Sustainability Appraisal of the Rayleigh Area Action Plan Pre-Submission Document (November 2013) – Schedule of Modifications

March 2015

Sustainability Appraisal of the Rayleigh Area Action Plan: Schedule of Modifications

This report forms an addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) technical report that accompanied the Rayleigh Area Action Plan on submission in December 2014. This report seeks to undertake an SA of Rochford District Council's Rayleigh Area Action Plan: Schedule of Modifications. The Schedule of Modifications sets out proposed modifications to the Rayleigh Area Action Plan Pre-Submission Document (November 2013) that is the subject of the examination, in light of the hearing session that has taken place, further discussions with Essex County Council and the Inspector's recommendations. The SA of the proposed modifications does not seek to repeat the assessment carried out for the SA of the Rayleigh Area Action Pre-Submission Document (November 2013), but rather seeks to assess the modifications made to the policies themselves. This report should therefore be read in conjunction with the SA technical report (December 2013) that accompanied the Rayleigh Area Action Plan on submission.

The Sustainability Appraisal Process

Throughout the development of the Rayleigh Area Action Plan the SA process has been used to assist in planning for the development and the use of land, as required by planning legislation and Government guidance, within the centre of Rayleigh. SA assists sustainable development through an ongoing dialogue and assessment during the preparation of Development Planning Documents (DPDs), and considers the implications of social, economic and environmental demands on land use planning.

An SA scoping process was undertaken to help ensure that the SA covers the key sustainability issues that are relevant to Rayleigh. This included the development of an SA Framework of objectives to comprise the basis for appraisal. An SA Scoping Report was prepared to summarise the findings of the scoping process and was sent to statutory consultees for consultation in September 2012. As part of the scoping process plans and programmes were reviewed and information was collated relating to the current and predicted social, environmental and economic characteristics of Rochford. The SA Framework for the Rayleigh Area Action Plan is based on that developed for the Rochford Core Strategy.

Consideration and Appraisal of Alternatives – Issues and Options Document 2009

The SA of the options (alternatives) was undertaken in November 2012. The purpose and key objectives of the AAP have been set at a higher level; therefore it was considered that the alternatives available to the plan-maker in preparing the AAP were limited to the level and type of intervention/ development that should be accommodated in the Town Centre.

The Issues and Options Document (2009) identified a number of areas within the town centre where opportunities may exist for redevelopment, as well as a range of opportunities related to transport and circulation and the public realm. A range of options were

proposed in relation to each area and some involved a number of key aspects which included the redevelopment of existing buildings or vacant for mixed-uses, or the redevelopment of existing businesses to enlarge existing car parking facilities. Some options were devised using a number of interventions which would result in differing levels of change i.e. low, medium, high and/or higher.

The options which proposed interventions which sought to improve the quality and attractiveness of particular areas, supported mixed-use development and/ or improve pedestrian links were found to progress many of the SA objectives relating to communities, health, accessibility, the economy, heritage, townscape and sustainable design. The significance of effects was found to increase along with the level of intervention. However, with a higher level of intervention there is also some uncertainty and this was because the proposed development could have the potential for negative effects in the short-term on SA objectives through increased noise and congestion. The SA also found that options which recommended full pedestrianisation may have negative effects on communities and health as they could potentially shift existing traffic issues elsewhere within the AAP area creating another barrier to movement.

Furthermore, with reference to the spatial options, it was considered that the composite option that sought the higher level of intervention proposed in option 4 with the shared space treatments proposed in option 3 (rather than the pedestrianisation of the High Street), would not require the diversion of traffic and would provide greater benefits to a wider area.

Alongside consultation responses, the Council considered the SA findings in its decision making. The reasons for the selection or rejection of options in plan-making are set out in Section 4 of the SA Report.

Appraisal of the AAP Vision and Policies – Pre-Submission Document 2013

A compatibility analysis of the Pre-Submission AAP Vision and Objectives was carried out using the SA framework in December 2013. Overall the vision and objectives were found to be compatible with the majority of SA objectives.

The Pre-Submission policies were subject to detailed SA in December 2013. On the whole, the findings of the SA suggest that the emerging AAP policies will make significant contributions to the progression of SA objectives. Throughout the development of the AAP and the Sustainability Appraisal process, data gaps and uncertainties were uncovered and these have been acknowledged in the appraisal matrices, where applicable.

The SA of the Pre-Submission policies found that the majority of polices would have significant positive sustainability benefits. The AAP has the potential for significant long term positive effects to ensure balanced and healthy communities by providing a mix of uses in the town centre and improved and enhanced pedestrian links into the centre. It was found that the AAP would have a significant positive effect on the local economy, primarily through enhanced opportunities for retail, leisure and offices. It was found that the economy would benefit from strengthened pedestrian links which would be likely to encourage consumers and workers to the centre. Cumulative improvements to the

public realm, bus facilities, the train station, and better pedestrian and cycle facilities were found to have a significant positive effect on accessibility. The setting of key principals for development to contribute positively to the local townscape and character, focusing on the individual parts of the AAP area, was found to have potential positive cumulative effects, when combined with requirements to enhance the public realm and the likely redevelopment of derelict, degraded or underused land. The SA found that the AAP's goal of protecting and enhancing the historic character of the centre was likely to have significant positive cumulative effects. These were found to come from new and improved pedestrian signage to key heritage assets in concert with public realm interventions and regeneration of the aesthetic value of the AAP area.

Some temporary negative effects in the short-term during demolition/ construction as noise and vibration were identified as being likely to occur but it is expected that this can be mitigated at the project level. Any other effects were considered to be mitigated by policies contained within the Core Strategy and Development Management DPDs.

There have been exceedences of the annual mean air quality objective for nitrogen dioxide at Eastwood Road/Rayleigh High Street and Eastwood Road. Any new development has the potential to increase nitrogen dioxide levels in the both the short-term and the long-term. Mitigation measures are already in place through Core Strategy Polices.

There may be some temporary negative effects in the short-term during demolition/ construction as waste, noise and dust nuisances may be created but it is expected that this can be mitigated at the project level.

There is the potential for negative effects on health, heritage and air quality in the short term during the construction of new development or redevelopment of existing buildings. However, it considered that suitable mitigation is available at the project level to address any adverse effects and suitable protection is provided through Core Strategy and Development Management policies. New development and the redevelopment of existing buildings will need to be carefully and sympathetically designed to ensure that there are no long term negative effects on heritage, particularly on the Rayleigh Conservation Area.

Uncertainties and Data Gaps

Throughout the development of the AAP and the Sustainability Appraisal process, data gaps and uncertainties were uncovered. It is not always possible to accurately predict sustainability effects when considering plans at this scale. Impacts on cultural heritage, for example, will depend on more detailed information and studies at a site-level. It is also difficult to predict air quality effects and future traffic levels based on interventions. These uncertainties have been acknowledged in the appraisal matrices, where applicable.

Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)

The assessment found that none of the policies in the Rayleigh Area Action Plan are likely to have significant impacts, either alone or in combination, on European Sites.

Sustainability Appraisal Update

The Rayleigh Area Action Plan Submission Document (December 2014) was submitted to the Secretary of State on 5 December 2014, although at the request of the Inspector the Pre-Submission Document (November 2013) is the subject of the examination. A hearing session was held on 4 March 2015 at which the various aspects of the plan were discussed. Following this hearing session, the Planning Inspector wrote to Rochford District Council on 6 March 2015 providing a Post Hearing Note.

In his Post Hearing Note the Inspector set out several suggested changes to the Pre-Submission Document (November 2013), relating to the soundness of the plan. Based on these suggested changes the Council produced a revised Schedule of Modifications, which will be the subject of this Sustainability Appraisal Update.

As per the SA of the Rayleigh Area Action Plan Pre-Submission Document, the appraisal recognised six categories of predicted effects, as illustrated in the key below. For further information on the method used for the SA, please refer to the SA technical report for the Rayleigh Area Action Plan Pre-Submission Document.

| Categories of sustainability effects | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| Colour | Impact | |
| ++ | Major Positive | |
| + | Positive | |
| 0 | No Impact | |
| ? | Uncertain | |
| - | Negative | |
| - | Major Negative | |

Section 1.1, Paragraph 1 (MM1)

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|----------------------------------|---|------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | ale, |
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
|---|--|---|
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Policy 1 – Rayleigh Area Action Plan Framework (MM2)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | The proposed modification to clarify that the Council is referring to new and improved pedestrian and cycle routes within the AAP area is likely to have a positive impact on the health and safety of the local community as it will serve to encourage the use of alternative modes of transport, and walking and cycling in particular. Better signage and improved routes will also help to improve safety. | + |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
| Employment | | |
| 5. Accessibility | Clarifying that Policy 1 refers to new and improved pedestrian and cycle routes within the AAP area will encourage alternative modes of travel in the form of walking and cycling and is likely to have a positive effect on accessibility. | + |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | Clarifying that Policy 1 refers to new and improved pedestrian and cycle routes within the AAP area will encourage alternative modes of travel in the form of walking and cycling and is likely to have a positive effect in terms of combatting climate change. By encouraging alternate modes of travel various emissions from motor vehicles could be reduced. | + |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | Clarifying that the Policy 1 refers to new and improved pedestrian and cycle routes within the AAP area will encourage alternative modes of travel in the form of walking and cycling and is likely to have a positive effect on air quality. By encouraging alternative modes of travel the policy has the potential to reduce the number of motor vehicles within the AAP area, this could also reduce emissions. | + |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|---|---|------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | ale, |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Policy 1 – Rayleigh Area Action Plan Framework (MM3)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, sreversibility, likelihood) | scale, |
|----------------------------------|--|--------|
| 1. Balanced Communities | The proposed modification clarifying that the Council expects that significant retail development within Rayleigh centre will contribute financially to the schemes proposed in the plan will help to ensure that the relevant financial contributions to projects within the AAP area are provided. This will help to ensure that potential schemes arising from the RAAP in the centre can be funded and are more likely to be viable. | + |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|---|--|---|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | The proposed modification clarifying that the Council expects that significant retail development within Rayleigh centre will contribute financially to the schemes proposed in the plan will help to ensure that the relevant financial contributions to projects within the AAP area are provided. This will help to ensure that funding will be available for improving and enhancing cultural heritage assets. | + |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Section 3.4, Paragraph 3 – Rayleigh Area Action Plan Framework (MM4)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so | cale, |
|----------------------------------|--|-------|
| | reversibility, likelihood) | |
| 1. Balanced Communities | The proposed modification to clarify that the Council recognises the potential to deliver greater priority and flexibility for the local market while still recognising the role played by the local taxi rank will have a positive effect in terms of balanced communities by ensuring that the market can continue to prosper while still acknowledging the local taxi rank and the service it provides. | + |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | |
| 4. Economy & Employment | The proposed modification could have benefits for the local market and wider High Street area through potentially providing greater flexibility for the market. | + |
| 5. Accessibility | The proposed modification ensures that taxis will continue to form a part of the transport mix in Rayleigh and can provide an alternative mode of transport to the private car. | + |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 9. Climate Change | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | cale, |
|---|--|-------|
| & Energy | | |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Figure 8 – Rayleigh Area Action Plan Framework (MM5)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|-------------------------------|---|------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | ale, |
| 4. Economy & Employment | The amended Figure 8 identifies locations for potential improvements, in particular improvements to the functioning of key crossing points. These improvements have the potential to improve accessibility to the AAP area which is in turn likely to increase the number of visitors coming into the centre for retail and other purposes. It also has the potential to improve the attractiveness of the area for employment. | + |
| 5. Accessibility | The proposed Figure 8 identifies several key sites for potential improvement, including improvements to key pedestrian crossing points. These improvements could have a positive impact on accessibility. Potential rationalisation of the taxi rank and a greater pedestrian focus, could also improve accessibility within the AAP area. | + |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | Potential improvements to key crossing points and rationalisation of the taxi rank would have a positive effect on landscape and townscape. | + |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | Potential improvements to key crossing points could have the effect of improving traffic flow within the AAP area. | + |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|---|---|------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | ale, |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Table 1 – Rayleigh Area Action Plan Framework (MM6)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | The amendment to Table 1 identifies potential improvements, in particular improvements to the functioning of key crossing points. These improvements have the potential to improve accessibility to the AAP centre, which is in turn likely to increase the number of visitors coming into the centre for retail and other purposes. It also has the potential to improve the attractiveness of the area for employment. | + |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
| 5. Accessibility | The proposed modification to Table 1 reflects what is shown in Figure 8, as amended in MM4, it identifies several key areas of potential improvement, including improvements to key pedestrian crossing points, which could have a positive impact on accessibility. Potential rationalisation of the taxi rank and a greater pedestrian focus, could also improve accessibility within the AAP area. | + |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | Potential improvements to key crossing points and rationalisation of the taxi rank would have a positive effect on landscape and townscape. | + |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | Potential improvements to key crossing points could have the effect of improving traffic flow within the AAP area. This may have a small positive effect in terms of air quality. | + |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Policy 3 – Rayleigh Area Action Plan Framework (MM7)

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
| 1. Balanced Communities | The proposed modification seeks to clarify that the non-A1 uses set out in Criterion 3 of Policy 1, which include leisure, cultural and community uses will also be acceptable under Criterion 3 of Policy 3. By clarifying in Policy 3 where such non-A1 uses will be acceptable, the modification will ensure that non-A1 uses of the type described will be supported in the secondary shopping frontage area to support the retail core (primary shopping frontage area). This will ensure that a complimentary mix of uses are available for the community, to contribute to a vibrant and viable town centre. | + |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | The proposed modification seeks to clarify that the non-A1 uses set out in Criterion 3 of Policy 1, which include leisure, cultural and community uses will also be acceptable under Criterion 3 of Policy 3. By clarifying in Policy 3 where such non-A1 uses will be acceptable the modification will ensure that there is an appropriate mix of non-A1 uses in the town centre. This will potentially have a dual effect, encouraging more visitors to the town centre and ensuring a greater variety of employment opportunities. | + |
| | The proposal to remove the target of ensuring that 75% of Rayleigh's primary shopping frontage and 50% of its secondary shopping frontage is in retail (A1) use, will still have a positive impact in terms of economy and employment. Although the percentage targets are proposed to be removed from the policy, it is proposed below in MM7 that they be included elsewhere within the main text of the RAAP. Therefore they still have a positive role to play in the plan, as they set a target that the Council will seek to reach. | |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|---|---|---|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | The proposed modification to ensure that any development would not have a negative impact on the amenity and character of the town centre, which would have a positive effect on this SA objective. | + |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Section 4.2 – Rayleigh Area Action Plan Framework (MM8)

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|----------------------------------|---|------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | ale, |
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | The proposal to clarify the target of ensuring that 75% of Rayleigh's new primary shopping frontage and 50% of its new secondary shopping frontage is in retail (A1) use, will have an impact in terms of economy and employment. Although the percentage targets have been remove from the policy, it is proposed that they be included elsewhere within the main text of the RAAP. Therefore they still have a positive role to play in the plan, as they set a target that the Council will seek to reach. | + |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 9. Climate Change | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
|---|--|---|
| & Energy | | |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Section 4.2, Paragraph 6 (MM9)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale reversibility, likelihood) | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. Balanced Communities | The proposed modification seeks to clarify that leisure, cultural and community uses are important to the vitality of the town, and would be supported in the secondary shopping frontage under Policy 3. This will ensure that a complimentary mix of uses are available for the community, to contribute to a vibrant and viable town centre. | + |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | The proposed modification seeks to clarify that leisure, cultural and community uses are important to the vitality of the town, and would be supported in the secondary shopping frontage under Policy 3. This will ensure that a complimentary mix of uses are available for the community, to contribute to a vibrant and viable town centre. This will potentially have a dual effect, encouraging more visitors to the town centre and ensuring a greater variety of employment opportunities. | + |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, sc | rale |
|---------------------------------------|---|------|
| OA OBJECTIVE | reversibility, likelihood) | arc, |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Section 4.2, Paragraph 6 (MM10)

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, s reversibility, likelihood) | cale, |
| 1. Balanced Communities | The proposed modification seeks to clarify that leisure, cultural and community uses are important to the vitality of the town, and would be supported in the secondary shopping frontage under Policy 3 provided it meets the criteria. This will ensure that a complimentary mix of uses are available for the community, to contribute to a vibrant and viable town centre. | + |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | The proposed modification seeks to clarify that leisure, cultural and community uses are important to the vitality of the town, and would be supported in the secondary shopping frontage under Policy 3 provided it meets the criteria. This will ensure that a complimentary mix of uses are available for the community, to contribute to a vibrant and viable town centre. This will potentially have a dual effect, encouraging more visitors to the town centre and ensuring a greater variety of employment opportunities. | + |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|---|--|--------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, reversibility, likelihood) | scale, |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Section 4.2, Paragraph 10 (MM11)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | ale, |
|----------------------------------|---|------|
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | The proposed modification to ensure that any development would not have a negative impact on the amenity and character of the town centre, which would have a positive effect on this SA objective. | + |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|---|---|-------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | cale, |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Policy 5 – Character Area A: Central High Street, Criterion 4 (MM12)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| | Assessment of Effects | |
|---|--|--------|
| SA Objective | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, reversibility, likelihood) | scale, |
| 5. Accessibility | Potential rationalisation of the taxi rank and a greater pedestrian focus, could also improve accessibility within the AAP area. | + |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | Potential rationalisation of the taxi rank would have a positive effect on landscape and townscape. | + |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Policy 6 – Character Area B: High Street North and Bellingham Lane (MM13)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | cale, |
|----------------------------------|--|-------|
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 4. Economy & Employment | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | The proposed modification clarifies that the criteria refers to the rear of existing buildings along to High Street, and affords an opportunity to utilise potentially underused land within the centre which would have a positive impact on the local townscape and character. | + |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, so reversibility, likelihood) | cale, |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------|
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Policy 8 – Character Area D: Websters Way (MM14)

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, scale, reversibility, likelihood) | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Balanced Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 2. Healthy & Safe Communities | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 3. Housing | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects | |
|---|--|-------|
| | Nature of the predicted sustainability effect (positive/negative, short/medium/long term, cumulative, serversibility, likelihood) | cale, |
| 4. Economy & Employment | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 5. Accessibility | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 6. Biodiversity | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 7. Cultural Heritage | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 8. Landscape & Townscape | The proposed modification clarifies that the criteria refers to the rear of existing buildings along to High Street, and affords an opportunity to utilise potentially underused land within the centre which would have a positive impact on the local townscape and character. | + |
| 9. Climate Change & Energy | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 10. Water | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 11. Land & Soil | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 12. Air Quality | No significant effects identified. | 0 |
| 13. Sustainable Design & Construction | No significant effects identified. | 0 |

Summary:

The SA of the Rayleigh Area Action Plan has appraised the effects of the proposed Schedule of Modifications on individual policies, as well as the overall effect of the plan. The findings of the SA Addendum indicate that the proposed modifications to the RAAP will have a positive effect on the key sustainability criteria, as well as the overall effect of the plan, including cumulative and incremental effects.