

Rochford District Council

**Rochford Area Action Plan Hearing
Statement**

January 2014

Contents

1	Matter 1: Legal compliance and overall strategy (Sections 1 and 2).....	2
2	Matter 2: A framework for a better Rochford (Section 3 and policy 1)	5
3	Matter 3: Proposals Plan, shopping frontages and sites (Section 4 and policies 2, 3 and 4).....	8
4	Matter 4: Rochford’s Character Areas (Section 5 and policies 5-9)	11
5	Matter 5: Infrastructure, delivery and monitoring (Section 6 and Table 2).....	12
6	Appendix 1 – Potential Residential Capacity of Opportunity Sites	14
7	Appendix 2 – Retail (A1) Floorspace Provision.....	16

1 Matter 1: Legal compliance and overall strategy (Sections 1 and 2)

- 1.1. Does the AAP meet all its legal requirements, especially in matters such as : the Local Development Scheme (LDS); the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI); the Rochford Core Strategy (CS); community/corporate strategies; Rochford Parish Council’s Vision Statement; Habitats Regulations; and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012?

The Rochford AAP has been prepared in accordance with the 2013 LDS and the most up-to-date, published timetable for document production (dated November 2013). The Plan has also been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 since they came into force on 6 April 2012, in particular Regulation 18, and the Council’s SCI as set out in the Consultation Statement. Although the SCI was prepared prior to the changes in regulations, the community involvement techniques set out in it are still relevant and have been adopted throughout the preparation of the Plan.

Community and corporate strategies, including Rochford Parish Council’s Vision Statement, have helped to influence the policies in the Core Strategy. Section 2 of the Rochford AAP sets out the policy context for the Plan, including the implications of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), as well as considering the potential effect of other plans and strategies such as Rochford Parish Council’s Vision Statement and the Rochford Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan on the town centre. These have been integrated into the proposed policies, where appropriate.

The Core Strategy sets out the overarching policies that have guided the development of the Rochford AAP. The Core Strategy was adopted on 13 December 2011 and forms part of the development plan for the District. All other planning policies for the District stem from the Core Strategy. The priorities of the Rochford AAP are identified in the Core Strategy. In particular Policy RTC5 of the Core Strategy sets out the objectives for the Rochford AAP to deliver. The Rochford AAP is consistent with the adopted development plan – the Core Strategy – in accordance with regulation 8 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

In terms of the Habitat Regulations, a Habitat Regulations Assessment has been undertaken as part of the preparation of the Plan, in consultation with Natural England.

- 1.2. Are there any differences of emphasis between the AAP and the Core Strategy?

The priorities for the Rochford AAP to deliver are set out in Core Strategy Policy RTC5, which includes:

- A safe and high quality environment for residents
- A market square area that encourages visitors
- Enhanced retail offer for Rochford
- A range of evening leisure activities

- Improves accessibility to and within the town centre
- Promotes youth community facilities

The Rochford AAP is aspirational, yet realistic as required by the NPPF, and it has taken account of the change in circumstances since the publication of the 2009 Issues and Options Document; a tougher economic climate and new developments (including the development of Sainsbury’s at the western end of West Street).

The priorities set out in the Core Strategy have been integrated into the Plan where appropriate and deliverable. The Plan seeks to focus retail uses within the core area of the town – the Market Square – through redefining both the town centre boundary and primary and secondary shopping frontage areas.

- 1.3. Has the Council worked collaboratively with other authorities and organisations during plan preparation to the extent that it has complied with its Duty to Cooperate? [A critical factor is that the Duty to Cooperate is incapable of modification at the Examination stage.]

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. As such, the key strategic elements of the Council’s Local Development Plan have already been determined in cooperation with neighbouring local authorities. In addition, the Core Strategy, to which the Rochford Area Action Plan conforms, was prepared having regard to input from a wide range of stakeholders, including Essex County Council and neighbouring authorities.

Whilst neighbouring authorities and Essex County Council were consulted throughout the preparation of the Rochford AAP, as set out in the Consultation Statement, no cross-boundary issues were identified by neighbouring authorities.

The main partner in relation to the AAP is Essex County Council, due to its role as Highways Authority for Rochford District and much of the wider area. In particular, conversations with Essex County Council officers have allowed for the project team to identify new or proposed developments with a significant highways impact.

- 1.4. Neighbouring plans and strategies:

How does the AAP relate to the plans and strategies of the remainder of the District and other neighbouring local planning authorities?

The Rochford AAP forms part of a suite of policy documents which would need to be considered together when preparing development proposals; including the Core Strategy, the Development Management Document and the Allocations Document.

The main planning policy document is the Core Strategy, which was adopted by the Council on 13 December 2011. The Core Strategy identifies a need to provide Area Action Plans for the District’s town centres, and as such it sets out a comprehensive approach to planning for the three towns; Rayleigh, Hockley and Rochford.

The Development Management Document is at an advanced stage and was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination on 13 December 2013. The Development Management Document sets out detailed proposed policies for managing development across the District, which address issues such as design (DM1), light pollution (DM5), the Local List (DM7), Sustainable Drainage Systems (DM28) and advertisements (DM37) for example, and would be applicable to proposals both within and outside the town centre.

The Allocations Document, which was submitted to the Secretary of State on 18 April 2013, sets out proposed interim allocations for the town centre boundary, and primary and secondary shopping frontages for Rochford. The Plan acknowledges that these may be superseded by those in the Rochford AAP.

In relation to the plans and strategies prepared by neighbouring local authorities, as noted above, when neighbouring authorities were consulted during the preparation of the Rochford AAP, no cross-boundary issues were identified.

How far has the AAP taken on board the plans and programmes of statutory providers and regulatory agencies, such as transport companies, the Environment Agency, the utility companies, and local businesses and community groups and agencies?

The Council operates a mailing list of specific and general consultation bodies along with groups and organisations who may have interest in the development of the District and members of the public who have requested to be kept updated with opportunities to participate. They have been contacted throughout the preparation of the Rochford AAP.

The statutory providers, regulatory agencies and utility companies consulted during the preparation of the Plan have been identified in Appendix 1 of the Consultation Statement. These include the Highways Agency, Essex County Council Highways Authority, the Environment Agency, English Heritage, Anglian Water, Essex and Suffolk Water, Essex Police, National Grid and South Essex NHS Trust.

In terms of local businesses, community groups and agencies consulted, the Council has consulted those local businesses and community groups who have expressed an interest in being kept updated on the development of the Plan and are on the Council’s mailing list. These include Rochford Takeaway, Rochford Day Centre, Rochford Hotel, Rochford Hundred Golf Club, Rochford District Residents and Rochford Hundred Amenity Society. Other groups which represent local communities and businesses, including Rochford Parish Council, as well as other Parish/Town Councils in the District, the Federation of Small Businesses and local Chambers of Trade have also been consulted on the Plan. In particular officers have met with the Rochford Chamber of Trade to encourage participation in the preparation of the Plan and to take into consideration their comments and suggestions.

The responses from these individuals and organisations have been carefully considered in the development of the Plan, and have been taken into account as set out in the Consultation Statement.

- 1.5. How does the AAP relate to the main recommendations of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)? Is there a clear audit trail between the SA and the reasons for selecting the preferred strategy?

The SA, in particular Table 4.1, sets out the reasons for the selection and rejection of the preferred and alternative options considered during the preparation of the Rochford AAP. However, the assessment recognises at paragraph 4.42 that although the SA findings are used by the Council in its decision-making, there are other factors that need to be taken into account when determining the way forward. Table 4.1, for example, makes reference to the influence of the challenging market conditions and community involvement in the preparation of the Plan.

In terms of the preferred strategy, the SA concluded that:

“On the whole, the findings of the SA suggest that the emerging AAP policies will make significant contributions to the progression of SA objectives.” (paragraph 5.3).

- 1.6. How does the AAP relate to the Localism Act, the Government’s Growth Agenda and the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework)?

The key issue for planning enshrined in the Localism Act is the Duty to Cooperate. The Council has complied with the Duty to Cooperate as set out above at 1.3.

The Rochford AAP has been positively prepared and identifies potential opportunity sites to accommodate sustainable development, which are considered to be realistic and deliverable. As such the Plan is in compliance with the NPPF, and is positive in terms of the Government’s Growth Agenda.

- 1.7. Sustainability: There is a need for the Government’s model policy of a presumption in favour of sustainable development or a similarly worded policy.

The above comment is noted. If deemed necessary, we can include text within the Plan, where appropriate.

2 Matter 2: A framework for a better Rochford (Section 3 and policy 1)

- 2.1. How robust are the five key objectives (page 21)?

The five key objectives of the Plan set out how the vision for Rochford town centre will be achieved over the plan period, and are considered to be appropriate and deliverable.

The five objectives stem from Core Strategy Policy RTC5, and have been appraised in the SA alongside the vision for Rochford town centre; the compatibility assessment is provided in Appendix V. The SA concluded that:

“Overall the vision and objectives are compatible with the majority of SA objectives.” (paragraph 5.1).

These objectives have been integrated in the policies for the town centre, for example the Plan identifies potential sites for redevelopment over the Plan period, and proposes to protect employment land at Lock’s Hill to the south of the Market Square.

2.2. How sustainable is the spatial framework in Figure 6 and policy 1?

The sustainability of the policies in the Plan has been assessed within the SA and for Policy 1 the SA surmises that:

“This policy requires development to be in accordance with the spatial development framework, which aims to improve accessibility and to respect, and where possible, enhance the character of the area and improve the public realm. All of these aims are consistent with the SA Framework objectives developed for the Rochford AAP, and the predicted effect is one that is positive for sustainability in the long term. The policy has the potential for positive long term effects on communities, the economy, accessibility and landscape/townscape. There is the potential for negative effects on some SA objectives in the short term during construction/ redevelopment as a result of increased traffic, noise and dust; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation is available at the project level and that policies in Core Strategy and Development Management DPDs will ensure that there are no adverse effects.” (paragraph 5.4).

2.3. Housing: How is the Plan responding to the heightened emphasis in the Framework to boost significantly the supply of housing? In view of this emphasis and the requirement in the Framework that local plans should set out clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where, it is important that the AAP gives a steer to the type and quantity of housing development that is likely to be delivered over the plan period. Should the AAP add anything to the Core Strategy in terms of the provision of affordable housing in the town centre?

The Rochford AAP is positive about sustainable development within the town centre. Potential opportunity sites for development have been identified in the Plan, and our consultants, Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (AMUP), have prepared a note on the potential residential capacity for these four sites (see Appendix 1).

In terms of the provision of affordable housing, Core Strategy Policy H4 sets out the overarching approach to affordable housing provision in the District, and it is not considered necessary to repeat this within the Rochford AAP.

2.4. Retail development: Is the estimated retail capacity set out in the consultant’s retail report (Ref. EB12) still realistic for Rochford? If so, how does the spatial framework of the AAP respond to this need both in terms of location and phasing?

Section 3.3 of the Plan acknowledges the changes that have occurred; a tougher economic climate and new developments (including the development of Sainsbury’s at the western end of West Street), since the publication of the Issues and Options Document in 2009.

The Plan has been prepared in conjunction with property specialists GL Hearn, who have analysed the potential opportunity sites identified in the 2009 document and have provided expert advice on developing the proposals for Rochford town centre.

AMUP/GL Hearn did not identify any additional sites or the demand / need for a large supermarket in the town.

- 2.5. Is the transport framework set out in Figure 7, justified and deliverable within the plan period? Has the potential for increased pedestrian priority and public transport been maximised in the AAP? Is the AAP sufficiently clear as to what changes/improvements to the highway network are proposed? What are the conservation and landscape implications, if any? Does the AAP need to have a policy stance on taxis and rear service roads?

The transport proposals in the AAP were formulated in conjunction with transport and public realm consultants, Alan Baxter Associates, who liaised with Essex County Council Highway Authority, - the lead partners in the environmental improvements/highway schemes identified in the Plan (Table 1). Figure 7 of the Plan clearly sets out the locations in the AAP area where improvements to junctions have been identified. The proposed junction improvements are set out in Table 1. Although Rochford District Council are not the local highway authority, the Plan sets out the schemes that the local planning authority wish to see delivered over the plan period.

Proposed improvements to the Market Square, which is the centre of the town, have been enshrined in Policy 6 which requires:

“Public realm enhancements should be focused on the creation of an improved Market Square and include the rationalisation and reduction in the number of car parking spaces and the potential relocation of the taxi rank to an appropriately central and accessible location” (point 4)

Two examples of how these principles for improvements to the Market Square could be delivered in practice have been identified in the Plan (Figures 11 and 12). However, these examples are proposed to be included in an accompanying topic paper rather than in the Plan itself (see Schedule of Changes).

The options for the transport network have been considered holistically in the plan making process. The proposals for the Market Square, for example, have been appraised within the SA accompanying the Plan, which concluded that proposed traffic management measures in Policy 6 could have a positive impact on balanced communities, economy and employment, and accessibility SA objectives in particular. The SA found that traffic management improvements would likely have a positive effect on cultural heritage in the medium to long term, and public realm improvements were found to have a positive impact on the landscape and townscape SA objective.

- 2.6. Heritage and the environment: How much guidance does the Plan provide to ensure that the development of the town centre pays special attention to conservation and archaeological considerations?

The Rochford AAP recognises the contribution of the historic fabric in the town centre to its sustainability, and the importance of the historic environment, particularly the Market Square, is reflected in both the vision and objectives of the Plan. The second key objective, for example, seeks enhancements to the town centre where appropriate.

The Plan identifies a number of character areas within the study area, based on those within the Rochford Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (see Figure 9) and sets out policies for each character area which seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the Conservation Area. The building on the eastern side of the Market Square is identified as a potential opportunity site in Figure 6 and Policy 6 (Character Area A: Central Area) sets out the key requirements for any development in this area should a site come forward.

The SA surmises that Policy 5 (Rochford’s Character Areas) would have positive implications for the cultural heritage objective, although it does note within the assessment for this policy and in policies 6-9 that:

“Policies contained within the Core Strategy and Development Management DPDs will help to ensure that proposed development does not adversely affect any important local heritage.” (page vi – 23).

Policies 6-9, which address each identified character area in turn would likely have both positive and uncertain sustainability implications in terms of cultural heritage. However, the SA notes that although any uncertain effects identified have the potential to be negative, it is likely that these could be mitigated at the planning application stage (paragraph 0.21). For cultural heritage in particular, the SA notes that the potentially significant negative effects would be short term, resulting from heavy vehicles movements during construction and improvement to the public realm and frontages impacting on the setting of heritage assets.

3 Matter 3: Proposals Plan, shopping frontages and sites (Section 4 and policies 2, 3 and 4)

3.1. Are the proposed changes to the town centre boundary justified and realistic?

The changes to the town centre boundary are based on the findings of the Retail and Leisure Study (61.EB12) and have been prepared in consultation with specialist property consultants, GL Hearn. The Retail and Leisure Study noted that although town centre activities are predominately located on West Street, South Street and North Street, the town centre boundary extends eastwards along East Street and Weir Pond Road. The inclusion of this area within the boundary has the effect of diluting the town centre activities due to the proportion of residential and other non-retail uses in this location (paragraphs 6.27 and 10.24). Indeed, a key opportunity identified by the Study is the potential to rationalise the town centre boundary. As such, the Plan proposes to remove East Street and Weir Pond Road from the town centre boundary.

The Plan also proposes to include the railway station and the Council offices within the town centre boundary as these are key facilities within the town supporting the local economy (section 4.1). The proposed revision to the town centre boundary is therefore considered to be both justified and realistic.

- 3.2. How much comparison goods retail floorspace has been completed over the last decade? What level of interest has been expressed from potential developers/retailers in new retail provision in the town centre?

The Rochford AAP has been prepared in conjunction with GL Hearn who provided a view on current market conditions, including examining demand for new development. As such the Plan has been prepared to reflect the change in market conditions and new developments that have occurred in the town since the publication of the Issues and Options Document in 2009.

The Council has been monitoring the supply of employment land in the District, including the provision of retail (A1) floorspace in the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) since 2004-05. However, the monitoring of retail (A1) floorspace does not distinguish between comparison or convenience retail floorspace or differentiate between the locations of retail floorspace. Although it is not possible to give the proportion of comparison goods retail floorspace that has been completed over the last decade as this is not recorded, Appendix 2 sets out the amount of retail floorspace developed between 2004-05 and 2011-12.

In terms of the level of interest from developments/retailers, the Retail and Leisure Study reported that between October 2007 and April 2008 four retailers registered demand for sites within Rochford town centre.

- 3.3. What would happen if the retail growth envisaged in the consultant’s study failed to materialise? Would it not be cheaper and more effective to focus on bringing into use empty shop units in the town centre? Is the policy substantively more than being aspirational?

The Rochford AAP is aspirational, yet deliverable, and has been prepared in conjunction with GL Hearn, who provided a view on current market conditions, and AMUP, specialist planning consultants with experience in preparing town centre plans. The Plan has been prepared to reflect the change in market conditions; a tougher economic climate and new development in the AAP area, since the publication of the Issues and Options Document in 2009.

The Council’s Economic Development team regularly monitor vacancy rates in the town centres, villages and industrial estates. On a quarterly basis any changes in use are recorded, and the team collate a list of any vacant units in locations across the District. The team send any business that contacts them asking for potential units a list of vacant units meeting their specifications using both their data and data from estate agents. The District has low vacancy rates and a fast turnaround for any properties that do become vacant, for example, in Rochford town centre in October 2013 there were eight vacant premises recorded, which equates to just over 7% of total premises in the town centre.

Any properties that remain empty for a prolonged period of time will be investigated by the team to ascertain why. Suitable and appropriate measures are then taken to remedy this. The team also work with other Council departments to manage empty properties, including the Leisure department, to utilise any opportunities to convert consistently empty properties into something appropriate for the area – for example

pop up shops, arts and craft display areas etc. An Empty Shops Strategy will be prepared for the District in due course.

- 3.4. Does the AAP adequately address proposals for food and drink establishments and the issues of the evening economy?

Within the revised primary shopping frontage area, Policy 2 seeks to strike a balance between ensuring a predominance of retail uses within this core area whilst permitting some complementary non-retail uses. It is proposed that A3 (Restaurants and cafés) and A4 (Drinking establishments) are permitted within the primary shopping frontage area provided this would not result in less than 65% of the frontage in the area being in retail (A1) use. The policy sets additional criteria for considering applications for non-retail uses.

Policy 3 also seeks to balance retail and other complementary town centre uses within the secondary shopping frontage area, including food and drinking establishments, through setting criteria to ensure that proposals would not be detrimental to the primary shopping frontage area, or create a cluster of uses within the same use class, and would positively contribute to the centre.

- 3.5. Are policies 2 and 3 which set the framework for the development of retail and other uses in the primary and secondary shopping frontages respectively, together with their proposed locations as defined in Figure 8, appropriate and realistic to meet the needs of the Borough?

The primary shopping frontage has been revised to focus predominantly on the north side of the Market Square which is considered to be the core area where retail uses should be focused. Policy 2, in line with Core Strategy Policy RTC5, seeks a predominance of retail uses within this area, whilst taking a more positive approach towards A3 (Restaurants and cafés) and A4 (Drinking establishments). The goal to retain 65% of the frontage in retail use is considered to be realistic and achievable given the current mix of uses within this area.

The secondary shopping frontage has been extended to include additional units at the western end of West Street (including Sainsbury’s) and along Roche Close to the north of the Market Square (to include Co-Op and the neighbouring units). Policy 3 seeks to encourage an appropriate mix of town centre uses (Class A and D) to complement those within the primary shopping frontage.

- 3.6. Is the management of employment development at Locks Hill in policy 4 realistic and consistent with paragraph 22 of the Framework?

The part of Locks Hill (Policy 4) identified in Figure 8 is currently in office (B1a) use. The proposed allocation of this area for employment use (and specifically office use) is based on the recommendations of the Employment Land Study (54.EB5). This Study recognises the importance of this cluster of office space in the District and recommends its protection.

The Employment Land Study notes that:

“The major office location within Rochford, at Locks Hill in the centre of Rochford itself, is not allocated as an employment site. Given the increasing future requirements for office stock set out in our base case and two scenarios we recommend that Rochford District Council should allocate the land at Locks Hill as employment land to emphasise the importance of the site for employment use. This will help to safeguard future office supply in the town centre.” (page ii-iii).

The Employment Land Study’s recommendation to allocate Lock’s Hill for employment use is supported by property specialists GL Hearn.

The proposed allocation of this area for employment use, and the criteria for managing employment development in this area, is realistic and consistent with paragraph 22 of the NPPF.

4 Matter 4: Rochford’s Character Areas (Section 5 and policies 5-9)

- 4.1. Is the character area-led approach in policy 5 appropriate and realistic for the town centre?

The Plan recognises that the historic environment significantly contributes to the character of the town centre, and it seeks to preserve and, where possible, enhance the historic environment. Four character areas have been identified within the Conservation Area which extends across the town centre, informed by those identified in the 2007 Rochford Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan to ensure that proposals respond both positively and sensitively to the identified character areas.

Policy 5 sets out the main principles for development within the character areas; largely in relation to improving the pedestrian environment and opportunities for sustainable travel. Policies 6-9 take each character area in turn and set out specific criteria for any development proposals based on the challenges and opportunities presented within each area.

This is considered to be a focused approach to ensuring the protection, and where appropriate, the enhancement of the town centre within the overall framework of the Plan.

- 4.2. Do policies 5-9 provide clear strategic direction for new development within the town centre, for example in relation to the opportunity sites identified in Figure 6?

Each policy gives guidance on the type of development that would be appropriate depending on the character of the surrounding area. As such it promotes development within the town centre, whilst responding positively to the fabric of the historic environment.

- 4.3. The Framework (paragraph 182) states that for a local plan to be justified, it has to be the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. Whilst the need for flexibility is recognised, and options can be explained, the AAP needs to make it clear which is the preferred option for the Market Square, should resources permit. Failure to do this runs counter to the Framework tests of justification and effectiveness, and fails to provide the level of

certainty which is necessary for the implementation of the AAP and could prejudice other planning proposals in and around the Market Square.

The above comment is noted. The Council have considered this further and looked at potential modifications to this part of the Plan. It is proposed to remove the two examples of intervention for the Market Square, based on the principles set out in Policy 6, and include these within an accompanying topic paper (see Schedule of Changes).

5 Matter 5: Infrastructure, delivery and monitoring (Section 6 and Table 2)

- 5.1. Are the key infrastructure providers signed up to the delivery of the key schemes in the AAP? Is the Council aiming to publish an Infrastructure Delivery Plan?

The Plan has been prepared by AMUP who have worked in conjunction with other specialist consultancies in the development of the Plan. The main infrastructure issue for the Plan is highways.

The proposals in the AAP were formulated in conjunction with transport and public realm consultants, Alan Baxter Associates, and AMUP who liaised with Essex County Council Highway Authority. Essex County Council Highways Authority did not object to the Plan during pre-submission consultation on transport grounds.

The Council does not intend to produce a separate Infrastructure Delivery Plan for this AAP.

- 5.2. Are there any showstoppers which threaten to halt the delivery of key schemes in the AAP?

No. The AAP has been prepared in consultation with key stakeholders and service providers and no issues have been identified

- 5.3. What is the critical path for securing the effectiveness of the AAP?

The Implementation, Delivery and Monitoring chapter of AAP sets out how the policies in the Plan will be delivered and the monitoring mechanisms that will be used.

- 5.4. Has a developers’ brief been prepared for the Market Square, outlining the likely costs involved and a timetable for implementation?

A developer’s brief has not been prepared for the Market Square, however, Table 1 sets out the key partners, indicative costs and potential funding streams for environmental improvements / highways schemes, including for the Market Square.

- 5.5. When is it envisaged that a CIL will be adopted by the Council?

It is anticipated that the CIL will be adopted in April 2015.

- 5.6. How will the monitoring arrangements work? Should this matter be addressed by a policy in the AAP?

The Council have a service level agreement with Essex County Council to undertake the monitoring of development in the District, which is reported in the Annual Monitoring Report.

The Council’s Economic Development team also monitor changes to retail and business units in the town centres, villages and industrial estates, as discussed above, on a quarterly basis.

It is not considered necessary to include a specific policy on monitoring within this AAP.

6 Appendix 1 – Potential Residential Capacity of Opportunity Sites

The below sets out the potential residential capacity for the four opportunity sites identified in the Plan (Figure 6); the Spar building, the Police Station, the Rail Station Car Park (adjacent to the Freight House) and North Street (at the junction with Weir Pond Road).

Spar Building

Site area: 391 sq m

30 dph = c. 1 unit

75 dph = c. 3 units

120 dph = c. 5 units

Typology: mixed-use, flats with commercial space.

Recommendation: the target should be a minimum 3 residential units on first floor with commercial space below; small residential units (i.e. 1- or 2-bedroom) would be suitable in this location.

Justification: the capacity of the site for residential development is limited due to the requirement for commercial uses at ground floor level in this key town centre location and the sensitivity of adjacent buildings to a replacement taller building. As such, only a single floor of the site is suitable for residential development and, despite its accessible location, the number of dwellings that could be achieved per hectare is relatively low compared to less constrained sites.

Police Station

Site area: 1,936 sq m

30 dph = c. 6 units

75 dph = c. 15 units

120 dph = c. 23 units

Typology: conversion of main building to flats, with new mews housing to the rear.

Recommendation: the target should be a minimum 15 residential units; the converted main building would be suitable for small residential units (i.e. 1- or 2-bedroom) and medium size residential units (i.e. 2- or 3-bedroom) would be suitable elsewhere across the site.

Justification: the main building is of historic interest, being included on the draft Local List SPD, and should be retained. It would be suitable for conversion to flats, which would result in a reasonably dense form of development. The remainder of the site would be suitable for mews houses, which would be a less dense form of development, given the need to respect the amenity of immediately adjoining house.

Rail Station Car Park

Site area: 2,347 sq m

30 dph = c. 7 units

75 dph = c. 18 units

120 dph = c. 28 units

Typology: flats

Recommendation: if the site is developed for new homes, the target should be a minimum 18 residential units; smaller residential units (i.e. 1- or 2-bedroom) would be suitable in this location.

Justification: the capacity of the site for residential development is limited due to the shape of the site and the need for the mitigation measures that would be required on account of the adjacent rail line. Therefore, despite its very accessible location, the number of dwellings that could be achieved per hectare is relatively low compared to less constrained sites. However, it should be noted that the AAP does not endorse the development of this site for residential uses.

North Street

Site area: 1,170 sq m

30 dph = c. 4 units

75 dph = c. 9 units

120 dph = c. 14 units

Typology: terrace houses and / or mixed-use, flats with commercial space.

Recommendation: the target should be a minimum 9 residential units; small (i.e. 1- or 2-bedroom) and medium size (i.e. 2- or 3-bedroom) residential units would be suitable in this location. Residential units on the first floor with commercial space below would be suitable along the site’s frontage with North Street.

Justification: Development should complete the existing block, and respect the form of smaller, two-storey units on the edge of the recent Roche Close development and Ash Cottage (which is included in the draft Local List SPD) to the north of the site. Therefore, either terrace houses with gardens or a single floor of flats above commercial uses would be suitable.

7 Appendix 2 – Retail (A1) Floorspace Provision

The following information on retail (a1) floorspace provision in the District are extracted from the published Annual Monitoring Reports which are available on the Council’s website (http://www.rochford.gov.uk/planning/policy/local_development_framework/evidence_base/annual_monitoring_reports) .

Annual Monitoring Report 2004-05 – In 2004-05 retail development approved and completed was as outlined in the below:

	Retail floor space outstanding 04-05 (m ²)	Retail floor space completed 04-05 (m ²)
Town centre	1281	0
Edge of centre	0	0
Out of centre	4934	520
Out of town	1585	0
TOTAL	8073	520

Annual Monitoring Report 2005-06 – In 2005-06 retail development completed was as outlined in the table below:

	Retail floor space completed 05-06 (m ²)	Of which on previously developed land (m ² / %)
Town centre	0	-
Edge of centre	0	-
Out of centre	1862	1862 / 100%
Out of town	0	0
TOTAL	1862	1862 / 100%

Outstanding retail development yet to be completed in 2005-06 was as outlined in the table below:

	Outstanding retail floor space 05-06 (m ²)	Of which on previously developed land (m ² / %)
TOTAL	3972	3972 / 100%

**Rochford District Council – Rochford Area Action Plan Submission Document
Examination: Rochford District Council’s Hearing Statement (January 2014)**

Annual Monitoring Report 2006-07 – In 2006-07 the amount of completed employment generating development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total completed in Rochford District		Completed in employment areas		Completed on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>
A1 Retail	1131 sq. m	N/A	N/A	N/A	1131 sq. m (100%)	N/A

In 2006-07 the amount of employment development lost was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total loss in Rochford District		Lost in employment areas		Lost to residential development	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>
A1 Retail	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A

In 2006-07 the net change in employment development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Net development in Rochford District		Net in employment areas		Percentage on previously developed land (PDL)
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	%
A1 Retail	1131 sq. m	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%

**Rochford District Council – Rochford Area Action Plan Submission Document
Examination: Rochford District Council’s Hearing Statement (January 2014)**

Annual Monitoring Report 2007-08 – In 2007-08 the amount of completed employment generating development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total completed in Rochford District		Completed in employment areas		Completed on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>
A1 Retail	-320 sq. m	N/A	N/A	N/A	1538 sq. m (100%)	N/A

In 2007-08 the amount of employment development lost was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total loss in Rochford District		Lost in employment areas		Lost to residential development	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>
A1 Retail	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A

In 2007-08 the net change in employment development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Net development in Rochford District		Net in employment areas		Percentage on previously developed land (PDL)
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	%
A1 Retail	-320 sq. m	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%

**Rochford District Council – Rochford Area Action Plan Submission Document
Examination: Rochford District Council’s Hearing Statement (January 2014)**

As of 31 March 2008 the outstanding permissions for employment development were as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total outstanding permissions in Rochford District		Outstanding permissions on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>
A1 Retail	1184sq. m	N/A	1184 sq. m (100%)	N/A

Annual Monitoring Report 2008-09 – In 2008-09 the amount of completed employment generating development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total (gross) completed in Rochford District		Completed in employment areas		Completed on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>
A1 Retail	0 sq. m	N/A	N/A	N/A	0 sq. m (100%)	N/A

In 2008-09 the amount of employment development lost was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total loss in Rochford District		Lost in employment areas		Lost to residential development	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	<i>Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)</i>
A1 Retail	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A

**Rochford District Council – Rochford Area Action Plan Submission Document
Examination: Rochford District Council’s Hearing Statement (January 2014)**

In 2008-09 the net change in employment development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Net development in Rochford District		Net in employment areas		Percentage on previously developed land (PDL)
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	%
A1 Retail	0 sq. m	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

As of 31 March 2009 the outstanding permissions for employment development were as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total outstanding permissions in Rochford District		Outstanding permissions on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	1112 sq. m	N/A	382 sq. m	N/A

Annual Monitoring Report 2009-10 – In 2009-10 the amount of completed employment generating development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total (gross) completed in Rochford District		Completed in employment areas		Completed on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	0 sq. m	N/A	N/A	N/A	0 sq. m	0

**Rochford District Council – Rochford Area Action Plan Submission Document
Examination: Rochford District Council’s Hearing Statement (January 2014)**

In 2009-10 the amount of employment development lost was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total loss in Rochford District		Lost in employment areas		Lost to residential development	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A

In 2009-10 the net change in employment development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Net development in Rochford District		Net in employment areas		Percentage on previously developed land (PDL)
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	%
A1 Retail	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

As of 31 March 2010 the outstanding permissions for employment development were as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total outstanding permissions in Rochford District		Outstanding permissions on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	2000 sq. m	N/A	1100 sq. m (55%)	N/A

**Rochford District Council – Rochford Area Action Plan Submission Document
Examination: Rochford District Council’s Hearing Statement (January 2014)**

Annual Monitoring Report 2010-11 – In 2010-11 the amount of completed employment generating development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total (gross) completed in Rochford District		Completed in Employment Areas		Completed on Previously Developed Land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	382 sq m	N/A	0	N/A	382 sq m	N/A

In 2010-11 the amount of employment development lost was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total Loss in Rochford District		Lost in Employment Areas		Lost to Residential Development	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	300	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A

In 2010-11 the net change in employment development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Net Development in Rochford District		Net in employment Areas		Percentage on Previously Developed Land (PDL)
	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	%
A1 Retail	82 sq m	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% (based on floorspace)

**Rochford District Council – Rochford Area Action Plan Submission Document
Examination: Rochford District Council’s Hearing Statement (January 2014)**

As of 31 March 2011 the outstanding permissions for employment development were as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total outstanding permissions in Rochford District		Outstanding permissions on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	1347 sq m	N/A	1347 sq m (100%)	N/A

Annual Monitoring Report 2011-12 – In 2011-12 the amount of completed employment generating development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total (gross) completed in Rochford District		Completed in Employment Areas		Completed on Previously Developed Land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	287 sq. m	N/A	0	N/A	287 sq. m	N/A

In 2011-12 the amount of employment development lost was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total Loss in Rochford District		Lost in Employment Areas		Lost to Residential Development	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	948	N/A	948 sq. m	N/A	0	N/A

**Rochford District Council – Rochford Area Action Plan Submission Document
Examination: Rochford District Council’s Hearing Statement (January 2014)**

In 2011-12 the net change in employment development was as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Net Development in Rochford District		Net in employment Areas		Percentage on Previously Developed Land (PDL)
	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and Land Area (ha)	Estimated Jobs (based on floorspace)	%
A1 Retail	-661 sq. m	N/A	-948 sq. m	N/A	100% (based on floorspace)

As of 31 March 2012 the outstanding permissions for employment development were as outlined in the table below (retail development extracted):

	Total outstanding permissions in Rochford District		Outstanding permissions on previously developed land (PDL)	
	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)	Floorspace (sq. m) and land area (ha)	Estimated jobs (based on floorspace)
A1 Retail	1060 sq. m	N/A	1060 sq. m (100%)	N/A