPD: Discussion & consultation document Sustainability Appraisal</i>' was undertaken by Enfusion for the initial SA to assess whether it met the requirements of the SEA Directive and whether it is in accordance with current guidance. A copy of this for the Updated SA Report (July 2012) for the Discussion and Consultation Document can be found in Appendix 14.</p>

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>RDC has also considered a paper on the potential routes available to extend the life of the Core Strategy by rolling it forward to cover a period of at least 15 years. It is significant that the preferred route, whilst being accepted by officers as failing to address the requirements of the NPPF, will pursue the designation of further land within the broad locations for growth for future development. The effect of this decision is such that future growth beyond 600 dwellings in West Rochford can be expected to come forward.</p>	<p>An early review of the Core Strategy (predominantly Policy H3) was agreed with the Inspector who conducted the examination into the soundness of the document.</p> <p>In addition the Core Strategy and the Allocations Submission Document are flexible to enable development to be brought forward in the plan period, if necessary.</p>
<p>Emphasis is placed on the importance of public transport connectivity between land to the west of Rochford and Southend. There is concern that development in West Rochford would undermine the role of Rochford. The SA appears to support this assumption (i.e. that the future residential of any development to the west of Rochford will look to Southend to satisfy their employment and recreational/shopping needs).</p> <p>This raises concerns regarding the sustainability of the proposed general location, it adds to the notional merging of the two settlements as RDC clearly expects future residential to travel west away from Rochford rather than look to the town centre to meet their needs.</p>	<p>The sustainability of the general location of West Rochford has been addressed through the preparation of the adopted Core Strategy. The Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document identified four alternative options with differing relationships to the existing residential area, and the services and facilities within the town centre, as well as the train station and bus routes along West Street and Ashingdon Road. Consequently a site has been proposed within the Submission Document (Policy SER2).</p> <p>Emphasis is not considered to be greatly placed on the connection between Rochford and Southend. The adopted Core Strategy recognises the relationship between different parts of the District and neighbouring local authority areas (see page 34 of the adopted Core Strategy). In this case, Rochford has links with the neighbouring area of Southend, and the appraisal acknowledges that there is potential for the creation of a “bus service heading west from the site, towards the main routes into Southend and to proposed employment growth at Southend Airport.” (page 221; Updated SA Report July 2012).</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
	The Updated SA does not support this assumption that development would undermine the role of Rochford. It simply acknowledges the relationship between Rochford, Southend and London Southend Airport, and seeks to ensure that sustainable transport provision is available in this location.
There was a failure to consult key stakeholders on the scope of the SA.	The statutory consultees were consulted on both the scope of the overarching LDF scoping report as well as the scope of the SA as set out in the report.
There is a lack of transparency as to the manner in which stakeholder opinion on the issues raised during the consultation on the Allocations DPD have been taken into account during its preparation.	This will be detailed within Consultation Statement prior to submission of the Allocations Submission Document to the government for independent examination.
Description of the effects of the proposals set out within the SA fail to address matters of magnitude, timescale, permanence, probability and nature (i.e. secondary, cumulative and/or synergistic).	These have been appropriately addressed within the Updated SA (July 2012), as confirmed by the compliance review. These have also been addressed within this report, in accordance with the SEA Directive.
Inconsistencies in the comparative assessment of the different allocations considered.	The assessments are not considered to be inconsistent.
RDC has failed to provide for a high level of protection or the environment in undertaking the SA and has failed to sufficiently integrate environmental considerations into the preparation of the Allocations DPD.	The Updated SA (July 2012) has considered the environmental, economic and social implications of the options included in the Discussion and Consultation Document, and has also considered additional alternative options suggested through consultation on the DPD. The Updated SA (July 2012) is supported by a compliance review (Appendix 14).

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>There is concern as to whether the SA of the Allocations has been an integral part of the plan-making process that is transparent and open to public participation.</p>	<p>The SA is an iterative process and has been used, alongside the wider evidence base, to inform the development of the Allocations Submission Document.</p>
<p>Identified spatial options proposed in regard to West Great Wakering have not been logically produced. Some Options (specifically WGW2, WGW3 and WGW4) relate to land parcels which have no spatial relevance to one another. In response to previous comments, RDC have responded that they were drawn up having regard to the need to accommodate the <i>‘dwelling and infrastructure requirements of the RDC Core Strategy’</i> (Source: p.1586, Appendix 12- Summary of responses to SA Consultation).</p> <p>However, infrastructure requirements are often specific to the needs of individual development proposals, and are best reflected in how individual sites might meet the future sustainable development needs of local communities.</p> <p>In terms of meeting the strategic housing requirement, it is evident that any identified shortfall in dwelling numbers arising from WGW2 can be met through the delivery of additional housing on land formed by WGW5 or potentially other sites within Great Wakering, without the need to use Green Belt land south of the High Street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The response quoted from Appendix 12 of the Updated SA (July 2012) relates to the specific infrastructure requirements to accompany development in the general location of West Great Wakering set out in Appendix 1 of the adopted Core Strategy. These include public open space, play space, youth facilities and community facilities.</p> <p>The Updated SA recommended/observed that “If an option may not be able to accommodate the number of dwellings at an appropriate density then an allocation comprising parts of options presented at the Discussion and Consultation stage (as opposed to one of the options in its entirety) may be preferable. In this case, ecological protection may need to be weighed against landscape protection.” (bullet 11 page 48; Updated SA July 2012). Consequently a policy consisting of two sites has been identified for the general location of West Great Wakering (Policy SER9).</p>

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>The updated SA Consultation fails to recognise the benefits of land west of Little Wakering Road, West Great Wakering and how the site might meet the future sustainable growth and development needs of West Great Wakering. The site is immediately available and has the potential to accommodate a range of alternative uses as well as housing, including elderly car accommodation.</p>	<p>Disagree. The assessment acknowledged that Option WGW5, alongside Option WGW1, performed strongly against the sustainability objectives. Specifically it noted that 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.” (bullet 1 page 47 Updated SA July 2012). However, concern was expressed with regard to the extension of the site westwards. Consequently a policy consisting of two sites has been identified for the general location of West Great Wakering (Policy SER9).</p>
<p>The updated SA assessment of ALT9- Land West of Purdey’s Industrial Estate fails to recognise the benefits which the site can bring in terms of the delivery of new employment land to meet the authority’s future employment needs, combined with new infrastructure to serve the town as a whole.</p> <p>The site has the potential to accommodate displaced businesses in addition to other start-up employment uses, through which to support economic growth and activity at a local level.</p>	<p>Disagree. The assessment recognises that the site has the potential to provide additional employment land, but also notes that this site is not located within one of the general locations for new employment land in the Core Strategy (west of Rayleigh, south of Great Wakering and north of London Southend Airport). Previous representations on this assessment have acknowledged that the site can provide employment provision.</p> <p>Noted. However, it should be noted that the Allocations DPD is required to conform to the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy identifies areas for employment growth, including areas where existing Green Belt land will be allocated for employment purposes. The allocation of this site would not accord with the adopted Core Strategy.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>The provision of new highways infrastructure may not only facilitate the diversion of Heavy Goods Vehicles away from established residential areas, but could ease traffic flows, whilst delivering broader network capacity improvements.</p>	<p>The assessment has been amended following previous representations on the potential to redirect heavy goods vehicle movements away from Southend Road (page 1550 of the Updated SA). Improvements to the highway network in this location are being explored through the preparation of the Joint Area Action Plan.</p>
<p>The representations submitted to the Allocations Development Plan Document: Discussion and Consultation Document in April 2010 in relation to land at Hambro Hill, Rayleigh (Site 194) remain relevant and valid, and will, as understood, continue to be taken into account. The availability and suggested benefits of the site located to the north east of Rayleigh were reiterated.</p>	<p>Noted. This site is not situated within one of the general locations identified in the adopted Core Strategy (as set out in the Site Screening Report September 2012). It has therefore not been considered further in the development of the Allocations Document.</p>
<p>Option NLR5 should be given significant weight in view of its performance against the sustainability objectives.</p>	<p>The Updated SA Report acknowledges that Option NLR5 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. A site similar to Option NLR5 has been identified within Policy SER1.</p>
<p>It was questioned why Rawreth Industrial Estate must be redeveloped for housing in order for NLR1, 4 or 5 to be acceptable. Whilst this consultation document describes it as a bad neighbour to the housing which it currently adjoins, there could be scope for a mix of housing and alternative employment within its boundaries, so that it could continue to provide some employment opportunities, thus reducing the distance to travel to work for some local residents. With a suitable landscape/visual buffer to its western boundary, it need not be an impediment to those NLR Options. Only NLR2 would appear to be reliant on its redevelopment to link with the existing community.</p>	<p>The principle of reallocating Rawreth Industrial Estate for residential use is included within the adopted Core Strategy (Policy H1 and ED3) which was subject to independent examination. The approach within the Core Strategy was found to be sound.</p> <p>The industrial estate is currently allocated an AQMA, and there are a number of heavy industrial uses on site which are not considered to be compatible with the surrounding residential uses. The Concept Statement has/will? Taken into account different scenarios and potential mitigation measures for the phasing of development, for example if development to the north of London Road precedes that on Rawreth Industrial Estate.</p>

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
Cohesive development would be assisted more if the Timber Grove land, including its Green Belt element, and the adjoining land, were included in the Residential Development Area 'NLR'.	This area of land has been included within the site to the North of London Road, Rayleigh (Policy SER1).
The Timber Grove care home is a valuable community facility, the preservation of which should be assisted by the Council, via the grant of planning permission for enabling development comprising housing.	<p>The community facilities, including the care home, are not proposed to be reallocated within the Allocations Submission Document. Community facilities will continue to be protected through Policy CLT6 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Planning applications are determined through the development management process.</p>
Option NLR1 (Objective 1; Question 2; Page 149) – Access to 50 dwellings could be via Timber Grove, London Road, if that is redeveloped for Care Home and housing also.	Noted. This site has been subject to a planning application (12/00279/FUL) which was refused by notice of 9 October 2012.
The allocation of Timber Grove, including the Green Belt land to the north, would have sustainability benefits for Options NLR1-5, for example through linking NLR1, NLR2 and NLR5 to London Road and the former Eon site, creating a defensible boundary, opportunity to create pedestrian and cycle links.	Noted.
Option NLR2 (Objective 1; Question 2; Page 162) – The wider regeneration benefits of NLR2 would appear low, given its need for connection through existing residential streets and the redeveloped Rawreth Industrial Estate.	Noted.
Option NLR3 (Objective 1; Question 1; Page 176) – Agree that NLR3 satisfies this objective very well. The loss of the playing field could easily be mitigated.	Noted.

Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Option NLR3 (Objective 1; Question 2; Page 176) – With residential redevelopment of the former Eon site under way, if the Timber Grove site between the Eon site and NLR3 is redeveloped for housing also, NLR3 would not be isolated from the existing residential environment. Therefore it would promote regeneration and enhancement of the existing community, by creating a new residential entrance to town.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The representations submitted to the Allocations Development Plan Document: Discussion and Consultation Document in April 2010 in relation to land at Canewdon (Site 193) remain relevant and valid, and will, as understood, continue to be taken into account.</p> <p>The availability and suggested benefits of the site located to the south west of Rayleigh were reiterated.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Landscape and visual appraisal (Site 193) – The Appraisal suggests that development should be restricted to the lower half of the site, where building heights should be predominantly two storeys. The upper part would include a new area of open space respecting views of the Church tower and the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Highways, Drainage and Utilities Statement (Site 193) – Information provided including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that a new access has been agreed in principle with Essex County Council highways to connect Lark Hill Road via a simple ‘T’ junction approximately 55m west of Church Lane; 	<p>Noted.</p>

Issues Raised	Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the site is within walking distance to local services and is also accessible by bus, with bus stops located a short distance from this site; - there is scope to provide a new footway along Lark Hill Road; - the Environment Agency has confirmed that the site falls within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at low risk of flooding; - a SUDs strategy can be devised and potentially include the provision of off-line detention basins; - Essex and Suffolk Water has confirmed that the existing water supply distribution main is capable of serving the proposed development; and - Gas distribution mains are in close proximity to the site. 	
<p>Masterplanning for Site 193 demonstrates that a range of house types in terms of tenure and affordability can be accommodated on the site, a concern which was raised at page 41, section 6.48 of the Updated Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Site 193 is sensitive in landscape terms. The plans clearly show the original area of land submitted to Rochford has diminished in size quite significantly and tapers off towards the Church.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>In consultation with the Highways Authority it has been agreed that access to Site 193 should be provided off Lark Hill Road with footpaths and an area of public open space proposed to link to the existing footpath network.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Option WGW3 includes three separate and unrelated plots. It is misleading to assess SA objectives collectively under WGW3 when each plot exhibits different locational and other planning characteristics.</p> <p>One of the three plots comprises land to the west of Alexandra Road. This plot has a good relationship with the existing built-up area of Great Wakering, and is located closer to existing village services on the High Street than any other WGW option. It is therefore incorrect to assert in relation to this plot, under SA Objective 4, that this option is not well related to the High Street, and that local services would be less accessible than for other options.</p> <p>The plot is also capable of providing a defensible Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, due to its visual containment, development in this location would not harmfully extend the developed envelope of the village in landscape quality terms. This contrasts strongly with the damage to Green Belt openness and rural character which would result from development at WGW2, WGW4 (also part of WGW3) and WGW5.</p>	<p>The land to the west of Alexandra Road has been identified as being potentially of ecological value, and the recommendations in the Updated SA Report have been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>This site has not been included within the proposed sites in the general location to the West of Great Wakering (Policy SER9).</p>

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>The brickworks site (Option E9 southern section of Industrial Estate) is a substantial brownfield plot which forms the larger part of the Core Strategy (Policy H1) re-allocation of the 'Star Lane Industrial Estate'. It is not accepted that the development of the brickworks site for housing purposes could reasonably be described as 'piecemeal' in the event that the existing industrial land to the north does not come forward for housing. The latter is unlikely in the short-term due to multiple ownership and operational issues. Residential development of the brickworks site is not dependent upon any future housing scheme for the industrial land, and offers wide ranging sustainability benefits.</p>	<p>Policy BFR1 in the Allocations Submission Document recognises the different characteristics of the northern and southern sections of the industrial estate. The Concept Statement for development of the industrial estate and residential development in West Great Wakering take into account potential scenarios for development in this location.</p>
<p>Residential use of the vacant and derelict brickworks site would provide regeneration and local visual enhancement, and would make beneficial use of a brownfield asset which is located within the general location of West Great Wakering where new housing development is deemed to be appropriate. Other specific sustainability and community need issues related to this site are identified within the Core Strategy, and are currently being addressed at development management stage. As the SA Report confirms, pedestrian links from the brickworks site to the centre of the settlement are provided via the existing footway/footpath network. These links can be enhanced irrespective of whether the existing industrial estate site to the north comes forward.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>The key observations of the SA are supported. The brickworks site performs strongly against the SA's objectives within the context of being allocated for residential use. In particular, it would positively impact on the balanced communities, housing, landscape, and land & soil objectives of the SA.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>It was previously suggested that none of the 5 suggested options for residential development north of London Road would be suitable to meet the dwelling and infrastructure requirements for this general location. It was also commented that an employment allocation north of London Road, as part of a comprehensive mixed-use development, would have sustainability benefits.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>It is noted that in the Updated SA, the 5 previously suggested options for residential development are still assessed separately, but it is noted and welcomed that the new recommendation 6 on the bottom of page 32 recognises that a site made up of parts of the previously presented options may be preferable to selection of one of the original options in its entirety.</p>	

Issues Raised	Responses
<p>Key recommendations/observations (page 32), Point 1 and 5 are inconsistent with each other. Point 1 appears to support Option NLP5 on the basis that it could provide a north-south public transport route, whereas point 5 supports the retention of the playing fields which would make point 1 impossible in this configuration.</p>	<p>The previous assessment recognised that the existing playing field is an important local facility which is accessible to the general location. Appendix 12 also noted that representations were received during the consultation on the Discussion and Consultation Document opposing the inclusion of this facility within the options 'North of London Road'. Consequently the Updated SA Report suggested that "The existing playing field to the south of the site is an established community facility which should be retained." (Recommendation/Key Observations 5; page 32). However, to enhance the inclusiveness of the site identified, and given that playing fields are an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt, it is proposed that this facility be relocated to the west of the site on a like for like basis.</p>
<p>Key recommendations/observations (page 32), Point 2 states that cohesive development at west Rayleigh would be dependent upon the reallocation and redevelopment of Rawreth Industrial Estate. With appropriate mitigation, development is not dependent upon redevelopment of Rawreth Industrial Estate. If the Estate is redeveloped at some point in the future, then equally the Masterplan would not preclude this, and the layout of the site can take account of this eventuality.</p>	<p>Noted. The Concept Statement takes into account potential different scenarios for the site to the north of London Road and Rawreth Industrial Estate.</p>
<p>Key recommendations/observations (page 32), Point 3, the easiest way to ensure that development of residential and employment land is co-ordinated and makes best use of available infrastructure is to incorporate the London Road employment allocation within a mixed-use development to the north of the road.</p>	<p>New employment land to the south of London Road has been identified in accordance with the Core Strategy. This is considered to be well related to proposed new residential development to the north of London Road. Additionally the Concept Statement proposes the development of small-scale neighbourhood shops within the residential allocation.</p>

Issues Raised	Responses
Key recommendations/observations (page 32), Point 4, we agree with the finding that residential development can be accommodated in a manner that avoids areas at risk of flooding.	Noted.
The Updated SA at pages 69-72 includes a discussion of the different options E13-E18, and the inference from paragraphs 6.169-6.170 is that the preference is to use E18 for relocation of uses from Rawreth Industrial Estate, and that E13 is favoured in terms of providing an element of office/light industrial use, presumably to meet the 2 ha requirement in the Core Strategy.	The Allocations Submission Document proposes to relocate the heavier industrial uses present on Rawreth Industrial Estate to an alternative location to the west of the A1245 as identified within Policy NEL2. Light industrial and office uses (including an additional 2 hectares for office use) are proposed to the south of London Road as identified within Policy NEL1.
Although noting that the site is previously developed land, the SA doesn't appear to contain any recognition that E13 is an existing employment site, and therefore redevelopment also includes the loss of existing employment land.	The assessment acknowledges (page 851) that this option, if allocated, could result in a loss of some local employment. However, it would not result in a loss of employment land as it is not designated as such.
Although E13 is previously developed, the existing uses are relatively low key in nature in terms of comprising principally single storey structures and open parking and storage areas. The intensification of use through redevelopment would create a largely isolated enclave of development in the Green Belt.	The proposed allocation of employment land to the south of London Road does not seek to affect the existing uses, but seeks to formalise the existing uses for employment. However, it proposes additional land to the east and west to accommodate light industrial and office uses.

Appendix 14 – Compliance Review of the Updated SA (July 2012) – Prepared by Enfusion

**Critical friend/ compliance review of
*Rochford Allocations DPD: Discussion &
consultation document Sustainability Appraisal***

**By Enfusion Ltd for
ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL**

July 2012



CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

2 RECOMMENDATIONS & CONCLUSIONS

Table 1: COMPLIANCE & QUALITY ASSURANCE REVIEW

<i>date:</i>	<i>V 1.0 March 2012 V2.0 July 2012</i>
<i>prepared for:</i>	<i>Rochford District Council</i>
<i>prepared by:</i>	<i>Toney Hallahan</i>
<i>quality assurance:</i>	<i>Barbara Carroll</i>

1. Introduction

- 1.1 In March 2012 Enfusion was commissioned to undertake a compliance review and independent assessment of the SA work undertaken by Rochford District Council for its Allocations DPD Discussion and Consultation Document. This report details the findings of the review of the SA report, titled: *Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document: Discussion and Consultation Document – Sustainability Appraisal*.
- 1.2 The compliance review considered whether the work meets the requirements of the SEA Directive and whether it is in accordance with current guidance¹.
- 1.3 Following the initial compliance review in March 2012, Council Officers have taken forward the recommendations of the review; subsequently revising the SA report- ready for consultation in July 2012. The report will be available on the Council's website at:
http://www.rochford.gov.uk/PDF/planningpolicy_allocations_sa.pdf.
- 1.4 This compliance report has been updated to consider the changes made to the SA report since Enfusion's earlier (March 2012) review.

2. Recommendations & conclusions

- 2.1 The initial compliance review found that the work undertaken to date, for the most part, met the requirements of the SEA Directive and current guidance and provided a thorough and detailed review of the alternatives available to plan-makers in developing the allocations DPD. The main report is clear and appropriately refers to the further detailed appraisal work available in the appendices.
- 2.2 Whilst a number of areas of non-compliance were highlighted to the Council Officers, this was generally due to the current, early stage in the SA process; these areas of non-compliance (e.g. outlining which alternatives were selected or rejected in decision-making) will need to be addressed through the production of the final SA or Environmental Report, and could not be expected to be addressed at this current early stage of development.

■ ¹ ODPM 2005 A Practical Guide to the SEA Directive :
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/practicalguidesea>

■ Plan Making Manual produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (available at: www.pas.gov.uk/planmakingmanual).

■ PAS 2010 Sustainability Appraisal Advice Note <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/aio/627078>

2.3 Other deficiencies in the current Discussion and Consultation Document SA were considered to be of a relatively minor nature, and have since been remedied by Officers in the draft consultation SA report. This will help to ensure both compliance and the following of good practice SA/SEA.

Specifically:

- The purpose of the plan and its objectives has now been described in the SA report.
- The requirements of the SEA Directive and how they have been met has been signposted in Appendix 1. (Note: SA Framework objectives should be clearly linked to the SEA topics, as per Enfusion's track changes 13 July).
- A compatibility analysis of plan and SA/SEA objectives has been included at Appendix 2.
- Technical, procedural and other difficulties encountered, assumptions and uncertainties have been made explicit in section 5 of the report.
- Short, medium and long term effects, temporary and permanent effects are considered throughout the report.
- A Non-Technical Summary has been included and can be updated for the final SA Report.
- Reference to the Habitats Regulations Assessment work undertaken to date has been included and should be updated in the final SA report, including discussion of findings.

2.4 Of key importance, the final SA report should include the following further information:

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

2.5 Table 1 below contains the updated compliance review undertaken in July 2012, after Enfusion's original recommendations were adopted.

Table 1: Detailed Compliance review of Discussion & Consultation SA Report with SEA Directive and good practice

		Requirements of SEA Directive	Compliance	Reference to Rochford Allocations DPD Discussion & Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal *Denotes non-compliance, but where compliance can be met through completion of the final SA report.
	Objectives and Context			
1	The plan's or programme's purpose and objectives are made clear.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)a	Yes	Detailed in section 1 of the SA Report.
2	Sustainability/environmental issues and constraints, including international and EC protection objectives, are considered in developing objectives and targets.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)e	Yes	The SA Framework has been derived from a review of the plans and programmes and strategic analysis of the baseline information. Refer to para 6.37 of the SA Report. Refer also to 6.27 for discussion of International and European objectives.
3	SA/SEA objectives, where used, are clearly set out and linked to indicators and targets where appropriate.		Yes	Section 4 of the SA report includes the SA framework of objectives (Table 3). A new section 17 on implementation and monitoring clearly sets out indicators and targets.
4	Links with other related plans, programmes and policies are identified and explained.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)a	Yes	Section 4, para 6.27-6.30 illustrate these links and where relevant linkages are also made in the appraisals. The report also refers readers to the SA of the Core Strategy for further detail.

5	Conflicts that exist between SA/SEA objectives, between SA/SEA and plan objectives, and between SA/SEA and other plan objectives are identified and described.		Yes	Compatibility analysis, including conflicts is now provided at Appendix 2 of the SA Report.
Scoping				
6	Consultation bodies are consulted in appropriate ways and at appropriate times on the content and scope of the Environmental Report.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 6.1 & 6.2	Yes	Refer to Section 4, Task A4 for information on consultation with Statutory Authorities.
7	The assessment focuses on significant issues.		Yes	The SA Framework was drafted to ensure that significant issues are addressed in the appraisal. The detailed appraisals and summaries clearly illustrate how key significant issues such as flood risk, transport and landscape have been considered.
8	Technical, procedural and other difficulties encountered are discussed; assumptions and uncertainties are made explicit.		Yes	Identified where relevant throughout the SA report (e.g. in appraisal matrices) and summarised in new section on uncertainties and assumptions in Section 5 of the SA report.
9	Reasons are given for eliminating issues from further consideration.		N/A	No issues were eliminated. This is typical for SAs of spatial plans as all issues are often considered to be relevant.
Alternatives				

10	Realistic alternatives are considered for key issues, and the reasons for choosing them are documented.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)h	No*	<p>The Discussion and Consultation version of the DPD specifies potential site allocation options for general locations for development having regard to the proposals and areas set out in the Core Strategy Document. For the purposes of SA, any options that were not in conformity with the Core Strategy would not be considered to be realistic alternatives. This approach is consistent with Government advice on the tiering of SA.</p> <p>Section 4 Task A4 of the SA Report detail the various alternatives considered and reasons why these alternatives have been considered.</p> <p>The reasons for selecting or rejecting alternatives will need to be given in the final SA report produced once decisions have been made about which sites are being taken forward.</p>
11	Alternatives include 'do minimum' and/or 'business as usual' scenarios wherever relevant.		Yes	<p>The 'do minimum' or 'business as usual' scenario (i.e. to not prepare the Allocations Document) is not considered relevant as it would result in the inability to deliver the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the appraisal has been undertaken against the existing baseline conditions and trends, which effectively constitutes a business as usual approach.</p> <p>This is explained in the SA report, Section 5, Task B2 (para 6.300</p>
12	The sustainability/ environmental effects (both adverse and beneficial) of each alternative are identified and compared.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)b	Yes	The adverse and beneficial effects of each alternative are detailed in the appendices to the Discussion and Consultation SA Report.
13	Inconsistencies between the alternatives and other relevant plans,		Yes	Where relevant, any inconsistencies are described in the appraisal matrices.

	programmes or policies are identified and explained.			
14	Reasons are given for selection or elimination of alternatives.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)h	No*	The sustainability performance of the options is described in the SA Report. The reasoning for selection and elimination of strategic alternatives will need to be included in the final SA report, which is the appropriate place to do this.
Baseline information				
15	Relevant aspects of the current state of the environment/sustainability and their likely evolution without the plan are described.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)b	Yes	Section 4, Task A2 of the report refers to the Baseline, produced annually by Essex County Council, which contains this information.
16	Environmental/sustainability characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected are described, including areas wider than the physical boundary of the plan area where it is likely to be affected by the plan.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)c & Article 5(1)d	Yes	Where relevant and available, information regarding particular areas has been included in the Baseline, produced annually by Essex County Council.
17	Difficulties such as deficiencies in information or methods are explained.		Yes	Uncertainties and difficulties are described in the appraisal matrices, and summarised in a new section on uncertainties and assumptions in Section 5.
Prediction and evaluation of likely significant environmental effects				
18	Effects identified include the types listed in the Directive (biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climate factors, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape), as	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)f	Yes	Relevant sustainability topics addressed in the SA Framework, however the correlation with SEA topics should be made clear in the framework.

	relevant; other likely environmental/sustainability effects are also covered, as appropriate.			
19	Both positive and negative effects are considered, the duration of effects (short, medium or long-term), and temporary/permanent effects are addressed.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)f	Yes?	Positive and negative effects are detailed in the appraisal matrices. Short, medium and long term effects, temporary and permanent effects are considered throughout the SA report and also in the conclusion.
20	Likely secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects are identified where practicable.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)f	Yes	Cumulative impacts are considered, in the options appraisal, as relevant. This will be more relevant in the SA of the final plan, where the cumulative impacts of all the selected sites should be considered.
21	Inter-relationships between effects are considered where practicable.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)f	Yes	Where relevant these are outlined in the appraisal matrices. As above, this may also be more relevant to the final SA report.
22	The prediction and evaluation of effects makes use of relevant accepted standards, regulations, and thresholds.		Yes	These are referred to in the appraisal matrices , where relevant, however due to the high level nature of the appraisal, this is not always appropriate.
23	Methods used to evaluate the effects are described.		Yes	The appraisal methods are described in section 5 of the Discussion and Consultation SA Report
Mitigation measures				

24	Measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the plan or programme are indicated.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5(1)g	Yes	At this stage of the Allocations DPD, the sustainability effects of the different options have been assessed comparatively against each other to identify the most sustainable option. Potential mitigation measures to offset adverse effect have been explored, but this will need to be further considered in the final SA report.
24	Issues to be taken into account in project consents are identified.		Yes	Yes, where appropriate, and should also be a consideration for the final SA report.
The Environmental Report				
25	<p>The final Environmental report is also known as the SA report, and is yet to be produced by the Council. However, the current draft has progressed as many of the following requirements as is possible at this stage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be clear and concise in its layout and presentation. Yes ▪ Use simple, clear language and avoids or explains technical terms. Yes ▪ Use maps and other illustrations where appropriate. Yes (refer to the SEA Baseline) ▪ Explain the methodology used. Yes, sections 4 & 5 ▪ Explain who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used. Yes discussed throughout report- especially in Section 7. ▪ Identify sources of information, including expert judgement and matters of opinion. Yes ▪ Contain a non-technical summary (NTS) covering the overall approach to the SA/SEA, the objectives of the plan, the main options considered, and any changes to the plan resulting from the SEA. Yes (and to be updated for final SA report) 			
Consultation				
32	The SA/SEA is consulted on as an integral part of the plan-making process.		Yes	The SA has been consulted on as an iterative and ongoing process – and integral to the plan-making process. Discussed throughout report- and especially in Section 7.
33	Consultation Bodies and the public likely to be affected by, or having an	Directive 2001/42/EC	Yes	Statutory and public consultation has been undertaken according to statutory timeframes i.e. 5 weeks for SA scoping with statutory

	interest in, the plan or programme are consulted in ways and at times which give them an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinions on the draft plan and Environmental Report.	Article 6.1 & 6.2		consultees; at least 6 weeks for this discussion and consultation stage.
Decision-making and information on the decision				
34	The environmental report and the opinions of those consulted are taken into account in finalising and adopting the plan or programme.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 8	?	This will become evident at the next stage of assessment. Refer also Appendix 12.
35	An explanation is given of how they have been taken into account.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 9 (1) b	Yes	Refer Appendix 12, consultation responses to date.
36	Reasons are given for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of other reasonable alternatives considered.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 9 (1) b	No*	Reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted will need to be outlined in the final SA report.
Monitoring measures				
37	Measures proposed for monitoring are clear, practicable and linked to the indicators and objectives used in the SEA.	Directive 2001/42/EC Article 5 (1) i	Yes	Refer to Section 8 Implementation and Monitoring of the SA Report.
38	Monitoring is used, where appropriate, during implementation of the plan or programme to make good deficiencies	Directive 2001/42/EC	N/A	This will be an ongoing process after adoption of the plan through the Annual Monitoring Review.

	in baseline information in the SEA.	Article 10		
39	Monitoring enables unforeseen adverse effects to be identified at an early stage. (These effects may include predictions which prove to be incorrect.)		N/A	As above.
40	Proposals are made for action in response to significant adverse effects.		N/A	As above.
Appraisal of Significant Changes & SEA Statement				
This should be considered in further detail in the final SA Report				

Appendix 15 – Addendum to Sustainability Appraisal

The draft Allocations Submission Document was presented to Members at Full Council on 27 November 2012. Members agreed the document for pre-submission consultation provided that the site identified for residential development in the general location of West Hockley was amended to exclude greenfield land to the east (Policy SER3).

The site identified in the consultation document (November 2012) therefore includes a slightly smaller area than previously assessed within Appendix 4. This revised site would still have the capacity to accommodate the dwelling and infrastructure requirements in this general location as set out in the adopted Core Strategy, and as such, this change is not considered to have a significant impact on the SA objectives for Policy SER3.



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