

# Consultation Statement

## **Hockley Area Action Plan Submission Document – the role of Community Involvement and Stakeholder Engagement**

This statement satisfies the requirements of Regulation 22 (c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

## Contents

1	Introduction .....	2
2	Statement of Community Involvement .....	3
3	Consultation Process Overview .....	3
4	The initial public participation and consultation .....	6
5	Consultation on Issues and Options Document 2009 .....	9
6	Options Document 2010 .....	13
7	HAAP Submission Document 2012 -2013 .....	17
8	Duty to Co-operate.....	24
9	Summary and Conclusion.....	25
	Appendix 1 – Specific & General Consultation Bodies .....	26
	Appendix 2 – Regulation 19 Notice .....	31
	Appendix 3 - Summary of issues raised by key stakeholders during Submission consultation and initial officer comments.....	49
	Appendix 4 – Summary of issues raised during Submission consultation and initial officer comments.....	78
	Appendix 5 – Economic Development Responses.....	80
	Appendix 6 – Hockley Parish Council Letter 2013.....	81
	Appendix 7 – Overview of approach taken to submission versions of Hockley, Rayleigh and Rochford AAPs.....	83
	Appendix 8 – Notes from Meeting between Rochford District Council and Essex County Council regarding Hockley Area Action Plan.....	85
	Appendix 9 – HAAP Issues and Options Summary of responses to the first round of community involvement.....	97
	Appendix 10 – HAAP Summary of responses to consultation carried out between November 2010 and February 2011.....	129

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 The Hockley Area Action Plan is a Development Plan Document (DPD) which focuses on guiding the development of Hockley centre, as well as adjoining light industrial areas and the rail station, during the current plan period to 2026. It is one of three such AAPs produced for the District's main urban areas of Hockley, Rochford and Rayleigh.
- 1.2 The Area Action Plans sit below the Core Strategy in the Local Development Framework and must conform to the overarching approach and policies set out within it. The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council on 13 December 2011.
- 1.3 The development of the HAAP has been an extensive process involving several stages of community involvement. This Consultation Statement sets out how local communities and other key partners have been involved in its preparation. It has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 22 (c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which requires the local planning authority to prepare a statement to accompany the proposed Allocations Submission Document, setting out the following:
- (i). which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18,
  - (ii). how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,
  - (iii). a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18,
  - (iv). how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account;
  - (v). if representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations; and
  - (vi). if no representations were made in regulation 20, that no such representations were made;

- 1.4 As such, for each stage in the production of the HAAP, this document sets out: the methods the Council employed to ensure community involvement; groups, organisations and bodies invited to make representation; a summary of the main issues raised; and how representations have influenced the plan-making process. It should be noted that this statement does not contain the detailed content of all the representations, but copies of all the representations are available on request.
- 1.5 There were four key stages where public consultation representations were invited: Initial public participation (2008); Issues and Options Document (2009); Options Document (2010); Pre-Submission Document (2012).

## 2 Statement of Community Involvement

- 2.1 Rochford District Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement. This sets out how the Council will involve the local community in the preparation of the Local Development Framework. Since the adoption of the Statement Community Involvement in 2007, new regulations came into force which amended the consultation requirements for Local Development Documents, including the stages at which consultation is undertaken.
- 2.2 Although the Statement of Community Involvement was prepared when different regulations were in place, the principles for community involvement and consultation set out in the Statement of Community Involvement are nevertheless still relevant and have been adhered to.
- 2.3 In addition to that undertaken specifically on the HAAP, it is important to note that community involvement and consultation on various elements of the evidence base and other strategies which have influenced the HAAP has also taken place.

## 3 Consultation Process Overview

- 3.1 The HAAP has been subject to an extensive process of consultation. Resulting from this high level of consultation and analysis the Council's plans for the town centre have evolved considerably to take into account the needs and wishes of the local residents, businesses and other stakeholders.
- 3.2 The Council retained the services of two consultants over the period of the consultation, the first being Urban Initiatives who were later replaced by Urban Practitioners (later AMUP). Urban Initiatives produce the Issues and Options version of the HAAP.
- 3.3 As a result of the early stages of public participation and consultation the HAAP was changed considerably, taking into account the views of the public.
- 3.4 Early public participation and consultation began in 2008. This included a Placecheck event on 23 February 2008. The event included a 'walkabout' around Hockley centre where residents could offer their views and aspirations for the centre. The Placecheck event was held so that the council could hear the public's views, ideas and concerns about the future of Hockley.

- 3.5 The Placecheck was a way of assessing the qualities of a place, showing what improvements are needed, and focusing people on working together to achieve them. The event involved a group tour of Hockley town centre where participants had the opportunity to point out what they liked and did not like, and what improvements they thought should be made.
- 3.6 Invitations to the Placecheck were sent to all residents on the Council's Citizens Panel who had expressed an interest in planning for the town centres.
- 3.7 The suggestions generated by the Placecheck event involved a high level of intervention and the HAAP has evolved considerably since this stage of public participation and community involvement.
- 3.8 Following the Placecheck event an online consultation system was provided, inviting people to submit their views and suggestions for improvements on the town centre. This system was successful and consequently the same online system was used throughout the HAAP consultation process. This had the beneficial effect of ensuring that members of the public were given many opportunities to use the online system and raise any issues or technical problems at the earliest possible stage. Further to this, members of the public who submitted their initial comments were automatically alerted to further developments as part of the Council's on-going commitment to public participation and consultation throughout the evolution of the HAAP.
- 3.9 The initial stage of public participation on the HAAP also involved engagement with local schools. This was carried out as an awareness raising exercise as well as a form of public consultation. The programme was largely carried out as part of a plan to raise awareness about the Council's Core Strategy however officers took the opportunity to raise awareness and seek feedback on the public's views on Hockley town centre. The main School workshop concerning Hockley took place at Greensward Academy, the only secondary school in Hockley.
- 3.10 Formal consultation on the HAAP Issues and Options Report began in 2009 and involved a round of public participation and community involvement. This version of the HAAP was subject to public participation and consulted between 13 February 2009 and 30 April 2009. Consultation letters and emails were sent out to members of the public, key-stakeholders and interested parties. Notification of the consultation was included in a copy of Rochford District Matters.
- 3.11 Taking account of the feedback from the public consultation the Council concluded that further changes to the HAAP would be of value and resolved to revisit the earlier options stage.
- 3.12 The Council's intention, supported by their consultant, to consult on a revised version of the HAAP, along with an explanation of the HAAP's wider strategic objectives was published on the Council's website.
- 3.13 The local community was consulted on the options for the HAAP in early 2010. A drop in session was arranged at the Greensward Academy in Hockley on 2 August 2010 and another was held on 27 August 2010. These meetings set out the Council's early options for the area. They constituted an additional stage of

public consultation prior to the start of the formal public participation and consultation process.

- 3.14 A subsequent drop-in session was held on 16 November 2010.
- 3.15 Following the formal publication for consultation, of the Options Document on 30 November 2010, there was a public meeting in Greensward Academy on 7 December 2010. This gave the public another opportunity to discuss the issues and ask questions about the HAAP.
- 3.16 The HAAP Options Report was made available for the first round of formal public consultation between 30 November 2010 and 4 February 2011. Specific and general consultation bodies; residents on the mailing list; and other stakeholders were directly notified of the consultation by email or post.
- 3.17 A public exhibition was held in Hockley Library running from 30 November 2010 to 4 February 2011. An online form was made available for the public to register their comments. The exhibition and the on-going status of the HAAP's development were covered in a publication of Rochford District Matters. The public were also made aware of the exhibition through notifications on the Council's website and mailing list.
- 3.18 A notification of the consultation was included in Rochford District Matters.
- 3.19 A public meeting was held on 7 December and a drop in session followed on 10 January 2011.
- 3.20 Based on the responses received from the consultation process and public consultations and participation, a frequently asked questions (FAQ) was produced and published on the Council's website. The aim was to provide further guidance to the public on the purposes of the HAAP and on the rest of the consultation and submission process.
- 3.21 The HAAP Options Report Consultation allowed the Council to narrow down its preferred options and to identify any areas of concern prior to the next stage of consultation.
- 3.22 With the assistance of AMUP, Rochford District Council undertook an additional stage of consultation on the HAAP which involved a public exhibition held at Hockey Library between 14 August 2012 and 28 August 2012. The exhibition gave members of the public the opportunity to comment on what would eventually become the final version of the HAAP. This was useful as it gave the Council the chance to re-engage with the public given a lengthy gap between iterations.
- 3.23 The comments from the Hockley Library Exhibition were used in conjunction with the experience gained from previous stages of community involvement to produce a frequently asked questions document. This FAQ was then published on the Council's website with the aim of providing another level of support and guidance to potential respondents.
- 3.24 The final stage of public consultation took place on 4 December 2012 with the publication for consultation of the HAAP Submission Document. At this stage the

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Council asked if the public believed the HAAP to be ‘sound and/or legally compliant’. This document was widely commented on and received a great deal of public interest.

- 3.25 A breakdown of the complete HAAP consultation process can be found in Table 1 below.

**Table 1- Consultation Process Overview**

Stage	Key event
Initial public participation and consultation	Placecheck event
	Online consultation
	School workshop
Issues and Options 2009	<b>Issue and Options Document published for consultation, 13 February 2009</b>
	Representations invited 13 February 2009 – 30 April 2009. Consultation letters and emails sent.
	Public meetings (including Central Area Committee, 3 March 2009)
	Rochford District Matters article
	Press release
Options 2010	Public drop-in session, 2 August 2010
	Public drop-in session, 27 August 2010
	<b>Options Document published for consultation, 30 November 2010</b>
	Representations invited 30 November 2010 – 4 February 2011. Consultation letters and emails sent.
	Rochford District Matters article
	Drop-in session, 16 November 2010
	Public meeting, 7 December 2010
	Drop-in session, 10 January 2011
Submission Document 2012-2013	Exhibition, 14 August 2012 – 24 August 2012
	<b>Submission Document published for pre-submission consultation, 29 November 2012</b>
	Representations invited 29 November 2011 – 25 January 2013. Consultation letters and emails sent.

## 4 The initial public participation and consultation

- 4.1 The HAAP has undergone a high degree of public consultation and community involvement.
- 4.2 The Council engaged the community and other stakeholders through the actions set out in Table 2 below.

**Table 2 - Consultation methods, Initial public participation and consultation**

Consultation Method	Details
---------------------	---------

<p>Placecheck Event, 23 February 2008</p>	<p>A Placecheck event was set up on 23 February 2008. The purpose of this event was to give residents and interested parties an option to participate in the HAAP from the very earliest stages of the process and to make the public participation and consultation process an integral part the HAAP's development.</p> <p>The Placecheck involved a series of questions, starting from what people liked or disliked about the place and what they felt needed to be done to improve the area. The Council used these questions to generate wider discussion.</p> <p>The Placecheck events were held to help inform ideas and options for future change and improvement in the town centres of Rochford and Hockley, ensuring that the views and opinions of local residents help generate these options.</p> <p>Invitations to participate in the process were sent to all residents on the Council's Citizens Panel who had expressed an interest in planning for the town centres.</p> <p>Participants joined a walking tour of the town centre, during which questions were asked about issues and opportunities, likes and dislikes. This was followed by a feedback session.</p> <p>The 2009 HAAP Issues and Options Report which was produced following the Place check event and public participation and consultation. It provides an overview of the comments received and an assessment of how they could be integrated into further plans for Hockley.</p> <p>Ultimately the Placecheck was used to help facilitate the development of the 2009 Issues and Options Report.</p>
<p>Online Consultation</p>	<p>An online consultation form was set up on the Council's website for members of the public to comment on what they liked and disliked about Hockley Centre.</p> <p>The consultation made use of a generalised series of questions, shown below, with the intention of gathering as wide a selection of viewpoints as possible.</p> <p>Questions asked in the consultation were as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What do you like about the town centre?</li> <li>- What do you think about the range of shops, cafes, restaurants and other facilities in the town centre?</li> <li>- What do you think is missing?</li> <li>- How do you think things could be improved?</li> <li>- What do you think about traffic and parking in the town centre?</li> <li>- Is the town centre accessible?</li> </ul> <p><a href="http://rochford.jdi-">http://rochford.jdi-</a></p>



	<a href="http://consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?docelemid=24105&amp;docid=160">consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?docelemid=24105&amp;docid=160</a>
Engagement with schools	<p>In late 2008 the Council engaged with local young people via schools.</p> <p>Primarily these engagement exercises were aimed at raising awareness about the Council’s Core Strategy, however Hockley was also addressed as part of the Greensward school event, as this is the only secondary school in Hockley.</p> <p>The workshop had the dual purpose of raising awareness and gaining feedback, particularly from young people from under represented.</p> <p>Several students were asked to produce video diaries which served the combined purpose of raising awareness about the issues that face Hockley and, once they were fed back to the rest of the participants, served as excellent consultation tools.</p> <p>The Greensward School workshop took place with up to 40 students being asked questions and responding using Zing software.</p> <p>The Zing software involves one large screen in the centre of the room, and several keyboards that can type onto it. Questions were displayed on the screen, and the students were given a set amount of time to discuss them before typing an answer. Each pair of students had one keyboard between them. Zing also enables everyone to read the responses, and the facilitators to pick up on an answer and create a new discussion point from it. For example, when talking about Town Centres, a graffiti wall provoked debate and so this was carried on to a separate question.</p> <p>The students were given an opportunity to discuss and respond to questions posed to them as well as to brainstorm issues freely.</p>

**Table 3 - Issues arising from initial public participation**

<b>Issues arising from the consultation</b>
Parking regulations are disregarded (they should be more clearly marked) and there should be more free parking (suggested site was on the Plumberow Avenue side of the Railway Station).
There is litter on the streets and many aspects of the town

**Making a Difference**

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

---

environment are in a poor state of repair including bus shelters and seats, open space near the railway bridge, the pavements, the shop car parks and shop fronts.
There is not a wide range of shops: too many charity shops / take away shops / closed down shops, not enough family restaurants, cafes and clothes stores.
There could be improvement of the station forecourt.
A youth meeting place is needed and it was suggested that Spa Pump rooms could be used for a community use. More community facilities and multi function buildings in general were also supported.
CCTV cameras are needed.
There is a need to improve traffic issues in Hockley - Traffic congestion at Spa Road roundabout and the junction of Spa Road, Station Road and Station Approach – and there should be more Cycling facilities.
Development should take place through infilling existing sites / replacing houses with flats rather than encroaching into the greenspace. In addition if development were to take place, infrastructure should match the housing development.
Development should be environmentally friendly .
The village feel of Hockley should be maintained.
Hockley would benefit from improvements to its public spaces.
Hockley lacks a clearly defined village centre with suitable anchor buildings.
Green links and pedestrian routes should be considered.
Improvements to public transport are needed.
A one way system was proposed.
A toll road system was proposed.
Additional street furniture and planted areas were suggested.
Additional car parking was suggested.

### 5 Consultation on Issues and Options Document 2009

- 5.1 The second stage in the preparation of the HAAP was the Issues and Options report that sets out the initial issues and options for the area in question and seeks the views of the public on them.
- 5.2 The issues raised during the initial stage of public participation and consultation were assessed prior to the production of the Issues and Options Document. The key issues and options set out in the Issues and Options report are based on the assessment of the views that were presented through the initial public participation undertaken in 2008, in conjunction with the expertise of the Council's consultants at the time, Urban Initiatives, and other elements of the Local Development Framework evidence base.

### Making a Difference

---

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

- 5.3 The Issues and Options Document took account of the data gathered during the initial stages of public engagement and consultation detailed in Table 2 in chapter 4. Feedback from these initiatives helped to shape the strategy for the development of the Town Centre. By seeking the views of residents at this early stage the Council was better able to integrate the wishes of the public into the HAAP process.
- 5.4 The Issues and Options Report was made available for public consultation between 13 February and 30 April 2009. The consultation period was advertised in an issue of Rochford District Matters, which is sent to the majority of residents within the District. Additionally the consultation was publicised on the RDC website and letters and emails were sent to general and specific consultation bodies; members of the public who had signed up to the Council’s mailing list; and other stakeholders. Members of the public that had previously used the online consultation form were also notified.
- 5.5 The Council consulted the community and other stakeholders using methods detailed in Table 4 below.

**Table 4** – Encouraging public participation on the initial HAAP options.

Consultation Method	Details
Public meetings	<p>Public Meetings took place in early 2009 as part of the consultation on the HAAP Issues and Options Report.</p> <p>A presentation on the purpose and content of the document was given by officers and members of the public could ask questions.</p>
Central Area Committee	<p>The plan was discussed at a meeting of the Central Area Committee on 3 March 2009. The publicity for this meeting of the Area committee was as per the publicity for all Area Committee meetings. In addition, a presentation was given to a Hockley Residents Association meeting to further increase local awareness of the proposals and the opportunity to participate.</p>
Consultation letters to stakeholders	<p>Letters were sent to those on the Council’s Local Development Framework mailing list – which comprises of statutory consultees, parties with an interest in the development of the District and members of the public who have registered an interest in the HAAP. The Council has also been encouraging residents to join the mailing list through, for example, articles in the Council’s free newsletter ‘Rochford District Matters’.</p> <p>Letters and emails were sent to local representative groups (including the Chamber of Trade, Hockley Parish Plan Group, Residents Association etc); statutory consultees (including Hockley Parish Council, Essex County Council, and a number of government and non-government organisations); and planning agents / developers on our mailing list.</p> <p>Groups written to inviting comment included those representing sections of the society who have traditionally been underrepresented in the planning process. Mindful that the over-reliance on electronic communication may</p>

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

	exclude some sections of society, the opportunity to comment via written correspondence was also made available.
Rochford District Matters	An article explaining the consultation and how to submit views was included in the Spring edition of Rochford District Matters which is delivered to the majority of households in the district.
Press release	A press release was issued to local newspapers.
Online consultation system	The Council's online consultation system was utilised. Those on the mailing list with an email address were sent a link to the website (letters sent out to consultees also included the link for the consultation system), and the consultation was a 'Hot Topic' on the Council's website, with links to the document and consultation system, prominently displayed on the Council's homepage.
Leaflets and Posters	Leaflets/posters were distributed to shops and businesses in Hockley, as well as to the local library. In addition, Hockley Parish Council were given five posters to display on their various Parish notice boards.
Paper copies of the Issues and Options Document were made available	Paper copies of the document were available in the Council Offices, Hockley Library, and were sent, free of charge, to those who requested them. Paper representation forms were made available in Hockley library and were sent out to those who requested them. Paper representation forms included a freepost address to return comments to. Comments submitted in writing which did not utilise the official paper representation form were still accepted and given equal weighting.

5.6 Table 5 provides a numerical break down of representations by subject.

5.7 **Table 5** – Numerical breakdown of initial consultation responses

Section Name	Respondents	Objectors	Support	Object	Comment	Representations
Hockley Area Action Plan – Issues and Options	396	327	27	784	263	1074
1.1 What is an Area Action Plan?	4	3	0	3	1	4
1.2 What does this Area Action Plan Cover?	11	9	0	22	3	25
1.3 What is the Issues and Options Report?	5	5	0	5	0	5
1.4 Overview of the area and planning policy context	12	10	0	27	2	29
1.5 Getting your views	24	12	0	12	12	24
2.1 Introduction	8	7	0	7	1	8
2.2 What you told us	22	11	2	15	12	29
2.3 Urban design analysis	15	9	1	13	6	20
2.4 Land uses	18	14	0	23	5	28

### Making a Difference

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Section Name	Respondents	Objectors	Support	Object	Comment	Representations
2.5 Form and structure	16	12	0	16	4	20
2.6 Street network/ management	19	13	0	24	6	30
2.7 Pedestrian and cycle network	14	7	1	8	6	15
2.8 Public transport	16	9	0	15	8	23
2.9 Summary of issues	31	10	3	11	22	36
3.1 Vision	15	11	1	11	3	15
3.2 Objectives	26	14	4	24	13	41
3.3 Potential opportunity sites	275	256	1	290	33	324
3.4 Development option 1.1 and 1.2	53	26	3	40	29	72
3.5 Development option 2.1 and 2.2	27	18	0	28	10	38
3.6 Development option 3.1 and 3.2	52	29	4	34	19	57
3.7 Summary comparison of the options	29	12	2	12	15	29
3.8 Scale/ quantum	11	11	0	21	0	21
3.9 Transport options	69	40	5	78	34	117
3.10 Development issues	17	11	0	13	7	20
4.1 The Area Action Plan Process	3	2	0	2	1	3
4.2 Sending in your views	30	22	0	22	9	31
Appendix A: Planning Policy Context	5	4	0	8	1	9
Appendix C: Glossary	1	0	0	0	1	1

5.8 The residents' comments on the original HAAP options were also taken into account when developing the update options and are summarised in Table 6 below.

5.9 **Table 6** - Issues arising from the consultation on the Issues and Options Document 2009

Issues arising from the consultation
The Hockley AAP should acknowledge the existing character of Hockley and seek to preserve and enhance this.
The AAP should not only promote new development in Hockley but should guard against inappropriate development in the centre.
A range of options should be provided for the centre, with different levels of intervention.
Eldon Way Industrial Estate should be preserved as an employment use as much as possible
Greater attention should be given to improvements in Hockley which do not rely on new development.
New housing in the centre should be limited in numbers and sensitive to the existing character.
Greater focus should be given to the delivery and funding of options for the Hockley AAP.
Respondents commented that the 2009 Issues and Options Report was too prescriptive and did not provide enough options for Hockley.

## Making a Difference

- 5.10 See Appendix 9 for the full HAAP Summary of Representations on the 2009 Issues and Options Document.

### 6 Options Document 2010

- 6.1 Several concerns were raised by the local community regarding the original Hockley AAP options, developed in 2009. In response to this the Council committed to reviewing the options and commission a new study to develop amended options for the community to consider.
- 6.2 The issues raised during the consultation on the 2009 Issues and Options Report were addressed during the production of the HAAP Options Report 2010.
- 6.3 Following the public consultation and participation carried out on the HAAP Issues and Options Report 2009 a series options were generated. These ranged from relatively minor interventions to the appearance of the area, to options that entail extensive redevelopment of Hockley Centre. Other options that were developed included possible highways improvements.
- 6.4 For the purpose of developing the updated Hockley AAP options the team looked at the data gathered from previous stages of community engagement and consultation exercises. These included feedback on options proposed in the Options report 2009, the Hockley Parish Plan residents survey and the Placecheck consultation.
- 6.5 The project team also held a drop in session on 2 August 2010 in Kilnfield House on the Foundry Business Park. Approximately 60 residents attended, giving the project team to speak with residents and gain a better understanding of their aspirations for the area.
- 6.6 This drop-in session was arranged as an opportunity for key stakeholders to discuss their concerns, ideas and issues in respect of the HAAP with the consultants who were appointed to produce it. The Parish Council, Residents Associations, Parish Plan Group, Hockley Under Threat group, Chambers of Trade, Network Rail, school, local churches, local traders, and other groups / organisations were invited.
- 6.7 A public drop-in session was held on 27 August 2010 which sought greater community involvement. As with the previous drop-in session, participants had the opportunity to discuss issues in an informal setting.
- 6.8 Although the Council chose to commission a new study to develop amended options for the HAAP, the issues raised through consultation on the Issues and Options Report 2009 were not ignored, instead they were incorporated into the evidence base used in the production of the updated report. In this way the views and concerns of residents who had previously commented were not ignored or devalued.

- 6.9 The HAAP Options Report built on the data gathered during the Issues and Options Report. Unlike the Issues and Options Report, the Options Report proposes a series of general principles that focus on guiding land uses, the design of buildings and the public realm, and traffic and pedestrian movement, transport and car parking.
- 6.10 Three key spatial options were proposed, each offering a different response to the overarching general principals. Each option represents a different level of intervention.
- 6.11 Within each of the overarching spatial options several detailed sub-options were proposed for consideration.

**Table 7 - HAAP Options Report 2010, Spatial Options**

Option Number	Option Description
Option1	A series of minimal interventions, with a focus on improving pedestrian links, car parking, the public realm and shop fronts, as well as the replacement of some poor quality buildings with new shops.
Option 2	A programme of higher level interventions, which would involve the replacement of poor quality buildings, including some existing light industrial uses, consolidation and expansion of leisure uses on the Hockley Trading Estate, redevelopment of retail uses on Main Road, and a strong pedestrian link between the rail station and the Hockley Trading Estate.
Option 3	The highest level of interventions, including substantial redevelopment of the Hockley Trading Estate and adjoining buildings fronting Spa Road to create a new leisure and retail space, the relocation of the existing health centre to form a community hub on Southend Road, and new housing north of the rail line.

- 6.12 The Options Report also set out several alternatives for transport in the area. These centre on providing junction improvements to alleviate the traffic congestion on the Spa Road mini roundabout. They suggested the possibility of a shared surface on the Spa Road and an increase in the provision of on- street parking. Drop off and pick up arrangements at the rail station were also identified as a priority for improvement.
- 6.13 Formal consultation on the amended HAAP Options Document 2010 took place between 20 November 2010 and 4 February 2011. The consultation was advertised in the Southend Standard on Friday 17 December 2010 whilst posters were set up in local shops, Hockley Library, parish notice boards and the Rochford District Council notice boards. Consultation emails / letters were sent to members of the mailing list (including general and specific consultation bodies; members of the public who had previously commented; and other stakeholders) from 30 November 2010. Notification of the consultation was included in the winter

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

2010 edition of Rochford District Matters. A notification was included in the RDC Hot Topic website. Additionally RDC liaised with Hockley Parish Council to produce an exhibition on 30 November 2010. As an additional part of the consultation an exhibition was set up in Hockley Library. The exhibition included posters outlining the proposals and options, a copy of the document itself and representation forms.

- 6.14 A public drop –in session was held on 16 November 2010 at Greensward Academy. This session gave members of the public the opportunity to speak face to face with the project team about the progress of the HAAP, and their views on it. A public meeting was held on 7 December 2010 in which the project team and Councillors explained the HAAP, and members of the public had opportunity to ask questions, suggest ideas and express concerns.
- 6.15 A further stakeholder drop-in session was held on 10 January 2011 part way through the consultation process.
- 6.16 A detailed breakdown of how the Council consulted the community and other stakeholders can be found in Table 8 below.

**Table 8 - Encouraging public participation in the HAAP Options Document 2010**

Consultation Method	Details
Hockley Parish Plan residents survey	Hockley Residents Association, Hockley Under Threat and Hockley Parish Plan Group carried out a survey on what changes residents would like to see for the Centre of Hockley. This survey also included Hawkwell residents, as the Residents Association concluded that Hockley is the main shopping centre for many residents of Hawkwell.
Public drop-in session 2 August 2010	A public drop-in session was held in Kilnfield House on 2 August 2010.
Public drop-in session 27 August 2010	Following the publication of the Options Report 2010 a public drop-in session was held on 16 November 2010.
Formal consultation on the HAAP Options Document from 30 November 2010 to 4 February 2011	Consultation on the HAAP Options Report 2010 was carried out between 30 November 2010 and 4 February 2011.
Rochford District Matters	Notification of the consultation period was included in the Autumn copy of Rochford District Matters, which is sent out to most of the District's residents.



## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Consultation Method	Details
Posters	Posters publicising the HAAP consultation were posted in local shops, Hockley Library, parish council notice boards and RDC's office.
Consultation letters	Consultation letters and emails were sent to residents. These went out to all members of the RDC mailing list as well as key stakeholders and members of the public who had previously used the online representation system.
Exhibition in Hockley Library.	An exhibition on the HAAP Options Document was held in Hockley Library on 30 November 2010. Copies of the document and representation forms were made available, both in the library and in Rochford District Council offices. The Council's Hot Topic website was also updated.
Consultation advertised in newspaper	The consultation on the HAAP Options Report was advertised in the Southend Standard on Friday 17 December 2010.
Public Meeting	Public meeting and presentation 7 December 2010.
Stakeholder drop-in session	Public Meeting 10 January 2011.

**Table 9** - Numerical breakdown of consultation responses

Section Name	Respondents	Objectors	Support	Object	Comment	Representations
Hockley Area Action Plan Options Report	192	152	58	1029	157	1244
1. Introduction	8	1	1	1	8	10
2. Context for the AAP options	5	1	0	1	6	7
3. Consultation feedback	8	1	1	1	8	10
4. Overarching framework and principles	144	134	1	138	12	151
5. Option 1	167	142	15	147	20	182
6. Option 2	160	140	15	148	24	187
Option 2a	149	137	3	143	14	160
7. Option 3	159	145	12	161	20	193
Option 3a	147	138	2	142	10	154
8. Transport options	153	138	4	142	15	161
9. Funding and delivery	12	3	0	3	11	14
10. Next steps	12	2	4	2	9	15

**Table 10** - Key Questions arising from the Options Report 2010

Issues arising from the consultation
Some residents were still unsure and/or unconvinced of why the Council was producing the HAAP. A common misconception was that the HAAP was essentially a planning application.
Respondents wanted to know what would happen once the HAAP had been finalised?
Respondents questioned why does the Hockley Area Action Plan Options Report propose housing in the centre of Hockley?
Respondents queried how the options in the HAAP Options Report were generated?
Respondents queried why the HAAP Options Report did not propose the redevelopment of the whole of Eldon Way or the Foundry estates?
Respondents asked for clarification on what it meant if their business/ home was proposed to be redeveloped in on of the options?
Respondents asked if businesses wish to relocate, will the Council help them to find new premises in the District?

6.17 A detailed breakdown of the responses to the HAAP Options Report 2010 can be found in Appendix 10.

## **7 HAAP Submission Document 2012 -2013**

- 7.1 The responses to the Options Document 2010 were reviewed once the consultation period ended and were used to help formulate the project team's strategy for developing the HAAP Submission Document.
- 7.2 Before the HAAP Submission Document was produced the team concluded that Hockley residents would benefit from a further stage of consultation, in large part due to the change in government and planning policy that took place during the interim between the Options Report and the Submission Document. It was decided that this should take the form of a public exhibition held between 14 and 24 August 2012.
- 7.3 Local Residents Associations, Parish Councils and Hockley and Hawkwell councillors were emailed on 8 August 2012 to inform them that the exhibition would be taking place.
- 7.4 The exhibition was held at Hockley Library. It included posters depicting the options being proposed for Hockley. Additionally comment forms were made available and were replenished regularly.
- 7.5 The Library Exhibition was publicised on the Council's website.

- 7.6 The issues raised as a result of the HAAP Library Exhibition were reviewed by the project team as a prelude to the production of the HAAP Submission Document. These issues can be viewed in the table below.

**Table 11 - Issues raised as part of HAAP Library Exhibition 2012**

Issue raised during HAAP Exhibition
Hockley is a village and its character should be maintained.
There is a great deal of concern about the current traffic situation and the impact that any development would have on congestion in Hockley.
Highways and other infrastructure should be improved in line with any new development.
The Spa Road mini-roundabout, the junction at the railway bridge and the pedestrian crossings on Spa Road and Southend Road should all be improved.
There is a distinct need for additional parking provision in the centre.
Additional public transport is require, as well as new and improved pedestrian and cycle routes, given that all of these measures would serve to reduce the congestion levels in the centre.
Affordable housing should be a priority, provided that a high standard of architecture and design would be delivered.
There is a need to retain existing shops and services within the area.
Retail development in Hockley should be of an appropriate scale.
A range of views have been expressed regarding proposals for the redevelopment of the Hockley Trading Centre. In particular, whilst there is support for the use of previously developed land for housing, there are concerns over the loss of employment and leisure uses.

- 7.7 The project team’s assessment of the responses to the Hockley Library Exhibition, in addition to helping to define the salient and up to date issues relating to the HAAP, demonstrated that there were several areas where the public and residents would benefit from clarification. As such the project team produced a ‘frequently asked question’ document.
- 7.8 The FAQ sought to address the most common questions raised during the course of the Library Exhibition. The FAQ sought to address any misconceptions the public may have held prior to the final formal stage of consultation. The HAAP FAQ can be viewed online on the Council’s website on the link below.
- [http://www.rochford.gov.uk/sites/rochford.gov.uk/files/documents/files/planning\\_haa\\_p\\_faq.pdf](http://www.rochford.gov.uk/sites/rochford.gov.uk/files/documents/files/planning_haa_p_faq.pdf)
- 7.9 Having concluded the HAAP Library Exhibition and updated residents and interested parties on the status of the HAAP the project team began preparing the HAAP Submission Document for formal consultation.
- 7.10 The HAAP Submission Document has built upon the work done to create the 2009 Issues and Options document and the 2010 Options Report. As a document it draws on the wealth of information gathered as part of the extensive public participation and consultation process that has been carried out for the HAAP.

This process also took account of other evidence based documents and appraisals including the Sustainability Appraisal as discussed below.

- 7.11 The HAAP Submission Document identified the key character areas within Hockley. It identified the existing planning policy context and gave an overview of other key documents that had informed the development of the HAAP, including the Hockley Parish Plan 2007 and the emerging Allocations (2010) and Development Management documents (2011).
- 7.12 In August 2012 a Sustainability Appraisal of the HAAP was published in accordance with the European SEA Directive. The Sustainability Appraisal assessed the alternatives set out in the 2010 Options Report in relation to their environmental, social and economic impacts.
- 7.13 The final Sustainability Appraisal identified that a ‘do nothing’ option was not appropriate in the face of national and local planning policies.
- 7.14 The conclusion of the Sustainability Appraisal was that the high and medium intervention options performed better than the low intervention option in terms of providing regeneration and economic growth, as long as suitable phasing and mitigation measures could be built in to minimise disruption through noise and traffic congestion during the construction of new developments.
- 7.15 The outputs of the Sustainability Appraisal helped to shape the policy options selected.
- 7.16 The HAAP then goes on to set out the ultimate vision to take Hockley up to 2026 through a series of Policies which will guide development.
- 7.17 The Council consulted the community and other stakeholders through the actions set out in Table 12 below.

**Table 12 – Consultation methods at the HAAP Submission Document 2012-13**

Consultation Method	Details
HAAP exhibition in Hockley Library	A public exhibition was held on the emerging framework for the plan. This exhibition presented several options for the development of Hockley Centre and in addition to the public exhibition, interested parties could also view the exhibition material on the RDC website.
	Comment forms were also made available in Hockley Library.
	Residents Associations, parish Councils and Hockley and Hawkwell councillors were contacted by email on 8 August 2012, informing them of the status of the Exhibition.
	The Hockley library exhibition helped to reengage with residents following a period of time between iterations of the Plan.

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Consultation letters to stakeholders	Consultation, letters were sent to those on the Council’s Local Development Framework mailing list – which comprises of statutory consultees, parties with an interest in the development of the District and members of the public who have registered an interest in the HAAP. The Council has also been encouraging residents to join the mailing list through, for example, articles in the Council’s free newsletter ‘Rochford District Matters’.
	Letters and emails were sent to local representative groups (including the Chamber of Trade, Hockley Parish Plan Group, Residents Association etc); statutory consultees (including Hockley Parish Council, Essex County Council, and a number of government and non-government organisations); and planning agents / developers on our mailing list.
	Groups written to inviting comment included those representing sections of the society who have traditionally been underrepresented in the planning process. Mindful that the over-reliance on electronic communication may exclude some sections of society, the opportunity to comment via written correspondence was also made available.
Online representations	The Council’s online consultation system was utilised. Those on the mailing list with an email address were sent a link to the website (letters sent out to consultees also included the link for the consultation system), and the consultation was a ‘Hot Topic’ on the Council’s website, with links to the document and consultation system, prominently displayed on the Council’s homepage.
Public notice	The Regulation 19 notice was submitted in copies of RDM and the Southend Standard . The relevant notice can be found in Appendix 2.

7.18 A total of 3298 representations were made at this stage by 849 different respondents. Of the 3298 representations made, 839 objected to the HAAP Submission Document on the grounds of soundness / legal compliance. Table 13 provides a numerical break down of representations by subject.

**Table 13** – Numerical breakdown of HAAP Submission Document 2012-13 consultation responses

Section Name	Respondents	Objectors	Support	Object	Comment	Representations
Hockley Area Action Plan Submission Document	849	939	22	3276	0	3298
1.1 The big picture	784	781	3	790	0	793
1.2 Working with our community	9	9	0	13	0	13
1.3 Working with our partners	3	3	0	3	0	3
1.4 The AAP area	2	2	0	2	0	2
2.1 The Hockley Context	2	2	0	2	0	2
2.2 Place profile	5	5	0	5	0	5

### Making a Difference

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Section Name	Respondents	Objectors	Support	Object	Comment	Representations
2.3 Policy context	4	4	0	4	0	4
2.4 Retail issues	6	6	0	7	0	7
2.5 Employment issues	2	2	0	2	0	2
2.6 Land ownership context	3	3	0	3	0	3
2.7 Property market overview	3	3	0	3	0	3
2.8 Movement issues	4	4	0	4	0	4
2.9 The Sustainability Appraisal	5	5	0	5	0	5
3.1 What makes for a sustainable Hockley?	5	5	0	5	0	5
3.2 Vision and Objectives	7	7	0	7	0	7
3.3 Arriving at a framework	3	3	0	3	0	3
Policy 1 – Hockley Area Action Plan framework	38	34	4	35	0	39
4. Proposals plan and area-wide policies	6	6	0	8	0	8
Policy 2 – Delivering environmental improvements	9	7	2	7	0	9
Policy 3 – Promoting better movement	780	776	4	790	0	794
Policy 4 – Increasing the availability of housing	9	8	2	10	0	12
Policy 5 – Protecting jobs	7	6	1	6	0	7
Policy 6 – Improving retail choice for local people	778	777	3	783	0	786
Policy 7 – Ensuring a healthy centre	4	3	1	3	0	4
Policy 8 – Encouraging leisure opportunities	6	4	2	4	0	6
5.1 – Working in partnership	4	4	0	4	0	4
5.2 – Financial viability	759	759	0	763	0	763
5.3 – Community infrastructure	3	3	0	3	0	3
5.4 – Monitoring change	2	2	0	2	0	2

- 7.19 Additional evidence submitted by respondents during the submission consultation is available to view separately.
- 7.20 A summary of the issues raised by specific and general consultation bodies at the pre-submission stage, together with initial officer comments on these, is detailed in Appendix 3. Issues raised by other respondents during the consultation are set out in Appendix 4.
- 7.21 Original copies of additional supporting evidence submitted during the consultation are available to view separately.
- 7.22 The questions and issues raised during the consultation on the Hockley Submission Document were assessed and a tables were produced to support this

document which contained responses to the various issues raised . These tables can be viewed online or in Appendixes 3 and 4.

7.23 The Table below gives an overview of the primary issues raised as part of the consultation on the HAAP Submission Document and officers responses to them.

**Table 14 - Issues raised during consultation on HAAP Submission Document**

Issue Raised	Officers Response
<p>Throughout the HAAP process the potential impact of development on the highways infrastructure of Hockley has been a significant area of concern.</p>	<p>A specialist transport consultant working on the HAAP regularly liaised with Essex County Council Highways in respect of the Plan.</p> <p>An overview of the approach undertaken in respect of the HAAP was produced for information, a copy of which can be viewed in Appendix 7.</p> <p>Following responses to public consultation raising concerns over highways, Rochford District Council met with Essex to discuss these issues. The notes from the meeting between Rochford District Council and Essex County Council can be viewed in Appendix 8.</p> <p>At this meeting Essex County Council confirmed that proposed development could be accommodated and any necessary mitigation measures to highways could be implemented; the approach to highways in the HAAP did not present any concerns for the Highway Authority; and confirmed a transport assessment for the Area Action Plan would not be required, rather such assessments would be required to accompany any strategic planning applications for development.</p>
<p>Several comments from members of the public queried why the area action plans for Rochford and Rayleigh included a traffic assessment whilst the HAAP did not?</p>	<p>RDC can confirm that no traffic assessments have been carried out for any of the area action plans.</p> <p>Traffic assessments are required to accompany strategic planning applications. Essex County Council Highways would only require area wide traffic assessments to be carried out for development plan documents if they have significant concerns about the impact on the transport network.</p> <p>As Essex County Council have confirmed that this is not the case for Hockley, Rochford or Rayleigh no traffic assessments have been carried out.</p> <p>However traffic assessments will be required as part of planning applications for any significant new development. Such applications must include surveys</p>

## Rochford District Council – Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

	<p>and modelling work and present these in detailed Transport Assessments and Travel Plans, in accordance with the Department for Transport's Guidance on Transport Assessment (March 2007).</p> <p>The Overview of the approach to Rochford's three Area Action Plans can be viewed online or in Appendix 7.</p>
Highways and other infrastructure should be improved in line with any new development.	<p>Noted. New development under the HAAP will bring with it potential investment in infrastructure. Appropriate improvements to infrastructure and local services will be required as part of any significant planning application to develop within the area.</p> <p>Additionally the HAAP options did identify that appropriate infrastructure improvements needed to be included in any medium or high intervention developments.</p>
The village character of Hockley should be maintained.	Noted. The HAAP is committed to retaining and enhancing the unique character of Hockley as part of its plan for any redevelopment.
The Spa Road mini roundabout, the junction at the railway bridge and the pedestrian crossings on Spa Road and Southend Road should be improved.	<p>Policy 3 in the HAAP Submission Document sets out the priorities for delivering transport improvements within Hockley.</p> <p>These include improving pedestrian links in key areas of Hockley, including Spa Road.</p> <p>Traffic assessments are required to accompany strategic planning applications. Essex County Council Highways would only require area wide traffic assessments to be carried out for development plan documents if they have significant concerns about the impact on the transport network.</p>
Additional parking in Hockley Centre is essential to improving the area.	<p>It is important that sufficient parking is available to ensure future uses are viable.</p> <p>The HAAP identifies opportunities for improvement which should be considered as part of any development. These include formalising and increasing the level of parking provision in the centre of Hockley.</p>
The area would benefit from additional public transport.	The HAAP notes that Hockley centre is relatively well-served by public transport, with the rail station giving access to regular services terminating at either Southend Victoria or London Liverpool Street, and with four regular bus services stopping along Spa Road and the B1013. However, the HAAP also recognises that there



	is potential for improvements, including the provision of more frequent services, real-time bus information, shelters at some stops, and improved walking routes between the rail station, bus stops and key destinations.
A diverse range of views have been expressed regarding the redevelopment of Hockley Trading Centre. There is support for the use of previously developed land for housing, there are concerns over the loss of employment and leisure uses.	Whilst still recognising the concerns of residents, both in support and opposition to the redevelopment, the Council feels that the Trading Estate offers an excellent opportunity to bring much needed rejuvenation to the area as well as to comply with national planning policy regulations on the preferential use of brownfield land over greenfield land. The HAAP proposes a balanced approach, whereby opportunities for redevelopment are recognised for part of Eldon Way; with the remainder of Eldon Way retaining its employment allocation.

7.24 A detailed assessment of the issues raised during the consultation on the HAAP Submission Document 2012-2013 is available in Appendix 3 and 4.

## **8 Duty to Co-operate**

- 8.1 The Localism Bill received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011. Section 110 of the Localism Act sets out the duty to co-operate, which relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas or on a planning matter that falls within the remit of a county council. It requires councils to set out planning policies to address such issues, and consider joint approaches to plan making. It also requires councils to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with other councils and public bodies in plan preparation.
- 8.2 The Core Strategy was produced in compliance with the now defunct Regional Spatial Strategy – the East of England Plan – which was approved by local authorities in the region.
- 8.3 Neighbouring authorities and Essex County Council were notified directly of the emerging HAAP prior to formal consultation on it. No neighbouring authorities identified any issues of cross-boundary concern, which is perhaps not surprising given Hockley’s central geographical position within the District and the fact that the objectives for the HAAP had already been identified through the Rochford Core Strategy.
- 8.4 Highways are the principal strategic issue facing the District. Essex County Council is the highways authority for the District, and the Council has engaged with the highways authority throughout the preparation of both the Core Strategy and the Allocations Document.

- 8.5 Discussions with the highways authority during the preparation of the HAAP has considered the cumulative, and individual, impact of the developments across Hockley on the highway network.
- 8.6 As the issue of highway was raised as a concern by a number of local residents during the pre-submission consultation, Officers of Rochford District Council met with Essex County Council to discuss these concerns and to clarify the Highway Authority's position. A note of this meeting is appended as Appendix 8.

### 9 Summary and Conclusion

- 9.1 Rochford District Council has been committed to preparing Area Action Plans for all of its major centres, including Rochford, Rayleigh and Hockley. It is the intention of the Council that the HAAP will ensure positive and appropriate growth in Hockley throughout the current plan period to 2026. It is envisaged that under the guidance of the HAAP, Hockley will benefit from a higher quality environment, enhanced public spaces, retail and connectivity within the town and the rest of the District. The HAAP also envisages that Hockley will experience housing growth partially through the redevelopment of light industrial areas.
- 9.2 These aspirations for Hockley have been essential throughout the development of the HAAP.
- 9.3 The Council would not have been able to develop its strategy for Hockley had it not been for the extensive amount of public engagement and public participation carried out throughout the entirety of the HAAP period. This public engagement and community consultation was instrumental in leading the Council to adapt the strategy for the HAAP following the Issues and Options Report to a more holistic and less interventionist policy.
- 9.4 The Council has gone beyond its requirement to consult with members of the public. On several occasions during the HAAP process the Council has held additional public meetings, awareness raising events and Library Exhibitions.
- 9.5 Consultation on the HAAP, as well as having been carried out over an extensive period of time also sought the views of the public at an early stage. This allowed the council to ensure that the views of the public were considered and assessed before documents were produced.

## **Appendix 1 – Specific and General Consultation Bodies**

The following organisations were consulted on the HAAP Submission Document.

Althorne Parish Council

Anglian Water Services Ltd

Arriva Southern Counties

Ashingdon Parish Council

Barling Magna Parish Council

Basildon Borough Council

Burnham on Crouch Town Council

c2c Rail & National Express East Anglia

Campaign to Protect Rural Essex

Canewdon Parish Council

Castle Point Borough Council

Chelmsford Borough Council

CPREssex

Crouch Harbour Authority

Croud Ace

Defence Estates

Department for Communities and Local Government

Disability Essex

DTZ Piedad Consulting

East of England Local Government Association

East of England Regional Animal Health Office

English Heritage

Environment Agency

Essex & Suffolk Water

Essex Autistic Society

## **Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan Document: Consultation Statement**

---

Essex Bridleways Association

Essex Chambers of Commerce

Essex County Council

Essex County Council (Highways)

Essex County Council (Schools Service)

Essex County Council Public Rights of Way

Essex Libraries

Essex no 1 Circuit of Jehovah's Witnesses

Essex Police

Essex Police Headquarters

Essex Wildlife Trust

Essex Wildlife Trust Rochford & Southend Area

Essex Youth Service

Estuary Housing Association

Federation of Small Businesses

First Essex Buses

Foulness Parish Council

Great Wakering Parish Council

Grove Park Residents Association

Hawkwell Parish Council

Hawkwell Residents Association

Health & Safety Executive

Highways Agency

Hockley Chamber of Trade

Hockley Parish Council

Hockley Residents Association

Home Builders Federation

## **Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan Document: Consultation Statement**

---

Homes & Communities Agency

Hullbridge Parish Council

Leigh Town Council

Little Burstead Parish Council

London Gypsy and Traveller Unit

London Southend Airport

Marine Management Organisation

Mobile Operators Association

National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups

National Grid Gas

National Wind Power

Natural England

Network Rail

NHS South East Essex

NHS South Essex

Noak Bridge Parish Council

North Fambridge Parish Council

Paglesham Parish Council

Purleigh Parish Council

Ramsden Bellhouse Parish Council

Ramsden Crays Parish Council

Rawreth Parish Council

Rayleigh Chamber of Trade

Rayleigh Mount Local Committee

Rayleigh Town Council

Renewable UK

Roach Fairways and Conservation Committee

## **Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan Document: Consultation Statement**

---

Rochford & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce

Rochford & Rayleigh CAB

Rochford Chamber of Trade

Rochford District Access Committee

Rochford District Council

Rochford District Residents

Rochford Hundred Amenity Society

Rochford Hundred Golf Club

Rochford Parish Council

Rochford Police Station

Runwell Parish Council

Sanctuary housing association

SE Essex Organic Gardeners

SEETEC

South East Essex Friends of the Earth

South East Essex Green Party

South East Local Enterprise Partnership

South Essex Natural History Society

South Essex NHS Trust

South Woodham Ferrers Town Council

Southend & Rochford Community Command

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Southminster Parish Council

Sport England (East Region)

St Peter & Paul Parish Church

Stambridge Parish Council

Stow Maries Parish Council

## **Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan Document: Consultation Statement**

---

Sustrans

Sutton Parish Council

Swan Housing Association

The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups

The National Trust

The National Trust Rayleigh Mount Local Committee

The Planning Inspectorate

The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings

The Theatres Trust

The Woodland Trust

Traveller Law Reform Project

Treasurer Crouch Harbour Authority

West Rochford Action Group

Woodham Ferrers & Bicknacre Parish Council

Woodland Trust

**ROCHFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**NOTICE OF THE PUBLICATION OF THE HOCKLEY AREA ACTION PLAN  
(SUBMISSION DOCUMENT)**

**Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004  
Town and County Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012:  
Regulation 19**

Rochford District Council has prepared a Hockley Area Action Plan Submission Document as part of its Local Development Framework which it proposes to submit to the Secretary of State under Regulation 22 of the above Regulations.

The Hockley Area Action Plan Submission Document and accompanying documents have been published in order for representations to be made prior to the submission of the Hockley Area Action Plan to the Secretary of State for examination.

The Plan provides the detailed planning policies and allocation of land for Hockley centre. The area covered by the plan is Hockley centre.

Representations can be made during the publication period which begins at noon on 29 November 2012 and ends at 5.00pm on 25 January 2013. Only representations received during this time will be considered. Late responses will not be accepted. C o n s u l t a t i o n  
r e p r e s e n t a t i o n s w i l l o n l y b e r e g a r d e d  
a s d u l y m a d e i f s u p p l i e d o n t h e  
r e p r e s e n t a t i o n f o r m o r m a d e d i r e c t l y  
v i a t h e o n l i n e c o n s u l t a t i o n s y s t e m .

The Plan, alongside a statement setting out how representations can be made, is available online via [www.rochford.gov.uk](http://www.rochford.gov.uk); at Rochford Council Offices; and in the District's libraries.



### Appendix 3 – Issues Raised by Specific and General Consultation Bodies during Submission Consultation

The following specific and general consultation bodies responded to the pre-submission consultation on the Hockley Area Action Plan.

Anglian Water                                  Hawkwell Parish Council                                  Natural England  
 Basildon Borough Council                          Hockley Residents Association  
 Hawkwell Residents Association          Hockley Chamber of Trade

It should also be noted that as of 1 January 2012, the Coal Authority’s response to any development plan consultations for the District is ‘No observation’.

	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
	<b>Key Stakeholders</b>	
1	<p><b>Anglian Water Services:</b></p> <p>No comments were made regarding the HAAP Submission Document but the consultee stated that comments on previous versions of the HAAP should be considered (see below).</p> <p><b>Consultation responses from Anglian Water Services re: HAAP Options Report;</b></p> <p>Anglian Water Services commented that the area covered by the Hockley Area Action Plan is served by Rochford Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). There is adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed flows from all three Spatial Options. Currently there are no significant issues with the sewerage network.</p> <p>Surface water should be removed from the public surface</p>	<p>Noted. The HAAP complies with these requirements in principal. Additionally any impact that future development may have on Hockley’s public foul, surface water sewers within the HAAP area will be considered in detail at the planning application stage.</p>

	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
	<p>water system where possible.</p> <p>The HAAP proposes the delivery of approximately 100 new dwellings on the site. The full impact to the foul network will have to be properly assessed to determine if infrastructure upgrades will be required prior to connection.</p> <p><b>Consultation responses from Anglian Water Services re: HAAP Issues and Options Report;</b></p> <p>Anglian Water Services commented that there are some public foul/ surface water sewers within the boundary of some of the sites listed. No development should be permitted over or within the easement without the prior consent of Anglian Water.</p> <p>Public sewers should be located in highway or open space to ensure access for maintenance and repair.</p> <p>Generally the Sewage Treatment Works (STW) has enough capacity to treat the potential foul flows from the area identified in the HAAP. Surface water will need to be accommodated.</p>	
2	<p><b>Basildon Borough Council</b></p> <p>Basildon Borough Council has no comments on the Hockley Area Action Plan.</p>	Noted.
3	<p><b>Hawkwell Parish Council</b></p> <p><b>Supermarket:</b></p> <p>1. Hawkwell Parish Council commented that there is no need for a supermarket of 3000sq metres in the Village.</p>	<p><b>Supermarket:</b></p> <p>1. As part of the viability assessment work carried out for the HAAP the project team entered into detailed discussions with experts working under AMUP. These viability assessments concluded that there was a demand for a large food store in Hockley.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p><b>Use Classes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. They asked whether the Village centre can accommodate all of the uses proposed in the plan.</li> </ol> <p><b>Insufficient Parking:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. They asked if there will be enough parking in the area given that they believe the plan proposes reducing the amount of parking in the Village.</li> </ol> <p><b>Traffic Assessment:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Parish Council feel that a Traffic Assessment should have been carried out to assess the HAAP's impact on the area and other parts of the District, particularly those areas where development is planned.</li> </ol> <p><b>Multi Storey Car Park undesirable:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A multi Storey would not be desirable as it would change the character of the Village.</li> </ol> <p><b>Alternative Options:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Parish Council questions why no alternative options for the HAAP have been proposed?</li> </ol> <p><b>Respondent Suggested Changes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not include such a large supermarket in the plan.</li> <li>2. There is a need for a Traffic Assessment to identify the parking needs of the area. Any development should have sufficient parking spaces.</li> <li>3. Produce other HAAP options.</li> </ol>	<p>If the market were unconstrained by land availability and planning policy (i.e. if no upper floorspace limit were set), then there might be demand for a larger store.</p> <p><b>Use Classes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rochford Council is able to set restrictions on the type and number of particular use classes in a given area. It should be noted that once a business is active under a given use class, planning permission can be granted for a change of use to a different use class, but this does not mean that the existing use and business is no longer permitted to operate. The change in use class would only take effect once implemented by the users of the premises. The HAAP proposes that a variety of retail, leisure and restaurants/ cafes be encouraged throughout Hockley. One reason for this decision, in addition to increasing the economic viability of the town centre, is to redress the current imbalance of uses in the area (as perceived by residents, as evidenced by consultation responses) in terms of the prevalence of takeaway food shops in the area.</li> </ol> <p>A range of mixed retail and service uses in Hockley will help to encourage economic and cultural regeneration within the town centre.</p> <p><b>Insufficient Parking:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The HAAP identifies and agrees with the view of residents that there is a distinct need for enhanced parking within the centre of Hockley and the HAAP proposes viable measures to provide additional parking in line with this need. The HAAP does not propose a reduction in car parking. It proposes an additional area for car parking be designated to the south of the railway line; and that, if Eldon Way were to be redeveloped, this should include new, consolidated car parking in the centre (as opposed to the current, informal, scattered arrangement of car parking).</li> </ol> <p><b>Traffic Assessment:</b></p>

	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>1. Essex County Council, as Highway Authority, has been engaged throughout the production of the HAAP. The AMUP team working on the HAAP includes a specialist transport consultant who liaised with the Highway Authority. Essex County Council Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposals in the HAAP, and that the required mitigation measures can be implemented.</p> <p>It was further noted that although the B1013 running through Hockley is a main distributor road, it is important that a situation is not created whereby additional non-local traffic is encouraged to use this route rather than the main strategic network (i.e. A130 and A127).</p> <p>Although the B1013 is already used by non-local traffic as an alternative to the strategic network, if such use were encouraged it could be of significant detriment to Hockley (and the District's other settlements along this route). It is important that ECC prioritise improvements to the strategic network.</p> <p>The impact of any development on the Hockley area will however be considered as a part of any planning application that may come forward and appropriate measures will be taken to address any issues that arise.</p> <p><b>Multi Storey Car Park undesirable:</b></p> <p>1. Noted.</p> <p><b>Alternative Options:</b></p> <p>1. Alternative options for the HAAP were in fact proposed as a part of the extensive series of public engagement and consultation carried out for the earlier HAAP documents, including the Issues and Options Document 2009 and the Options Document 2010. The HAAP Submission document is intended to show the Councils final option, which has come about as a result of consultation on the options proposed in previous iterations of the document and during public consultation activities over the past several years; considered alongside other evidence including sustainability appraisal and viability.</p> <p><b>Respondent Suggested Changes:</b></p> <p>The suggested changes have been noted and the issues they raise are</p>

	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		addressed elsewhere in this document.
4	<p><b>Hawkwell Residents Association</b></p> <p><b>Definition of Hockley:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association stated that Hockley is a Village and not a town centre and should not be treated as such.</p> <p><b>Parking:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association commented that as the HAAP proposes an increase in parking provision but goes on to propose the loss of parking provision in the car park on Plumberow Avenue, it is unsound.</p> <p><b>Retail:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association point out that there are now three food stores in the town and that there is a sufficient range of choice for shoppers. They state that only one out of every forty or fifty retail units are empty and that residents do not need or want a new supermarket.</p> <p>2. The Residents Association would accept a proposal including some additional retail units but not a supermarket. They comment that a larger supermarket would create too much competition for smaller food stores.</p> <p><b>Housing:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association does not think that Eldon Way is a sustainable location for housing.</p> <p>2. They accept that Hockley may need additional housing. But they do not wish to see it at the cost of the trading estate.</p>	<p><b>Definition of Hockley:</b></p> <p>1. There is no formal distinction between a village and a town in terms of how planning issues are assessed, although it is relevant to note that Hockley centre is formally designated a town centre and has been since the first Rochford District Local Plan in 1988. However the Council recognises the village character of Hockley and the HAAP is clear that this character must be retained.</p> <p><b>Parking:</b></p> <p>1. The HAAP commits the Council to ensuring that development of Hockley includes suitable levels of parking in addition to any development that comes forward. The HAAP proposes an additional area for car parking be designated to the south of the railway line; and that, if Eldon Way were to be redeveloped, this should include new, consolidated car parking in the centre (as opposed to the current, informal, scattered arrangement of car parking).</p> <p><b>Retail:</b></p> <p>1. Research carried out by Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (AMUP) showed that there was a significant market demand in Hockley for an additional large food store. The HAAP will provide a policy framework which gives the Council more control over the future of the centre and this positive, proactive planning is generally the approach planning authorities are encouraged to take in the NPPF.</p> <p>There is a danger that, if appropriate sites are not identified within the development plan (i.e. if the Council did not prepare the AAP), developers and retail operators will find it easier to achieve planning consents for stores which are bigger than the planning authority would want and in locations which further draw trips and spending power out of established town centres. If the market were unconstrained by land availability and planning policy (i.e.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>3. They feel that there are sufficient vacant units elsewhere in the town to accommodate housing demand.</p> <p><b>Offices:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association state that there is no demand for offices in the town and that some existing offices are empty.</p> <p><b>Accuracy:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association feel the HAAP's diagrams and figures are unclear. They feel that the HAAP is based on out of date information and includes errors. The Residents Association feel that the council has contradicted itself on several points such as the retention of Eldon Way as a trading centre. The Residents Association state that the Foundry Business Park and Eldon Way are owned by different groups and are not largely under the same ownership as stated in the HAAP. The Residents Association would like the plan to be more detailed and comprehensive.</p> <p><b>Engaging with partners/ community and the Localism Act 2011:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association does not believe that RDC has complied with the Localism Act 2011. They feel that the Residents Association and residents have not been included in the consultation process.</p> <p>2. The Residents Association state that RDC has lied about the amount of community involvement undertaken and that residents and the Parish Plan have been ignored. They state that this was also the case in previous</p>	<p>if no upper floorspace limit were set), then there is a possibility that there might be demand for a larger store.</p> <p>Whilst it may be the case that the market would wish to see a larger store built, the 3,000 square metre maximum is considered an appropriate limit, as a larger store may be overly dominant, undermining the vitality of the centre.</p> <p>Also relevant is the findings of the Retail and Leisure Study which identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre</p> <p>2. Regarding the presence of additional food stores in Hockley at present it should be noted that the Retail and Leisure Study shows that a great deal of retail expenditure by local Hockley residents is spent outside of Hockley. One of the purposes of the HAAP therefore is to encourage retail opportunities within Hockley and to focus spending, particularly by residents, back into Hockley.</p> <p><b>Housing:</b></p> <p>1. The Council in partnership with AMUP has identified that Hockley is a sustainable location for housing, particularly because of the availability of previously developed land in Hockley centre, the use of which, local and national planning policy support. The results of consultation have made clear that if housing must be provided, brownfield sites are preferred to greenfield.</p> <p>2. Eldon Way will not solely be allocated for housing. It will be used to deliver a mixed use development including, homes, shops, leisure facilities, offices, car parking and public spaces.</p> <p>3. Additionally the HAAP does propose that some of the existing employment and leisure uses on the Eldon Way site should be retained.</p> <p><b>Offices:</b></p> <p>1. AMUP carried out a capacity study for the HAAP which indicated Hockley could support 1200sq m (gross) of offices.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>versions of the HAAP.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Residents Association stated that the size of the HAAP document meant that it was difficult to print and distribute.</li> <li>The Residents Association stated that it is unfair to expect the public to fill in an online response form and that electronic forms are not a viable form of consultation.</li> <li>They commented that the public have 'consultation fatigue' having been consulted too often and that this accounted for the low level of responses from the public.</li> </ol> <p><b>No consideration given to Parish Plan:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Residents Association does not believe that RDC has included any elements of the Parish Plan in the HAAP. Although they understood that RDC stated this would be the case.</li> </ol> <p><b>Public Realm:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Residents Association state that Hockley does not need additional public space.</li> <li>They state that new tree plantings could undermine the foundations of nearby buildings and clutter the street. They also feel a raised entry on Woodlands Road would be dangerous.</li> </ol> <p><b>Leisure Opportunities:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Residents Association are concerned that existing leisure facilities will be replaced by housing and that recreational facilities will be surrounded by housing and retail units.</li> </ol> <p><b>Land Assembly:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Residents Association do not agree that much of the</li> </ol>	<p>The NPPF classifies offices as a main town centre use and as such the Eldon Way Opportunity Site was identified as a sustainable location. The HAAP recognises that demand for office space in Hockley is weak. The HAAP allows for office development, but does not insist upon it. Whilst office demand is weak at the moment, we are mindful that the Plan is a long-term planning document and should be flexible. Protection of existing employment within the Foundry Business Park has also been identified as a key priority. This also includes retaining office space in this location.</p> <p><b>Accuracy:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The diagrams and figures shown in the HAAP are high resolution images. The HAAP Submission Document is an iterative process and was based on information gathered throughout all stages of the HAAP's development.</li> </ol> <p>It should be noted that in response to comments from residents the Council has adapted the HAAP to better represent the views of the public. Notably by adopting a less prescriptive approach to the development of Hockley, and a lesser degree of intervention, following concerns raised during the consultation on the 2009 Issues and Options Report.</p> <p>Whilst areas of Eldon Way are proposed to be allowed to be redeveloped the Plan proposes a number of existing uses be retained.</p> <p>The ownership of the Eldon Way and Foundry sites is noted.</p> <p><b>Engaging with partners/ community and the Localism Act 2011:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Residents Association and residents have been consulted at all stages of the HAAP's development. Responses to public consultations have been received, considered and assessed. Consideration was also given to the Hockley Parish Plan, which has been used to provide evidence in the production of the HAAP, but the HAAP cannot simply follow the Parish Plan and must have regard to other factors.</li> <li>The council has been open and accountable throughout the consultation</li> </ol>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>land covered by the HAAP is in the hands of a single land owner.</p> <p>2. The Residents Association feel that acquiring land from the railway operator will be difficult.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association feel that the costing for the HAAP is not sufficient to cover the potential infrastructure costs and that some infrastructure costs have not been considered at all.</p> <p>2. They are concerned that too much funding is dependent on developer contributions and that a developer will not fund all of the proposed improvements to the area in exchange for a 3000sq m supermarket.</p> <p>3. The Residents Association state that RDC’s main aim is to finance the HAAP through a deal with a developer regardless of the needs of the residents.</p> <p><b>Economic Impacts:</b></p> <p>1. The Residents Association question what wider impacts the development of Hockley and Eldon Way will cause to existing businesses?</p> <p>2. They do not believe that the HAAP will protect jobs.</p> <p><b>Traffic &amp; Traffic Infrastructure:</b></p> <p>1. The residents association are concerned that the development of the area and of Eldon Way in particular will drive out existing businesses and cause others to have to increase the distances their employees travel to work.</p> <p>2. They claim that there is no certainty about what traffic infrastructure changes Essex County Council Highways</p>	<p>process and the production of all its documents. Community involvement has been central to the production of the HAAP, with initial public participation undertaken in 2008 driving the content of the subsequent 2009 Issues and Options document; and with significant community involvement at each stage after this.</p> <p>3. The HAAP is 60 pages in total (including covers) and is not considered to be an excessively large document. The HAAP was available online and paper copies were sent out to those who requested it.</p> <p>4. The online consultation form is one way in which consultation responses can be submitted. It is used for all planning policy consultations, and there have been considerable numbers of responses made using the system. In addition, responses could be made using paper copies of the form.</p> <p>5. The Council is required to consult residents and stakeholders; and it is considered that community involvement and consultation is an important aspect of the planning process.</p> <p><b>No consideration given to Parish Plan:</b></p> <p>1. Noted. The Hockley Parish Plan was used as part of the evidence base for the HAAP. It should be noted that this document was considered as part of the wider public participation and community involvement process. The HAAP cannot simply follow the Parish Plan and must have regard to other factors.</p> <p><b>Public Realm:</b></p> <p>1. Policy RTC6 of the Core Strategy requires that appropriate public space should be included in the development of Hockley. Additional public space is considered a positive addition to Hockley centre.</p> <p>2. Detailed matters such as the impact of specific trees on specific buildings, and the precise nature of alterations to the Highways will be considered at the planning application and implementation stage. It is not accepted that tree planting would be inherently dangerous to structures in Hockley centre.</p> <p><b>Leisure Opportunities:</b></p>



Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Department will propose.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. They are concerned that some necessary infrastructure improvements have been overlooked and that the council is unaware of the infrastructure needs of the local community.</li> <li>4. They support the addition of a third lane to the Spa roundabout but feel that the pavement cannot be widened.</li> <li>5. They also state that there are no detailed plans for the improvement of the Spa Road junctions with Eldon Way and the Foundry Estate.</li> <li>6. The Residents Association state that the HAAP will cause an unacceptable increase in traffic on the B1013 that will make access to the village impossible by car.</li> </ol> <p><b>Suggested Changes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create a plan based on what a majority of residents want to avoid confrontations.</li> <li>2. Re assess the potential costs of infrastructure improvements and seek alternative funding from government rather than a developer.</li> <li>3. Provide clearer drawings.</li> <li>4. Perform new studies and update the plan.</li> <li>5. Leave Eldon Way as it is.</li> <li>6. Work Within the Hockley Parish Plan and include local people at all stages of the process.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The HAAP proposes that certain leisure facilities be retained even in areas where development comes forward. Additional leisure facilities are also proposed in Policy 1 of the HAAP.</li> </ol> <p><b>Land Assembly:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Much of the land on Eldon Way is owned by a single owner.</li> <li>2. The Council will not seek to acquire land itself but rather seeks to set out the guidance for future development in Hockley . It should be noted that in any case delivery of the HAAP does not require the Council’s acquisition of the land owned by the train operator.</li> </ol> <p><b>Funding:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Estimates of the necessary funding for infrastructure costs were compiled by AMUP. It should also be noted that Policy CLT1 of the Core Strategy requires developers to provide on-site infrastructure to mitigate specific issues relating to their development scheme. Contributions to off-site strategic infrastructure will also be required to mitigate the impact of new development.</li> <li>2. The purpose of the HAAP is to guide development of the HAAP area. The Council does not intend to lead development itself by purchasing sites and developing them. Further to this the HAAP does not and cannot exclude private sector organisations from the normal development process.</li> <li>3. This is not the case. No arrangement between the Council and any developer is in place in respect of the HAAP. Without the HAAP development of Hockley could still progress, only without the checks and balances which the HAAP would provide.</li> </ol> <p><b>Economic Impacts:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The HAAP will ensure the economic regeneration and positive growth of Hockley. It will ensure that additional retail expenditure is retained in Hockley and will ultimately benefit local businesses. The presence of an anchor store will also assist this goal.</li> </ol>

	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>2. The Council intends to encourage development that will increase employment opportunities and protect existing employment. The mechanism for this will be the development management process.</p> <p><b>Traffic &amp; Traffic Infrastructure:</b></p> <p>1-6. The HAAP intends to ensure Hockley is well served by both transport infrastructure as well as supporting a variety of transport modes, including public transport, cycle and private car.</p> <p>Essex County Council, as Highway Authority, has been engaged throughout the production of the HAAP. The AMUP team working on the HAAP includes a specialist transport consultant who liaised with the Highway Authority. Essex County Council Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposals in the HAAP, and that the required mitigation measures can be implemented.</p> <p>It was further noted that although the B1013 running through Hockley is a main distributor road, it is important that a situation is not created whereby additional non-local traffic is encouraged to use this route rather than the main strategic network (i.e. A130 and A127).</p> <p>Although the B1013 is already used by non-local traffic as an alternative to the strategic network, if such use were encouraged it could be of significant detriment to Hockley (and the District's other settlements along this route). It is important that ECC prioritise improvements to the strategic network.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs of specific developments will be met through the development management process.</p> <p><b>Suggested Changes:</b></p> <p>1. While the HAAP attempts to meet the wishes and expectations of local residents it is not possible accommodate the varied wishes of all residents. For example many residents expressed support for more extensive alterations of Hockley. As such the HAAP has considered the</p>

	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>representations and wishes of residents and adopted the most viable and sustainable option possible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The HAAP does not prohibit funding from Government, should it become available. Indeed it provides a Plan from which funding bids could be made.</li> <li>3. The drawings provided in the HAAP are considered to be clear.</li> <li>4. The HAAP has been subject to significant levels of consultation over several years and has gone through several iterations taking account of the views of stakeholders and residents.</li> <li>5. Eldon way has been identified as a key opportunity site and in addition it complies with the government’s requirement that brownfield land be prioritised.</li> <li>6. This has been the case in the production of the HAAP, although other factors must be considered also.</li> </ol>
5	<p><b>Hockley Chamber of Trade (Mr J Stanton)</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The respondent commented that Hockley is a large village.</li> <li>2. They commented that residents are not well served by existing shops in the area and that many of the buildings are in poor condition.</li> <li>3. They commented that Eldon Way industrial estate is largely a waste land, most of the occupants having moved away.</li> <li>4. They commented that access to Eldon Way is poor considering how close it is to Spa Road and that improved pedestrian access would be strongly supported.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted. This issue was dealt with earlier in this document.</li> <li>2. Noted. The Rochford Core Strategy identifies Hockley as an area for change and improvement. The HAAP also acknowledges that the retail offer in the area is relatively limited compared to other nearby towns. It does note that there are a reasonable number of independent retailers.</li> <li>3. Noted. The HAAP will encourage the positive redevelopment of an area of Eldon Way.</li> <li>4. Noted. The HAAP also proposes enhanced access to Eldon Way.</li> <li>5. Noted. These issues are identified in the HAAP in general however appropriate measures will be included as part of any development.</li> <li>6. As part of the viability assessment work carried out for the HAAP the project team entered into detailed discussions with experts working under AMUP. These viability assessments concluded that there was a demand for a large food store in Hockley. A food store of the size suggested by the HAAP would help to sustain these</li> </ol>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>5. Several traffic issues were raised including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They support the idea of introducing pedestrian crossings particularly on Spa Road towards the Spa Pub.</li> <li>• They commented that traffic lights would not be desirable on the Spa mini roundabout. But they would be supportive of a larger roundabout.</li> <li>• They would support a filter lane on the turnoff to Greensward Lane to reduce congestion.</li> <li>• They point out that Hockley Library car park is under used because of both signage and accessibility issues and measures to increase its use would be useful.</li> <li>• While buses are considered sufficient they comment that they disrupt traffic flow when stopping.</li> </ul> <p>6. They comment that they are concerned that a large supermarket would undermine the profits of other shops in the area, particularly the existing food shops.</p> <p>7. The respondent commented that affordable housing in the village centre is badly needed.</p> <p>8. They are also supportive of enhancements to the public realm through tree planning.</p>	<p>local independent traders through increased footfall. The Retail and Leisure Study identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre. A food store of the size suggested by the HAAP would act as an anchor store, encouraging retail expenditure to be retained; but at the same time would not be of such a size as to dominate other retail units.</p> <p>7. Noted. A proportion of the housing in any development will be affordable however there are some conditions under which the exact amount of affordable housing can be reduced, for example if the maximum amount of affordable housing that can be required would render a development unviable. As such the exact quantum of affordable housing will be determined at the development management stage.</p> <p>8. Noted.</p>

	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
6	<p><b>The Highways Agency (Mr Mark Norman)</b></p> <p>The Highways Agency support any policies that provide the opportunity to minimise the need to travel by motor vehicle and welcome the general principles being set out in the development of the plan.</p> <p>With respect to the promotion of mixed use development, this is likely to be the most sustainable approach and is supported. However it should be noted that unless the timing of build and occupation is not carefully managed, commuting patterns can become established with increased separate residential and employment trips, which would undermine the aim of mixed use development.</p>	<p>Noted. The HAAP will encourage a mix of transport uses including enhanced cycle provision and public transport improvements.</p>
7	<p><b>Hockley Residents Association (Mr Brian Guyett)</b></p> <p><b>Freedom of Information Request:</b></p> <p>1. The respondent stated that several Freedom of Information requests were submitted requesting information regarding highways, the Spa roundabout and Traffic Assessments. The respondent stated that the council has not answered these specific questions.</p> <p><b>Community involvement:</b></p> <p>1. The respondent commented that RDC has discriminated against Hockley residents and mislead them about key information. The respondent commented that RDC have pre-determined the outcome of the HAAP consultation, stating that this action was authorised in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p><b>Freedom of Information Request:</b></p> <p>1. All freedom of information queries have been answered as per the legislation. In addition throughout the consultation process officers were available for discussions on any topics relating to the HAAP.</p> <p><b>Community involvement:</b></p> <p>1. This is not the case. RDC endeavours to be accurate and transparent in all of its dealings with residents throughout the District. The HAAP has been through an extensive series of public engagement exercises and consultations. These are detailed in the main body of the Consultation Statement. In overview they included awareness raising initiatives going back as far as 2008, stakeholder and public meetings throughout the production process of each iteration of the HAAP. The views of the public were sought at all stages of the production of each document. Feedback from residents was integrated into each new iteration to the extent that the HAAP underwent a number of changes as a direct result of the views of the public. Furthermore in addition to the minimum requirements for community</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>The respondent commented that RDC did not consider responses to the previous round of consultation before determining further actions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The respondent commented that the council deliberately miss posted residents comments online.</li> <li>The respondent commented that RDC has treated CJ Bowling as a special case and would like to see clarification as to why.</li> </ol> <p><b>Traffic Assessment:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The respondent commented that RDC’s approach to highways issues is inconsistent. They claim that detailed highways proposals were promised to them during a Full (RDC) Council.</li> <li>They also point out that Traffic Assessments were carried out for the Rochford and Rayleigh Area Action Plans but not for Hockley, on the grounds that it would save money, and feel that this is discriminatory.</li> <li>The respondent stated that the HAAP Sustainability Appraisal recommended a Traffic Assessment be carried out and that RDC agreed to include one in the process.</li> <li>The respondent commented that RDC intends for a developer to carry out a Traffic Assessment and that this would result in a biased report.</li> <li>They comment that the Council’s consultant reported that there is restricted space for improvements. The respondents wish to know why the Council have reached a different conclusion and what evidence there is to support their conclusion.</li> </ol> <p><b>Cycle Provision:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The respondent commented that additional cycle parking</li> </ol>	<p>participation and consultation library exhibitions and drop in sessions were also held.</p> <p>Clearly the HAAP cannot have been pre-determined as it as been subject to significant alterations in its trajectory as a direct result of community involvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is not the case. The representations made by the public can be viewed at any time on the Councils website. When respondents submit representations, they receive a confirmation letter or email (as appropriate) which includes confirmation as to which policy their representation has been registered against. If respondents are dissatisfied with how their representation has been registered they may request it be changed.</li> <li>CJ Bowling is not a ‘special case’ instead it was identified during community consultation and participation process as a well used leisure facility, and as such has been referred to in the HAAP in response to the views of the public. <b>Traffic Assessment;</b></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic assessments will be included as appropriate through planning applications. The Highways Authority has confirmed that this is an appropriate position.</li> <li>This is not the case. No Traffic Assessments have been carried out for the other two AAP locations.</li> <li>The Sustainability Appraisal states that further traffic modelling will be required, and the HAAP proposes that Transport Assessments and Travel Plans be required to accompany planning applications for new development . Essex County Council, as Highway Authority, has been engaged throughout the production of the HAAP. The AMUP team working on the HAAP includes a specialist transport consultant who liaised with the</li> </ol>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>is proposed but there is no mention of improvements to safety.</p> <p><b>Public Open Space:</b></p> <p>1. The respondent stated that residents reject the councils plan to provide public open space and an evening culture. They comment that such development would place too much strain on local police.</p> <p><b>Retail:</b></p> <p>1. The respondent commented that there is no evidence that Hockley needs additional retail capacity and that the Retail and Leisure Study (2008) did not show any such need. They point out that since the initial stages of consultation on the HAAP two new supermarkets have opened so there is not need for a new one. They point out that the RLS states that Hockley has limited potential to support additional retail where as the HAAP states that the capacity is greater. The respondent commented that the proposed supermarket may out compete the other shops in the area and drive down choice for residents. The respondent stated that the proposed 3000sq m supermarket is six times the size of the current Co-op supermarket and if built will change the character of Hockley. The respondent commented that there is no justification for the HAAP proposal that there should be greater focus on food retail.</p> <p><b>Parking:</b></p> <p>1. The respondent commented that there is not enough</p>	<p>Highway Authority. Essex County Council Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposals in the HAAP.</p> <p>The impact of any development on the Hockley area will however be considered as a part of any planning application that may come forward and appropriate measures will be taken to address any issues that arise.</p> <p>4. Transport Assessments are carried out by developers, however they must be to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority, in this case, Essex County Council.</p> <p>5. Whilst clearly opportunities for highways improvements in Hockley centre are not totally unconstrained or limitless, Essex County Council has confirmed, as Highway Authority, that the highway proposals in the HAAP do not give rise to concerns.</p> <p><b>Cycle Provision;</b></p> <p>1. Noted. Specific improvements to the area’s cycle network will depend partly on the nature of development coming forward.</p> <p><b>Public Open Space;</b></p> <p>1. Noted. Evening culture and public open spaces are an aspiration of the HAAP. Security features and mitigation of any negative impacts will be dealt with at the development management phase of the process. This will involve an assessment of the impact of any new development on the area. There were no objections to the HAAP from the Community Safety Partnership or the Police Authority.</p> <p><b>Retail;</b></p> <p>1. The HAAP will provide a policy framework which gives the Council more control over the future of the centre and this positive, proactive planning is generally the approach planning authorities are encouraged to take in the NPPF. There is a danger that, if appropriate sites are not identified within the</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>parking at present and that the HAAP will in fact reduce the availability of parking. The respondent later stated that the HAAP will only provide a small increase in parking which will not be enough to accommodate the demands that a new supermarket will bring.</p> <p>The respondent commented that the proposal to include additional housing north of the rail line by consolidating parking in Eldon Way is unsound because it does not include sufficient parking in Eldon Way.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The respondent commented that the HAAP does not take into account the full costs of land acquisition and is therefore not viable.</li> <li>2. The respondent commented that the HAAP allows £200,000-£300,000 to be spent on the Spa Roundabout. The respondent claims that the Council states it has not assessed the changes but the same proposal in the Core Strategy allowed up to £2m. They wish to know why these figures have changed.</li> </ol> <p><b>Accuracy:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The respondent commented that the HAAP refers to the 2009 Issues and Options Report and that the report was deemed inappropriate by all parties including RDC and residents. They state that RDC agreed to start the issues and options process again but that they have not done this.</li> </ol> <p><b>Suggested Changes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include adequate parking.</li> </ol>	<p>development plan (i.e. if the Council did not prepare the AAP), developers and retail operators will find it easier to achieve planning consents for stores which are bigger than the planning authority would want and in locations which further draw trips and spending power out of established town centres.</p> <p>If the market were unconstrained by land availability and planning policy (i.e. if no upper floorspace limit were set), then there is a possibility that there might be demand for a larger store.</p> <p>Whilst it may be the case that the market would wish to see a larger store built, the 3,000 square metre maximum is considered an appropriate limit, as a larger store may be overly dominant, undermining the vitality of the centre.</p> <p>Also relevant is the findings of the Retail and Leisure Study which identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Retail and Leisure Study also states that there is a demonstrable need to increase the local provision for food shopping to reduce the need for local residents to travel to competing facilities elsewhere. The development of a food store in Hockley would serve this purpose.</p> <p><b>Parking:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is not the case. The HAAP does not propose a reduction in car parking. It proposes an additional area for car parking be designated to the south of the railway line; and that, if Eldon Way were to be redeveloped, this should include new, consolidated car parking in the centre (as opposed to the current, informal, scattered arrangement of car parking).</li> </ol> <p><b>Funding:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The full cost of land assembly may vary.</li> <li>2. Estimates of the necessary funding for infrastructure costs were compiled by</li> </ol>



Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Reassess the retail capacity of the area.</li> <li>3. Undertake Traffic Assessment.</li> <li>4. Re-consult on a transparent basis.</li> <li>5. Clarify why CJ Bowling receives special consideration in the HAAP.</li> <li>6. Reduce the maximum size of the proposed supermarket.</li> <li>7. Remove the assertion that there should be a greater focus on food retail.</li> <li>8. Withdraw the reference to the 2009 Issues and Options report.</li> </ol>	<p>AMUP. It should also be noted that Policy CLT1 of the Core Strategy requires developers to provide on-site infrastructure to mitigate specific issues relating to their development scheme. Contributions to off-site strategic infrastructure will also be required to mitigate the impact of new development.</p> <p><b>Accuracy:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Developing the HAAP Submission Document has been an iterative process and was based on information gathered throughout all stages of the HAAP's development. A number of concerns were raised by the local community regarding the original HAAP options, developed in 2009. In response to this the Council committed to reviewing the options and commission a new study to produce amended options for the community to consider.</li> </ol> <p>It should be noted that in response to comments from residents the Council has adapted the HAAP to better represent the views of the public, including proposing a lesser degree of intervention, following concerns raised during the consultation on the 2009 Issues and Options Report. It would not be appropriate to ignore the 2009 Issues and Options, or the consultation responses to this, which had a significant impact on the direction the HAAP took.</p> <p><b>Suggested Changes:</b></p> <p>Noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adequate parking will be included.</li> <li>2. The current retail assessment is extant.</li> <li>3. Traffic/ Transport Assessments are not necessary or appropriate at this stage.</li> <li>4. The consultation process has been extensive and transparent. RDC does not agree that further consultation is necessary or would be productive.</li> <li>5. This issue has been dealt with above.</li> </ol>

	Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
		<p>6. This issue has been dealt with above. The size of the food store has already been reduced.</p> <p>7. The Retail and Leisure Study identified a quantifiable need for additional retail food capacity in the district. This is also the case in Hockley.</p> <p>8. This issue has been dealt with above. The Issues and Options report, and the consultation response it engenders, is an important part of the process that should not be simply erased.</p>
8	<p><b>Natural England</b></p> <p>The respondent commented that they support policy 2(a).</p>	Noted.

Appendix 4 – Issues Raised during Submission Consultation

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p><b>1.1 The Big Picture</b></p>	
<p>The respondent commented that RDC has deliberately misled residents and manipulated the HAAP consultation.</p> <p>They state that RDC has misrepresented evidence, including evidence provided by the Consultants at AMUP. They cite the Retail and Leisure Study, stating that it identified a limited potential for development whereas the HAAP states that the town has great potential.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council endeavours to be accurate and transparent in all of its dealings with residents throughout the District. The HAAP has been through an extensive series of public engagement exercises and consultations. These are detailed in the main body of the Consultation Statement.</p> <p>The views of the public were sought at all stages of the production of each document. Feedback from residents was integrated into each new iteration to the extent that the HAAP underwent a number of changes as a direct result of the views of the public.</p> <p>Also relevant are the findings of the Retail and Leisure Study which identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre. It is this loss of spend that impacts upon Hockley's potential for growth. By addressing this issue, as the HAAP proposes, Hockley's potential is increased.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that there is no justification for a supermarket and that the presence of two other supermarkets in the town demonstrates this.</p>	<p>As part of the viability assessment work carried out for the HAAP the project team entered into detailed discussions with experts working under AMUP. These viability assessments concluded that there was a demand for a large food store in Hockley.</p> <p>If the market were unconstrained by land availability and planning policy (i.e. if no upper floorspace limit were set), then there might be demand for a larger store.</p> <p>The HAAP will provide a policy framework which gives the Council more control over the future of the centre and this positive, proactive planning is</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
	<p>generally the approach planning authorities are encouraged to take in the NPPF.</p> <p>There is a danger that, if appropriate sites are not identified within the development plan (i.e. if the Council did not prepare the AAP), developers and retail operators will find it easier to achieve planning consents for stores which are bigger than the planning authority would want and in locations which further draw trips and spending power out of established town centres.</p> <p>Whilst it may be the case that the market would wish to see a larger store built, the 3,000 square metre maximum is considered an appropriate limit, as a larger store may be overly dominant, undermining the vitality of the centre.</p> <p>Also relevant is the findings of the Retail and Leisure Study which identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that although the HAAP should comply with the Core Strategy there have been two motions in Full Council to the contrary on the 9<sup>th</sup> of September 2009 and the 14<sup>th</sup> of October 2010.</p>	<p>The HAAP is required to comply with the Core Strategy, however the Core Strategy only sets broad objectives and the HAAP provides detailed guidance for Hockley centre.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents stated that public consultation has been limited with poor advertisement of exhibitions.</p>	<p>The HAAP has been through an extensive series of public engagement exercises and consultations. These are detailed in the main body of the Consultation Statement. In overview they included public participation going back as far as 2008, prior to the production of the first iteration of the HAAP, and stakeholder and public meetings throughout the production process of each iteration of the HAAP. The views of the public were sought at all stages of the production of each document. Feedback from residents was integrated into each new iteration to the extent that the HAAP underwent a number of changes as a direct result of the views of the public. Furthermore in addition to the minimum requirements for community participation and consultation library exhibitions and drop in sessions were also held.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that RDC has pre determined the outcome of the consultation by referring to information gathered in previous HAAP consultations.</p>	<p>The production of the HAAP has been an iterative process building upon the views of residents provided during all stages of community involvement. During the production of the HAAP multiple development options have been proposed, reviewed, subjected to public consultation and then reconsidered and revised as a result of this process.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that there was less time to comment on the HAAP than was allowed for other AAPs.</p>	<p>The production of the HAAP has been underway for the longest period of time out of all of the Area Action Plans, having begun in 2008.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that Rochford and Rayleigh AAPs included a Traffic Assessment but that the AAP for Hockley has not. They acknowledge that this was denied by the council.</p>	<p>No traffic/ Transport Assessments have been carried out for the Rayleigh or Rochford AAPs.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that RDC had confirmed that highways issues would be included in the HAAP but that this is not the case.</p>	<p>The HAAP discusses highways issues at length. More detailed Transport Assessments and traffic modelling will be required during the development management phase of development.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents commented that under the proposed HAAP there would be insufficient parking particularly if a 3000square metre supermarket were to be built.</p> <p>Residents stated that removing the parking at the train station to the south side of the railway line would reduce the amount of available parking.</p>	<p>The HAAP proposes an additional area for car parking be designated to the south of the railway line; and that, if Eldon Way were to be redeveloped, this should include new, consolidated car parking in the centre (as opposed to the current, informal, scattered arrangement of car parking).</p>
<p>Respondents commented that an additional 3500 homes would exacerbate parking problems and create bottlenecks at several points.</p>	<p>The HAAP is not proposing an additional 3500 dwellings in Hockley. The HAAP in fact proposes a total approximately 100 new dwellings.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that there should be free parking throughout Hockley Town Centre.</p>	<p>At present the provision of free parking in Hockley is not viable or sustainable. It is likely that constant free parking at all times would encourage people to leave their vehicles for long periods of time, thus limiting the availability of parking spaces in the centre.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that Hockley is subject to significant traffic congestion and query how this will be dealt with if the HAAP were to be approved.</p>	<p>The HAAP proposes a number of measures to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion in Hockley. Key areas for improvement include, but are not limited to, improvements to the Spa Road mini-roundabout, raised entry treatments on the Woodlands Road, enhanced pedestrian crossing features and improvements to the provision for alternative modes of transport such as cycling and public transport.</p> <p>Additional improvements to Hockley’s transport infrastructure may also be required as development comes forward. This will be managed through the development management process.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that a slip road at the Spa Roundabout would be inadequate to deal with traffic.</p>	<p>Essex County Council, as Highway Authority, has been engaged throughout the production of the HAAP. The AMUP team working on the HAAP includes a specialist transport consultant who liaised with the Highway Authority. Essex County Council Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposals in the HAAP, and mitigation measures can be implemented.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
A respondent commented that they are not interested in the legal compliance of the HAAP document but that they do not feel any of the proposed changes will benefit Hockley.	Noted.
A respondent commented that Hockley has a village feel and that the residents refer to it as a village.	Noted. The Council recognises that Hockley has a village feel, and that this village feel is important to retain. As such, the HAAP is clear that the village character of Hockley must be retained.
One respondent commented that older residents would have difficulty filling in the representations form.	The Council has provided alternative means of submitting representations on the HAAP for those who did not wish to use the online representations form. Paper copies of the form were made available at local libraries and in the reception of the Council's offices. They could also be requested by phone and returned by post.
Respondents stated that they were uncomfortable with RDC spending money to develop Hockley at a time when government finances are limited.	The HAAP does not propose that the Council finance redevelopment. Any redevelopment would have to be financed privately; but would be required to conform to the HAAP.
Respondents commented that the major beneficiaries of the HAAP will be the developers of the new supermarket and housing as well as the council who will claim the rates.	<p>Noted. The purpose of the HAAP is to enhance quality of life for the residents of Hockley. The Action Plan seeks to enhance Hockley's environment and public spaces, and improve the retail offer in the town centre. It is planned that Hockley will experience housing growth which will help to meet the housing needs of the district and the local area. A proportion of new housing will be affordable.</p> <p>The aims of the HAAP will be achieved whilst appropriate consideration is given to the protection and enhancement of the unique character of the area. Clearly any development that comes forward will need to be economically viable. However unsustainable or inappropriate development will not be permitted within the area covered by the HAAP.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents questioned how an increase in traffic in Eldon Way would be dealt with.</p>	<p>Traffic issues relating to specific developments will be dealt with at the development management stage.</p> <p>Essex County Council, as Highway Authority, has been engaged throughout the production of the HAAP. The AMUP team working on the HAAP includes a specialist transport consultant who liaised with the Highway Authority. Essex County Council Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposals in the HAAP, and that the required mitigation measures can be implemented.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that there is no mention of what will happen to the factories in Eldon Way.</p>	<p>Part of Eldon Way has been identified as an opportunity site while the remainder of the sites employment uses will be retained.</p> <p>It should be noted that the decision to redevelop the site would be up to the land owner even in the case of the Opportunity Site.</p> <p>The Council is also committed to assisting in the relocation of any businesses that wish to find new premises elsewhere in the District.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that larger retail units will not work as rates will be increased as a result, driving out smaller businesses.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that heavy goods vehicles and lorries often stop along Spa Road to supply some of the shops along the road.</p>	<p>The HAAP will ensure that future developments requiring the loading and unloading of goods will also have suitable loading facilities.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that a mix of housing and industrial uses is not desirable in Hockley.</p>	<p>An area of Eldon Way has been identified as an Opportunity Site with potential to be redeveloped as a mixed use development. The remainder of Eldon Way is proposed to be retained as employment use.</p>



## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents commented that the additional impact on utilities that development will cause has not been addressed.</p>	<p>The exact impact of a development on infrastructure and utilities will be dependent on the details of any development brought forward. Infrastructure improvements will be required to accompany development. No fundamental issues in respect of infrastructure provision that would render the proposals in the HAAP undeliverable have been identified – service providers have been consulted but have not raised objections.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the HAAP document was difficult to read because the text and diagrams were too small.</p>	<p>The HAAP is a high definition document. It can be viewed on-line or as a paper copy. The first page of the HAAP includes the statement: “If you would like this information in large print, Braille or another language, please contact 01702 318111” in large font.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the Spa Road mini roundabout should be upgraded before wider development goes ahead.</p>	<p>Suggestion noted. However, it may be the case that such improvements are partly funded by contributions from developments and implemented alongside them.</p>
<p>Respondents queried how the HAAP would relate to wider development planned in other areas of the district?</p>	<p>The HAAP is one of three Area Action Plans that are being produced for the Districts major urban areas. These include Rochford, Rayleigh and Hockley. Each AAP sets out the level, nature and extent of development that is permitted in each area. Without an AAP there is a risk that inappropriate or unsustainable development might occur.</p> <p>The HAAP and other emerging AAPs comply with the policies set out in the Core Strategy and provide more in depth guidance on what sort of development is appropriate for their respective areas.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>A respondent stated that no study of the HAAP's impact on air quality has been carried out.</p>	<p>The HAAP Sustainability Appraisal identifies the potential impact on air quality that may occur as part of associated construction when development comes forward. It identifies that on going monitoring should be undertaken in Hockley.</p> <p>The HAAP identifies air pollution as a result of traffic congestion as a potential issue. In order to address this issue the HAAP focuses on reducing traffic congestion, and increasing the use of alternative forms of transport.</p> <p>Air Quality Impact Assessments will be required where appropriate at the development management stage of development.</p>
<p>A respondent suggested that the HAAP should be re evaluated from scratch.</p>	<p>This is not considered necessary and would leave Hockley centre without any clear planning framework in place to guide future development or encourage investment.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that they accepted the need for housing but only on the condition that infrastructure, parking provision and public services are considered.</p>	<p>Noted. The HAAP concurs with this point.</p> <p>The Core Strategy and the HAAP both require that appropriate infrastructure improvements be included as part of development.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the redevelopment of the Foundry site will drive local business away and put pressure on struggling shops.</p>	<p>The HAAP proposes that the Foundry site retains its employment land use allocation. The HAAP does not propose this area be redeveloped.</p>
<p>Residents suggested that the Eldon Way site should be developed as a cultural focal point with a social/ education centre.</p>	<p>Noted. The redevelopment of the Eldon Way Opportunity Site will include leisure facilities and public spaces.</p>
<p>A resident suggested that HAAP should be put on hold until regional issues have stabilised.</p>	<p>The East of England Plan has now been formally revoked. The Rochford Core Strategy is in place and is adopted. An early review of the Core Strategy is required, but this is to ensure there is a fifteen-year housing land supply – this does not unduly affect the HAAP.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>A respondent commented that the HAAP should be suspended indefinitely because Hockley residents are content with the town as it is.</p>	<p>A 'do nothing' option is not appropriate given the aims of Core Strategy Policy RTC6, which in itself is supported by sustainability appraisal and other evidence base documents, and is an adopted part of the Development Plan. In addition, it should be noted that Hockley centre will not necessarily remain unchanged regardless of whether the HAAP is in place or not – the HAAP ensures there is a planning framework in place to guide development, and ensure the necessary infrastructure etc. accompanies new development; as opposed to new development and change taking place on an unplanned, ad-hoc basis.</p>
<p>Respondents queried how elderly residents would be affected by the loss of facilities key facilities including the post office and medical centre.</p>	<p>Key facilities will not be lost. The HAAP seeks to enhance the provision of services and public facilities in the area.</p> <p>The Post Office have commented that while they agree that their present premises are potentially a strong candidate for redevelopment they would also seek to relocate within the Hockley area if they vacate the site, so that they could continue to serve local residents.</p>
<p>Residents suggested that the planned changes to Hockley could be relocated to an area of Green Belt land allocated as a housing development in Hawkwell District.</p>	<p>The NPPF and the Core Strategy both oppose the unnecessary allocation of Green Belt land. Additionally relocating the range of uses proposed within the HAAP to a less central location would make them less accessible and would represent a less sustainable form of development than if they were to be directed to Hockley centre.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that there is already significant pressure on Hockley's public services and that these services cannot accommodate more residents within their catchment areas.</p>	<p>The HAAP's key objective is set by the Core Strategy which is supported by a robust evidence base including consultation on Essex County Council's School Organisation Plan. Essex County Council was consulted as the Local Education Authority and has raised no objections.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that several facilities which provide activities for children and young people should be retained if possible.</p>	<p>The HAAP intends to retain existing leisure facilities on Eldon Way and to encourage the development of new leisure facilities in the Opportunity Site.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents commented that the HAAP deals with central Hockley only and that other areas further out of the centre of the town are now available for development. For example the former Bullwood Hall prison site.</p>	<p>Suggestion noted. However this particular document is concerned with the centre of Hockley.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the HAAP should be reassessed with an emphasis on smaller shops and improvements to Spa Road. They state that Eldon Way should be allocated for housing, leisure and some light industrial development.</p>	<p>The HAAP seeks to do to all of these things. As such there is not need to reassess it.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the public now have ‘consultation fatigue’ and are no longer willing to respond to the consultation.</p>	<p>The Council is required to consult residents and stakeholders; and it is considered that community involvement and consultation is an important aspect of the planning process.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the HAAP Exhibition was only advertised once the exhibition was half way through.</p>	<p>The HAAP Library Exhibition was advertised from 14 August 2012 to 24 August 2012.</p>
<p><b>1.2 Working with our community</b></p>	
<p>Respondents commented that the Parish Plan has been ignored.</p>	<p>The Residents Association and residents have been consulted at all stages of the HAAP’s development. Responses to public consultations have been received, considered and assessed.</p> <p>Consideration was also given to the Hockley Parish Plan, which has been used to provide evidence in the production of the HAAP, but the HAAP cannot simply follow the Parish Plan and must have regard to other factors.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that RDC aims to finance the HAAP by allowing a developer to build a 3000square metre supermarket in the town.</p>	<p>This is not the case. No arrangement between the Council and any developer is in place in respect of the HAAP.</p> <p>Without the HAAP development of Hockley could still progress, only without the checks and balances which the HAAP would provide.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents commented that residents do not want or need a supermarket on the scale of the one that has been proposed.</p>	<p>Research carried out by AMUP showed that there was a significant market demand in Hockley for an additional large food store.</p> <p>The HAAP will provide a policy framework which gives the Council more control over the future of the centre and this positive, proactive planning is generally the approach planning authorities are encouraged to take in the NPPF.</p> <p>There is a danger that, if appropriate sites are not identified within the development plan (i.e. if the Council did not prepare the AAP), developers and retail operators will find it easier to achieve planning consents for stores which are bigger than the planning authority would want and in locations which further draw trips and spending power out of established town centres.</p> <p>If the market were unconstrained by land availability and planning policy (i.e. if no upper floorspace limit were set), then there is a possibility that there might be demand for a larger store.</p> <p>Whilst it may be the case that the market would wish to see a larger store built, the 3,000 square metre maximum is considered an appropriate limit, as a larger store may be overly dominant, undermining the vitality of the centre.</p> <p>Also relevant is the findings of the Retail and Leisure Study which identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents suggested that the HAAP should follow the Hockley Parish Plan and encourage minimal change.</p>	<p>The HAAP has taken the views of residents and the Hockley Residents Association into account throughout the development of the document and has specifically considered the views expressed in the Parish Plan.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Core Strategy identified Hockley as an area in need of improvement and that the absence of the HAAP will not prevent future development.</p> <p>A 'do nothing' approach was also assessed as part of the consultation on the HAAP and was found to be unsustainable in view of Core Strategy Policy RTC6.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the development of a 3000square metre supermarket would cause other local shops to go out of business.</p>	<p>A food store of the size suggested by the HAAP would help to sustain these local independent traders through increased footfall. The Retail and Leisure Study identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre. A food store of the size suggested by the HAAP would act as an anchor store, encouraging retail expenditure to be retained; but at the same time would not be of such a size as to be overly dominant within the centre.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents stated that access roads into Hockley should be improved to allow an increase in traffic flow through the area.</p>	<p>The HAAP seeks to make improvements to the local highways through Hockley.</p> <p>Although the B1013 running through Hockley is a main distributor road, it is important that a situation is not created whereby additional non-local traffic is encouraged to use this route rather than the main strategic network (i.e. A130 and A127).</p> <p>Although the B1013 is already used by non-local traffic as an alternative to the strategic network, if such use were encouraged it could be of significant detriment to Hockley (and the District's other settlements along this route). It is important that Essex County Council prioritise improvements to the strategic network.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the HAAP would not benefit the area enough to merit it being advanced in its current form.</p>	<p>The current level of intervention proposed by the HAAP is the result of extensive consultation. Earlier iterations supported higher levels of intervention in Hockley. However these options were less well supported during the consultation process and as such a lower impact strategy was adopted.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that there had not been enough responses to the HAAP to justify taking it forward.</p>	<p>Consultation on the HAAP has been extensive and thorough. The most recent consultation on the HAAP received 3298 representations from 849 respondents.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the HAAP should take appropriate account of the Retail and Leisure Study.</p>	<p>The HAAP takes account of the Retail and Leisure Study as one of its primary evidence base documents.</p>
<p>Respondents request that the Council should revise the plan to take more account of residents' points of view.</p>	<p>The views of residents have been considered throughout the HAAP consultation process and are further assessed as part of this document.</p>
<p><b>1.3 Working With Our Partners</b></p>	

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents commented that the Council did not include Hawkwell or Hockley Residents Associations in its list of partners and that it has not consulted with them.</p>	<p>Hockley and Hawkwell Residents Associations have been consulted as part of the representation process and have submitted representations.</p>
<p><b>1.4 The AAP Area</b></p>	
<p>All issues raised in this section have been dealt with elsewhere in this document.</p>	
<p><b>2.1 Hockley the Context</b></p>	
<p>All issues raised in this section have been dealt with elsewhere in this document.</p>	
<p><b>2.2 Place Profile</b></p>	
<p>A respondent commented that there are no banks on Main Road.</p>	<p>This is beyond the remit of the HAAP. The HAAP seeks to encourage appropriate uses to the centre, which would include banks; but cannot force banks to open premises within Hockley.</p>
<p><b>2.3 Policy Context</b></p>	
<p>Respondents stressed the importance of including affordable starter homes in any new development.</p>	<p>A percentage of the new dwellings developed in Hockley will be affordable. The exact figure will be partly dependant on the economic viability of any proposed development.</p> <p>Requirements for the provision of affordable housing might be relaxed in exceptional circumstances; for example, where constraints would make on-site provision impossible, or where a developer could demonstrate that 35% provision would be economically unviable. In such cases the Council will negotiate the proportion of affordable dwellings based on evidence regarding financial viability.</p>



Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents commented that the inclusion of housing on Mount Crescent would be problematic.</p>	<p>The HAAP acknowledges that any development on Mount Crescent would need to include a careful assessment of the amenity of existing residents.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the HAAP's assertion that buildings on Main Road/ Southend Road do not respond positively to their corner locations is subjective and has no merit.</p>	<p>Disagree. Whilst preference of style is subjective good design is not. It is entirely appropriate for an Area Action Plan to take a view on such matters.</p>
<p><b>2.4 Retail Issues</b></p>	
<p>The Co-operative Group question the evidence of a need for a food store of the size that the HAAP would allow.</p>	<p>The Rochford Core Strategy identifies Hockley as an area for improvement. The HAAP also acknowledges that the retail offer in the area is relatively limited compared to other nearby towns. It does note that there are a reasonable number of independent retailers.</p> <p>As part of the viability assessment work carried out for the HAAP the project team entered into detailed discussions with experts working under AMUP. These viability assessments concluded that there was a demand for a large food store in Hockley.</p> <p>A food store of the size suggested by the HAAP would help to sustain these local independent traders through increased footfall. The Retail and Leisure Study identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre. A food store of the size suggested by the HAAP would act as an anchor store, encouraging retail expenditure to be retained; but at the same time would not be of such a size as to dominate other retail units.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents commented that the Retail and Leisure Study 2008 did not recommend the development of a new supermarket.</p>	<p>The Retail and Leisure Study did not specifically recommend a new supermarket however the Retail and Leisure Study identified that a significant proportion of local spend was leaking to other centres and retail locations - thereby generating trips and spending patterns which only detracts from the economic viability of Hockley centre. A food store of the size suggested by the HAAP would act as an anchor store, encouraging retail expenditure to be retained; but at the same time would not be of such a size as to be overly dominant in the centre.</p> <p>The need for greater focus on food retail has come about from changes in the economic climate since 2010, as explained within the HAAP.</p>
<p><b>2.5 Employment Issues</b></p>	
<p>A respondent commented that the HAAP is based on information which is 5 years out of date.</p>	<p>This is not the case. The HAAP process began in 2008 and it takes account of information gathered at this time. However the production of the HAAP has been an iterative process and the document has been updated on an on-going basis.</p>
<p><b>2.6 Land Ownership</b></p>	
<p>Respondents commented that the Planning and Compensation Act 2004, Part 8 No 3 states that local authorities should not use Compulsory Purchase powers unless they think it is likely to improve the “economic well being of the area”.</p> <p>As the HAAP states that the Council may have to assist in land assembly.</p>	<p>The HAAP does not propose the use of Compulsory Purchase powers.</p>
<p><b>2.7 Property Market Overview</b></p>	

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
A respondent commented that most of Eldon Way is occupied meaning that it cannot be redeveloped whilst they are occupied and as such the plan is unsound.	Units will not be redeveloped by the Council or by force. Instead the decision to develop the sites will be the choice of the landowner. The HAAP is only intended as a guide to development.
Respondents commented that Hockley does not offer many opportunities for residential development.	The HAAP proposes the development of approximately 100 dwellings to be site on brownfield land.
Respondents commented that many of the areas proposed for housing would be better suited to serve as an extension to the existing retail area.	The HAAP and the Core Strategy, in addition to national planning policy, require housing to be developed on brownfield land where it is viable to do so. The HAAP proposes that Hockley centre accommodates a range of uses, including additional retail; but there is also opportunity to help meet housing need through development in this area in a manner that will minimise loss of greenfield outside of the centre.
<b>2.8 Movement Issues</b>	
All issues raised in this section have been dealt with elsewhere in this document.	
<b>2.9 The Sustainability Appraisal</b>	
One respondent commented that the HAAP should have included an option that involved no action being taken.	The August 2012 Sustainability Appraisal report acknowledges that a ‘do nothing’ option is not appropriate, given the regeneration aims of Core Strategy Policy RTC6 and the need to ensure positive outcomes through the creation of a sustainable community with good access to housing and jobs.
<b>3.1 What makes for a sustainable Hockley?</b>	

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>One respondent commented that large out of town supermarkets have reduced the amount of demand in Hockley leading to the loss of smaller local shops such as butchers and green grocers. They commented that a large shopping centre on the scale of those in Basildon and Southend would be needed to draw shoppers back to the area.</p>	<p>If the market were unconstrained by land availability and planning policy (i.e. if no upper floorspace limit were set), then there is a possibility that there might be demand for a larger store.</p> <p>Whilst it may be the case that the market would wish to see a larger store built, the 3,000 square metre maximum is considered an appropriate limit, as a larger store may be overly dominant, undermining the vitality of the centre. A food store of under 3,000 square metres still has the potential to act as an anchor store, encouraging footfall in the centre.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that the HAAP would create unemployment in Hockley. The respondent commented that services in Eldon Way would go out of business if the area was developed.</p>	<p>The HAAP does not seek to force the redevelopment of any areas of Hockley. Instead the HAAP sets out a vision for the area which will guide development and prevent inappropriate development. Even without the HAAP land owners can still sell their land and / or seek its redevelopment. However, the HAAP ensures that guidance is in place if this situation arises.</p> <p>The Council will assist businesses in finding new premises in the District should they choose to relocate.</p>
<p><b>3.2 Vision and Objectives</b></p>	
<p>A respondent commented that the Councils assessment of housing need in the District is based on the RSS which is out of date and that the figures should be based on more up to date studies.</p>	<p>The East of England Plan has now been formally revoked. The Rochford Core Strategy is in place and is adopted. An early review of the Core Strategy is required, but this is to ensure there is a fifteen-year housing land supply – this does not unduly affect the HAAP.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that the only way to develop housing on Plumberow Avenue would be to develop flats which would cause traffic congestion and other safety issues.</p>	<p>The land opposite Plumberow Avenue has the potential for residential development however the HAAP notes that care must be taken in considering the impact of any such development on the amenity of existing residents. The impact on transport infrastructure would also need to be considered as part of any planning application.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>A respondent commented that the 2009 Issues and Options report was deemed inappropriate by all parties including RDC and that the Council agreed to start from scratch.</p>	<p>A number of concerns were raised by the local community regarding the original Hockley AAP options, developed in 2009. In response to this the Council committed to reviewing the options and commission a new study to produce amended options for the community to consider.</p> <p>It should be noted that in response to comments from residents the Council has adapted the HAAP to better represent the views of the public, including proposing a lesser degree of intervention, following concerns raised during the consultation on the 2009 Issues and Options Report. It would not be appropriate to ignore the 2009 Issues and Options, or the consultation responses to this, which had a significant impact on the direction the HAAP took.</p>
<p><b>3.3 Action Plan Submission Document</b></p>	
<p>All issues raised in this section have been dealt with elsewhere in this document.</p>	
<p><b>Policy 1 Hockley Area Action Plan framework</b></p>	
<p>A respondent commented that a large supermarket was the least well supported option proposed for the HAAP and asked why it has been carried forward.</p>	<p>The HAAP does not propose a large supermarket. The HAAP sets a size limit of 3,000 square metres for any food store to be developed in Hockley centre.</p> <p>If the market were unconstrained by land availability and planning policy (i.e. if no upper floorspace limit were set), then there is a possibility that there might be demand for a larger store.</p> <p>Whilst it may be the case that the market would wish to see a larger store built, the 3,000 square metre maximum is considered an appropriate limit, as a larger store may be overly dominant, undermining the vitality of the centre.</p>

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Royal Mail commented that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Royal Mail Hockley Delivery Office is an operational site and although there are no plans to relocate or to close the site they are prepared to allow the HAAP to include the building as a potential development site. Royal Mail feel that the site does offer good opportunities for redevelopment. They request that any redevelopment of the site should include funding from the developer to assist in the relocation of the Royal Mail offices. This will ensure that Royal Mails operations will not be threatened.</li> <li>They also request that any surrounding development be sensitive to the needs of Royal Mails operations.</li> <li>They request an amendment to the text in Policy 1 and Figure 3.2 as follows:                      'The council does not own or control the majority of the land within the Eldon Way opportunity area. Its redevelopment is therefore largely dependent on private land owners and developers bringing the land forward. In relation to Royal Mail's site, redevelopment of the site will require the relocation of the Delivery Office prior to its redevelopment.'                      And;                      'Any new development within the Opportunity Site will need to need to ensure that it is designed to be cognisant and sensitive to existing land uses. This may be particularly important in relation to Royal Mail's Delivery Office'.</li> </ul>	<p>The HAAP does not seek to threaten Royal Mail operations.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate for the HAAP to single out one landowner in the manner requested in this representation, and it will be for the landowners to manage the financial arrangements of any land transactions.</p>
<p>The Co-operative Group commented that they object to the Co-operative building being included in Figure 13 as an area of 'new retail development' as they have no intention of redeveloping the existing site. They request that it not be identified in Figure 13.</p>	<p>Figure 13 shows the HAAP framework plan. It includes an indicative area identified as 'new retail development potential', but it is not an allocation of land, nor does it seek to force landowners to undertake development against their wishes.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>A respondent commented that the land where housing is proposed is home to badgers which are a protected species.</p>	<p>There are no records of any protected species on the existing employment site. However, any redevelopment would be subject to ecological assessments as necessary.</p>
<p>A respondent queried that with other housing developments going forward in the District is it really necessary to develop the town centre?</p>	<p>The Council in partnership with AMUP has identified that Hockley is a sustainable location for housing. Particularly because of the availability of previously developed land in Hockley centre (the use of which, local and national planning policy support) and proximity to local services and public transport links. The results of consultation have made clear that if housing must be provided, brownfield sites are preferred to greenfield.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that they would support the HAAP in principal if a Traffic Assessment were included.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate to include a Transport Assessment at this stage. Essex County Council, as Highway Authority, has been engaged throughout the production of the HAAP. The AMUP team working on the HAAP includes a specialist transport consultant who liaised with the Highway Authority. Essex County Council Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposals in the HAAP, and that the required mitigation measures can be implemented.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that Hockley could benefit from restrictions on the number of take-aways and regulation to encourage more variety of shops.</p>	<p>Rochford Council is able to set restrictions on the type and number of particular use classes in a given area. It should be noted that once a business is active under a given use class, planning permission can be granted for a change of use to a different use class, but this does not mean that the existing use and business is no longer permitted to operate. The change in use class would only take effect once implemented by the users of the premises.</p> <p>The HAAP proposes that a variety of retail, leisure and restaurants/ cafes be encouraged throughout Hockley. One reason for this decision, in addition to increasing the economic viability of the town centre, is to redress the current imbalance of uses in the area (as perceived by residents, as evidenced by consultation responses) in terms of the</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
	<p>prevalence of takeaway food shops in the area.</p> <p>A range of mixed retail and service uses in Hockley will help to encourage economic and cultural regeneration within the town centre.</p>
<p>Mt Paul Taylor a 'share holder' in the company which owns the Foundry business park objects to the proposal to route a footpath from Eldon Way through the Foundry business park to the Station. This is because of concerns over the security of the business park and the risk of vandalism.</p>	<p>There were no objections to the HAAP from the Community Safety Partnership or the Police Authority.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that Eldon Way may be contaminated from some of its previous uses.</p>	<p>The need for a Contaminated Land Study will be met through the development management process and mitigated.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that they do not support the idea to widen roads and make the pavements narrower.</p>	<p>The HAAP notes that at certain junctions it may be appropriate to alter the widths of the road / pavement.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that Hockley does not have sufficient infrastructure to deal with any additional housing. They also commented that local services such as schools and doctors were insufficient to deal with any increase in demand.</p>	<p>Any housing development in Hockley will involve the developer making contributions to mitigating the developments impact on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>As the HAAP only sets out the parameters of Hockley's future development it is not appropriate for the document to go into detail regarding the specific infrastructure improvements that should be applied. In many cases doing so would be counter productive as any infrastructure improvements will by necessity need to be related to the specific development brought forward.</p> <p>No fundamental issues in respect of infrastructure provision that would render the proposals in the HAAP undeliverable have been identified – service providers have been consulted but have not raised objections.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that a youth centre would be of value in Hockley.</p>	<p>Noted. Although the HAAP does not specifically propose the inclusion of a youth centre, it does not rule out the possibility that one may be developed in the future.</p>



## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>A respondent commented that Eldon Way is an eyesore and offers a great opportunity to add to the existing mix of shops, offices, leisure facilities and retail in the town. They also commented that Hockley is long over due for improvement.</p>	<p>Eldon Way has been identified as an Opportunity Site for redevelopment. Responses from the consultation process lead the Council to conclude that some areas of the Opportunity Site, including leisure facilities, should be retained because they are still well used by the public.</p> <p>The redeveloped area of the Eldon Way Site will include a mix of uses, including residential, retail, leisure and office.</p>
<p><b>4. Proposals and Area Wide Policies</b></p>	
<p>Co-operative Group commented that they support the inclusion of the Co-operative in the Primary Shopping Frontage. Although they do not agree that the Eldon Way Opportunity Site is viable and so do not wish to be included in it. They wish Figure 14 to be amended to exclude the Co-operative.</p>	<p>The fact that the Co-operative is included in the Opportunity Site places no onus on the land owner to redevelop it. The HAAP merely shows that the site has potential for redevelopment.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that the Council stated that they would retain the Eldon Way trading centre but that the HAAP proposes that it be redeveloped.</p>	<p>The HAAP proposes that an area of Eldon Way retains its allocation for employment use; but parts of Eldon Way are identified as having opportunity for redevelopment.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that there is insufficient analysis of the positive and negative impacts of development in the HAAP.</p>	<p>A full Sustainability Appraisal was completed for the HAAP and was publicly available. This considers the economic, social and environmental impacts of proposals.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that new dwellings should be owner occupied only and should not be available to those who wish to let them.</p> <p>They commented that only residents of Hockley, able to prove residence of fifteen years, should be allowed to buy a property in the area.</p> <p>They commented that new employment opportunities should go to Hockley residents only.</p>	<p>This is beyond the remit of the HAAP.</p> <p>A percentage of the dwellings to be built under the HAAP will be affordable. The HAAP acknowledges that the Core Strategy (which applies to the whole District, including Hockley centre) requires 35% of new dwellings to be provided as affordable housing, unless this would render the scheme unviable.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>A respondent commented that rather than a supermarket the council should encourage a large retail mall to include bars, cafes and other recreational services.</p>	<p>Following the extensive process of public participation, consideration of viability and other evidence, it was concluded that a mixed use development including a food store of up to 3000 square metres was the most sustainable option to take forward. However the mixed use development will include cafes, and recreational facilities.</p>
<p><b>Policy 2 Delivering environmental improvements</b></p>	
<p>A respondent commented that the proposed raised area at Woodlands Road would not be safe.</p>	<p>The Spa Road mini-roundabout and the side roads along Spa Road act as barriers to pedestrian movement around Hockley centre. Raised entry treatments would help to prioritise pedestrian movements and enhance the centre's public realm.</p> <p>Discussions with Essex County Council has not raised any concerns over safety.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that a new health centre should be well related to the rest of the town, including shops and services and residential areas.</p>	<p>It could not be substantiated from the Primary Care Trust that a new health centre would be deliverable. However the HAAP does not rule out the potential for a new health centre in Hockley in the future.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that the Council does not maintain existing public areas and that an additional area of public open space should only be included if the Council will ensure it is maintained.</p>	<p>Appropriate mechanisms will be put in place to manage public space as and when they come forward.</p>
<p><b>Policy 3 Promoting better movement</b></p>	
<p>All issues raised in this section have been dealt with elsewhere in this document.</p>	
<p><b>Policy 4 Increasing the availability of housing</b></p>	

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
<p>Respondents commented that affordable housing should be included in any development.</p>	<p>A percentage of the dwellings to be built under the HAAP will be affordable. The HAAP acknowledges that the Core Strategy (which applies to the whole District, including Hockley centre) requires 35% of new dwellings to be provided as affordable housing, unless this would render the scheme unviable.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that they wished to know the timeframe for building 250 dwellings in Hockley.</p>	<p>The actual number of housing to be developed in Hockley is not 250 dwellings, it is approximately 100. The plan period runs up to 2026.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that housing should be kept a reasonable distance away from the railway lines.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Respondents commented that the council should restrict the use of white UPVC windows, doors and fixtures on any houses developed in the HAAP area. And further that criteria should be established for what materials are used in new residential developments.</p>	<p>The HAAP requires that a high quality of design be applied to any housing that is proposed in Hockley. However there are no plans to ban the use of UPVC fixtures. This is not considered a proportionate, appropriate approach, particularly as the centre is not a Conservation Area.</p>
<p>A respondent commented that there are several brownfield sites in Southend that could absorb the additional housing requirement for Hockley.</p>	<p>The Council is required under national planning policy and under its own Core Strategy to meet its objectively assessed housing demand. As Southend-on-Sea is not part of the same Local Planning Authority, and is a functionally separate settlement, the housing need identified for the District as set out in the District's Core Strategy cannot be met through development there.</p>
<p>Respondents raised concerns that the sewage and foul water system cannot support the additional housing proposed in the HAAP.</p>	<p>Anglian Water Services have stated that the area covered by the HAAP is served by Rochford Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). There is adequate capacity to accommodate the flows proposed in the HAAP.</p> <p>Currently there are no significant issues with the sewerage network.</p> <p>They also stated that the full impact of housing development should be assessed when it comes forward.</p>

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
A respondent commented that the HAAP should encourage more light industrial uses on Eldon Way.	Noted. The HAAP has identified that a mixed use development on the Eldon Way Opportunity Site would be a more sustainable option as well as being more appropriate to an area with a village character.
Respondents commented that they would be amenable to additional housing within Hockley provided that it was developed on brownfield sites and was of a high standard.	Noted. The HAAP, Core Strategy and national policy all concur that where possible development should utilise brownfield sites where possible.
<b>Policy 5 Protecting Jobs</b>	
Respondents commented that local employment should be protected and enhanced as a high priority.	Noted. The HAAP seeks to balance the importance of protecting local jobs with attracting new investment to strengthen the vitality of the centre. In particular, some of the employment uses on the Hockley Trading Centre and Foundry Business Park should be retained, alongside some of the leisure uses on these sites that also provide employment and recreational opportunities.
A respondent commented that Eldon Way provides a strong mix of employment but that the employment that would replace it would amount to retail employment only.	The HAAP proposes the Eldon Way Opportunity Site should include a mix of uses including retail, food stores, cafes and leisure.
A respondent commented that more emphasis should be given to encouraging small businesses.	Noted. The HAAP seeks to encourage small and boutique retail services in Hockley. The inclusion of an anchor store will assist in achieving this goal as it will draw additional retail expenditure to the area.
<b>Policy 6 Improving Retail Choice for Local People</b>	
All issues raised in this section have been dealt with elsewhere in this document.	
<b>Policy 7 Ensuring a Healthy Centre</b>	

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
Respondents commented that a mixed use of housing, retail and leisure facilities would be helpful in enhancing the health of residents.	Noted. The Council in partnership with AMUP has identified that Hockley is a sustainable location for housing.
Respondents commented that additional pubs and cafes are proposed but that there is no proposal to enhance policing.	The provision of a greater evening culture is an aspiration of the HAAP. Security features and mitigation of any negative impacts will be dealt with at the development management phase of the process. This will involve an assessment of the impact of any new development on the area. Additionally there were no objections to the HAAP from the Community Safety Partnership or the Police Authority.
<b>Policy 8 Encouraging Leisure Opportunities</b>	
Respondents commented that existing leisure facilities should be retained if possible.	Noted. The HAAP seeks to retain some of the existing leisure facilities and encourage additional leisure uses into the centre.
Respondents commented that the present leisure facilities in Hockley are insufficient and of a low quality. They suggest the role of larger leisure developments outside of the HAAP boundaries should be considered.	The HAAP identified that additional leisure facilities should be included in the redevelopment of the Eldon Way Opportunity Site.
<b>5.1 Working in Partnership</b>	
Respondents commented that they were unconvinced that a developer would be willing to take on the development of Eldon Way because of complications involved in acquiring the land.	It is important to recognise that AMUP undertook high-level viability advice in respect of individual development schemes, to ensure that the proposals set out within the HAAP are robust and based in commercial realism.
<b>5.2 Financial Viability</b>	
Respondents commented that the financial analysis in the HAAP is not sufficiently detailed.	Proposals have been subject to viability testing and a viability note has been published. This is to a level of detail appropriate for an Area Action Plan.

## Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan: Consultation Statement

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
Respondents commented that land assembly costs are not included.	The full detailed land accusation costs are not included in the HAAP, but proposals have been subject to viability testing.
Respondents commented that redevelopment of Eldon Way would lead to the loss of jobs and reduce the financial viability of the HAAP.	<p>The redevelopment of Eldon Way is likely to create a significant number of jobs, in both food stores and boutique shops, and leisure services.</p> <p>Existing businesses will also be assisted by the Council in relocating new premises within the District if they choose to relocate.</p>
A respondent commented that noise pollution would adversely affect the amenity of residents.	<p>Noted. The HAAP Sustainability Appraisal identifies that short term noise pollution may occur during the construction phases of development. But it also identifies that the HAAP has sought to limit this impact by focusing strongly on public transport, walking and cycling to reduce noise from traffic.</p> <p>Potential noise impacts from individual developments will also be subject to assessment at the development management stage.</p>
Respondents commented that there is no financial assessment of whether or not the businesses in Eldon Way could afford to relocate if the site were developed.	<p>The HAAP does not force landowners to sell their land and give up existing uses if they do not wish to do so.</p> <p>Proposals have been subject to viability testing and a viability note has been published.</p> <p>The Council is committed to assisting local businesses to find new premises in the District if they decide to relocate.</p>
<b>5.3 Community Infrastructure</b>	
Respondents commented that nothing has been included in the HAAP to deal with the issue of traffic flow under the railway bridge.	Essex County Council, as Highway Authority, has been engaged throughout the production of the HAAP. The AMUP team working on the HAAP includes a specialist transport consultant who liaised with the Highway Authority. Essex County Council Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objections to the proposals in the HAAP, and

Issues Raised	Initial Officer Comments
	<p>that the required mitigation measures can be implemented.</p> <p>It was further noted that although the B1013 running through Hockley is a main distributor road, it is important that improvements are not so significant that a situation is not created whereby such as they encourage additional non-local traffic is encouraged to use this route rather than the main strategic network (i.e. A130 and A127).</p> <p>Although the B1013 is already used by non-local traffic as an alternative to the strategic network, if such use were encouraged it could be of significant detriment to Hockley (and the District's other settlements along this route). It is important that Essex County Council prioritise improvements to the strategic network.</p> <p>The impact of any development on the Hockley area will however be considered as a part of any planning application that may come forward and appropriate measures will be taken to address any issues that arise.</p>
<p>Respondents queried why the HAAP suggests £200,000 to £300,000 for improvements to the Spa Roundabout whilst the Core Strategy allowed £2 million?</p>	<p>The figures published as background to the Core Strategy in Topic Paper 2 were, as stated in Topic Paper 2, indicative. Topic Paper 2 made clear that actual costs may vary as additional work was carried out.</p>
<p><b>5.4 Monitoring change</b></p>	
<p>All issues raised in this section have been dealt with elsewhere in this document.</p>	

Date: 5<sup>th</sup> March 2013

Dear Sam,

**Hockley Area Action Plan Pre Submission Document**

The Economic Development Unit are in general support of the HAAP as it recognises the unique features of the centre and aims to maintain and enhance these, whilst also recognising the issues faced by visitors residents and businesses, and suggests a series of measures to mitigate these issues.

We are supportive of the size limitations placed on any supermarket wishing to locate in Hockley by the HAAP; Market trends are suggestive that the area adjacent to Hockley centre may be seen as an opportunity to locate a larger scale supermarket in the area. A supermarket considerably larger than that which the HAAP would limit any to could have the potential to be of detriment to the local economy: it would be likely to have negative impacts on the local area in terms of transport and loss of trade from local independent traders. In contrast, a smaller supermarket (such as that which the HAAP would allow) would help to sustain these local independent traders through enhanced facilities and increased footfall.

As stated the HAAP recognises the issues currently faced by visitors, traders and residents, one key issue being the parking facilities that are available within Hockley centre. The HAAP does consider this issue and we would recommend that detailed



proposals ensure there is adequate and suitable parking to sustain local retailers and businesses located within Hockley centre, and to enable and encourage increased footfall to the area. We would also recommend that the business community within Hockley are consulted with and informed as to the progress of the HAAP.

Yours

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Jody Owens-Hughes'.

**Jody Owens-Hughes**  
**Economic Development Officer**

HOCKLEY  
PARISH  
COUNCIL



THE OLD FIRE STATION • 58 SOUTHEND ROAD • HOCKLEY • ESSEX S55 4QH

---

For the attention of

Sam Hollingworth,  
Planning Department,  
Rochford District Council

Dear Mr Hollingworth,

Following your briefing on the Hockley Area Action Plan, the council considered the matter and made the following statement.

*The council understands that traffic management planning would be dependent on the specific applications, but considers that a more comprehensive analysis of traffic needs of the district would be an essential starting point for the action plans.*

*Although the council has reservations about the lack of a detailed traffic assessment, it is recognised that the plan is necessary to manage uncontrolled development. The council accepts the need for the plan and notes that the plan is sound and adequately prepared.*

This was ratified at the January Council Meeting in Minute 13/15. The council wished to emphasise that this did not necessarily express support or objection to the plan, simply that they noted its necessity.

Regards

Michael Letch

Clerk to Hockley Parish Council

**Overview of the approach to Rochford's three Area Action Plans**

Local Authorities are encouraged to prepare local strategies and planning policies for key locations where investment and change might take place. National planning policy is clear that the most preferable locations for new retail and commercial developments are established town centres which tend to benefit from good quality public transport services and already benefit from a range of shops and services. These locations are therefore seen as sustainable. Rochford District Council took the decision some time ago to prepare Area Action Plans for its three key centres of Rayleigh, Rochford and Hockley.

The approach taken to all three of the District's AAPs has been the same – with strategies and policies for each of the three centres emerging from analysis and a number of stages of consultation.

Issues and Options documents were prepared and consultation carried out in relation to all three AAPs in 2009; in 2010 an additional stage of options work was undertaken in relation to Hockley, on account of the challenging issues raised by proposals for the potential redevelopment of employment land at Eldon Way.

Since this time, a new project team lead by Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners, including planners, urban designers, property advisers and transport consultants, has been appointed by Rochford District Council (RDC) to review the existing issues and options and prepare draft AAPs from submission. The work programme for all three AAPs requires the development of further options and strategies, and additional consultation.

To date the project team has undertaken a public exhibition in relation to its preferred options for the Hockley AAP and finalised the pre-submission version of this document, which RDC has now published for consultation. Preferred options for the Rochford and Rayleigh AAPs are currently being prepared and public exhibitions will be held in early 2013. Pre-submission AAPs for Rochford and Rayleigh are expected later in the same year.

The National Planning Policy Framework, when setting out its presumption in favour of sustainable development, requires that Local Planning Authorities undertake plan-making in a manner that positively seeks opportunities to meet the development needs of their area. In appointing an experienced team to undertake the production of AAPs for its three town centres, RDC has taken the opportunity to ensure that it is able to respond to the evidence collected as part of its Local Plan evidence base – such as that relating to future retail capacity, which was identified through in the 2008 Retail and Leisure Study. This will allow RDC to ensure that its Development Plan is robust and steers development towards appropriately sized and located sites.

**Transport Approach**

The approach taken to transport and movement issues in the preparation of draft AAPs for Hockley, Rayleigh and Rochford has been the same as specified in the single contract for the preparation of the three AAPs.

The consultant team tasked with preparing consultation drafts of these three AAPs has included a specialist transport consultant, who has worked closely with the urban designers, planners, property advisers and key stakeholders in the review of issues and opportunities, development of AAP options and drafting of policy statements.

Specific transport-related input for each of the three towns has included:

- Local site visits and steering group meetings
- District and County-level stakeholder consultation (discussions regarding transport and highways have been focused through Mark Lawrence at Essex County Council, the local highway authority)
- Baseline review of existing evidence base, consultation responses and policy context
- Refinement of early draft movement strategies in response to issues raised and the emerging preferred approaches, including concept sketches for potential highway and public realm improvements
- High level assessment of site proposals, involving the preparation of sketch options for access arrangements and broad trip generation exercises
- Input into the drafting of transport-related policy text for the final AAPs

Note that, as is usually the case with strategies of this nature and at this stage of policy development, the work undertaken for all three towns has not included any detailed traffic, parking or other surveys; nor has it included any detailed highway modelling work. However it will be a requirement that planning applications for any significant new development must include such surveys and modelling work and present these in detailed Transport Assessments and Travel Plans, in accordance with the Department for Transport's Guidance on Transport Assessment (March 2007).

Transport Assessments would need to identify the specific impacts of increased movement that come with increased development, and set out a range of mitigation measures (like junction improvements, parking strategies and smarter travel measures) that would be required, as a prerequisite of development, in order to mitigate these impacts. Travel Plans will be required as a way of encouraging any new residents and businesses to live and operate in a more sustainable way, reducing the number and length of car trips generated in the area, whilst promoting more sustainable modes of travel like public transport, walking and cycling.

Essex County Council, as the highway authority responsible for managing and maintaining the highway network and coordinating bus services in and around Hockley, Rayleigh and Rochford, has been fully consulted in the preparation of this AAP document. In its role as highway network manager, ECC will consider the issues, opportunities and improvement framework identified in this AAP and will take these forward as part of its strategic planning process. ECC will also be responsible for reviewing and approving Transport Assessments and Travel Plans submitted as part of any future planning applications for significant development in the AAP area.

## **Rochford District Council – Local Development Framework Hockley Area Action Plan Document: Consultation Statement**

---

### **Notes from Meeting between Rochford District Council and Essex County Council regarding the Hockley Area Action Plan (HAAP)– 3 April 2013**

#### **Attendees**

Mark Lawrence (ML) Strategic Development Engineer, Essex County Council (ECC)  
Sam Hollingworth (SH) Planning Policy Team Leader, Rochford District Council (RDC)

#### **Notes of discussion**

Meeting was arranged between RDC and ECC by RDC, following concerns expressed by members of the public through pre-submission consultation on highway issues in relation to the HAAP.

SH explained that a number of individuals had responded to the pre-submission public consultation expressing concerns with regards to highway issues and the HAAP. Concerns expressed by members of the public included: highways issues not being properly considered as part of the HAAP; impact the proposed development would have on highways; the lack of transport assessment to accompany the HAAP; and deliverability of highway improvements.

ML confirmed that ECC had had a number of discussions with a specialist transport consultant working with Allies Morrison Urban Practitioner (AMUP) (the consultants engaged to produce the HAAP). ML confirmed ECC had already been familiar with a number of the proposals and suggestions that were discussed with the specialist transport consultant, as many had been raised through work on previous iterations of the HAAP. ML confirmed that none presented any concerns for the Highways Authority.

ML confirmed that ECC had considered the proposed development in the HAAP. ML confirmed that, having regard to its scale and type, ECC is confident that the proposed development could be accommodated and any necessary mitigation measures implemented. ML noted that the proposed development would replace existing employment uses, and that transport assessments would be required to consider the differential between the existing and proposed impacts on the highway network.

It was further noted that although the B1013 running through Hockley is a main distributor road, it is important that improvements are not so significant such as they encourage additional non-local traffic to use this route rather than the main strategic network (i.e. A130 and A127). Although the B1013 is already used by non-local traffic as an alternative to the strategic network, if such use were encouraged it could be of significant detriment to Hockley (and the District's other settlements along this route). It is important that ECC prioritise improvements to the strategic network.

ML confirmed that ECC would not require a transport assessment for the Area Action Plan; rather such assessments would be required to accompany any strategic planning applications for development. It was noted that the HAAP proposes policies in respect of transport assessments and travel plans, and that ECC did not have any concerns in relation to such policies.

ML confirmed that suggested highway improvements in the HAAP had the potential to be implemented, including the incorporation of two-lane approaches on the three principle arms (Spa Road, Southend Road and Main Road) of the Spa Road mini-roundabout; although it was noted that this would result in losing some public realm. ML confirmed that precise costs would be dependent on details of any schemes and factors such as the presence of underground utilities. This would be something that should be considered through transport assessments and addressed through planning obligations / Community Infrastructure Levy.

[End]

## **Hockley Area Action Plan - Issues and Options**

### **Summary of responses to the first round of community involvement**

Rochford District Council is preparing an Area Action Plan for the centre of Hockley. The Area Action Plan will form part of the Council's Local Development Framework, the collection of planning policy documents that will set out how the District develops in the future. The Hockley Area Action Plan (HAAP) will set out a vision for how growth and change can be managed within Hockley and how regeneration of the area might be stimulated through this development.

Community involvement will play an important role in the production of the HAAP, and in January 2009 the Council published a document for public consultation on the evidence gathered and potential options for the centre. This Issues and Options document was subject to consultation between 13 February and 30 April 2009 and this report provides a summary of the issues raised through responses.

It should be noted that as a result of the consultation, it has been determined that further consultation should be carried out on a new version of the HAAP, but in the meantime, an analysis of the responses received to the first consultation is considered to be useful. This paper sets out a brief summary of the consultation responses, but provides no feedback for the moment, given there will be a new consultation launched later in 2010.

#### **Overview**

A clear message from the representations received to the Issues and Options consultation is that Hockley has a distinct village feel and that the existing character adds to this. Large scale redevelopment is not considered appropriate or necessary, as this would erode the cherished character of Hockley, although it is generally acknowledged that some improvements to the appearance of the centre and some highway enhancements may be usefully made, with particular reference to problems of parking and traffic congestion. There is concern regarding the impact of major redevelopment on existing businesses and the vitality of Hockley. The redevelopment of Eldon Way for residential development is generally not supported.

#### **Vision and Objectives**

It was proposed that the vision should be more specific to Hockley, and suggestions for amendment included making reference to retaining the identity / character of Hockley and that it should be referred to as a village. It was also suggested that the vision is contradicted by the option to relocate local employment opportunities and that it lacks clarity.

The objectives were suggested by some to be in need of improvement for example by including reference to economic and employment opportunities and linking this to the vision. It was suggested that the plan needs to identify how it will deliver the economic aspects of regional and local strategies (note: since the consultation, the regional spatial strategy has been revoked). It was also suggested that the objectives needed to be 'SMART' (specific; measurable; achievable; relevant; time-framed).

### **Highways and Traffic Flow**

The amount of traffic and congestion through Hockley centre, and the potential for any development to worsen this, was a significant concern expressed in the representations. Concern was expressed with regard to a potential increase in the number of dwellings in the centre of Hockley if Eldon Way Industrial Estate were to be redeveloped, which would impact on the highway network, particularly at peak times. Concern was also expressed with regard to the proximity of a new, larger supermarket at the junction of Bramerton Road and Spa Road to the roundabout and the impact this may have on traffic flow, with particular reference to servicing. In general any development which may increase traffic directed towards the centre of Hockley was highlighted as a concern. It was emphasised that if development was needed then appropriate highway improvements would be required. The impact of pedestrian crossings on traffic flow was also highlighted.

The roundabout at the Spa Road/Southend Road/Main Road/Woodlands Road junction was generally recognised as in need of improvement, however, the general consensus was that traffic lights would not be an appropriate replacement for the existing roundabout. Concern was expressed regarding the impact on traffic flow and through traffic (between Rochford and Rayleigh), impact on the view of the Spa Pub, and the increase in street clutter. There was also a comment that traffic lights have been used at the junction in the past but the existing roundabout has improved traffic flow. Conversely there were some suggestions that traffic lights could improve traffic flow and also a suggestion that it would improve pedestrian crossings. Another comment suggested a slip road into Spa Road from Main Road to improve traffic flow from the west i.e. Rayleigh. It was suggested that more detailed research, modelling and options were needed in addition to a road count. It was commented that pedestrian and traffic movements need to be fully considered.

It was also commented that drivers need to be made more aware of the Woodlands Road turning at the Spa Road roundabout. Suggestions were made to improve signage, reduce road speeds approaching the junction and other traffic calming measures such as raising the whole junction or introducing humps.

The general consensus with regard to Woodlands Road was that it should not be closed off as this would move the problem to Hockley Rise. It was stressed that this would exacerbate the problems at the Hockley Rise/Southend Road junction which respondents felt has somewhat restricted visibility (as it is situated on the brow of a hill on a bend). It was suggested that it would create a hazardous junction which is already problematic at school times (Westerings Primary School is accessible from here). There was also a suggestion that the plan should refer to the opportunities for potential improvements to this junction.

The option referring to restrictions on the right turn or left turn only out from Woodlands Road was considered to be confusing, difficult to enforce and inappropriate. Although there was another comment that a signalised junction instead of the roundabout may be appropriate with restricted use at peak times and sensors.



It was felt that there are limited opportunities for traffic to bypass the centre of Hockley and relieve traffic flow which would make improving the Spa Road roundabout junction difficult. The current impact of deliveries to Somerfield supermarket and the Spa Pub were noted as impeding traffic flows and causing congestion along Spa Road at certain times. It was emphasised that the B1013 is already under pressure and this is likely to increase from future development both in and around Hockley. There is a need to consider the impact of other developments in the area on traffic flow through Hockley, as concern was expressed that the wider highways impact has not been considered. It was also commented that many people commute from Hockley and that this needs to be recognised in the Plan. It was suggested that many travel by car.

A comment suggested that through traffic entering the centre of Hockley should be separated from customer traffic. There was a suggestion that a new road could be built from Waters and Stanton, Main Road to Eldon Way Industrial Estate behind the shops in Spa Road. It was also suggested that improvements to Lower Road could ease traffic in Hockley and that improvements to Plumberow Avenue could also be made. It was emphasised that a better bus service is needed.

There was a suggestion that the junctions to the north and south of the station need improving. It was commented that the roundabout along Station Approach is appropriate, however concern was expressed that moving back the stop lines from the junction of Station Approach and Spa Road would further restrict a driver's vision. With regard to this junction, which also relates to the nearby Station Road / Spa Road junction, a double mini roundabout was suggested. It was also highlighted that Spa Road can be accessed from Southend Road via Great Eastern Road / Station Road which increases traffic at this junction. Furthermore there was a comment that the railway bridge by Plumberow Avenue could be widened to allow widening of the road at this point and the pavements. It was also suggested that paragraph 2.6.2 should mention height restrictions due to the presence of the railway bridge along Spa Road.

It was suggested that with reference to paragraph 3.9.2 it states that buildings have been set back due to congestion, however, this may be due to planning restrictions to permit future junction improvements. It was suggested that buildings which are set back add to Hockley's character.

There was concern regarding the impact of the Airport development on Hockley with particular reference to implications for the road and rail network. It was suggested that more detail needs to be provided.

It was noted that paragraphs 2.6.3 and 2.9.1 should refer to Plumberow Avenue and not Mount Crescent. It was also suggested that contrary to Figure 4, Woodlands Road is not a distributor road but a local road. It was also commented that the District does not have a transport plan. A comment also expressed support for the option outlined in paragraph 3.9.10.

## **Parking**

The suitability of existing parking was raised as an important concern during the consultation. The lack of free off street parking was highlighted as an issue, particularly

along Spa Road which is generally considered to be the main retail area. On street parking along Spa Road was identified as a concern with reference made to improper parking in disabled bays and bus stops. Respondents stated that inappropriate parking was a hazard for pedestrians and drivers in Hockley centre.

Respondents suggested that inadequate parking provision was harmful to businesses in the centre. In particular, it was suggested that there is inadequate parking behind Somerfield. Concern was expressed at the potential loss of car parking for Potters identified as Site K. Concern was also expressed regarding the impact of proposals around the junction of Bramerton Road and Spa Road. There were also worries in respect of the impact of car parking and increased traffic on this junction and the nearby Spa Road roundabout.

It was commented that increasing car parking to the south side of the railway line as proposed in the Plan would cause more congestion problems at busy junctions, and it was considered to be too far away from centre of Hockley. Another respondent questioned that if the station car park is underused then why has it been proposed to be extended, and it was commented that the focus should be on improving public transport instead. However, another comment was made which suggested the provision of free parking on some of Eldon Way Industrial Estate. Furthermore it was suggested that the car park behind the library along Southend Road is inadequate and underused due to its distance from the main retail area along Spa Road – links between the main retail area and existing parking provision was considered poor. The vacant shops along Main Road were also highlighted as a concern, along with the lack of parking available in this area. A comment suggested that more central parking is needed. One idea put forward was that the vacant wood yard could be used for parking.

It was recognised that parking for proposed additional dwellings in the centre of Hockley needs to be addressed. Underground parking was suggested as a solution. There was also a suggestion that this may also be used to increase parking provision for customers.

It was noted that paragraph 2.6.4 does not include all off street parking along Spa Road for example behind Alldays, Somerfield and the Factory Shop, although it was recognised that whilst these are free, they are for use by customers only.

### **Public Transport**

Public transport in Hockley is considered to be inadequate with regards to the bus service which is not frequent enough, although there was a suggestion that the buses are underutilised. A comment suggested that real time bus information would be useful. Concern was expressed regarding the siting of bus stops particularly on the north side of Spa Road which, it was highlighted, restricts drivers' view from the two nearby car parks. There was a suggestion that adequate space should be provided to allow buses to turn around so that they can avoid the Great Eastern Road / Station Road route. It was also highlighted that at paragraph 3.9.12 the improved bus facilities providing a central focus would coincide with the proposed square, which assumes that this proposal has been approved.

It was recognised that an improved interchange between bus and rail links are needed. A comment suggested that one ticket to use on both the bus and train would be useful. Improvements to the appearance of the train station were generally welcomed, although concern was expressed regarding investment, funding and maintenance and the need to avoid vandalism. The problem of overcrowded trains was also highlighted. With regard to paragraph 2.8.1 it was noted that although the trains run every 20 minutes off peak, this is increased during rush hour.

### **Cycling**

The general consensus was that provision of a cycle network and racks are needed although there were some suggestions that dedicated cycle lanes are unnecessary, and that, in any case, the roads are too narrow.

### **Public Open Space, Pavements and Crossings**

Concern was expressed regarding the implications of developing a central public open space particularly the potential to attract anti-social behaviour. Reiterating the predominant consensus that residents like the village feel of Hockley, there was general unease with the reference to the development of a *town* square. It was suggested that this was a contradiction. It was also questioned as to whether a square was needed and that it would be an inefficient use of space in the centre of Hockley. A comment was also made that Hockley had a village green in the past which was developed.

There was a comment which recognised that open space and preservation of the countryside are important. It was highlighted that allotments are needed, as well as more green spaces in general. The importance of Hockley Woods was also recognised.

There was concern regarding the proposed landscaped route through the church garden (which is included in all options) and implications for neighbouring properties. Comments suggested that it is unnecessary, there would be a loss of private green space, it would need to be linked with the pedestrian crossing on Southend Road, it would create problems in terms of safety and security, and the benefits for the church would be questionable.

A comment highlighted that the alleyways and pavements around the centre of Hockley are well used, although it was suggested that there is nothing wrong with the width of the pavement, or road, along Spa Road.

It was recognised that some improvements to the public realm may be made. Suggestions included more planting, bins and benches. However, other comments felt that recent improvements are adequate. Furthermore, concern was expressed that any public realm improvements would need to be funded by large-scale development. Landscaping is supported but there is concern regarding maintenance. A respondent felt that the legibility and adaptability of the built environment is irrelevant.

It was recognised that pedestrian and traffic movements need to be fully considered. There was concern around the Spa Road roundabout and the pedestrian crossing close to this junction which have an impact on traffic flow. It was suggested that the zebra crossing outside Potters should be moved a short distance to improve safety, although it was commented that it does have benefits for traffic flow at the roundabout. Another

suggestion is that this crossing should be moved to past the Bramerton Road / Spa Road junction and that there should be another crossing closer to Station Approach and Station Road on Spa Road for commuters. The relocation of the crossing by the Factory Shop to a more central location was another idea put forward.

Another comment suggested providing an additional link over the railway line to connect the north of Hockley with the facilities at Eldon Way Industrial Estate.

### **Employment Land**

The general consensus in the representations was that Eldon Way Industrial Estate is viable in its existing form. It was suggested that some refurbishment and improvements to the layout may be appropriate and implemented gradually, but more leisure facilities and a greater mix of employment uses should be encouraged. However it was noted that the Industrial Estate (light industrial uses) was meant to be separate from main retail environment but that it now includes leisure facilities. It was also suggested that Eldon Way contributes to the vision of the Plan.

Concern was expressed as to where existing businesses on Eldon Way would be relocated to. It was suggested that the relocation of the existing employment units at Eldon Way to the area around the Airport (as an option) would be expensive, and concern was expressed over a lack of public transport in this area. It was noted that the Foundry Industrial Estate had not been included in the Plan. There was a suggestion that the units on this Industrial Estate could be moved onto Eldon Way and this site used for housing. It was also suggested that if a larger supermarket than existing is necessary then this may be more appropriately sited on Eldon Way.

Concern was noted that promoting some residential uses in Eldon Way (options 1.1. and 1.2) would generate a loss of employment land, undermine employment vitality, undermine the customer base and vitality of the centre of Hockley, and increase commuting for workers to elsewhere for employment. Concern was expressed regarding a lack of full time employment opportunities in Hockley, other than those provided on Eldon Way and the impact on employment/job losses on the area. A suggestion was made that another low level option may be appropriate, for example focusing regeneration on the centre and promoting Eldon Way for additional employment uses.

There was, however, some support for the redevelopment of Eldon Way with a mix of uses but it was emphasised that it should not be just residential. The inclusion of a health care centre was proposed. In terms of the appropriate mass and scale of any development, it was suggested that where redevelopment is proposed for residential use, then it should not be above two storeys. Concern was expressed regarding the overlooking of proposals for residential use in Eldon Way (options 2.1. and 2.2) and the impact on traffic. There was also a suggestion to create a village square in Eldon Way, remove the existing industrial uses and replace these with community uses. Another comment suggested that some redevelopment of Eldon Way (Sites B and C) along the south side backing the shops along Spa Road may be appropriate but not the other options/sites identified.

A respondent questioned the height of the water table at Eldon Way and the implications of this.

EEDA suggested that consideration should be given to the guidance note on Employment Land Reviews produced by EERA/EEDA/Go East.

### **Retail Environment**

There was a general consensus in the representations received that large scale redevelopment is inappropriate and unnecessary for the centre of Hockley.

It was suggested that Hockley cannot compete with other centres such as Southend, Basildon and Lakeside as these are easily accessible. It was further suggested that there are limited opportunities to enhance the retail offer within Hockley to enable it to compete. A large supermarket in the centre was felt to be inappropriate and unnecessary, as other such facilities are accessible to Hockley residents. There was unease about enabling multinational chains to locate in the centre of Hockley and the impact this would have on established local and independent businesses. There was general concern regarding the impact of proposals on existing businesses and dwellings.

It was emphasised that Hockley is perceived as a village with small shops, and that larger units are not needed. People want to retain the village feel and the existing fine grain of shops. There was concern regarding moving the centre away from its existing location and the impact this would have on character. As such large scale development of the centre is not supported. It was noted that local shops need more support. The vacant former Alldays unit was highlighted, and there was concern regarding existing vacant retail units and whether there was a demand for more. A comment suggested that Alldays may be used as the village centre or square. Additionally it was suggested that it may be used for parking and linked to Somerfield's car park.

It was suggested that gradual improvements to the centre may be appropriate. It was highlighted that the appearance of the centre needs some attention and there is potential for shop front improvements. Some respondents felt that the buildings at junction of Main Road / Woodlands Road may benefit from regeneration. Again it was emphasised that the focus should be on small independent shops. There was also concern regarding the impact of business rates on businesses – whether improvements would drive these up leading to the displacement of local businesses.

Comments highlighted that some areas have not been included in the Plan, for example the shops opposite the Baptist Church on Main Road including the former wood yard and the shops opposite Potters on Main Road. It was also noted that the Plan neglects other local shops in Hockley for example Broad Parade near Greensward Lane and it was questioned as to why some shops on the south side of Spa Road (Site J) have been included whereas the other shops have not (except in the higher options).

The existing low level buildings are preferred and it was emphasised that buildings should not be above two storeys. It was suggested that the low buildings on the south side of Spa Road ensure there is sunlight along the main retail area. Further to this

concern was expressed regarding the impact on residential buildings fronting Southend Road if the height of buildings at Site J were to be increased above one storey. The building line was generally considered to be ok on the north and south sides of Spa Road and this was considered to add to the character of Hockley. Although there was a suggestion that the north side of Spa Road is better than the south side. However, a comment expressed concern that doing nothing is not an option.

Concern was expressed with regard to the implication of the proposals on existing businesses, the cost of renting redeveloped premises, the potential loss of local services with redevelopment (e.g. the bank), implications for the sorting office if forced to relocate and concern that this local facility may not remain in Hockley. Concern regarding the impact of any redevelopment on local service provision for the local community was expressed, in particular for the elderly and those without transport. Concern was also expressed for a supermarket and car park proposed on corner of Bramerton Road, especially as it would be accessed from this road. Comments also referred to the impact on existing shops, the neighbouring church on Bramerton Road, pedestrian safety and the traffic impact particularly at the nearby Spa Road roundabout junction. Hockley should retain all the services which provide for the day to day needs of residents.

It was noted that there are vacant shops along Main Road and there is a lack of parking available to service the occupied premises. As noted earlier, there was a suggestion to redevelop the vacant wood yard for parking.

Whilst there was a comment that existing shops are doing well, it was also expressed that there is a need to attract shoppers and encourage people to shop locally. Indeed concern was expressed regarding decreases in footfall and the impact on local shops. There was also a suggestion of holding a farmers market.

### **Residential Development**

There was concern expressed regarding the potential increase in housing within the centre of Hockley. It was commented that the numbers proposed in all options is too high, and there are existing empty dwellings. Concern was expressed regarding the impact this would have on local services such as schools, doctors and dentists. To reiterate, the general consensus was that large scale redevelopment is not required. Overcrowding is a concern. Infilling was commented as being inappropriate, as it is considered to affect the village feel and there is a need to retain Hockley's character.

Concern was expressed that the proposed housing does not seek to provide for the aging population, or provide an appropriate mix of housing, and that there is a need for single storey bungalows. As such the proposal of flats was raised as an issue and concern was expressed regarding the compatibility of leisure uses with residential above. Concern was raised with reference to three of four storey flats. There was also a suggestion that if new homes are needed then they should be affordable and environmentally friendly. Furthermore it was suggested that existing empty offices above shops and the vacant shops along Main Road could be converted into flats. There was a suggestion that additional residential development is preferable on

brownfield land rather than on Green Belt but there was concern with regard to the infrastructure to support such proposals and the impact on traffic.

### **Infrastructure, Facilities and Services**

There was concern relating to the provision of infrastructure to support any proposals.

It was suggested that more youth, leisure and community facilities are needed, although it was noted that there are already some located in Eldon Way. It was commented that better access from Spa Road to these facilities is needed. It was also suggested that youth facilities should not be sited close to the Spa Pub or residential uses, and concern was expressed regarding the congregation of youths around Woodlands Road and impact on residential amenity. The problem of youths gathering around the train station and shops was also highlighted. It was suggested that new youth facilities would be more appropriately located on Eldon Way along with other leisure and industrial uses. It was also suggested that the siting of youth facilities should have a separate option. Consideration needs to be given to the running of youth facilities and encouraging the youth to use the facilities provided beyond the provision of a building.

It was commented that community facilities should be centrally located with adequate parking. Concern was expressed regarding the clustering of community uses around the Spa Road roundabout and the impact this may have on traffic and the associated parking provision which would be needed. However, a comment suggested that the community hub is a good idea. It was suggested that the health facility at Site H should remain. Another comment suggested that Hockley already has the facilities to meet its residents' needs; conversely others felt that there was a lack of doctors and dentists in the area and a new facility at Site L may be a good idea. There was concern regarding the compatibility of proposed health facilities and existing doctors surgeries, although improvements to existing facilities were welcomed. There was also concern regarding the accessibility of a central health facility for the elderly, and the removal of health care facilities from Hockley. Concern was also expressed regarding the implications for Hockley and Hawkwell Day Centre (situated within Site L) as there is no reference to it in the Plan.

It was suggested that future iterations of the document should be more specific regarding the type of community and leisure facilities proposed. There is a need to include reference to improving access to sports and recreational facilities and the revised Playing Pitch Strategy. It was commented that additional and enhanced provision should be funded through planning obligation contributions and Sport England active design guidance should be referred to.

Concern was expressed regarding the capacity of existing sewerage/drainage systems. In addition a comment from Anglian Water Services Ltd suggested that generally there is available capacity at the Sewage Treatment Works to treat the potential foul flows from these sites, but there is limited capacity within the foul network that will require further consideration - surface water can be accommodated.

There was a suggestion that public toilets proposed for the train station should be closer to the centre, and that the library and neighbouring restaurant on Southend Road

should remain. It was suggested that more signposts and policing are needed. Concern was expressed regarding increased crime, and the responsiveness of the fire service to incidents.

### **Community and Character**

It was suggested that the lack of uniformity of buildings adds to the character / identity of Hockley. There was concern regarding the impact on the existing linear structure and moving the centre away from its existing location on the character of Hockley. It was emphasised that there is a need to retain the community feel. Any redevelopment should be sensitive to the village atmosphere, incorporating small units and encouraging independent shops. Concern was expressed regarding the quality of any buildings / development proposed and impact on character.

### **Historic Environment**

It was suggested by Essex County Council that the cultural heritage / historic environment needs to be further considered and any impacts should be mentioned. There was a suggestion that Spa Road from the Spa Pub to old spa building (which is a Listed Building) is the centre of Hockley. It was highlighted that past redevelopment has resulted in the loss of some historic buildings, although an historic road sign remains by the roundabout, and it was emphasised that the existing historic / landmark buildings need to be preserved. A comment also stated that Hockley is unique and should be treated as such and reference was made to the Essex Design Guide.

### **Deliverability**

Concern was expressed regarding deliverability, viability, how private investment could be attracted without large-scale development, the role of public funding, whether an Environmental Impact Assessment will be needed and whether the Council will lead the planning application process. There was also concern raised regarding compulsory purchase orders. A comment specifically referred to the long-timescale for the Plan and the potential for property blight for both residents and businesses. It was therefore stated that if compulsory purchase is needed then it should be used sooner rather than later.

### **General Comments**

It was suggested that the 'Summary of Issues' table should include a theme to address future development. It was also suggested that it should include more reference to congestion, parking and public transport. A comment suggested that many would disagree that there is not a diverse range of shops. It was proposed that the roads should be enhanced to accommodate HGVs and that development should be focussed on the existing area only. Sport England suggested that opportunities to enhance sports / recreational provision as part of a mixed use development should be explored. There was concern regarding anti-social behaviour and that the summary of issues is not representative of the majority of opinions. It was also highlighted that there is a need to keep residents informed.



There was a suggestion that some of the phrases used in the document need to be in plain English and better justified, for example “enhancements to the public realm”. There was concern regarding the lack of detail to explain the proposals with particular reference to the distinction / difference between the low and medium options concerning the development of Eldon Way, what is actually being proposed and lack of supporting evidence for statements made in the document. It was noted that identifying the sites as A to H is an appropriate way of identifying the different areas proposed. Concern was expressed in a comment that the proposals are not evidenced by a sustainability appraisal. Another comment suggested that the tables on page 41-45 should be accompanied by a table of existing floorspace to enable comparison with proposals. Some respondents felt the text and description needed to be clearer and more detailed.

The Environment Agency suggested that the ‘Development Issues’ section should provide advice for delivering high quality sustainable development covering sustainable development / construction, sustainable drainage and biodiversity / landscaping.

It was claimed that that the Retail and Leisure Study suggested that Hockley is not a town. There was concern that the Plan has not had regard to the Sustainable Community Strategy. There was also a comment which stated that the options go against the Employment Land Study. It was highlighted by Go East that the reference to the East of England Plan on page 51 is out of date and page 57 should refer to Natural England. It was suggested that the Placecheck information and web-based evidence should be available. Concern was also expressed that a timescale is not included in the Plan.

It was noted that page 47 is titled Southend Road but the text below only refers to Spa Road.

A respondent also disagreed with the assertion that Site L and M are 'cluttered and uncoordinated'.

### **Comments on the consultation process**

There was general concern expressed regarding the lack of notification and awareness of the consultation, and as such the consultation period was not considered to be long enough to provide residents with sufficient time to read the document and comment.

Particular reference was made to:

- the method of advertising which was not considered to be effective
- a suggestion that the SCI had not been complied with
- that residents were not on or aware of the Citizens Panel and that these views were not representative
- the HAAP presentation was not in Hockley but in Hullbridge
- residents were not given enough notice of the meeting held in Hockley
- there was not enough time to respond
- it was not clear how to access/obtain the consultation document
- there were problems experienced commenting online

It was suggested that more information was needed on the purpose of the document and what it is trying to achieve. There was also criticism by a resident that inclusion of some of the larger scale proposals were hidden in the emerging Core Strategy.

End

## **Hockley Area Action Plan - Summary of responses to consultation carried out between November 2010 and February 2011**

This document summarises the responses received to the consultation on the Hockley Area Action Plan Options Report. A detailed analysis of the responses will be prepared and published later in the plan-making process as part of the evidence base supporting the pre-application version of the plan.

### **Introduction**

Comments were received from a few respondents, including Hawkwell Residents Association, who suggested that they would like to retain the village feel of Hockley, but would also like to see some gradual improvements to the village centre. These respondents also stated that they cannot support any of the five options but would like to see some of the improvements included within them. Natural England supports the production of the Hockley Area Action Plan and, in particular, the incorporation of Green Infrastructure principles within various Options. Another comment suggested that low density nature and reasonable character should be retained for Hockley Town Centre.

### **Context for the AAP options**

Some respondents expressed their concerns regarding the cost of the study.

One comment suggested that some of the content within the document needed to be amended or updated, as Alldays is now occupied, another supermarket (Costcutters) has now opened, the give way sign on the roundabout does not apply to all exits, etc.

### **Consultation feedback**

SEPT (South Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust) welcomed the plan and believed that it will create more affordable housing for people with mental health problems and will bring job opportunities.

Some comments expressed concern regarding the size of the document as this would have prevented printing and general distribution, and the complication of the online consultation system is an unfair method for consultation.

A respondent questioned why the Foundry industrial estate is not mentioned in the document. The comment suggested that existing businesses should be encouraged to stay, but consideration (if housing really must occur) should be given to conversion of unoccupied premises. The possibility for the area next to the train station platform on the south side to be used for housing was also mentioned.

## **Overarching framework and principles**

Comments suggested that the Foundry Estate, which is one of the obvious locations for improvement, is missing from the plan.

A number of respondents, including the Hockley Residents Association, claimed that they have made it clear from the previous consultation that highways infrastructure improvements to the key junctions need to be determined as a precursor to any redevelopment, however, they believed that insufficient attention has been paid to these key requirements.

A comment agreed that Hockley has the potential for improvement to cater for the increased population, to keep spending local and reduce the need to travel. It also suggested that the existing character of Hockley does not justify wholesale preservation and change and improvements are much needed.

Essex County Council welcomed the initiative of the HAAP. They trusted that the HAAP would assist revitalisation of commercial and leisure activity at a key focal point in the District and would strengthen the role of the area and help meet the future needs of the local community in support of the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. They also considered that future stages in preparation of the Plan should be assisted by further consideration of highways and infrastructure issues, implementation and delivery, design matters and locations of community facilities.

The East of England Development Agency commented that although the document does contain an overarching framework and principles there seems to be a lack of vision that seeks to promote an economically successful and prosperous town centre that will deliver the regeneration benefits and meet its full economic performance.

A respondent considered that the principles proposed in this document seem to more closely reflect the views of local residents than the previous plan. It was suggested that bullet point 7 (on page 14) could be strengthened to limit the size of retail units in order to avoid attracting large national chains but to encourage new and different types of outlets not found in nearby towns.

BNP Paribas Real Estate UK, on behalf of Royal Mail suggested that new development will create additional demand for infrastructure, services/facilities and public realm improvements. However, they requested any financial contribution towards the provision of such infrastructure, services/facilities and public realm improvements for Hockley is sought in areas where there is an identified need and at a level that ensures that the overall delivery of appropriate development is not compromised i.e. is subject to viability. They also cited government guidance in Circular 05/05 to support their opinion.

A comment questioned why the previously proposed relocation of health facility at Eldon Way to a site near Jones Practice surgery/library has not been carried over. It was also suggested that land to west of Eldon Way along Spa Road could all potentially be converted to residential use.

One comment highlighted that there are two major obstacles to all the options proposed - funding and the attitude of the owners of buildings and land likely to be affected. It was suggested that at least two events have happened since the drafting of the Plan which could impinge on it. First the opening of Cost Cutters in a location suggested for conversion to housing. Second the new Co-op funeral parlour where the opportunity for consolidating parking has gone and existing parking is reduced. The respondent then stated that the driver supporting the level of proposed houses is not understood.

### **Option 1**

One respondent considered that without more infrastructure further housing cannot be supported, and thus believe Option 1 is the best option for Hockley. Some other respondents who also supported Option 1 do not want to see any developments which would lead to more traffic and residents coming to the area thus turning Hockley into a larger town. One would not want to see any plans that would spoil Potters (a shop on the eastern end of Main Road).

Another comment also supported minimal intervention due to the highly sustainable location of the employment site, which is close to public transport and residential areas and so employment retention makes sound planning sense. The respondent also believed that the current stock of employment units is necessary for light industrial, storage and other uses. Moreover large-scale employment adds to the viability of the town centre. One comment also suggested it may be possible to incorporate a new library and health centre into this option.

A respondent supported any proposed intervention to improve facilities provided in Hockley but considered that this option contributes nothing to the provision of housing which is much needed, and felt that this location is much more appropriate and sustainable than in the Green Belt.

A comment suggested that planting lots of trees is a good idea, and believed that additional homes should come from existing brownfield areas i.e. empty retail spaces in Main Road.

Numerous respondents believed that Option 1 offered insufficient benefit for the area. Likewise, one respondent objected to this option because the proposal would allow a continued decline in the facilities available in the village and provides no vision for the future or framework. A respondent also questioned the availability of funding for the proposed changes to develop a public realm for Hockley.

Another respondent also agreed that Option 1 only offers very few benefits and does not go far enough in protecting the area. It also claimed that that the document is unhelpful in not naming the current occupier of the premises where changes are envisaged e.g. the warehouse style premises at 2 Main Road and 34-40 Spa Road. The Plan has also not explained how established businesses are meant to adopt the plan. The respondent felt that opening up the parking is a good idea but with the Funeral Parlour at the former Alldays site, this is unlikely to happen in short to medium term. Various questions were raised such as the usage and awareness of the existing pedestrian link between Bramerton Road and Eldon Way; why a through road from Eldon Way to the Station has not been considered as this would link two industrial sites, provide additional access to the leisure facilities and remove some of the issues around the station; what does “secondary road treatment” mean on page 22; and would planting trees attract litter and dog mess, etc.

One respondent criticised five areas in Option 1 as well as the whole Area Action Plan. For example, no private funding and no indication of the level of RDC support undermine this proposal; RDC should specify which public realm developments are included in long term plans; new entrance to Potters irrelevant; Potters zebra crossing relevant to traffic exiting Spa Road; RDC should publish traffic flow statistics to enable a meaningful discussion.

A Community safety officer from RDC pointed out that there are some issues which need to be scrutinized in terms of safety and anti social behaviour. For example, fencing around car parks is important (i.e. the potential consolidated Co-op parking); public car parking/potential consolidated Co-op parking should preferably be shut when the shop closes and secured by a gate; the alleyway from Evelyn Road to Meadow Way is not well used and it is a ‘hot spot’ for youths. It was created as a short cut to the centre of Hockley and is wide enough for mopeds; there are problems with groups of youths congregating along Spa Road; the provision of alleyways should be avoided; damage to proposed trees would be an issue.

Some comments suggested the proposal in Option 1, which is to replace existing single story shops near the Factory Shop with single story shops, has already been turned down in a recent planning application i.e. to use the Factory Shop car park for a takeaway food outlet. Respondents do not believe the parking proposals are practical and felt that the width of Spa Road should not reduce with tree planting.

One respondent supported some elements proposed in Option 1 i.e. Shop front improvements, consolidate parking at the rear of the former Alldays, open a west entry to Potters car park; improve pedestrian links, streetscape, greening, tabletop crossings. However, the respondent cannot support some of the proposals such as the replacement of 2 Main Road and 34-40 Spa Road due to the loss of successful businesses, and considered improved

station frontage is unnecessary. Suggestions also included more parallel on-street parking in Spa Road and replacing railings with steps

Another respondent, however, believed no further car parking is necessary as people refuse to use the existing pay car park behind the library which is never more than a third full. The comment recommended a minimal intervention approach with an improved roundabout at the Spa junction; and building housing on the brownfield site of Eldon Way to save the Green Belt.

A business strongly objected to Option 1 and all other options as they felt the Council have not given any consideration to businesses and impact to the customers when proposing modernisation and residential use above Seemore Glass. A respondent also commented that any redevelopment to Seemore Glass would put Seemore Glass and Potters out of business as neither could carry on without their car parks.

One respondent who supported Option 1 suggested cycle paths should be introduced as part of the plan.

Some residents objected to all options and believed that the plan formulated by Hockley Residents Association would be the best to adopt.

Hawkwell Parish Council supported Option 1 which allows optimal intervention and best preserves the character of Hockley. Public realm improvements, green areas and trees, improved access and parking would benefit the village. Employment and Leisure would be maintained on Eldon Way Industrial Estate. The Parish Council considered there will be no benefit of relocation of the supermarket away from the shopping frontage. In addition, the best location to provide housing in Hockley centre would be the north of the railway station on part of the car park in Plumberow Avenue, where replacement parking spaces can be located in the south of the railway on the disused land next to the Foundry site - this would make use of a brownfield site and save the Green Belt land.

One respondent believed Option 1 best reflects the views of the residents which is the least disruptive and has minimal intervention. Proposals to add more trees, greenspaces, and improve traffic flow and parking are welcomed. The respondent also believed that it is best to concentrate all leisure uses on one part of Eldon Way Estate as it is best suited for transport links and is away from residential areas. With regard to housing, this respondent shared the same view suggested by Hawkwell Parish Council. A hybrid version of Option 1 in order to meet housing needs was recommended in general.

BNP Paribas Real Estate UK (Royal Mail) supported this 'minimal intervention approach' in Option 1, and believed the focus should be on improvements to pedestrian links, parking and the public realm and shop front improvements

along Spa Road, with a small number of poor quality buildings being replaced by new shops.

Anglian Water do not consider this option would have any major impact to the foul network or WwTW (Wastewater Treatment Works). In addition, surface water treatment measures should comply with PPS25 and be removed from the public surface water (SW) system where possible.

One comment showed that Option 1 would be their preference because it proposes only four houses. It also stated that the Council should stand up and tell the Government that no more housing is needed for Hockley, and believed that building houses would lead to global warming.

Some residents commented that the Co-op funeral parlour has ruined the village feel and one would like to see the Co-op funeral parlour return to a supermarket as it was 25 years ago. Some respondents suggested that people move to Hockley to get the village atmosphere and it is important to retain the village feel in the area; one claimed that a suggestion of every shop being a supermarket would kill this.

A resident suggested that free parking would encourage shopping locally and also help local doctors and nurses who are penalised now.

A resident questioned why public conveniences have not been included in any of the options.

A respondent complained that the proposed use of farmland in Hawkwell and Rochford for housing is disgusting and the Council should pester the Government to stop immigration in order to reduce the expenditure.

One respondent questioned why the Council has to waste money on so called improvements in the current economic climate.

A resident suggested that the Council should introduce a one way system from the first entrance on Cornhill Avenue leading down to the bottom of Hamilton Gardens, then alternate the side of road parking on a monthly basis.

## **Option 2**

Numerous of respondents objected to this option because although it forms the basis of an appropriate plan, it does not go far enough. Some suggestions have been made such as improvements to Eldon Way, Station Approach, and Plumberow junctions; added/consolidated parking square behind shops on west side of Spa Road reached via Eldon Way and (if possible) Bramerton Road; redevelop shops on Southside of Main Road, opposite Potters, to remove 'pinch -point' on B1013; change from retail to housing at Costcutters Parade of shops; modernised retail units with 2 added



retail units at Factory Shop/Car park area (to remain single storey); redevelop Co-Op undertakers etc and extend to join existing shops either side, removing access roads creating additional Retail; no large format retail units in Eldon Way; housing on north side of Station along Plumberow Ave, to include railway drop-off point; retail option (possibly a market) to be considered for Sorting Office site; options for undeveloped portion of Foundry Estate to be considered, etc.

Anglian Water believe this option, which includes a proposal of 56 new properties, has no major impact to the foul network or the WwTW. In addition, surface water should comply with PPS25 and be removed from the public surface water (SW) system where possible.

One respondent felt that Option 2 is unacceptable and believed that if the Council need to build more housing, Foundry Estate would be a more suitable location. The respondent also cannot agree with the proposal for more office space as the existing office space is not utilised which was echoed by a number of respondents. It was also suggested that the proposed pedestrian link from the train station to Eldon Way should be a road,; there is an opportunity to have a pedestrian link from the High Street and open up existing Car Parks to the rear of most of these properties - as with the area behind the shops on Main Road which is always utilised; and to have a link running though the Pub beer garden or the Old Fire Station area. On the other hand, the respondent found it difficult to understand the meaning of some phrases used in the document i.e. stronger frontage. Another major concern the respondent had was that the Council is using redevelopment of Eldon Way as an excuse to move businesses to the airport. The respondent continued to comment that Site C on page 35 could be used for housing, and the Council should also consider road entry/exit via Eldon Way to the Station and exit only from Station Approach, and/or alternate one-way on Spa Road between Station Approach and Eldon Way. A question was also raised about deliveries on site.

Concern was expressed by a number of respondents in relation to the proposed office space in the plan and in general respondents believed that there are many empty units on the Foundry industrial estate and therefore additional offices are not required. Several respondents suggested that the Plan should replace the Co-op funeral parlour, but not other single story buildings, however, it was also commented that existing shops should not be turned into residential dwellings. One respondent also highlighted that a new home on Spa Road, close to the train station is unnecessary. Furthermore, the respondent suggested that the proposed redevelopment of the existing library and health centre to provide a new combined community centre with library and health facilities should not be squeezed into the area allocated and should not include shops in that area. It was added that consideration should also be given to include and replace the Indian restaurant area and the shop opposite Walton & Stanton's to bring the building line back from the road for

Spa Junction improvements. Modern computer controlled traffic lights with additional lanes were suggested to improve the traffic flow in the Spa junction. Other suggestions include access to the car park from Woodlands Road, the creation of a new parking area on the south side of the train station, the vehicular drop-off and pick-up points should not be in the car park but at the station, seating area at the side of Kilnfield House could be better utilized, the parallel parking proposals may not be practical and the width of Spa Road should not reduce with trees planted close to shops, Potters parking should not be changed especially as parking for flats would be necessary and if a green link walk way was created through the churchyard a crossing should be provided to cross Southend Road at its end.

BNP Paribas Real Estate UK (Royal Mail) supported this option as it provides a slightly higher level of intervention in the centre, and would strengthen the uses in the centre and provide greater improvements to the public realm. It also pointed out that although Royal Mail's Hockley DO is not identified for development within Spatial Option 2, the site located to the immediate north, which abuts the boundary of Royal Mail is identified for development, therefore should any sites surrounding Royal Mail's Hockley DO be redeveloped it would be vital that their design are consistent with and sensitive to Royal Mail's existing operations.

Two respondents suggested that the proposed layout of the car park entrance would not be safe for the pedestrians as that is too near to the already congested mini roundabout. One of the respondents also raised a few questions such as if there would be a proposal to define the proposed footpath, why has the proposed change of use of the retail units on Main Road to Rayleigh been dropped in Option 3 and will the remaining existing buildings on the corner of Bramerton Road be revamped.

Another respondent objected to this option because of the reduction in the type and number of employment units for which there is no alternative accommodation in a sustainable location. The respondent considered that alternative employment such as offices is not satisfactory as it harms current light industrial and storage provision. And, there is no evidence of a need for ice skating locally. In terms of residential use, the respondent believed that there is no longer a need to focus housing in this location given the intention to abolish the RSS and more importantly housing should not replace employment. Furthermore, there is lack of evidence of funding for this option or how CPO will occur.

A respondent supported Option 2 except for the proposed pedestrian link through the church garden as it would attract a lot of litter, and that would only be acceptable if there is a substantial reduction of the paving area in front of the Spa Pub; the implementation of traffic calming in Spa Road; improvements for the Spa junctions; and the unnecessary changes to the library area. Another respondent also supported this option except the

increasing parallel parking in Spa Road. Some major issues that need to be considered have been highlighted by another respondent such as major improvements at Spa roundabout, support from landowners, disruption to shops and services, funding issues, infrastructure/services in place and support/compensation to businesses in Eldon Way.

One respondent who objected to Option 2 did not see any advantages to having a link through the church garden from Spa Road to Southend Road, and believed that it would only attract graffiti, litter and disruption to the church's services.

A resident commented that all the options published in the Plan have positive aspects and try to address residents need. A respondent believed that there is a need for central parking facilities, traffic lights instead of the roundabout at Spa Road and pedestrian crossings further away from the roundabouts. It was added that a huge supermarket is not needed and is important to retain small retail shops in order to preserve some vestige of 'village' atmosphere. On the other hand, a respondent believed that a few high rise flats could blend in the Hockley centre if designed properly. A respondent also considered that more seats in the High Street would encourage shoppers and to enlarge the library as well as the community centre would promote the facilities for both young and old people. Moreover, it is also very important for the Council to protect existing Green Belt and woods.

One respondent objected to Option 2 due to inadequate highways infrastructure. Although the respondent recognised that there is a need for housing, she questioned whether the roads and services can cope with the development.

A resident supported bullet point 1-3 listed in the Development and Land uses section in Option 2, but has concern about the loss of business. In bullet point 4, although the resident believed parking space is essential, she believed that no more offices are needed. The respondent then asked if someone has offered to create the skating facility in the proposed new leisure space in bullet point 5 and questioned why consolidation existing leisure has been suggested in bullet point 6 without a problem at present. Support was given to bullet point 7 which is to improve frontages to existing buildings on Eldon Way. The resident is also positive towards the consolidation of Hockley centre in bullet point 8 and would like to see more protection of the Victorian houses. Bullet points 9 and 10 were not welcomed as the resident believed that there is no further space for the library and the GP surgery has just spent a large sum on modernisation. In addition, the business unit on Spa Road should not be a new home but be added on to the Local List. The resident then questioned where funding is coming from and whether the public convenience will go when there is a cut on spending.

In the Traffic and Parking section, the resident supported bullet point 1-3 and creation for a new parking area in particular. There was concern about pressure added to the increasing amount of the proposed parallel on-street parking. Opening the western entrance to Potters car park in bullet point 5 was supported by the respondent.

In the Movement and Public realm section in Option 2, the resident believed that no improvement is needed for the train station frontage. However support was given to bullet point 2-7 and the respondent would be pleased to see the establishment of the proposed links and streetscape improvements in the Plan. In bullet point 8, objection was given to enhancing the public realm at the new combined community centre, and in bullet point 9, it was felt the meaning of “strengthening the link between Spa Road and Eldon Way” was unclear. The resident objected to bullet point 10 and raised concern about security risk and anti-social behaviour to the church and the surrounding areas. However, support was offered to bullet point 11 which is enhancing the environment and improving safety in front of the existing leisure uses in Eldon Way.

One respondent believed Option 2 seems to be positive in improvements but not impacting too much on the village. Another respondent believed that the only thing Hockley need is a better flow of traffic at the Spa Junction, building more houses will only increase the traffic.

One respondent questioned how consolidation of Hockley can be implemented i.e. where to and how can Cost Cutters be persuaded to move, and also asked whether there will be enough space for a centralised and growing GP Practice with enough parking space for the increase number of patients to use, therefore, consider a combined community centre would be impracticable. In addition, a respondent suggested that there should be an increase in parking in the centre where possible. A respondent continued to suggest that there should be new Leisure facilities in Eldon Way and there is opportunity to extend the building of flats in Station Approach into the Foundry Industrial estate with suitable screening converting the new unsold office block to flats.

A Community safety officer from RDC pointed out that there are 4 issues that need to be scrutinized in terms of safety and anti social behaviour for this option. Firstly, natural surveillance is important for the proposed link through the green space to the side of the Church, therefore some trees may need to be thinned back and there is potential for gates to lock/ secure the area with no benches provided to avoid people to congregate there. Secondly, a footpath alongside Eldon Way would be a concern, proper fencing is needed and potential for closure of the route should be looked at. Thirdly, an improvement in lighting is suggested. Lastly, consideration should be given to a link from Eldon Way to the train station as it would be an issue if youths were congregating there or using it as a cut through or escape route, etc.

A respondent who objected to Option 2 believed that the picture illustrated in this option makes Hockley look like any other clone town with all the individuality and charm lost.

One respondent welcomed improvements to the fronts of retail units and using existing brownfield sites for retail/housing, but cannot agree with developing Eldon Way for business use and believed that area should be used for public services (e.g. leisure/youth/public gardens) and/or partially used for housing. In addition, the respondent did not consider a new car park in the train station area is a good idea and the retail areas should only be used by existing residents of Hockley not encouraging more traffic and people into the area.

Another respondent who supported the plan believed that there are some aspects of this option that need to be changed to form the basis of a sound plan, balancing the need for a clear way forward. Respondents were concerned about the dependency on the co-operation of property owners which would affect both public and private sectors ability to deliver the plan, therefore suggested that the next stage of the process should engage with these bodies to establish the level of support they have for any changes.

A respondent objected to this option because of the reduction in the type and number of employment units for which there is no alternative accommodation in a sustainable location. Alternative employment such as offices is not satisfactory as it harms current light industrial and storage provision. And like what the respondent suggested in Option 1, there is no evidence of a need for ice skating locally. In terms of residential use, respondent believed that there is no longer a need to focus housing in this location given the intention to abolish RSS and more importantly housing should not replace employment. Furthermore, there is lack of evidence of funding for this option or how CPO will occur.

A business in the centre strongly objected to Option 2 and all other options as they felt the Council have not given any consideration to businesses and impact to the customers when proposing modernisation and residential use above Seemore Glass.

One respondent objecting to Option 2 asked whether the village needs to have 2 funeral parlours and suggested that local shops could be improved with another supermarket to rival the Co-op supermarket.

### **Spatial Option 2a**

Respondents objecting to this option, commented that it proposes inappropriate changes and missed opportunities.

Several respondents commented that they do not like the look of the proposed new shops and flats. It was commented that they look bland and characterless.

A respondent commented that this option proposes a bit too much development, although it was noted that there are aspects that could be taken forward in the final plan.

One respondent did not express their support for this option, but commented that whilst they agree with the development of existing brownfield sites, the increase in housing and retail units will exacerbate the existing traffic issues.

A respondent objected to this option and commented that there are similar benefits and issues as Option 2, but this option has inappropriate changes. For example flats proposed above modernised retail units at 34-40 Spa Road would create a 2-storey building which is inappropriate due to the proximity of the houses behind. Another respondent commented that the replacement of 34-40 Spa Road with shops/flats is ok but concern was expressed regarding loss of business and it was also emphasised that it should be ensured the flats do not impact on the bungalows behind.

Concern was also expressed that there would be a disruption to shops and services for a long period during the development of the supermarket and sorting office area and that shoppers would have to shop outside of Hockley during this period and may not return. It was commented that older residents and non-drivers would not be able to cope.

Several respondents commented that this option also appears to replace existing single story shops near the Factory Shop with single story shops, and it was noted that a recent planning application to use the Factory Shop car park for a takeaway food outlet has already been refused permission. Another respondent commented that the changes made to the factory shop car park are seen as beneficial as it is utilising space that is essentially doing nothing now. It was commented that something should be included to replace the Foundry area. It was commented that the area from Waters & Stanton to Harrison's restaurant should also be replaced and additional parking provided.

A respondent commented that the proposed layout in this option means that the existing footpath will exit onto Southend Road pavement between two vehicular access points (for the Indian restaurant and the new car park entrance), opposite the vehicular entrance to the Spa Pub and near to the Old Fire Station, and also where the zebra crossing is. It was questioned whether this proposal is safe for pedestrians.

Concern was expressed regarding the link through the churchyard from Southend Road to Spa Road, which it was noted is owned by the Church, and it was commented that an alleyway could create graffiti, litter and a disruption to services. It was stated that this link would encourage a minimal amount of

people to use the car park behind the library. It was commented that if people will not walk around the Spa Pub then the walkway will not encourage them either.

A respondent commented that the village green seems to have been a key point raised in previous consultations and would create the village feel. It was commented that this also gives opportunities for the café culture.

A respondent objected commenting that whilst they recognise the need for housing, especially affordable housing, there are concerns regarding whether there will be infrastructure provided alongside any development. It was commented that proposed development in Rochford will have an impact on the existing highway network and concern was expressed regarding this.

Furthermore another respondent commented that the addition of housing would still be required to increase business within the centre of Hockley. It was noted that this option brings 56 new units of accommodation, which should be coordinated with any changes to business premises to incentivise business moves/re-locations, offering the attraction of significantly more trade. It was commented that more housing should be incorporated into this model on the Eldon Way site as set out in Option 3 and housing on the railway siding as proposed in Option 3a could also be erected. It was also commented that more affordable housing within the area would give opportunities to first time buyers and enable families to move onto larger accommodation if required. It was commented that the availability of such housing is scarce.

A respondent raised strong objections to the changes concerning Seemore Glass (modernisation and four flats above). It was commented that Seemore Glass is a long-established, family run business. Concern was expressed that inadequate consideration had been given to the impact of the proposals on businesses and customers, particularly in the current economic climate. However, another respondent commented that the proposals for Site 1 (page 36) are good and the image shown on page 49 would give a nice balance to the centre.

Support for this option was expressed by one respondent. However, some modifications were suggested including a drop-off turning circle for the northern side of the station so that cars and passengers are dispersed quickly during peak times, and additional use of the southern side alongside the platform for parking with foot and vehicle access through the Foundry to Eldon Way industrial estate.

A respondent who attended one of the drop-in events at Greensward Academy commented that a lot more thought had gone into the ideas than previously. Support was expressed for this option. It was commented that general improvements to the road layout at the Spa roundabout are preferable to traffic lights or the one-way idea for Woodlands Road. It was felt that traffic

lights at the junction would make it almost impossible to exit Bramerton Road particularly at peak times.

Support was expressed for this option and it was commented that it represents an overall improvement. It was commented that the current level of housing in the vicinity is not adequately served by existing facilities. It was also commented that any improvement to the pedestrian environment in Spa Road is welcomed.

This option was considered by one respondent (the Fryery), with some amendments, to be the best option all round. It was commented that given the issues they raised for Option 2, Option 2a seems to give scope for some solutions. It was further commented that if they did need to relocate they could see potential to move to one of the new units proposed on the Co-Op site to prevent any break in their business. It was highlighted that relocation costs and appropriate compensation would have to be built into any agreement to move their business, although it was noted that there still may be some planning issues with units being built above their shop but they would anticipate advice from RDC about this.

This respondent commented that in general Option 2a would be preferred to Option 2 as it addresses more issues. It was suggested that the centre would then have a more consistent feel, although it was felt that some of the shopfronts to the south of Spa Road need more improvements than those to the north but they have not been included.

It was commented that the changes to Eldon Way are welcomed, and hope was expressed that improvements to leisure facilities might help to address the anti-social behaviour issue of youths in Hockley in the evenings. It was commented, however, that the site of the consolidated leisure facility proposed in Option 3a is preferred (shown on this model as O), which would also give scope to increase the number of housing units in line with those set out in Option 3. However, concern was expressed regarding a large leisure facility at Eldon Way and it was commented that housing would be more beneficial to the area.

It was commented that on-street parking is welcomed and will increase trade from opportunistic buyers that want to just pop into any business along the high street.

A respondent did not support the proposal to replace the Co-Op, flats and sorting office with new shops and flats. It was commented that the 1960s Co-Op building replaced houses and the remaining house features in Options 3 and 3a. However, it was commented that the proposed building is better than the existing building but it is out of character. It was questioned where the businesses and flats will be accommodated during redevelopment. Funding was highlighted as an issue and it was commented that the proposals do not seem realistic.



A respondent objected to this option and suggested an amended version for example improvements to Eldon Way, Station Approach and Plumberow Avenue junctions and pick-up/drop-off points both sides of Hockley Station, and it was suggested that options for the undeveloped portion of the Foundry industrial estate should be considered.

The Council's Community Safety Team in discussion with Essex Police (Rochford) Neighbourhood Specialist Officer commented that trees may be a problem; if young/small they are likely to be snapped. It was commented that the proposed route from Spa Road north to Eldon Way needs to be visible from Spa Rd so that you can see right through, and it was suggested that CCTV should also be pointed in right direction e.g. on top of retail units to deter youths from gathering. It was emphasised that there is a need to be able to see what people are doing. It was questioned whether there would be drinking premises there. It was commented that the first floor flats above the retail units leading onto the leisure facilities may cause an issue with noise nuisance, and it was emphasised that there should not be an off licence etc. below. Restaurants would be a good idea because they are an evening use as this would provide natural surveillance. It was commented that there may be an issue with empty retail units as in other areas which can attract vandalism and flats above can be an issue. It was commented that undercroft parking to south side of Spa Road may encourage youths to gather if no cars are parked there, and it was suggested that a single storey building would be better. It was commented that rows of restaurants are better.

The Council's Community Safety Team in discussion with Essex Police (Rochford) Neighbourhood Specialist Officer also commented that CCTV on top of buildings can act as a deterrent for youths hanging around and it was highlighted that they need to be high up so they cannot be damaged. It was suggested that maybe there could be a precondition for businesses to have their own CCTV. It was commented that leisure uses could encourage youths to the area, and that a mix of leisure and industrial uses are ok as long as the units are secure (see for example the mixed uses at Festival Leisure Park). It was also emphasised that the area needs to be accessible for the police, have CCTV, be well lit and managed.

The replacement of the sorting office with new dwellings was not supported by some respondents. It was commented that the sorting office is an essential facility in Hockley and it was commented that if it is removed then residents will have to travel to Basildon, Chelmsford and Colchester to collect their mail. It was commented that the Southend sorting office may be replaced by a Tesco. Several respondents commented that the sorting office area should not be used unless a replacement is built first as jobs should not be lost unnecessarily. It was also commented by several respondents that if the sorting office area was used the junction of Eldon Way and Spa Road should

be widened with a roundabout and Eldon way should be used to access a new free shopping car park.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail noted that this option is the same as Option 2, however there is a slightly greater level of intervention on Spa Road. It was noted that Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office is identified in Option 2a for houses/mews houses and the provision of amenity space. It was also noted that the figure on page 40 identifies Royal Mail's site, reference 3c, as part of a wider site with the land to the west which is identified for shops with flats above. Furthermore, the table on page 41 indicates that Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office will provide 6 residential units totalling 700 sq.m of gross external floorspace. It was stated that the Hockley delivery office is a vital operational site, and it was commented that for the site to come forward for residential led mixed use development in the future it will be essential to relocate or re-provide Royal Mail's existing operations. However, it was commented that there are currently no plans or timescales for the relocation/re-provision of Royal Mail's operations. Notwithstanding this it was commented that the Hockley delivery office site presents a good opportunity for a range of uses as part of the redevelopment of Hockley centre, including large scale and small scale retail, residential, employment uses. Further, to come forward, it was commented that redevelopment must generate values sufficient to make a relocation viable and attractive to Royal Mail.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail also stated that they request that the Council includes Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site within the emerging Hockley AAP for mixed use development, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the re-provision/relocation of Royal Mail's operations prior to the site's redevelopment. It was commented that this will ensure that the Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their licence issued pursuant to the Postal Services Act 2000, which requires the provision of a 'universal service' for the UK. Furthermore, as a provider of infrastructure, it was commented that they would promote in such circumstances Royal Mail receiving assistance in their relocation. It was also commented that should any sites surrounding Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office be redeveloped it would be vital that any new uses be designed so that they are cognisant of and sensitive to Royal Mail's existing operations. It was commented that their requests accord with paragraphs 10 and 36 of PPS3, and various sections of PPS4.

### **Spatial Option 3**

Respondents objecting to this option, commenting that it proposes inappropriate changes and over development. Another respondent objected to Option 3 favouring Option 2 but their comments stated that major improvements at the Spa roundabout, support from landowners, additional infrastructure and support for businesses in Eldon Way are required. It was also noted that disruption to businesses and services etc. would need to be

considered and it was suggested that funding could be a challenge. Comments were made that an increase in dwellings in the centre of Hockley would impact on the highway network and put pressure on health, education (e.g. larger class sizes) and other infrastructure. It was also commented that it offers less parking and leisure facilities than Option 2. A respondent commented that improvements should only be made to the shopping area and pavements etc. and another respondent expressly stated that the proposals in Option 3 would change the character of Hockley centre to that of a small town.

Comments were made by several respondents which stated that to replace the relatively modern building opposite Potters which currently appears to be in use does not make sense. It was also commented that the proposed redevelopment of the existing library and health centre to provide a new combined community centre with library and health facilities should not be squeezed into the area allocated and should not include shops in this area. Furthermore another respondent objected to redevelopment of the library and health centre, and it was commented that the doctors surgery has been modernised. The funding for this proposal was questioned. The proposal to move the Eldon Way health centre to a new combined community centre on Southend Road and replacing it with housing was objected to by a respondent. The funding for this was questioned and concern regarding disruption to services was raised.

Several respondents suggested that the unit containing the Indian restaurant and the units opposite Waters & Stanton should be replaced to bring the building line back from the road for the Spa junction improvements. It was also suggested that the units opposite Waters & Stanton should be replaced with homes not shops and that these should only be accessed from Woodlands Road, however, it was also commented that existing shops should not be turned into homes. It was commented that this junction should be replaced with traffic lights with additional lanes and the access to Southend Road car park should only be from Woodlands Road.

A respondent commented that the scale of redevelopment would significantly erode the industrial estate and the particular type and nature of units available. It was commented that Eldon Way performs an important role in terms of the mix of units suitable for different commercial operations and that replacement offices would not be satisfactory compared with the loss of industrial, light industrial and storage units. It was commented that the report does not explain what alternative accommodation is available for the occupiers and that this in itself indicates that delivery is unproven.

A respondent also commented that there is no evidence in the plan of a need for large-scale leisure uses in Hockley and it was stated that it is not considered appropriate to direct such uses to this area. It was also commented that although the plan indicates that a key objective is to provide

more housing thus avoiding the need to identify Green Belt land for housing, it was stated that this is unnecessary given the Government's intention to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies. Furthermore it was commented that there is no evidence of how the proposals will be funded and concern was expressed regarding the various funding options identified in the plan. It was stated that it would be wrong to put forward options which cannot be realistically funded or do not have any prospect of funding. It was also noted that a scheme the scale of Option 3 would require tenant and landowner agreement and it was stated that no discussion with landowners has taken place. It was commented that CPOs would be required and it was questioned whether this would be viable.

Several respondents commented that additional offices are not required as there are empty units on the Foundry industrial estate and at the Spa roundabout. It was commented by one respondent that they cannot see the benefit of creating more office space, especially where this can be more usefully utilised for housing or retail units. It was also felt that this detracts from the village feel referenced throughout the HAAP. It was commented that the housing proposed in Option 3 seems a good idea and would make use of what is not well utilised currently.

Another respondent objected stating that the removal of the former Alldays building and a building on Eldon Way would result in the removal of some leisure facilities for offices which are not needed. It was also commented that the former Alldays car park is needed for public parking. The replacement of the Co-Op was considered to be unnecessary by several respondents. Another respondent commented that the large supermarket does not have adequate space for parking and shoppers would have to take trolleys to new parking areas at Hockley station which is not practical and would drive shoppers to supermarkets outside Hockley that have adjacent on-site parking facilities. It was also commented that small local shops would not be able to compete with a large supermarket. It was commented that this option also appears to replace existing single story shops near the Factory Shop with single story shops, and it was noted that a recent planning application to use the Factory Shop car park for a takeaway food outlet has already been refused permission. Another respondent stated that replacing 34-40 Spa Road with new retail units is not supported. An objection was raised to the replacement of the office block on the corner of Woodlands Road/Southend Road by a respondent as it is considered to be presentable and useful.

Several respondents commented that a new home on Spa Road, close to the train station is unnecessary. Another respondent suggested that 59 Spa Road should go on Local List and its replacement was not supported. It was commented that the proposed car park to the south side of the train station for commuters is a good idea but concern was expressed that it would not be used by weekend shoppers. It was commented that the vehicular drop-off and

pick-up points should not be in the car park but at the station. The proposed new parking area south of the train station and the narrowing of the roundabout were supported by another respondent. However, improvements to the station frontage were not supported by a respondent and were considered to be unnecessary.

Concern was expressed by several respondents in relation to the parallel parking proposals and it was commented that the width of Spa Road should not be reduced due to tree planting. It was commented that this junction should be replaced with traffic lights with additional lanes and Potters parking should not be changed especially as parking for flats would be necessary.

Another respondent commented that parking should be within the main shopping centre, and that parallel on-street parking would put pressure on bus services etc. Support was expressed by a respondent for the proposed pedestrian links, paving improvements tree planting and the table-top crossing etc.

It was commented that the dwellings proposed in the churchyard is a curious option by one respondent, and it was questioned where the access for cars etc. would be and how it fits with development proposed on the Factory Shop car park. It was commented that it is unnecessary development. Several respondents also commented that if a walking route was created through the churchyard, then a crossing should be provided to cross Southend Road at its end. Concern was expressed by another respondent regarding the link through the churchyard from Southend Road to Spa Road, which it was noted is owned by the Church, and it was commented that an alleyway could create graffiti, litter and a disruption to services. It was stated that this link would encourage a minimal amount of people to use the car park behind the library. It was commented that if people will not walk around the Spa Pub then the walkway will not encourage them either. Another respondent objected to the proposed dwellings in the churchyard and it was stated that this is a small area and there is no parking. It was questioned how the link between Spa Road and Eldon Way could be strengthened.

A respondent noted that a footpath is proposed along the new car park entrance to the rear of the library, however, it was questioned where the access would be to the rear of the Indian restaurant to service the proposed dwellings and retail unit. It was also noted that the car park entrance is proposed to be relocated close the Spa roundabout which is a busy junction. It was noted that the footpath is not defined and it was questioned what, if any, proposals are being made to define the public footpath. It was questioned why the proposed change of use to the retail units along Main Road have not been included within Option 3. A respondent expressed their support for improved parking facilities etc. along Main Road (page 44). It was questioned by another respondent whether the remaining existing buildings would be

refurbished – the building on the corner of Bramerton Road was highlighted as an issue. Furthermore, a respondent expressed their support for shop front improvements but only where necessary.

A respondent highlighted that the former Alldays store is mentioned, but it is unclear whether this includes the other shops next to it or not, and it was commented that if it does then this should be stated. A business (the Fryery) commented that they could only be located in their current position or the unit immediately next to them to ensure that they have the same level of footfall which is crucial to their business. It was commented that they cannot see how this could be achieved without any break in their business given that the re-design would have to be so significant. A respondent commented that they are in favour of the increased housing presented in this model, but would prefer for it to be incorporated into option 2a.

A respondent raised strong objections to the changes concerning Seemore Glass (modernisation and four flats above). It was commented that Seemore Glass is a long-established, family run business. Concern was expressed that adequate consideration has not been given to the impact of the proposals on businesses and customers, particularly in the current economic climate. However, in relation to the key elements of Option 3 (page 42), a respondent considered the replacement of the shops at 2 Main Road to be ok but concern was expressed regarding the loss of businesses.

With reference to the bullet point “Replacement of poor quality building on Southend Road” (page 42) it was questioned by a respondent which building this refers to as it is not stated, and it was commented by other respondents that this building cannot be located on the maps. However, in relation to the replacement of the building on Southend Road, an objection was raised by a respondent stating that this is a single storey extension to the adjacent building and the proposed dwellings are in the rear car park. It was commented that the proposed development in this area would impact on the existing business there. It was questioned whether the public toilets would be lost.

With reference to the bullet points relating to table-top crossings (page 44) doubt was expressed whether the comparable sites are as busy as those intersecting at the Spa roundabout. It was commented that a major issue at this junction is that drivers fail to take care and drive appropriately e.g. speeding. A flexible bollard to ensure vehicles navigate properly at low speed was suggested. Another respondent expressed their support for the proposed shared surface at the Spa roundabout and the opening up of the western entrance to Potters car park.

With reference to site 6 (page 53) concern was expressed that the proposal to replace existing businesses with numerous dwellings has not considered the impact on infrastructure e.g. drainage. Another respondent commented that

replacing the Co-Op etc. with new retail/housing was not supported and it was questioned where they would be moved to. Replacing two buildings on Eldon Way with housing was not supported by a respondent. It was commented by another respondent that this option includes 80 dwellings on Eldon Way Industrial Estate against the wishes of local residents and creates additional traffic in Eldon Way, and there would be a loss of 2 large Industrial/leisure buildings on Eldon Way industrial estate for residential uses.

A respondent objected commenting that the option proposes to replace the present leisure facilities with houses and flats and it was noted that these facilities are popular. It was commented that they serve neighbouring towns, not just Hockley, and can be easily accessed by foot and public transport. It was commented that moving them to Southend would be detrimental for the local community. It was suggested that there are similar issues with the proposals for the Co-Op supermarket and funeral parlour. Conversely one respondent stated that a huge leisure complex is not wanted or needed and would take away from the village feel of Hockley. It was also commented by another respondent in relation to the proposal for new leisure space that this is smaller than the existing facilities, and it was questioned whether there has been an application for a skating rink. This proposal was objected to. Where it is stated that the environment and safety would be improved in front of existing leisure uses (page 44), it was commented that the existing leisure facilities are proposed to be moved within this option.

A respondent objected commenting that whilst they recognise the need for housing, especially affordable housing, there are concerns regarding whether there will be infrastructure provided alongside any development. It was commented that proposed development in Rochford will have an impact on the existing highway network and concern was expressed regarding this.

Another respondent objected to this option. Concern was expressed that there would be a disruption to shops and services for a long period during the construction of the supermarket and that shoppers would have to shop outside of Hockley during this period and may not return. It was commented that older residents and non-drivers would not be able to cope.

Some respondents expressed support for Option 3. It was commented that the industrial estate requires refurbishment and that this would be a suitable place for dwellings and retail units close to all amenities. Similarly another respondent commented that brownfield land can be used for housing instead of Green Belt land elsewhere. It was also commented that this could be the same as the new terraces next to the Spa and Spa House. A respondent commented that the photograph of Option 3 (page 49) makes the centre of Hockley look much more attractive. It was commented that Option 3 seems to keep everything central which was considered to be better by one respondent. It was commented that Hockley lacks any public area where pedestrians can sit away from traffic. Support was expressed for Option 3 which was stated as

going some way to remedying this. It was commented that there is also a need for a supermarket of a larger size than the existing premises. It was stated that the Eldon Way industrial estate is a real eyesore and contains too much wasted space. Support was expressed for the highest level of intervention and it was commented that Hockley is currently stagnant and is a poor shopping environment. It was commented that any intervention and improvement is better than nothing. Furthermore it was commented that the current level of housing justifies this level of intervention, and any visual enhancement would hopefully encourage investment.

Anglian Water commented that the area covered in the Hockley AAP is served by Rochford Wastewater Treatment Works where there is adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed flows from all three Spatial Options. It was commented that currently there are no significant issues with the sewerage network. Specifically in relation to Option 3 it was noted that this proposal includes a total of 159 properties (95 flats and 54 houses), and that the full impact to the foul network will have to be properly assessed to determine if infrastructure upgrades will be required prior to connection. It was commented that surface water should comply with PPS25 and be removed from the public surface water system where possible.

The Council's Community Safety Team in discussion with Essex Police (Rochford) Neighbourhood Specialist Officer commented that they like the long stretch of buildings from Spa Rd north to Eldon Way as there is nowhere to hide, and restaurants with offices above are preferable. It was commented that the more open area in these options are better because you can see from end to end. It was highlighted that there may be an issue with the road to the south of the consolidated leisure uses leading to parking behind the retail/office units and there may be a problem with youths, however, if the car park can be closed when the offices close at night it was commented that this would be ok. It was commented that Option 3 is not supported, due to the presence of housing and there is less leisure space. It was suggested that there should not be any houses on the green space by the Church, although it was commented that the dwellings to the north of the railway line are ok. It was also commented that people congregating outside the supermarket is an issue, and it was questioned whether there would be an issue with the proposal to the rear of the Indian restaurant. It was commented that direct access from the new station car park to Eldon Way (north to south) would be preferable to the route through the Foundry industrial estate.

A respondent objected to this option commenting that the sorting office would be taken away and probably combined with Southend or Chelmsford.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail noted that the Hockley delivery office is identified in this option for a supermarket in conjunction with the adjacent site to the west, and it is identified as Site 3 on page 53 as part of the land to the immediate north and west. It was noted that the land to the



north of the Royal Mail's site is identified for leisure with the land to the north-west for shops with flats above. It was also noted that the table on page 53 states that the redevelopment of the Royal Mail's site would provide 22 flats totaling 1,830 sq.m of gross external floorspace. It was requested that the Council clarifies whether Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site is identified in the AAP Option 3 and 3a for a retail supermarket or residential units. It was reiterated that the Hockley delivery office is a vital operational site.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail also stated that they request that the Council includes Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site within the emerging Hockley AAP for mixed use development, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the re-provision/relocation of Royal Mail's operations prior to the site's redevelopment. It was commented that this will ensure that the Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their licence issued pursuant to the Postal Services Act 2000, which requires the provision of a 'universal service' for the UK. Furthermore, as a provider of infrastructure, it was commented that they would promote in such circumstances Royal Mail receiving assistance in their relocation. It was also commented that should any sites surrounding Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office be redeveloped it would be vital that any new uses be designed so that they are cognisant of and sensitive to Royal Mail's existing operations. It was commented that their requests accord with paragraphs 10 and 36 of PPS3, and various sections of PPS4.

A respondent commented that a residential opportunity has been identified in the Woodpond Avenue end of the car park behind the library. It was questioned where this came from as there is no mention of it in the options.

Additionally it was commented that there should be no building on Green Belt land and agricultural land should be retained for that purpose. It was also suggested that whilst most comments may be negative, some praise is due to the Council in providing and working on the HAAP.

### **Spatial Option 3a**

Respondents objecting to this option commented that it proposes inappropriate changes and over development. Concern was expressed regarding the infrastructure to support the new dwellings. It was commented that Option 3a has similar issues to Option 3 except that the 80 homes on Eldon Way are replaced by 40 homes at the railway sidings and car park in Plumberow Avenue. It was commented that although this alternative option retains the 2 large industrial buildings on Eldon Way, there are further issues of additional traffic at the Plumberow Avenue traffic lights, and homes close to the railway line.

Conversely several respondents supported the development of dwellings proposed to the north of the railway line along Plumberow Avenue although concern was expressed that it would increase the traffic at the junction with

Greensward Lane and there would be parking problems. It was questioned whether these would be single storey like existing dwellings along the road. It was also commented by several respondents that the proposed northern entrance to the train station is a good idea.

However, a respondent commented that Option 3a is an improvement on Option 3, provided that the existing leisure space is retained with the existing facilities, and it was commented that a skating rink is also very welcome.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail noted that the Hockley delivery office is identified in this option for a supermarket in conjunction with the adjacent site to the west, and it is identified as Site 3 on page 53 as part of the land to the immediate north and west. It was noted that the land to the north of the Royal Mail's site is identified for leisure with the land to the north-west for shops with flats above. It was also noted that the table on page 53 states that the redevelopment of the Royal Mail's site would provide 22 flats totaling 1,830 sq.m of gross external floorspace. It was requested that the Council clarifies whether Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site is identified in the AAP Option 3 and 3a for a retail supermarket or residential units. It was reiterated that the Hockley delivery office is a vital operational site.

Representations made on behalf of the Royal Mail also stated that they request that the Council includes Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office site within the emerging Hockley AAP for mixed use development, supported by an appropriate flexible policy requiring the re-provision/relocation of Royal Mail's operations prior to the site's redevelopment. It was commented that this will ensure that the Royal Mail's operations will not be prejudiced and they can continue to comply with their licence issued pursuant to the Postal Services Act 2000, which requires the provision of a 'universal service' for the UK. Furthermore, as a provider of infrastructure, it was commented that they would promote in such circumstances Royal Mail receiving assistance in their relocation. It was also commented that should any sites surrounding Royal Mail's Hockley delivery office be redeveloped it would be vital that any new uses be designed so that they are cognisant of and sensitive to Royal Mail's existing operations. It was commented that their requests accord with paragraphs 10 and 36 of PPS3, and various sections of PPS4.

A respondent noted that a footpath is proposed along the new car park entrance, however, it was questioned where the access would be to the rear of the Indian restaurant to service the proposed dwellings and retail unit. It was also noted that the car park entrance is proposed to be relocated close to the Spa roundabout which is a busy junction. It was noted that the footpath is not defined and it was questioned what, if any, proposals are being made to define the public footpath. It was questioned why the proposed change of use to the retail units along Main Road have not been included within Option 3a. It was questioned whether the remaining existing buildings would be refurbished – the building on the corner of Bramerton Road was highlighted as an issue.

A respondent objected commenting that whilst they recognise the need for housing, especially affordable housing, there are concerns regarding whether there will be infrastructure provided alongside any development. It was commented that proposed development in Rochford will have an impact on the existing highway network and concern was expressed regarding this.

Concern was expressed regarding the link through the churchyard from Southend Road to Spa Road, which it was noted is owned by the Church, and it was commented that an alleyway could create graffiti, litter and a disruption to services. It was stated that this link would encourage a minimal amount of people to use the car park behind the library. It was commented that if people will not walk around the Spa Pub then the walkway will not encourage them either.

A respondent raised strong objections to the changes concerning Seemore Glass (modernisation and four flats above). It was commented that Seemore Glass is a long-established, family run business. Concern was expressed that adequate consideration has not been given to the impact of the proposals on businesses and customers, particularly in the current economic climate. As with Option 3, Option 3a is considered to represent over development. It was commented that this option seems to focus on provision of office space at the expense of new or refurbished retail units, and that again car parking is less than that offered under Option 2, although the housing proposed under Option 3 in Eldon Way has gone. However, it was stated that there are again some aspects that could be incorporated into the final plan.

The Council's Community Safety Team in discussion with Essex Police (Rochford) Neighbourhood Specialist Officer commented that they like the long stretch of buildings from Spa Rd north to Eldon Way as there is nowhere to hide, and restaurants with offices above are preferable. It was commented that the more open areas in these options are better because you can see from end to end. It was highlighted that there may be an issue with the road to the south of the consolidated leisure uses leading to parking behind the retail/office units and there may be a problem with youths, however, if the car park can be closed when the offices close at night it was commented that this would be ok. It was commented that Option 3 is not supported, due to the presence of housing and there is less leisure space. It was suggested that there should not be any houses on the green space by the Church, although it was commented that the dwellings to the north of the railway line are ok. It was also commented that people congregating outside the supermarket is an issue, and it was questioned whether there would be an issue with the proposal to the rear of the Indian restaurant. It was commented that direct access from the new station car park to Eldon Way (north to south) would be preferable to the route through the Foundry industrial estate.

A respondent expressed support for this option stating that the centre of Hockley has limited facilities and there are only a few buildings worth

preserving. It was commented that this scheme will create new housing, shops, pedestrian links etc. and will make a significant improvement to the area. Furthermore it was commented that the local action group do not represent the view of the population and that the Council should ballot every household in Hockley to get a more realistic view. It was stated that to not have a realistic action plan in place will mean the Council will be unable to defend against inappropriate piecemeal development within the centre of Hockley.

Anglian Water commented that the area covered in the Hockley AAP is served by Rochford Wastewater Treatment Works where there is adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed flows from all three Spatial Options. It was commented that currently there are no significant issues with the sewerage network. Specifically in relation to Option 3a it was noted that this proposal includes a total of 107 properties (82 flats and 25 houses). The full impact to the foul network will have to be properly assessed to determine if infrastructure upgrades will be required prior to connection. Surface water should comply with PPS25 and be removed from the public surface water system where possible.

A respondent commented that a residential opportunity has been identified in the Woodpond Avenue end of the car park behind the library. It was questioned where this came from as there is no mention of it in the options.

### **Transport options**

Numerous respondents commented that previous consultations have emphasised that highways infrastructure improvements to the key junctions at: Spa roundabout; Eldon Way; Station Approach and Plumberow Avenue need to be determined before any redevelopment. It was commented that insufficient attention has been paid to these key requirements and the proposals provided have not been researched and may not be viable.

A respondent commented that most of the congestion in Hockley is caused by through traffic, and the options will not solve the problem. It was commented that the only solution is to divert it which is likely to be expensive, but unless it is solved, any scheme to develop Hockley centre should be shelved, as this would also exacerbate the problem.

Comments on the proposal for increasing the capacity at the Spa roundabout were generally supportive of this option (page 59) and Hawkwell Parish Council commented that this option for improving traffic flow would be of benefit and would negate the need for traffic lights. It was commented that improving traffic flow is a key priority for the centre of Hockley. It was suggested that pelican crossing lights should be considered to regulate the flow of pedestrians crossing the road outside Potters. Several respondents commented that the filter lanes in particular would ease traffic at peak times

and improve the situation. It was commented by another respondent that Woodlands Road is frustrating to exit at peak times, however, this stops people using it as a short cut, and the rest of the roundabout runs smoothly during busy times. It was suggested by a respondent that the unit containing the Indian restaurant and the units opposite Waters & Stanton should be replaced to bring the building line back from the road for the Spa junction improvements. It was also suggested that the units opposite Waters & Stanton should be replaced with homes not shops and that these should only be accessed from Woodlands Road. It was commented that this junction should be replaced with traffic lights with additional lanes and the access to Southend Road car park should only be from Woodlands Road. It was also noted that Heavy Goods Vehicles turning into Spa Road from Southend Road require a wide turning circle. The use of 'No Right Turn' signs and the earlier filtering of traffic from Rayleigh turning left at the roundabout were suggested.

On the other hand some respondents expressed their concern at the benefits of this option, and it was commented that slip roads would exacerbate the situation. Another respondent commented that there are insufficient vehicles turning right from Southend Road to permit vehicles to exit Spa Road, and there are poor sight lines for vehicles turning left.

Concern was expressed by a number of respondents in relation to the shared space option for the Spa roundabout (page 60) and in general this proposal was not supported. Several respondents expressed their concern that this option would be hazardous and should not be considered at this busy junction. However, some respondents did express their support for this option. It was noted that there would be a need to slow traffic down entering all arms of the junction which must be considered.

In general a respondent questioned how the proposals would cope with an increase in traffic due to the other proposals which the plan is considering. Some respondents commented that a traffic survey is required to analyse traffic at the Spa roundabout before deciding the best solution. However, one respondent objected stating that the proposals for improving traffic flow at the Spa roundabout are likely to have only a small impact.

Generally comments received relating to the parking options on Spa Road (page 63) suggest that this option is not favourable. One respondent specifically expressed their opposition for on-street parking and another respondent commented that on-street parking provision should not be improved but should be discouraged on Spa Road as this would make it more pedestrian friendly. It was commented that drivers should be encouraged to use public car parks instead. Concern was expressed regarding the parallel parking proposals and it was commented that the width of Spa Road should not be reduced due to tree planting. Another respondent commented that additional parking is welcomed, but it was stated that there is insufficient space to provide echelon parking along Spa Road. A respondent agreed that

the retaining wall outside the bank needs to be removed and it was commented by another respondent that the varying heights are a problem for the elderly and partially sighted especially in poor weather. Lack of gritting of surrounding roads and pavement areas is also a concern. It was also commented that there is an issue with buses stopping along Spa Road and cars trying to turn right out of the Co-Op car park. It was commented that the disabled bay should be moved to Bramerton Road. A respondent suggested that deliveries for shops and refuse collections should be restricted to be certain times and enforced, and parking restrictions along the main roads should be extended and enforced. Furthermore it was commented that any plan must give consideration to deliveries especially to the larger retail units.

Comments on improving the drop-off provision at the station (page 64) generally showed a lack of consensus for these options. It was commented that the proposed car park to the south side of the train station for commuters is a good idea but concern was expressed that it would not be used by weekend shoppers. It was commented that the vehicular drop-off and pick-up points should not be in the car park but at the station. The proposed northern entrance to the train station was considered to be a good idea. However, another respondent specifically expressed their opposition to the station drop-off options. It was commented that any changes at the station must include provision for short stay pick up and for taxis. It was commented that the roadway under the railway bridge is very narrow, and it was suggested that pedestrian walkways under the side of the bridge would improve matters.

Essex County Council commented that the options, as currently presented in the consultation document, raise a general issue in terms of the balance to be struck between the need for extra car parking and the need to address congestion hotspots and to make Hockley centre more attractive for other modes of transport. There is a requirement for presentation of a more detailed analysis of the effect of the provision of extra free car parking on the network and on other modes of transport using the network.

With regard to the Southend Road / Spa Road roundabout Essex County Council commented that any changes to the existing layout of this junction would require a detailed design incorporating safety audit and junction modelling, including traffic surveys and vehicle swept path analyses. It was commented that improvement to the existing zebra crossings by upgrading to signalised crossings could potentially improve vehicle flows and manage crossing pedestrians.

In relation to the realignment / provision of parking bays on Spa Road Essex County Council commented that a survey of utilities could potentially identify numerous facilities along Spa Road, with the cost implication of diversions, adversely affecting the deliverability of the Plan. Any road realignment along Spa Road would need to ensure that visibility splays are maintained to Highway standards. Similarly, any changes to the road width to provide

parking bays would also require capacity assessment of the carriageway. The Highway Authority would require further information to assess these proposals.

Essex County Council commented that with regard to Station Approach / Spa Road any extension of car parking facilities at the station would need careful consideration in terms of its impact on the Station Approach/Spa Road junction and also the ability for all modes of transport, especially pedestrians, to gain access to the station. A station travel plan should be prepared for implementation in conjunction with any new works. The removal of the existing roundabout would create a 'crossroads' style junction which may lead to increased safety concerns regarding vehicle movements associated with the existing residential/business areas. The Highway Authority would require further information on pedestrian and vehicle flows at the Station Road/Spa Road junction to determine the need for junction improvements. There are safety implications as the junction is currently used to enable access to the station, residential areas and the business park.

In terms of implementation and delivery, Essex County Council commented that the Highway Authority would promote improvements encouraging modal shift and use of more sustainable forms of transport, including improved public transport infrastructure enhancements and provision for cyclists. Any proposal which seeks to create pedestrian links should also incorporate cycling infrastructure where appropriate. The focus on pedestrian and cycling routes is welcome as a means of widening travel choice and enabling reduced use of motorised vehicles for local journeys. Such routes should also contribute to 'Safer Journeys to School' and be considered alongside traffic speed reduction measures, especially in the vicinity of schools and early years and childcare facilities.

Essex County Council further commented that appropriate text and provision should be included in the Plan for: developer contributions to be sought from future development in the area, car parking provision to conform to the EPOA parking standards, and provision of Transport Assessments or Transport Statements for defined proposals.

A respondent suggested that if the sorting office area was used, then the junction of Eldon Way and Spa Road should be widened with a roundabout and Eldon way should be used to access a new free shopping car park.

It was commented that the footpath down the side of The Fryery needs to be lit at night, as large groups of youths congregate there and cause anti-social behaviour. It was suggested that lighting could deter their presence and give a feeling of safety to others using the footpath.

A respondent commented that when the Area Action Plan is published for consultation, it will be necessary to explain what the costs of the

improvements are, how the proposed transport works are to be funded and the programme for delivery. It was further commented that without this the Area Action Plan would not be able to demonstrate delivery.

### **Funding and delivery**

A respondent commented that there seems little justification for further office building when existing facilities cannot be let. It was questioned how it can be justified that demand is strong when there are several retail units which have been vacant long-term.

Several respondents expressed the concern that in the current financial climate this kind of development will not happen. It was commented that there is little demand for new shops and offices, the demand for homes is impacted by mortgage restrictions and any new developments would have to be carried out by a major developer who would need to pay for any infrastructure required. Furthermore another respondent commented that in the current financial climate it is surprising that there seems to be a lot of money to spend on so-called improvements to Hockley. It was commented that these are improvements that the majority of residents do not want. It was questioned who will fill the retail units. It was suggested that the pavements in Hamilton Avenue should be improved, there should be double yellow lines at Plumberow Primary School, and graffiti, rubbish and weeds should be removed.

Hawkwell Parish Council stated that they believe the suggestion that the Council could borrow money to fund improvements on the assumption that more business rates would be generated and the Government would release such funds is a dangerous road to go down.

A respondent objected commenting that if the New Homes Bonus is used to fund improvements, building more houses will exacerbate the infrastructure and traffic problems that already exist in Hockley.

A respondent commented that it is assumed that most of this development will fall on the private sector to finance, and any section 106 agreements with developers will need to be enforced.

Another respondent objected stating that the principles underpinning the plan should be to discourage lots of large national retailers. It was commented that under delivery options the bullet points relating to minimum retail unit size should be changed and a limit of only one or two units above a maximum size allowed. Also it was suggested that as office space would need to be pre-guaranteed, some more flexible types of building should be proposed.

A respondent suggested that aside from exploring the funding opportunities, the components that add little or no value should be removed from the Plan



e.g. some of the proposed pedestrian walkways. It was commented that any housing developments should be utilised to fund improvements to Hockley centre.

A respondent commented that as Option 1 is their preferred option, they do not think there is an issue with funding, however if the other options are pursued, it was commented that the Council should consider the risks very carefully.

### **Next steps**

Essex County Council noted that next steps in preparation of the Plan will include discussion with key stakeholders, including Essex County Council (Chapter 10, page 70, column 1). The County Council would welcome early discussion of issues relating to delivery of its range of services that arise from preparation of the Plan. It was commented that the Highway Authority will require further analysis to be provided in order to reach a considered opinion on the options identified within the consultation document and to advise on transport requirements for the preferred option.

Several respondents commented that it is unreasonable to expect the public to make online responses to this document. It was noted that this is the second consultation on options for the centre of Hockley, and concern was expressed that the public will not respond in sufficient numbers.

The Environment Agency stated that their comments, which included advice on sustainable development, Sustainable Drainage Systems and biodiversity and landscaping, submitted during the 2009 consultation remain valid and should be considered in future iterations of the AAP. They also noted that some parts of the AAP area may be subject to land contamination due to their past uses, and subsequently recommend that consideration should be given to this matter in taking the AAP forward. Furthermore, should the proposed future development include industrial development or other potentially polluting land uses, it was commented that it will need to be ensured that adequate pollution control measures are in place.

A respondent considered the document to be very long and not easy to understand, with specific reference to the models. An executive summary in plain English and a list of the shops referred to in an appendix (instead of just quoting their numbers) was suggested to aid the public's understanding. It was further commented that the document has been the cause of much concern to businesses and it was commented that the reasons for preparing the document should have been clearer e.g. it would lead to a blue print for future development which may or may not happen.

A respondent supported the next steps noting that the Council is planning to meet with shop keepers. They offered their assistance in further discussing

their comments or anything else in relation to the HAAP, and stated that they are very keen to be involved throughout the process in a constructive way. Another respondent expressed support for further consultation with stakeholders. It was noted that the plan is modular and therefore some parts could be taken forward independently of the rest, and it was commented that before the preferred option is published it would be useful to identify the modular components and the issues and dependencies affecting each. It was stated that residents should continue to be involved.

A respondent objected to all options. It was commented that previous consultations have made clear that highways infrastructure improvements to Spa roundabout, Eldon Way, Station Approach and Plumberow Avenue need to be determined before any redevelopment could be considered and that insufficient attention has been paid to these key requirements. However, one respondent expressed support for Option 1 or Option 2 as it was felt that this would be an improvement to the centre of Hockley without too much overcrowding. The other options were considered to cause too much overcrowding in a very small area and are unnecessary. Another respondent expressed support for Option 2a as the retail units and flats were considered to positively contribute to the area. It was stated that large scale development is not welcomed and the industrial estate should be retained. It was questioned what would happen to the Royal Mail sorting office. It was further stated that the Spa roundabout should be kept and the new integrated health centre and library is good idea. It was also suggested that a drop off area in Plumberow Avenue for the station to ease congestion should be considered by two respondents, although one suggested double yellow lines on the road should be included. The scale of development proposed in Option 3 was commented by a respondent to be potentially detrimental to the character of the area, although it was commented that some of the existing buildings in the centre do need improving.

A respondent suggested several ideas to be considered in the development of a single option for Hockley, for example focusing retail development between Waters & Stanton (Main Road) and the Co-Op (Spa Road), increase parking in the centre and continue developments along Station Approach into the Foundry industrial estate.

End of summary