

## Local Development Framework

# Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Evidence Base Document)



**LDF**  
Evidence Base

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

## **Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
1 Introduction .....	5
2 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology.....	9
3 Preparation of the Allocations DPD and SA Report .....	11
4 Allocations SA Scoping Process .....	12
Task A1: Reviewing Relevant Plans, Policies and Programmes .....	12
Task A2: Collecting Baseline Information.....	13
Task A3: Identifying the Sustainability Issues and the Appraisal Objectives .....	14
Task A4: Considering Options and Alternatives .....	14
Task A5: Developing the SA Framework.....	16
Task A6: Consultation on Scope of the Allocations DPD SA.....	17
5 Developing and Refining Policies and Assessing Effects.....	29
Task B1: Testing the DPD Objectives against the SA Framework .....	29
Task B2: Developing the DPD Policies .....	30
Task B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD .....	35
Task B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD .....	36
Task B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects.....	36
Task B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD .....	37
6 Sustainability Appraisal – Matrices and Summaries.....	38
7 Consultation on the Allocations DPD and the SA Report.....	73
8 How the Plan has Incorporated SA Recommendations .....	74
9 Implementation and Monitoring .....	75
10 Conclusion and Next Steps.....	81

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Statement on Compliance with the SEA Directive and Regulations .....	82
Appendix 2 – SA of Core Strategy Vision and Objectives.....	84
Appendix 3 – Brownfield Residential Land Allocations.....	89
Appendix 4 – Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations.....	90
Appendix 5 – Gypsy and Traveller Allocations.....	401

## **Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report**

---

Appendix 6 – Existing Employment Land Allocations .....	431
Appendix 7 – New Employment Land Allocations.....	432
Appendix 8 – Ecological and Landscape Allocations .....	492
Appendix 9 – Educational Land Allocations .....	494
Appendix 10 – Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations.....	505
Appendix 11 – Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations .....	506
Appendix 12 – Allocations Policy Progression.....	539
Appendix 13 – Summary of Responses to Consultation on the Updated SA and the Discussion and Consultation Document .....	573
Appendix 14 – Compliance Review of the Updated SA (July 2012) – Prepared by Enfusion .....	604
Appendix 15 – Addendum to Sustainability Appraisal.....	615

## **1 Introduction**

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

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

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

- 1.6 In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Allocations DPD has been the subject of, and has been produced in conjunction with, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). European and UK legislation require that the LDF is also subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), a process that considers the effects of development planning on the environment. Government guidance advises that these two processes should be carried out together and outlines a number of stages of SA work that need to be carried out as the LDF is being prepared. Government guidance, as detailed further below, also states that SA work should not repeat that carried out at a higher level. As such, this SA incorporates the requirements of SEA and does not repeat the SA/SEA work undertaken on the Rochford District Core Strategy. This SA should be read in conjunction with the SA/SEA of the Rochford District Core Strategy, including addendums to such work.
- 1.7 The purpose of the SA is to ensure that wider sustainability issues, encompassing environmental, economic and social implications of options or policies proposed, are taken into consideration throughout the preparation of Development Plan Documents.

- 1.8 This document combines the initial Scoping Report for the SA which has informed the preparation of the full SA Report for both stages of the Allocations DPD. It has been produced in-house to ensure that the SA process is as integrated with the plan making process as possible.

### **Vision and Objectives**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 1.12 The SEA Regulations set out certain requirements for reporting the SEA process, and specify that if an integrated appraisal is undertaken (i.e. SEA is subsumed within the SA process, as for the SA of the Rochford LDF), then the sections of the SA Report that meet the requirements set out for reporting the SEA process must be clearly signposted. The requirements for reporting the SEA process are set out in Appendix 1 and within each relevant section of this SA Report, as appropriate. This SA Report should also be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 1.13 This SA report has been produced in-house to ensure that the SA process is as integrated with the plan making process as possible. To ensure the preparation of a robust and compliant report, a compliance review of the previous SA (July 2012) for the Discussion and Consultation Document was undertaken by independent consultants, Enfusion.
- 1.14 In general the SA was found to be in compliance with the SEA Directive, although some deficiencies were identified due to the early stage of the SA process. The following outstanding tasks were identified to be addressed within the Submission SA:
- The reasoning for the selection and elimination of strategic alternatives; and
  - Reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted.
- 1.15 The reasons for the selection and rejection of the numerous alternative options considered throughout the preparation of the Allocations Document are addressed within Task A4, Task B2, and at paragraph 6.3 of this report. This clearly sets out the range of alternative options that were identified appraised through the SA process, including some ‘unreasonable’ alternatives, and why they were rejected in favour of the proposed policies.
- 1.16 The justification for choosing the proposed policies within the plan is detailed within the tables at paragraph 6.3.

### **Habitats Regulations Assessment**

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

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

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

“The majority of broad interest areas proposed in the Core Strategy are within or adjacent to existing settlements and are at a distance that is unlikely to result in significant effects on European sites alone. This along with the mitigation provided by Core Strategy policies means that the impacts of development at the different site specific options – outlined area in the Consultation and Discussion Document – are unlikely to vary from



each other significantly. **The result is that from an HRA perspective there is no preferred site specific option for the following interest areas:**

- (a) North of London Road, Rayleigh
- (b) West Rochford
- (c) West Hockley
- (d) South Hawkwell
- (e) East Ashingdon
- (f) South Canewdon
- (g) South East Ashingdon
- (h) West Great Wakering”

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

- 1.19 However, the HRA recommended that Option SWH3 for South West Hullbridge should not be considered the preferred option for this general location **“as this is closer to the European sites than the other three options and is also further outside the boundary of the settlement.”**
- 1.20 The proposed policies within the Allocations Submission Document, in general, do not differ greatly from those proposed in the Discussion and Consultation Document, and in any case, proposed residential development to the south west of Hullbridge does not extend as far northwards as Option SWH3.



## **2 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology**

- 2.1 The SA Report has been produced alongside the Allocations Submission Document, and as such has been undertaken in accordance with the advice set out in the guidance on the preparation of SAs for Development Plan Documents published in 2005<sup>1</sup>. This guidance has since been superseded (in September 2009) by the CLG Plan Making Manual<sup>2</sup>, which continues to refer to guidance on undertaking Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) published in 2005<sup>3</sup>. This SA Report will combine the SEA guidance with the advice within the Plan Making Manual.
- 2.2 An overarching LDF Scoping Report generic to all LDF Development Plan Documents has already been prepared. This was produced during the preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Document and as such the overarching SA of the Council's LDF is the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. This was in accordance with government guidance which stated that the SA must be proportionate to the plan in question and it should not repeat the appraisal of higher level policy.
- 2.3 The Council's Core Strategy was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination (to be undertaken by the independent Inspector on behalf of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) on 14 January 2010. The final SA Report for the Core Strategy Submission Document with an integrated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was produced in 2009. However, following the Forest Heath case (Save Historic Newmarket v. Forest Heath District Council) in March 2011 which provided an additional interpretation on undertaking SEA, the Council requested that the Inspector delay the issuing of a decision on the soundness of the Core Strategy to enable a review of the Core Strategy Submission SA to be undertaken. The Inspector accepted this request, and an addendum to the submitted Core Strategy SA was produced, and consulted upon in June/July 2011. The addendum appraised in further detail the preferred general locations for housing and employment development and the reasonable alternatives. The addendum should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 2.4 The Core Strategy was found sound, subject to changes and the Inspector's Report stated that the SA/SEA work undertaken, including the addendum, was adequate. The Core Strategy was adopted on 13 December 2011.
- 2.5 The SEA Baseline Information Profile for the District, which contains a wealth of environmental, economic and social information, is produced by Essex County Council and updated on a regular basis. This will therefore enable a consistent methodology and approach to all LDF documents, and a wide ranging set of information has been included to ensure the full appraisal of individual documents.

---

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

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

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

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

The 2009-2010 SEA Baseline Information Profile has been used in the appraisals. The evidence base supporting the development of the Core Strategy has also been drawn upon, as appropriate.

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

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

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

### **3 Preparation of the Allocations DPD and SA Report**

3.1 This SA Scoping Report has been drafted to set the context for the preparation of the SA Report of the Allocations DPD. It should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report which is the overarching SA document of the Council's LDF. In effect it makes up the second part of the SA scoping process for the Allocations DPD.

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

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

## **4 Allocations SA Scoping Process**

- 4.1 SA Scoping Methodology is set out in government guidance. Stage A describes 5 main tasks set out in Table 2 below. In the context of scoping the Allocations DPD it was considered a useful exercise to re-examine the previous findings of this stage as set out in the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report.

**Table 2 – Stages of the SA Scoping Study Process**

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

- 4.2 The scope of the SA was consulted on and comments were received and considered as set out below. The remaining stages of the SA process have been completed as an integral part of the Allocations DPD preparation.

### **Task A1: Reviewing Relevant Plans, Policies and Programmes**

- 4.3 As the overarching SA for Council’s LDF, Appendix IV of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies a number of plans, policies and programmes relevant to the production of the LDF generally. It is not intended to repeat here the documents identified but attention is drawn to the Core Strategy Submission SA Report which provides a thorough review of these.
- 4.4 The SEA Baseline Information Profile also sets out the evidence base used to prepare this report.

- 4.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 superseding the National Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes (see Annex 3 of the NPPF for a full list of superseded guidance)<sup>4</sup>.
- 4.6 Since the production of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report, other evidence base documents have been produced to inform the production of the LDF. Other plans, policies or strategies which will be considered in the appraisal of the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document are as follows:
- Rochford Core Strategy (December 2012)
  - Sustainable Community Strategy 2010-2015
  - Affordable Housing Viability Study 2010
  - Open Space Study 2009
  - Essex and South Suffolk Shoreline Management Plan (2010)
  - Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (2009)
  - Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010)
  - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 & 2 Final Report (February 2011)
  - Thames Gateway South Essex Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Update Report 2010
  - South Essex Outline Water Cycle Study Technical Report (September 2011)
  - River Basin Management Plan – Anglian River Basin District (December 2009)
  - Surface Water Management Plan (2012)

### Task A2: Collecting Baseline Information

- 4.7 The SEA Baseline Information Profile in Appendix III of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report is a report produced by Essex County Council on a regular basis. It provides a plethora of valuable up-to-date information on the social, economic and environmental status of the District. This living document, which forms part of the Council's Evidence Base for the LDF, will therefore be adequate to enable the monitoring of the Allocations DPD once adopted and it will also help provide an assessment of the performance and impact of the emerging Allocations policies on the SA Objectives.
- 4.8 The 2009-2010 SEA Baseline Information Profile has been used, where appropriate.

---

<sup>4</sup> National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012): available from:  
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>

- 4.9 The SEA Baseline Information Profile documents can be found on the Council's website at [www.rochford.gov.uk](http://www.rochford.gov.uk).

### **Task A3: Identifying the Sustainability Issues and the Appraisal Objectives**

- 4.10 Essex County Council was commissioned in October 2005 by Rochford District Council to progress the SA work of the Core Strategy DPD. An SA scoping process was undertaken during 2005 to help ensure that the SA covers the key sustainability issues that are relevant to the spatial and development planning system in the Rochford area. This included the development of an SA Framework of objectives (which are detailed within the Core Strategy Submission SA Report) to comprise the basis for appraisal. An SA Scoping Report was prepared to summarise the findings of the scoping process. This was published in November 2005 for consultation with statutory consultees. Responses to this scoping consultation, and how they were taken into account, are reported in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 4.11 Four iterations of the Core Strategy have been developed; the Issues and Options Document (2006), the Preferred Options Document (2007), the Revised Preferred Options Document (2008) and the Submission Document (2009). Each stage has been subject to SA assessing the environmental, economic and social implications of the options/policies considered.
- 4.12 Following the findings of SA work undertaken, consultation responses and other evidence base work, the Core Strategy was significantly revised in 2008 (the Revised Preferred Options Document). The SA Framework (discussed further under Task A5) was revised and statutory consultees were consulted in November 2008.
- 4.13 The key sustainability issues for the District are identified in Table 3.1 of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. It is considered that this list is of relevance to the Allocations DPD. These issues were used in developing the objectives and policies of the document, as detailed below under Task A5.

### **Task A4: Considering Options and Alternatives**

- 4.14 The inclusion of the effects of 'reasonable alternatives' is required by the SEA Directive. 'Reasonable alternatives' should form part of both the SA and the plan, and the guidance notes that within DPDs this will take the form of options. Furthermore it is advised that there is no need to devise alternatives to simply to comply with the SEA Directive. However, the aforementioned Forest Heath case has provided an additional interpretation on undertaking SEA, in that reasons for the rejection of reasonable alternatives should be clearly set out.
- 4.15 The reasoning for the different options presented in the Discussion and Consultation Document are detailed under 'Task A4' of the Updated SA for the Discussion and Consultation Document.
- 4.16 It is noted that additional alternative options which did not form part of the Discussion and Consultation Document were also appraised within Appendix 11 of the Updated SA (July 2012).

- 4.17 Other alternative options have been identified during the preparation of the Allocation Submission Document, and these have subsequently been appraised within Appendix 11 of this SA report.
- 4.18 Another option identified to the south east of Hullbridge (Option ALT1) is not considered to be a realistic alternative to those options considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document for the general location of ‘South West Hullbridge’ as it does not accord with the adopted Core Strategy.
- 4.19 Two alternative options to the ‘West Hockley’ options already considered through the SA process were identified during the preparation of the ‘Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012’ (reference: 30 and EFC1). These were rejected as reasonable alternatives as they would not have the capacity to meet the dwelling requirements for this general location set out in the adopted Core Strategy. These options were not considered in sustainability terms.
- 4.20 Four options identified during the preparation of the ‘Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012’ for ‘South Hawkwell’ (reference: 41, 158, 166 and 217), and another option for ‘East Ashingdon’ (reference: 198) are not considered realistic alternatives as if allocated on their own they would create an island of residential development in the Green Belt, which could undermine its defensibility. These options were not considered in sustainability terms.
- 4.21 An option to the West of Great Wakering (reference: SHS1) was identified through further detailed assessment of potential residential site options (Detailed Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012). The option was identified in the assessment as additional land that would need to be allocated should Option WGW3 presented in the Discussion and Consultation Document, or a variation of this option, be taken forward. However, the area adjacent to this alternative option was acknowledged within the previous assessment (Updated SA July 2012) as potentially having ecological value. This option was therefore not considered to be a realistic alternative option and was therefore rejected.
- 4.22 Two options identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document (2010) are no longer considered realistic alternatives following the adoption of the Rochford Core Strategy, as they conflict with policies in this adopted Development Plan Document. This applies to Options GT4 and GT5.
- 4.23 Another alternative option for South Canewdon is not considered to relate well with this general location identified in the adopted Core Strategy (Option ALT6) and is therefore not considered to be realistic.
- 4.24 An additional option to those identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document for new employment land was considered in the previous SA (Option ALT9). However, this option to the west of Purdeys Industrial Estate was not considered to be realistic as it would not accord with the adopted Core Strategy.
- 4.25 One of the options identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document (2010) for new employment land to the west of Rayleigh is no longer considered to be a realistic



alternative following the adoption of the Rochford Core Strategy, as it would conflict with policies in this adopted Development Plan Document. This applies to Option E17.

- 4.26 The option included within the Discussion and Consultation Document to allocate community facilities (Option CF1) is not considered to be realistic, as the previous SA noted that whilst there would be benefits to allocating community facilities for community use, it is not considered to be practical to identify and allocate all buildings/structures in community use, as there is potential that some facilities could be missed, or despite being of importance, are too small to warrant a land-use allocation.
- 4.27 The reasons for the inclusion of the different options considered and the proposed policies set out in the Allocations Submission Document are further discussed with Task B2.

#### **Task A5: Developing the SA Framework**

- 4.28 The Local Planning Authority does not anticipate that additional sustainability objectives, beyond those set out in the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report need to be added to adequately test the sustainability impacts of the Allocations DPD.
- 4.29 Several stages of scoping and consultation on the sustainability issues and objectives and the SA Framework have informed the preparation of the overarching Core Strategy SA Report as discussed below:
- 4.30 The key sustainability issues were identified through the SA scoping process, and Rochford District Council invited statutory consultees to comment on these in November 2005.
- 4.31 The Core Strategy Issues and Options Document was initially prepared in spring/summer 2006 and was then published for consultation in September 2006. The SA and the comments received during the consultation helped to determine the preferred overall spatial strategy, and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document was published for public consultation in May 2007. A number of the comments received from the consultation expressed a desire to see greater detail in the Core Strategy DPD. However, the issue that elicited the most responses related to the location and amount of new housing. As a result of these concerns the Council resolved to revise the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document. This document was prepared and published for consultation in November 2008.
- 4.32 A revised SA framework was sent out to statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and Environment Agency) in September 2008. Comments received as a result of this consultation were reviewed and changes made where possible and relevant; responses are summarised and reported in Appendix II of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 4.33 The Core Strategy Preferred Options SA Report was published for public consultation alongside the revised Core Strategy Preferred Options Document in November 2008. Comments received on the SA were considered and, where appropriate, were addressed in the Submission report and appendices. Appendix II of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report provides a summary of comments received and responses to those comments.

- 4.34 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report was published alongside the Core Strategy Submission Document, in accordance with SEA Regulations and SA guidance. It has been published on the Council’s website [www.rochford.gov.uk](http://www.rochford.gov.uk) and sent to statutory consultees and other relevant stakeholders.
- 4.35 It is important to note that SEA as required by the European SEA Directive 2001/42/EC and as transposed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, has been formally integrated into the SA of the Allocations DPD. The SEA requirement as aforementioned has been embedded within the SA of the Core Strategy Submission Document, and has been used to inform the preparation of the Allocations SA Report. As was stated in government guidance the SA must be proportionate to the plan in question and it should not repeat the appraisal of higher level policy. Therefore as a higher level policy document, the SA/SEA of the Core Strategy Submission Document should be referred to as appropriate.
- 4.36 The final SA Framework used to appraise the development of the Core Strategy DPD is set out in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.

**Task A6: Consultation on Scope of the Allocations DPD SA**

- 4.37 Even though consultation has taken place on the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report and throughout the development of the Core Strategy DPD and the SA Report, it is considered appropriate, in order to satisfy the SEA Directive, and necessary to consult again at this stage in the preparation of the Allocations SA Report.
- 4.38 The decision-aiding questions of the SA Framework were adapted from that of the Core Strategy Submission Document to reflect the differing perspectives and scales of the Development Plan Document, where appropriate (Table 3).

**Table 3 – Draft SA Framework**

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	
1	To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the phasing of infrastructure, including community facilities to meet ongoing and future needs?</li> <li>● Will it ensure the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural and urban communities?</li> <li>● Will it ensure equal opportunities and that all sections of the community are catered for?</li> <li>● Will it meet the needs of an ageing population?</li> <li>● Will the policies and options proposed seek to enhance the qualifications and skills of the local community?</li> <li>● Will income and quality-of-life disparities be reduced?</li> </ul>

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
	<b>Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</b>	
2	Create healthy and safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the delivery of high quality, safe and inclusive design?</li> <li>● Will it improve health and reduce health inequalities?</li> <li>● Will it promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles?</li> <li>● Will green infrastructure and networks be promoted and/or enhanced?</li> <li>● Will it minimise noise pollution?</li> <li>● Will it minimise light pollution?</li> </ul>
	<b>Housing</b>	
3	To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?</li> <li>● Will a mix of housing types and tenures be promoted?</li> <li>● Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</li> <li>● Does it promote high quality design?</li> <li>● Is there sustainable access to key services?</li> <li>● Does it meet the resident's needs in terms of sheltered and lifetime homes or those that can be easily adapted so?</li> </ul>
	<b>Economy &amp; Employment</b>	
4	To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and promote town centre vitality/viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does it promote and enhance existing centres by focusing development in such centres?</li> <li>● Will it improve business development?</li> <li>● Does it enhance consumer choice through the provision of a range of shopping, leisure, and local services to meet the needs of the entire community?</li> <li>● Does it promote mixed use and high density development in urban centres?</li> <li>● Does it promote a wide variety of jobs across all sectors?</li> </ul>

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District?</li> <li>Will it aid the realisation of London Southend Airport's economic potential?</li> </ul>
<b>Accessibility</b>		
5	To promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and moving freight ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase the availability of sustainable transport modes?</li> <li>Will it seek to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation other than the private car, including walking and cycling?</li> <li>Will it contribute positively to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services?</li> <li>Will it reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>Does it seek to encourage development where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located in sustainable accessible locations?</li> <li>Does it enable access for all sections of the community, including the young, the socially deprived, those with disabilities and the elderly?</li> <li>Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District, and for out-commuting to be reduced?</li> </ul>
<b>Biodiversity</b>		
6	To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats, including the District's distinctive estuaries and salt marshes?</li> <li>Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to protected species and priority species?</li> <li>Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?</li> <li>Will it conserve and enhance sites of geological significance?</li> <li>Does land use allocation reflect the scope of using brownfield land for significant wildlife interest where viable and realistic?</li> </ul>

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	
7	To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?</li> <li>Will it support locally-based cultural resources and activities?</li> </ul>
	<b>Landscape &amp; Townscape</b>	
8	To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it seek to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces?</li> <li>Will it contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe?</li> <li>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?</li> <li>Will it preserve and/or improve the quality of the landscape?</li> <li>Will it preserve and/or enhance townscape character and value?</li> </ul>
	<b>Climate Change &amp; Energy</b>	
9	To reduce contributions to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?</li> <li>Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources?</li> <li>Does it adapt to and provide for the consequences of climate change in a largely low-lying area?</li> </ul>
	<b>Water</b>	
10	To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it improve the quality of inland water?</li> <li>Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?</li> <li>Will it provide for an efficient water conservation and supply regime?</li> <li>Will it provide for effective wastewater treatment?</li> <li>Will it require the provision of sustainable drainage systems in new development?</li> <li>Will it reduce the risk of flooding and promote sustainable flood management?</li> </ul>

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
	<b>Land &amp; Soil</b>	
11	To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does it ensure the re-use of previously-developed land and urban areas in preference to Greenfield sites, as far as is practicable given the characteristics of the District?</li> <li>● Will higher-density development be promoted where appropriate?</li> <li>● Will soil quality be preserved?</li> <li>● Will it promote the remediation of contaminated land?</li> <li>● Will the best and most versatile agricultural land be protected?</li> </ul>
	<b>Air Quality</b>	
12	To improve air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will air quality be improved through reduced emissions (e.g. through reducing car travel)?</li> <li>● Will it direct transport movements away from AQMAs and/or potentially significant junctions?</li> </ul>
	<b>Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b>	
13	To promote sustainable design and construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the use of sustainable design principles, e.g. encouraging a mix of uses?</li> <li>● Will climate proofing design measures be incorporated?</li> <li>● Will the local character/vernacular be preserved and enhanced through development?</li> <li>● Will it require the re-use and recycling of construction materials?</li> <li>● Will it encourage locally-sourced materials?</li> <li>● Will it require best-practice sustainable construction methods, for example in energy and water efficiency?</li> </ul>

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

4.40 Responses were received from Natural England, which have been taken into account and a revised SA Framework has subsequently been produced. The issues raised by Natural England are set out in Table 4 below.

**Table 4 – Comments received from Natural England**

SA Objective	Comments
Healthy and safe communities	Natural England supports the inclusion of a criteria relating to access to green infrastructure assets. If possible the appraisal should make clear what constitutes green infrastructure <sup>5</sup> , and acknowledge that there are increasingly apparent linkages between access to quality green spaces and habitats with improved physical and mental health.
Accessibility	Natural England welcomes the addition of walking and cycling to these criteria. The design and layout of new development and the pro-active and integrated management of green infrastructure networks can greatly enhance the accessibility (and attractiveness) to walking and cycling. Criteria might also be utilised which examines the accessibility to green infrastructure and the 'natural environment' to all sections of the plan area community.
Biodiversity	The profile of biodiversity within the criteria is welcomed, and the inclusion of reference to locally distinctive assets is welcomed (estuarine environments) as is reference to biodiversity value of brownfield sites. Both strengthen the local specificity of the overall process. However Natural England sees there is potential to further enhance the appraisal's biodiversity credentials. In particular it should make reference to the practice of 'biodiversity by design'. In other words, does new development integrate within it opportunities for new habitat creation, particularly where they could facilitate species movement and colonisation in relation to climate change pressures on biodiversity and its distribution?
Landscape	The general thrust of the decision-aiding criteria in this objective is supported. Natural England supports enhanced recognition of the importance of local landscapes to local communities, and the importance this has in strengthening sense of place and local distinctiveness. It also considers it important to recognise character rather than quality which is a more subjective approach. Most counties and Districts have in place landscape character assessments. Therefore, criteria 4 which states 'preserve and/or improve the quality of the landscape', should be altered to relate to 'will it conserve (as preservation is neither realistic or desirable) the landscape character areas of the plan area?'
Climate and energy	The second bullet is welcomed, but could be expanded to facilitate the need for enhanced habitat connectivity and landscape permeability for species movement in the light of climate change.
Water	The final new bullet could be expanded to acknowledge the need for integrated sustainable flood management which works with natural processes, presents habitat enhancement opportunities and is landscape character sensitive.

<sup>5</sup> Green infrastructure is defined in the NPPF as "A network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities." (The NPPF is available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf))



SA Objective	Comments
Sustainable design and construction	This addition to the appraisal process is welcomed by Natural England, particularly in respect to the need to protect and conserve vernacular design whilst adopting more environmentally friendly construction methods. However a further enhancement could be made in respect of designing in biodiversity (see above). Buildings and places, particularly larger developments (although all buildings have the potential) for biodiversity friendly design to be integrated in through either building design (such as nesting openings in buildings or bat roosts within structures such as bridges) or through appropriate landscaping and masterplanning of larger sites (through management, habitat mix and indigenous planting).

4.41 The SA Framework used to appraise the policies set out in the Allocations Submission Document is the same as the one used to appraise the alternative options within the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document. The SA Framework has been amended according to consultation responses, additional text is highlighted in green and omitted text has a ~~strike through~~. This framework has been used for both assessments is set out in Table 5.

**Table 5 – Revised SA Framework**

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

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

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District?</li> <li>Will it aid the realisation of London Southend Airport’s economic potential?</li> </ul>
	<b>Accessibility</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health, Air, Climatic Factors)	
5	To promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and moving freight ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase the availability of sustainable transport modes?</li> <li>Will it seek to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation other than the private car, including walking and cycling?</li> <li>Will it contribute positively to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services?</li> <li>Will it reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>Does it seek to encourage development where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located in sustainable accessible locations?</li> <li>Does it enable access for all sections of the community, including the young, the socially deprived, those with disabilities and the elderly?</li> <li>Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District, and for out-commuting to be reduced?</li> <li>Does it enable access to green infrastructure and the wider natural environment to all sections of the community?</li> </ul>
	<b>Biodiversity</b> (SEA topic: Fauna & Flora)	
6	To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats, including the District’s distinctive estuaries and salt marshes?</li> <li>Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to protected species and priority species?</li> <li>Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?</li> <li>Will it conserve and enhance sites of geological significance?</li> </ul>

	SA Objective	Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does land use allocation reflect the scope of using brownfield land for significant wildlife interest where viable and realistic?</li> <li>Does new development integrate within it opportunities for new habitat creation, particularly where they could facilitate species movement and colonisation in relation to climate change pressures on biodiversity and its distribution?</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural Heritage</b> (SEA topic: Cultural Heritage, Landscape)		
7	To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?</li> <li>Will it support locally-based cultural resources and activities?</li> </ul>
<b>Landscape &amp; Townscape</b> (SEA topic: Landscape, Cultural Heritage)		
8	To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it seek to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces?</li> <li>Will it contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe?</li> <li>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?</li> <li>Will it preserve and/or improve the quality of the landscape?</li> <li>Will it conserve (as preservation is neither realistic or desirable) the landscape character areas of the plan area?</li> <li>Will it preserve and/or enhance townscape character and value?</li> </ul>
<b>Climate Change &amp; Energy</b> (SEA topic: Climatic Factors)		
9	To reduce contributions to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?</li> <li>Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources?</li> <li>Does it adapt to and provide for the consequences of climate change in a largely low-lying area?</li> </ul>

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
	<b>Water</b> (SEA topic: Water, Fauna & Flora)	
10	To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it improve the quality of inland water?</li> <li>● Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?</li> <li>● Will it provide for an efficient water conservation and supply regime?</li> <li>● Will it provide for effective wastewater treatment?</li> <li>● Will it require the provision of sustainable drainage systems in new development?</li> <li>● <del>Will it reduce the risk of flooding and promote sustainable flood management?</del></li> <li>● Will it reduce the risk of flooding?</li> <li>● Will it integrate sustainable flood management which works with natural processes, presents habitat enhancement opportunities and is landscape character sensitive?</li> </ul>
	<b>Land &amp; Soil</b> (SEA topic: Soils)	
11	To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does it ensure the re-use of previously-developed land and urban areas in preference to Greenfield sites, as far as is practicable given the characteristics of the District?</li> <li>● Will higher-density development be promoted where appropriate?</li> <li>● Will soil quality be preserved?</li> <li>● Will it promote the remediation of contaminated land?</li> <li>● Will the best and most versatile agricultural land be protected?</li> </ul>
	<b>Air Quality</b> (SEA topic: Air, Climatic Factors)	
12	To improve air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will air quality be improved through reduced emissions (e.g. through reducing car travel)?</li> <li>● Will it direct transport movements away from AQMAs and/or potentially significant junctions?</li> </ul>

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
	<b>Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b> (SEA topic: Human Health, Material Assets, Climatic Factors, Fauna & Flora, Water, Air)	
13	To promote sustainable design and construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the use of sustainable design principles, e.g. encouraging a mix of uses?</li> <li>● Will climate proofing design measures be incorporated?</li> <li>● Will the local character/vernacular be preserved and enhanced through development?</li> <li>● Will it require the re-use and recycling of construction materials?</li> <li>● Will it encourage locally-sourced materials?</li> <li>● Will it require best-practice sustainable construction methods, for example in energy and water efficiency?</li> </ul>

## **5 Developing and Refining Policies and Assessing Effects**

- 5.1 The Allocations Submission Document, having regard to proposals and areas identified in the Core Strategy, sets out proposed policies for:
- Brownfield Residential Land Allocations
  - Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations
  - Existing Employment Land Allocations
  - New Employment Land Allocations
  - Ecological and Landscape Allocations
  - Educational Land Allocations
  - Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations
  - Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations
- 5.2 As such the Allocations DPD must be in conformity with the Core Strategy and must be read in conjunction with it.
- 5.3 The second stage in the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal is Stage B which encompasses the development and refinement of policies and assessment of effects. The six main tasks are set out in Table 6 below.

**Table 6 – Stage B Tasks following the Scoping Process**

Stage	Task
B1	Testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework
B2	Developing the DPD options
B3	Predicting the effects of the DPD
B4	Evaluating the effects of the DPD
B5	Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects
B6	Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD

### **Task B1: Testing the DPD Objectives against the SA Framework**

- 5.4 The vision and objectives for the Allocations Submission Document are consistent with those set out in the Core Strategy as set out within paragraphs 1.9-1.11 of this report. The vision and objectives of the Core Strategy have been tested against the SA objectives to identify both potential synergies and inconsistencies and reported within the Core Strategy Submission SA Report (see paragraphs 5.6-5.8 and Appendix V). Although some of the decision-aiding questions for the SA Objectives have been amended to reflect stakeholder comments, the general thrust of the SA Objectives remains the same.



- 5.5 A commentary was provided for each individual theme within the Core Strategy to consider the compatibility of the themes vision and objectives against the SA Framework. The compatibility analysis and commentary for the individual themes can be found in Appendix 2 of this SA Report.

### **Task B2: Developing the DPD Policies**

- 5.6 The purpose of the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document was to facilitate discussion on a range of options to deliver the Rochford District Core Strategy. At this stage no options were rejected, and additionally, alternative options submitted during the consultation on the Discussion and Consultation Document were appraised.
- 5.7 Consequently the Allocations Submission Document has identified proposed policies to deliver key aspects of the Core Strategy, and a number of alternative options have been rejected, as detailed within Task A4 of this report and reported on in paragraph 6.3.
- 5.8 **Alternative Scenarios** – There are two alternative scenarios in the preparation of the Allocations Document: a ‘do minimum’ and a ‘business as usual’ scenario (i.e. to not prepare the Allocations DPD). Whilst these approaches in general are not considered relevant as it would result in the inability to deliver the Rochford District Core Strategy, this appraisal has been undertaken against existing baseline conditions and trends, which effectively constitutes a ‘business as usual’ approach.
- 5.9 **Proposed Policies and Alternative Options** – A number of different options for the themes addressed within the Allocations Submission Document were included within the Discussion and Consultation Document and appraised within the Updated SA (July 2012); housing (including Gypsy and Traveller site options), employment land, environmental and landscape designations, educational, community and leisure facilities, open space and town centres.
- 5.10 The policies included within the Submission Document have had regard to a wide range of evidence base documents, including the Updated SA (July 2012). The justification for the inclusion of the different alternative options and the proposed policies within the Submission Document is set out below. The reasons for the rejection of the alternative options is set out in Task A4 and paragraph 6.3 of this report.
- 5.11 **Brownfield Residential Land Allocations (Policy BFR1-4)** – The Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal recognises that the identified areas of employment land for reallocation as residential may “generate significant positive effects through re-allocating unviable brownfield land for housing” (paragraph 5.37). The Discussion and Consultation Document, and subsequently the Allocations Submission Document, identify the existing employment land to be reallocated for residential development in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy. These are Star Lane Industrial Estate, Stambridge Mills and Rawreth Industrial Estate. Eldon Way/Foundry Industrial Estate, as identified in the Submission Document, will be addressed within the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan. The accompanying text

within the policies relating to these sites has been prepared using a range of background information.

- 5.12 **Settlement Extension Residential Land Allocations (Policy SER1-9)** – The identification of the general locations for proposed residential development have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal throughout the development of the Core Strategy.
- 5.13 The Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal recognises that “The actual locations for growth proposed in the policy are considered to be the most sustainable options available, within the context of the overall high levels of population growth being proposed in the East of England Plan” (paragraph 5.17). Thus the general locations identified are considered to be the most sustainable options for future development in the District given the alternatives. The decision-making process has been further strengthened following the review of the Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal in light of the judgment in the Forest Heath case. The Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2011 clarifies that the proposed general locations for residential development are the most sustainable when compared to the reasonable alternatives.
- 5.14 Accordingly the options for the reallocation of Green Belt land identified in the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document correspond with the general locations identified in the adopted Core Strategy. Other potential alternative options , which were submitted to the Council following the public consultation on the Discussion and Consultation Document in 2010 were appraised in the Updated SA (July 2012) and the reasonable alternatives have been included as part of the assessment of options within the general locations as appropriate.
- 5.15 The sites identified in the policies for the reallocation of Green Belt land in the Submission Document correspond to the general locations set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The detail within the policies relating to these sites has been prepared using a range of background information, which is listed in the introductory section of the Allocations Submission Document.
- 5.16 Other alternative options have been identified through further detailed assessment of the alternative options within the general locations for residential development (Detail Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012) which is based on the ‘Call for Sites’, and the options considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document. Subsequently a number of potential additional alternative options within the Core Strategy general locations have been included within this report.
- 5.17 **Gypsy and Traveller Allocations (Policy GT1)** – The Council is required to allocate 15 Gypsy and Traveller sites by 2018 as detailed in the adopted Core Strategy. There are few unauthorised Gypsy and Traveller sites in the District and a limited number of potential sites were put forward to the Council during the ‘Call for Sites’ exercise to be considered during the preparation of this stage of the Allocations Document (the two points together indicating a lack of demand for such sites in the District). As such the alternative options considered and appraised at the Discussion and Consultation Document stage included existing unauthorised sites, extensions to unauthorised sites as appropriate, sites put forward as part of the ‘Call for Sites’ exercise and a new

option on greenfield land which relates well to new residential development and the Core Strategy as a whole.

- 5.18 Another alternative option, submitted as part of the Council's 'Call for Sites' was appraised in the previous SA.
- 5.19 The site identified in the Submission Document is located in the western part of the District on a portion of one of the options identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document. The detail within the policy relating to this site has been prepared using a range of background information, which is listed in the introductory section of the Submission Document.
- 5.20 **Existing Employment Land Allocations (Policy EEL1-3)** – Other existing employment land which is not identified to be reallocated for residential development in the Core Strategy have been included as options to be designated for employment land. The Core Strategy Submission Sustainability Appraisal recognises that protecting these locations from residential development would have a positive benefit through “ensuring existing locations are better supported and offering the possibility that such locations may be able to coordinate either individually or collectively effective travel that would be more sustainable” (paragraph 5.37). The sites were considered and appraised in the Updated SA (July 2012) for the previous stage of the document, and have been included within the Allocations Submission Document accordingly.
- 5.21 **New Employment Land Allocations (Policy NEL1-4)** – To compensate for the reallocation of existing employment land and to provide for projected future need, as identified in the Core Strategy, additional employment land will be allocated to the west of Rayleigh, north of London Southend Airport and south of Great Wakering.
- 5.22 A range of potential alternative options were identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document which correspond to these general locations, although it is noted that the allocation of land to the north of London Southend Airport will be determined through the emerging London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan, and as such will be subject to an independent Sustainability Appraisal.
- 5.23 Two sites to the west of Rayleigh have been identified to compensate for the loss of employment land through the reallocation of Rawreth Industrial Estate plus additional land for offices uses (south of London Road and to the west of the A1245).
- 5.24 A site to the south of Great Wakering to the east of Star Lane has also been identified to compensate for the loss of Star Lane Industrial Estate.
- 5.25 The accompanying text within the policies relating to these sites has been prepared using a range of background information.

- 5.26 **Ecological and Landscape Allocations (Policy ELA1-3)** – The Local Wildlife Sites have been identified through the Local Wildlife Sites Review 2007 which forms part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework. Their formal adoption through the allocations process would formalise their local importance and protection through the planning system. The Core Strategy seeks to safeguard these sites.
- 5.27 The Upper Roach Valley is recognised as an important green open space, which the Core Strategy seeks to protect. As such, this area was identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document for allocation in its own right. The Coastal Protection Belt, as recognised in the Core Strategy is an important natural designation for nature conservation and amenity reasons which was subsequently identified as an option for allocation. Local Wildlife Sites, the Upper Roach Valley and the Coastal Protection Belt have therefore been identified for allocation within the Allocations Submission Document.
- 5.28 **Educational Land Allocations (Policy EDU1-4)** – The general locations identified for new primary schools for west Rayleigh and west Rochford correspond with the general locations identified for residential development and where additional educational facilities would be required to support this in the Core Strategy. In addition to two new primary schools, the Core Strategy recognises the need for additional land for the expansion for King Edmund School, and the Discussion and Consultation Document identified several potential options for this. There are options to designate existing educational leisure and community facilities to safeguard their future.
- 5.29 The Allocations Submission Document proposes a potential site for the expansion of King Edmund School, following appraisal of the alternative options, and a policy to designate existing educational facilities to safeguard their future has also been proposed.
- 5.30 **Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations (Policy OSL1-3)** – The Discussion and Consultation Document considered options to allocate open space as set out in the 2006 Replacement Local Plan or to not allocate these areas. It considered whether to allocate the District’s leisure centres and community facilities or not.
- 5.31 A policy is proposed to allocate all identified open space within the District and protect it from alternative uses, and in addition a policy relating to the promotion of new public open space, in accordance with the Core Strategy, has been included with the Submission Document. Two leisure centres are also identified in the document to safeguard their future.
- 5.32 **Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations (Policy TCB1-3)** – Local development documents are required to define the primary shopping area in accordance with the NPPF. The Discussion and Consultation Document set out a range of options for the allocation of a primary shopping area for each of the District’s town centres. It also provided numerous options for the designation of the town centre boundaries to ensure their future vitality and vibrancy. Additionally an option was included to de-allocate Hockley as a town centre which has taken into account the Retail and Leisure Study 2008 and community feedback from the initial consultation on the Hockley Area Action Plan (the Issues and Options Document).

- 5.33 The Allocations Submission Document designates the existing town centre boundaries for Rayleigh and Rochford to ensure their future vitality and vibrancy, in the interim period until the emerging Area Action Plans for these town centres are finalised. The Submission Document proposes the existing primary shopping frontages and secondary shopping frontages for allocation within Rochford and Rayleigh town centres be allocated as the primary shopping area/secondary shopping area respectively. However, whilst a policy is included for Hockley, the detail is deferred to the emerging Hockley Area Action Plan, which is at an advanced stage and subject to an independent SA.
- 5.34 **Additional Alternative Options** – In addition to the range of options identified in the Discussion and Consultation Document, which conform to the Core Strategy, a number of additional alternative site options have been identified, primarily for residential allocation but also one for Gypsy and Traveller allocation, and one for employment allocation. These were primarily identified through comments received during the public consultation and assessed against the SA Framework with Appendix 11 of the Updated SA (July 2012). These are as follows:
- ALT1 Nevendon Salvage, Lower Road, Hullbridge – This alternative option has not been considered against the other alternative options and the proposed policy as it is not located within a Core Strategy general location.
  - ALT2 South of Hall Road, Rochford
  - ALT3 North of Ironwell Lane, Rochford
  - ALT4 East of Folly Chase, Hockley
  - ALT5 South of the Anchor Lane/Gardeners Lane Junction, Canewdon
  - ALT6 North of Gardeners Lane and South of Lambourne Hall Road, Canewdon – This alternative option has not been considered against the other alternative options and the proposed policy as it could arguably not be considered commensurate within the general location of ‘South Canewdon’.
  - ALT7 Potash Garden Centre, Main Road, Hawkwell
  - ALT8 Land at Madrid Avenue, Rayleigh
  - ALT9 West of Purdeys Industrial Estate, Sutton Road, Rochford – This alternative option has not been considered against the other options for new employment land as it is not within a Core Strategy general location.
- 5.35 Through further detailed assessment of the options within the general locations for residential development (Detail Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options September 2012) other potential alternative options were identified depending on the options taken forward to ensure a defensible Green Belt boundary. As such the following sites have been identified for further assessment as a reasonable alternative within this report. This excludes extensions to areas that have already been appraised and other options which were not considered to be realistic, as detailed within Task A4.



- 5.36 The following additional alternative options have been identified and appraised:
- ALT10 – Land to the north of Watery Lane, Hullbridge (reference: 218)
  - ALT11 – Land at Rosemount, Anchor Lane, Canewdon (reference: 140)
  - ALT12 – Land to the west of Ash Green, Canewdon (reference: WAG1)
- 5.37 Other options were identified in the Detail Assessment of Potential Residential Site Options (September 2012), however, these were rejected as they are not considered to be realistic/reasonable alternatives as detailed within Task A4 and at paragraph 6.3.
- 5.38 Each proposed policy included within the Submission Document has been appraised against the same SA Framework as the options included within the Discussion and Consultation Document, and the other alternative options that have been identified and appraised through the SA process.
- 5.39 A summary of the assessments can be found in Section 6.

### **Task B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD**

- 5.40 The strategic sites identified in the Allocations Submission Document have been subject to assessment in order to determine their performance in sustainability terms, with reference to social, environmental and economic factors.
- 5.41 The SA Objective for every policy corresponding to the general locations identified in the Core Strategy has been appraised according to the decision-aiding questions for the SA Objectives set out in Table 5. The SEA Baseline Information Profile has been used to inform the SA, where appropriate.
- 5.42 **Uncertainties and Assumptions** – Throughout the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal process for the Submission Document, data gaps, limitations and uncertainties were uncovered. Even at this level it is not always possible to accurately predict sustainability effects due to assumptions that may be made or other uncertainties encountered.
- 5.43 The impact of the different options on light and noise pollution, for example, are difficult to predict. Other uncertainties include whether the size of some sites would impact on the viability of some Sustainable Drainage System measures and the impact of development on soil quality. Assumptions such as the provision of onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies on a site should it be taken forward have also been made. These uncertainties and assumptions have been acknowledged in the appraisal matrices, where applicable.
- 5.44 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report also identifies more strategic scale uncertainties such as the impacts of climate change (see Section 5 & 6 and further detail in Appendix V, VI and VII of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report).

**Task B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD**

- 5.45 The options within the Discussion and Consultation Document and the proposed policies within the Submission Document have been assessed against the same objectives and decision-aiding questions set out in the SA Framework (Table 5). The assessment of the options has been updated to reflect comparison with the proposed policies, and the proposed policies have been comparatively assessed against the alternative options.
- 5.46 Each of the alternative options and the proposed policies have been given an impact category according to the table below.

**Table 7 – Categories of Sustainability Effects**

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

- 5.47 Commentary has also been provided to further clarify the predicted effects of proposed policies in comparison with the reasonable alternative options, and the effects have been evaluated as appropriate. Where indirect impacts have been identified these are also included in the matrices.
- 5.48 The detailed matrices, which include the assessment of the proposed policies and the alternative options, are presented in Appendix 3-11. A summary is provided within Section 6.

**Task B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects**

- 5.49 At this pre-submission stage of the Allocations Document, the sustainability effects of the proposed policies were assessed comparatively against the options in the Discussion and Consultation to demonstrate the comparative sustainability of the different alternative options considered in the preparation of this document.
- 5.50 Potential mitigation measures to offset adverse effects and opportunities to enhance the alternative options were explored at the Discussion and Consultation stage, and initial recommendations were included as appropriate, for example the inclusion of a wildlife corridor and need to accommodate non-vulnerable uses within areas at risk of



flooding, in order to inform the development of the Submission Document. A number of recommendations for mitigation have also been identified through the assessment of the proposed policies. How the recommendations and in particular the suggested mitigation measures identified through appraisal of the proposed policies have been integrated into the Submission Document is set out within Appendix 12.

- 5.51 Strategic mitigation measures and recommendations for the Core Strategy, which the Allocations Document must conform to, are detailed within the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.

**Task B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD**

- 5.52 Strategic measures to monitor the implementation of the Core Strategy Submission Document, which the Allocations DPD must conform to, are detailed within the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 5.53 In addition, and where appropriate, the indicators to monitor the significant effects of the Allocations Submission Document have been amended from the Core Strategy as set out below.
- 5.54 The Allocations Submission Document includes a section on the implementation, delivery and monitoring of the proposed policies.

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

- 6.1 The following section (forming Stage C) provides a summary of the detailed assessment of the proposed policies and the alternative options against the SA objectives. Matrices in Appendices 3-11 to the document set out the detailed assessment themselves of the proposed policies and the alternative options against the SA objectives and accompanying decision-aiding questions.
- 6.2 A scoring summary of the proposed policies and the reasonable alternative options considered is set out in the table below.

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
<b>Brownfield Residential Land Allocations</b>													
Policy BFR1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 3.												
Policy BFR2	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 3.												
Policy BFR3	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 3.												
Policy BFR4	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. Please see appendix 3.												
<b>Settlement Residential Extension Land Allocations</b>													
<b>North of London Road</b>													
Policy SER1	++	++	++	+	++	++	+	-/+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
Option NLR1	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	++/-	+	+	+/-/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
Option NLR2	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-/-	+	+/-	+/-/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
Option NLR3	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-/-	+	+/-/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
Option NLR4	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	0/-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option NLR5	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	0/-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
<b>West Rochford</b>													
Policy SER2	++	++	++	++/-	++	+	+	++/-	++	+	-	+/0	+
Option WR1	++	++	++	++	++	+	+/-	++/-	++	+	-	+/0	+
Option WR2	+/-	+/-/-	++	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	++/-	++	+	-/-	+	+/-
Option WR3	+/-	+/-	++	++	+/-	+	+/-/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-/-	+/-	+
Option WR4	+/-	0/-	+	+/-/-	+/-/-	+	+/-	-	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option ALT2	+/-	+	+	+	++/-	?	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
Option ALT3	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	?	+/-	+/-/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
<b>West Hockley</b>													
Policy SER3	+	++	++/-	+/-	++/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option WH1	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option WH2	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	0/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+/-
Option WH3	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option WH4	+	+/-	+	+/-/-	+/-/-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option WH5	+	++	++/-	+/-	++/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option ALT4	++	++	+	+	+/-	-	+	+/-/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+
<b>South Hawkwell</b>													
Policy SER4	+	+	++	++/-	+	++/-	-	+	+	+/-	+	+	+/-
Option SH1	+/?	+/-	+	++/-	+/-	+/-	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
Option SH2	+	+	++	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	++	+	+
Option SH3	+/-	+/-/-	++	++/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
Option SH4	+	+/-	+	++	++	+/-	-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-
Option ALT7	+/-	+	+	++	+/-	-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
<b>East Ashingdon</b>													
Policy SER5	++/?	+	++	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option EA1	+/-	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option EA2	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option EA3	++	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
<b>South West Hullbridge</b>													
Policy SER6	++	++	+	++	+/-	+/-	-	++/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option SWH1	+	++/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option SWH2	++	++	+	+	+	0/-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option SWH3	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	0/-	-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
Option SWH4	++/-	++/-	+	+	+	-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option ALT10	+/-/-	+/-/-	++	+	-	+/-	+/-	-	+	+/-	-	-	-
<b>South Canewdon</b>													
Policy SER7	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	++/-	+	0	+/-	+/-	+
Option SC1	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	++/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option SC2	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option SC3	+	+	+	+	+/-	-	-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+
Option SC4	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option ALT5	+	+	+	+	+/-	?	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option ALT11	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+/-	-	+	+
Option ALT12	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	-	+	+
<b>South East Ashingdon</b>													
Policy SER8	++	++	+	++	++	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option SEA1	++	++	+	++	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option SEA2	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option SEA3	+	+/-	+	++	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+
<b>West Great Wakering</b>													
Policy SER9	+/-	++	+	++/-	+/-	++	-	++	+	+	-	+	+
Option WGW1	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+



## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option WGW2	+/-	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option WGW3	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
Option WGW4	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+	+	-	+/-	+
Option WGW5	+/-	+	+	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	+	+	-	+	+
<b>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation</b>													
Policy GT1	+/-	+/-	++/-	-	+/-	+/-	?	+/-	0	+	+/-	-	0
Option GT1	++/-	+/-	+/-	0	-	0	-/?	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	-	0
Option GT2	00/-	+/-	+/-	0	-	0	-/?	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	-	0/-
Option GT3	+/-	+/-	+/-	0	0	?	?	+/-	0	+/-	+/?	0	0
Option GT6	++/-	+/-	+	0	+/-	0	-/?	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	-	0
Option GT7	+	+/-	+	0	+	-	-/?	-/-	0	0/-	-/-	0	0
Option ALT8	+/-	+/-/-	+	0	+/-	?	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0/-	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
<b>Existing Employment Land Allocations</b>													
Policy EEL1	This option is not assessed in this version of the Sustainability Appraisal. Please see appendix 6.												
Policy EEL2	This option is not assessed in this version of the Sustainability Appraisal. Please see appendix 6.												
Policy EEL3	This option is not assessed in this version of the Sustainability Appraisal. Please see appendix 6.												
<b>New Employment Land Allocations</b>													
Policy NEL1	++	0	0	+	+/-	+	+	+/0	+	+	+/-	0	+
Policy NEL2	-	+/-	0	+	+/-	-	-	?	0	0	+/-	0/-	++
Option E13	+	+/?	0	+/-	+/-	+/?	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E14	+	?	0	+	+	+/?	0	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E15	+	+/?	0	+	+/-	+/?	0	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E16	+	+/?	0	+	+/-	+/?	0	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E18	+/-	0/?	0	++/-	+/-/-	+/-	0	++/-	+	+/-	+/-/-	+/-	+
Policy NEL3	++/-	+/-	0	+	+/-	+	+	0/+	+	+	-	+/-	+

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Option E19	+	0/?	0	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E20	+/-	0/?	0	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E21	+/-	-/?	0	+	+/-/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E22	+/-	-/?	0	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option E23	-	-/?	0	+/-	+-	?/+	+	-	+	+/-	-/?	-	+
Option E24	+/-	-/?	0	+	+/-	?/+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+
Policy NEL4	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 7.												
<b>Ecological and Landscape Allocations</b>													
Policy ELA1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 8.												
Policy ELA2	-	+	0	+	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0
Policy ELA3	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 8.												

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
<b>Educational Land Allocations</b>													
Policy EDU1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 9.												
Policy EDU2	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 9.												
Policy EDU3	+/0	+	0	+	+	0	-	++	0	0	-	+	+
Option KES1	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	+	0	+	+	0	+
Option KES2	+	+	-	+	+/-	0	-	+/-	0	+/-	+	0	+
Option KES3	+	+	-	+	+/-	0	+/-	+	0	+	+	0	+
Policy EDU4	This option is not assessed in this version of the sustainability appraisal. See appendix 9.												
<b>Open Space and Leisure Facilities Allocations</b>													
Policy OSL1	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 10.												
Policy OSL2	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 10.												
Policy OSL3	This policy has not been reappraised in this SA as it has previously been assessed. See appendix 10.												
<b>Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area Boundary Allocations</b>													

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal Report

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Policy TCB1	+	+	+	+	++	+/?	?	+	+	+	++/?	+/-	+
Option TC1	+	+	+	+	+	+/?	?	+	+	+	+/-/?	+/-	+/-
Option TC2	+/-	0/-	-/-	-	+/-	-/?	?	+/-	-	+/-	-/-/?	-	+
Option TC11	+	0	0	+	+	0	?	+	+	+	++	+/-	+
Option TC12	-	0	0	-	-/?	0	?	+	-	+	++	-	-
Policy TCB2	+	+	-	++/-	+	?	+/-	++/+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+
Option TC3	-	0	+	-/+	-/?	+/?	-/?	+	-	-	++/-	+/-	+
Option TC4	+	+	-	+	+	?	?	+	+	+/-	+	+/-	+
Option TC5	+	+	-	+	+	?	+/-	++	+	+/-	+	+/-	+
Option TC6	+/-	+	-	+/-	-/?	-/?	?	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+
Option TC13	+	0	0	+	+	0	?	+/-	+	+/-	++	+/-	+
Option TC14	-	0	0	-	-/?	0	-/?	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+/-	-

- 6.3 The tables below summarise the options / reasonable alternatives considered for the Allocation DPD, with an outline of the reasons for rejection / selection of these in the Submission Document. It should be noted that whilst the SA findings are considered by the Council in its selection of options and form part of the evidence supporting the Allocations DPD, the SA findings are not the sole basis for a decision; planning and feasibility factors play a key role in the decision-making process.

#### **Brownfield Residential Land Allocations**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a Local Wildlife Site and it was noted that potentially it would be challenging to create a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary with this option.

ALT4 was therefore rejected.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

land along Thorpe Road.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALT7 was therefore not taken forward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A combination of SC2 and SC3 has been proposed within the Submission Document. The proposed allocation to the west of the road leading to the church, however, does not extend as far north as the site identified in SC2.

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

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

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



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

rejected.

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

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

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

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

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

Both ALT5 and ALT6 were rejected for the aforementioned reasons.

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

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

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

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

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

Both SEA2 and SEA3 extend further to the east away from Ashingdon Road, and would have a greater impact on the Green Belt than SEA1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Consequently this option was rejected.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

Although Policy NEL1 is detached from the existing residential area to the east by a green buffer, the site is well related to the existing settlement and the proposed residential development to the north of London Road (Policy SER1). It encompasses both brownfield land and greenfield land. Consequently the policy would result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land.

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

Policy NEL2 generally performs well against the sustainability objectives, as it has good links to the highway network (A127 and A1245) and can accommodate a significant proportion of employment land without impacting on residential amenity or the local highway network.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

However, the allocation of this site would necessitate the loss of grade 1 agricultural land.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Consequently this option was not rejected.

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

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

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

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



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

Submission Document.

**Ecological and Landscape Allocations – Upper Roach Valley**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Educational Land Allocations – King Edmund School**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OS2 was therefore rejected.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although LF3 was also found to perform strong against the sustainability objectives, however, the appraisal noted that the leisure centre had closed in October 2011 and it

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

may therefore not be appropriate to allocate this facility. Consequently LF3 was rejected.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

shopping frontage is also proposed to be allocated.

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

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

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

TC3, 4 and 6 were rejected.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 6.4 A broad assessment of whether the effects of implementing the proposed policies are likely to be short, medium and long-term, temporary or permanent has been identified, where possible, in relation to the SA objectives. This is detailed below.
- 6.5 The proposals within the Submission Document can be divided into two categories; the development policies and the protection policies. The development policies propose residential and employment land provision and associated infrastructure (Policies BFR1-4, SER1-9, GT1, NEL1-4 and EDU1-3). Conversely the protection policies seek to protect new and existing land use designations (Policies EEL1-3, ELA1-3, EDU4, OSL1-3 and TCB1-3).
- 6.6 A broad assessment of whether effects are likely to be short, medium and long-term, temporary, permanent or cumulative has been included, where possible, in relation to the SA objectives for both the development and protection policies.

**Short Term Impacts**

- 6.7 The development policies would have an impact on communities, in terms of the proximity of construction to the existing residential area, highways, and air pollution. Though such short-term impacts can be mitigated against through the development management process. This could also have short-term positive effects on employment and economy through construction and the wider impacts of development.
- 6.8 In particular the allocation of the site within Policy SER3 would have a negative, temporary impact in the short-medium term on the economy & employment objective through the loss of unallocated employment land.
- 6.9 The provision of additional employment land in a timely manner would compensate for the loss of existing employment land which would have a short-medium term impact on the economy & employment objective.
- 6.10 The protection of primary and secondary schools and enabling their expansion would, in the short-term, have an impact on communities in terms of the proximity of construction to the existing residential area, highways, and air pollution. However, such short-term impacts can be mitigated against through the development management process.

### **Medium-Long Term Impacts**

- 6.11 The development policies would have a medium-long term impact on the sustainability objectives of housing and balanced communities, through the provision of homes, jobs and associated infrastructure.
- 6.12 In general they would have a long term, permanent negative impact on landscape & townscape and land & soil, in terms of the impact on the Green Belt and their location on greenfield land. However, Policy NEL2 and GT1 are proposed on degraded greenfield land, and Policy SER3 is predominantly located on brownfield land, which would likely have a positive/neutral, permanent impact in the longer term on the land & soil objective.
- 6.13 Proposed flood management measures (where applicable) and the provision of a range of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) to manage excess surface water within the development policies would have a medium/long-term positive impact on water objectives through water conservation and risk management.
- 6.14 The development policies may also have a medium/long-term positive impact on biodiversity through the creation of green buffers, open space and wildlife corridors to facilitate species movement and habitat creation.
- 6.15 The protection of existing employment land would have a long term positive impact on the economy & employment objective, and in general would have a positive longer term impact on the accessibility objective.
- 6.16 The provision additional employment land in a timely manner would compensate for the loss of existing employment land which would have a longer term impact on the economy & employment objective.
- 6.17 The protection of Local Wildlife Sites would have a medium/long-term positive impact on biodiversity, and the protection of the Upper Roach Valley and Coastal Protection Belt would positively impact in the longer term on geological diversity, biodiversity soil quality and landscape character.
- 6.18 Allocation of the Upper Roach Valley may also have minor positive effects for the local economy through seeking to protect areas of nature conservation importance, which may support the local tourist industry, and there may be minor positive effects through increased employment opportunities. It may also very positive biodiversity effects, through enhancement of habitats and a potential longer term reduction in habitat fragmentation enabling flora and fauna to cope with the forecast effects of climate change.
- 6.19 The designation of the Coastal Protection Belt would have a positive effect on high quality, sustainable, healthy and safe communities by directing development away from coastal areas towards existing developed areas, which may also contribute to their regeneration. This option would potentially have indirect positive benefits for local economy. It would also positively impact in the longer term on water quality, landscape and the climate change objectives.



- 6.20 The allocation of primary and secondary schools would have a positive long term impact on equal opportunities, qualifications and skills. This would have a positive long-term impact on the balanced communities, healthy & safe communities and accessibility objectives. It would also reduce the need to travel for those in the community who wish to attend, which could have a positive impact on the air quality and accessibility objectives in the longer term.
- 6.21 The protection of existing open space would positively impact on biodiversity, air quality, accessibility and healthy & safe communities in the long term.
- 6.22 The allocation of existing leisure facilities would have a positive long term impact on healthy & safe and balanced communities and the accessibility.
- 6.23 Designating town centre boundaries and primary and secondary shopping areas would have long term positive impact on the regeneration and enhancement of the urban communities, sustainable access to key services, air quality equal opportunities and that all sections of the community are catered for through encouraging a mix of uses. They could also have a positive longer term impact on economy and employment and housing through promoting appropriately dense development.

### Cumulative Impacts

- 6.24 Implementation of the Allocations Submission Document as proposed would likely have a positive impact on housing, balanced communities, economic development and accessibility.
- 6.25 However, the identification of greenfield and Green Belt land in the draft plan would have a negative impact on land and soil over the plan period.



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

- 7.1 The initial stage of the Allocations DPD (the Discussion and Consultation Document) was consulted upon in March and April 2010 and elicited a considerable response from a wide range of stakeholders, including statutory bodies, parish councils, members of the public, developers, agents and landowners. In total 8,239 representations were received. A summary of the responses to the consultation, which includes the issues raised and officers' initial responses to these, was also published.
- 7.2 The draft SA Report was published in early 2012 and key stakeholders were consulted on this document (which included statutory consultees, developers and agents) for a six week period between 16 January 2012 and 27 February 2012 (forming Stage D). The document was also published on the Council's website. The issues raised and the responses to these are presented within Updated SA (July 2012) Appendix 12. These responses have been taken into account as appropriate.
- 7.3 Given the delay between the publication of the Discussion and Consultation Document and the draft SA Report it was considered appropriate to provide stakeholders with an additional opportunity to comment on both documents together, and in particular the implications of the SA Report for the initial stage of the Allocations DPD on the options within the Discussion and Consultation Document. Key stakeholders will be invited to comment again on these documents for a four week period between 13 August 2012 and 10 September 2012. The issues raised and the responses to these are presented within Appendix 14. These responses have been taken into account as appropriate.
- 7.4 The Submission Document and SA Report will be consulted on for a period of eight weeks between 29 November 2012 and 25 January 2013.

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

- 8.1 An explanation of how the Allocations Submission Document has incorporated the SA recommendations for mitigation and enhancement at the Discussion and Consultation stage is provided in Appendix 12.
- 8.2 The appraisal of the draft Submission Document has recommendations embedded within it which have been addressed within the proposed policies, as this SA report has been produced alongside the Submission Document and has informed its development. The detailed assessment of the proposed policies should be referred to.
- 8.3 Some of the key recommendations identified through the SA process include:
- Taking into account the relationship between potential alternative options when considering different land uses which are in proximity to one another
  - Areas at risk of flooding should, if taken forward as part of a preferred option, be given over to public open space
  - The preparation of Local Wildlife Site Management Plan where development of particular options has the potential to impact on neighbouring Local Wildlife Sites
  - The inclusion of green buffers to mitigate impact on neighbouring sites of potential ecological value, areas subject to preservation orders or for landscape purposes

## 9 Implementation and Monitoring

- 9.1 Indicators and targets are important tools to help monitor the sustainability effects of the LDF (forming Stage E). Targets and/or indicators for each sustainability objective have been identified (from the SA Framework) within Section 8 of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report to provide a suggested list for discussion, and refined further to consider the significant sustainability effects of the plan as required by the SEA Directive.
- 9.2 Monitoring of the LDF will take place through the publication of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The proposed LDF monitoring strategy and further information is detailed within Section 8 of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 9.3 Indicators aim to measure all relevant aspects of life in the District social and economic as well as environmental. These are drawn from:
- Objectives and targets set out in the LDF - these will mostly be quantitative and may be expressed as maps, graphs, diagrams or percentages (e.g. Percentage of new housing built on brownfield land, target of 10% of energy on major new developments to be provided by renewables etc.);
  - Indicators already identified and used in the SA process, again mostly likely to be quantitative;
  - Measures drawn from the baseline data collected during the early stages of the LDF or from the previous Local Plan (e.g. air quality, extent of wildlife habitats, need for affordable housing); and,
  - Any other measures suggested by the community. These might be more qualitative (e.g. quality of life) and could be useful in enriching understanding and giving people a sense of ownership of the LDF.
- 9.4 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies potential indicators for monitoring which relate to the SA Framework objectives. The Allocations DPD is a key component to deliver the Core Strategy. The potential indicators for monitoring the Allocations DPD are set out in the table below. Suggested amendments have been highlighted.

Potential Indicators	
<b>1. Balanced Communities</b>	
	To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Changing educational attainment at GCSE Level</li><li>• Proportion of persons in the local population with a degree level qualification.</li><li>• Parishes with a GP, post office, play area, pub, village hall</li></ul>

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Percentage of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centre</li> <li>● Mix of housing tenure within settlements</li> <li>● Provision of new <u>youth and</u> community facilities secured through new developments</li> <li>● <u>Provision of open space secured through new developments</u></li> </ul>
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</b></p> <p>Create healthy and safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Monitor the number of domestic burglaries, violent offences, vehicle crimes, vandalism and all crime per 1,000 population.</li> <li>● Percentage of residents surveyed who feel ‘fairly safe’ or ‘very safe’ during the day whilst outside in their Local Authority.</li> <li>● Indexes of Multiple Deprivation throughout the District.</li> <li>● Monitor the type and number of applications permitted in the greenbelt.</li> <li>● Life expectancy</li> <li>● Hectares of new greenspace created</li> <li>● Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard</li> <li>● Death rates from circulatory disease, cancer, accidents and suicide</li> <li>● Residents description of Health</li> <li>● Obesity levels</li> <li>● <u>Provision of open space secured through new developments</u></li> </ul>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Housing</b></p> <p>To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings.</li> <li>● Indices of Multiple Deprivation – Housing and Services Domain</li> <li>● Percentage of households rented from the Council or in Housing Association/Registered Social Landlords properties</li> <li>● Percentage of new housing which is affordable</li> <li>● Average house price compared with average earnings</li> <li>● Number of housing Completions</li> <li>● <u>Percentage of Lifetime Homes</u></li> </ul>

## Potential Indicators

### 4. Economy & Employment

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

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

### 5. Accessibility

To promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and moving freight ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling

- Changes in the travel to work mode of transport
- Indices of Multiple Deprivation most notably the Housing and Services Domain
- Car ownership
- Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major health centre
- Kilometres of cycle routes and facilities for cyclists
- Kilometres of new walking routes provided
- Number of houses within a specified radius of services/facilities
- Number of houses within a suitable distance of [open space \(based on Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards – ANGSt<sup>6</sup>\)](#)

---

<sup>6</sup> Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards available from: [http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east\\_of\\_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandarda ngst.aspx](http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandarda ngst.aspx)

## Potential Indicators

### 6. Biodiversity

To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development

- Net change in natural/ semi natural habitats
- Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance
- Condition of designated sites
- Change in area of woodland
- Proportion of new developments delivering habitat creation or restoration
- Number of management plans for designated sites prepared and implemented
- Proportion of new developments delivering habitat mitigation
- Proportion of new developments delivering wildlife corridors
- Areas of geological significance safeguarded and/or extracted

### 7. Cultural Heritage

To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District

- Buildings of Grade I and II at risk of decay
- Condition of Conservation Areas
- Number of historic parks and gardens

### 8. Landscape & Townscape

To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes

- To monitor the number of parks awarded Green Flag Status
- To monitor the number of landscape or built environment designations
- Hectares of new development outside settlement boundaries
- Hedgerow and/or veteran tree loss
- Area of /change in landscape designations
- Percentage of development on previously developed land

## Potential Indicators

### 9. Climate Change & Energy

To reduce contributions to climate change

- Changes in the travel to work mode of transport
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Renewable energy capacity installed by type
- Percentage of new development including renewable energy generation
- Energy consumption
- [Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM compliance](#)
- [Percentage of the tonnage of household waste arisings which have been recycled](#)
- [Percentage of household waste sent by the Authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion](#)

### 10. Water

To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding

- Changing water quality
- Groundwater levels
- Percentage of new development incorporating water efficiency measures
- Water consumption per household
- Number of homes built against Environment Agency advice on flooding
- [Number and types of Sustainable Drainage Systems approved and implemented](#)

### 11. Land & Soil

To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil

- Use of previously developed land
- Density of new residential development
- Number of sites/hectares decontaminated as a result of new development



**Potential Indicators**

**12. Air Quality**

To improve air quality

- AQMA designations or threshold designations
- Growth in cars per household
- Growth in car trip generation
- Type of travel mode to work
- Percentage change in public transport patronage
- Number of days in the year when air quality is recorded as moderate or high for NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, CO and Ozone on average per site.

**13 Sustainable Design & Construction**

To promote sustainable design and construction

- Percentage of new development incorporating energy and water efficiency measures, and sustainable drainage systems
- Percentage of new development meeting BREEAM very good/excellent standards
- Percentage use of aggregates from secondary and recycled sources

## **10 Conclusion and Next Steps**

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