

# Local Development Framework

## Allocations DPD

### Discussion and Consultation Document Updated Sustainability Appraisal – Non Technical Summary



**LDF**

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

## **Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
Introduction .....	5
Purpose of the Allocations DPD and the Sustainability Appraisal .....	5
Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment.....	7
Allocations SA Scoping and Issues for Sustainability .....	8
SA Framework .....	8
Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations.....	9
Recommendations/Key Observations.....	10
Consultation on the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document and the draft SA Report .....	44
Implementation and Monitoring.....	44
Conclusion and Next Steps.....	44



## **Introduction**

### **Purpose of the Allocations DPD and the Sustainability Appraisal**

- 1.1 Rochford District Council is at the preliminary stage of preparing the Allocations DPD, which will form part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF).
- 1.2 The Allocations DPD sits below the Core Strategy in the LDF. The Core Strategy sets out the broad policies to guide the future development of the District, addressing a range of issues including housing, employment, open spaces and community facilities. Broad locations for the allocation of new housing and employment development for example are identified within the Core Strategy.
- 1.3 In turn, the Allocations DPD will set out site specific policies for the different land uses in accordance within the Core Strategy. It will address a number of issues such as housing (including Gypsy and Traveller site options), employment land, environmental and landscape designations, educational, community and leisure facilities, open space and town centre allocations.
- 1.4 The initial stage of the Allocations DPD, called the Discussion and Consultation Document, was published for public consultation in March/April 2010. The purpose of this document is to set out a number of options for the specific issues it seeks to address, for example, it identifies a number of potential sites within each of the general locations for housing development.
- 1.5 In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document has been the subject of, and has been produced in conjunction with, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). This SA should be read in conjunction with the SA/SEA of the Rochford District Core Strategy, which was adopted on 13 December 2011, including addendums to such work.
- 1.6 The purpose of the SA is to ensure that wider sustainability issues, encompassing environmental, economic and social implications of options or policies proposed, are taken into consideration throughout the preparation of Development Plan Documents.

### **Vision and Objectives**

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

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

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

***Key Planning Objectives:***

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

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

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

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

1.9 Whilst these objectives are not explicitly referred to within the Discussion and Consultation Document, the Allocations DPD seeks to deliver key aspects of the Core Strategy in relation to housing (including Gypsy and Traveller site options), employment land, environmental and landscape designations, educational, community and leisure facilities, open space and town centres.

**Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations**

1.10 The SEA Regulations set out certain requirements for reporting the SEA process, and specify that if an integrated appraisal is undertaken (i.e. SEA is subsumed within the SA process, as for the SA of the Rochford LDF), then the sections of the main Environmental Report that meet the requirements set out for reporting the SEA process must be clearly signposted. The requirements for reporting the SEA process are set out in Appendix 1 and within each relevant section of the main Sustainability Appraisal, as appropriate. The Sustainability Appraisal should also be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.

## Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document: Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)

---

- 1.11 The relationship of the different documents forming the LDF, the current condition of the environment within Rochford District and the sustainability issues (encompassing environmental problems) are summarised within the Core Strategy Submission SA non-technical summary.

### Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.12 The Sustainability Appraisal has been produced alongside the Discussion and Consultation version of the Allocations DPD, and as such has been undertaken in accordance with the advice set out in the guidance on the preparation of SAs for Development Plan Documents published in 2005<sup>1</sup>. This guidance has since been superseded (in September 2009) by the CLG Plan Making Manual<sup>2</sup>, which continues to refer to guidance on undertaking Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) published in 2005<sup>3</sup>. This Sustainability Appraisal will combine the SEA guidance with the advice within the Plan Making Manual.
- 1.13 An overarching LDF Scoping Report generic to all LDF Development Plan Documents has already been prepared. This was produced during the preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Document and as such the overarching SA of the Council's LDF is the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. This was in accordance with government guidance which stated that the SA must be proportionate to the plan in question and it should not repeat the appraisal of higher level policy.
- 1.14 The SEA Baseline Information Profile for the District, which contains a wealth of environmental, economic and social information, is produced by Essex County Council and updated on an annual basis. This document has been used to inform the assessments and will therefore enable a consistent methodology and approach to all LDF documents, and a wide ranging set of information has been included to ensure the full appraisal of individual documents. The evidence base supporting the development of the Core Strategy has also been drawn upon, as appropriate.
- 1.15 The stages of the SA process are outlined in Table 1 below.

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

Stage	Task
Stage A	SA Scoping Process
Stage B	Developing and refining options and assessing effects.

---

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

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

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

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

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical  
Summary)**

Stage	Task
Stage C	Preparing the SA Report.
Stage D	Consulting on the Plan and the SA Report.
Stage E	Monitoring and implementing the Plan.

1.16 The SA/SEA of the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document has been prepared in accordance with these requirements for SA/SEA.

**Allocations SA Scoping and Issues for Sustainability**

1.17 In the context of scoping the Allocations DPD it was considered a useful exercise to re-examine the previous findings of this stage as set out in the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report. The scope of the SA was consulted on and comments were received and considered on the Scoping Report as set out below. The remaining stages of the SA process have been completed as an integral part of the Allocations DPD preparation.

1.18 The key sustainability issues for the District are identified in Table 3.1 of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. It is considered that this list is of relevance to the Allocations DPD. These issues were used in developing the objectives and policies of the document.

**SA Framework**

1.19 The SA Framework was refined during the preparation of the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report. The final SA Framework used to appraise the development of the Core Strategy DPD is set out in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.

1.20 The SA Framework used in the appraisal of the Core Strategy Submission Document was adapted from that of the Core Strategy Submission Document to reflect the differing perspectives and scales of the Development Plan Document, where appropriate. Three statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) were consulted on the draft SA Framework, and the final framework was amended to reflect the responses received, as appropriate.

**Table 2 – SA Objectives**

SA Objective Headings	
1. Balanced Communities	8. Landscape & Townscape
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	9. Climate Change & Energy
3. Housing	10. Water
4. Economy & Employment	11. Land & Soil
5. Accessibility	12. Air Quality
6. Biodiversity	13. Sustainable Design & Construction

7. Cultural Heritage

- 1.21 Each option included within the Discussion and Consultation Document and the additional alternative options identified through the consultation on this document have been appraised against the SA Framework, where appropriate. A broad assessment of whether effects are likely to be cumulative, short, medium and long-term, temporary or permanent has been included, where possible, in relation to the SA objectives are detailed within the main Sustainability Appraisal.

**Uncertainties and Assumptions**

- 1.22 Throughout the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal process for the Discussion and Consultation Document, data gaps, limitations and uncertainties were uncovered. Even at this level it is not always possible to accurately predict sustainability effects due to assumptions that may be made or other uncertainties encountered.
- 1.23 The effect of the options on biodiversity is unclear and would depend on the exact site coming forward for development, although where development is likely to have an impact, this is indicated within the options. Potential mitigation measures have also been indicated where appropriate. There are uncertainties in terms of flooding and the prediction of effects at this relatively strategic level, and again this would depend on the site taken forward. However, the assessment has identified areas at risk of flooding (flood zone 2 and 3) and has suggested potential mitigation measures, where appropriate. In terms of other sources of flooding, surface water has not been fully assessed at present due to the Surface Water Management Plan still being in draft format, however, the ability of the different options to accommodate Sustainable Drainage Systems has been considered within the assessment.
- 1.24 The impact of the different options on light and noise pollution, for example, are difficult to predict. Other uncertainties include whether the size of some sites would impact on the viability of some Sustainable Drainage System measures and the impact of development on soil quality. Assumptions such as the provision of onsite renewable or low carbon energy technologies on a site should it be taken forward have also been made. These uncertainties and assumptions have been acknowledged in the appraisal matrices, where applicable.
- 1.25 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report also identifies more strategic scale uncertainties such as the impacts of climate change (see Section 5 & 6 and further detail in Appendix V, VI and VII of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report).

**Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations**

- 1.26 Potential mitigation measures to offset adverse effects and opportunities to enhance options have been explored within the assessments, and initial recommendations have been included as appropriate, for example the inclusion of a wildlife corridor and need to accommodate non-vulnerable uses within areas at risk of flooding, in order to inform the development of the next stage of the document (the Pre-Submission Document).

## **Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document: Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

---

- 1.27 Strategic mitigation measures and recommendations for the Core Strategy Submission Document, which the Allocations DPD must conform to, are detailed within the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 1.28 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies potential indicators for monitoring which relate to the SA Framework objectives. The Allocations DPD is a key component to deliver the Core Strategy. The potential indicators for monitoring the Allocations DPD are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal. Suggested amendments have been highlighted.

### **Recommendations/Key Observations**

- 1.29 The table below identifies the range of reasonable options in the Allocations DPD in respect of residential, employment, environmental and landscape designations, educational, community and leisure facilities, open space and town centre allocations, and pulls together a summary of the recommendations/key observations identified through the SA process.

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

**Table 3 – Alternative Options set out in the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document and Recommendations/Key Observations following Sustainability Appraisal**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
<b>Residential Options</b>	
<p><b>North of London Road</b></p> <p>Five options for the allocation of 550 dwellings considered: Option NLR1, Option NLR2, Option NLR3, Option NLR4 and Option NLR5.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option NLR5 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives, particularly in terms of accessibility and the impact on landscape character and the Green Belt to the north of London Road, and would enable the development of a public transport link between Rawreth Lane and London Road.</li> <li>2. Cohesive development in this general location would depend upon the reallocation and redevelopment of Rawreth Industrial Estate which is situated to the east of most of the options, with the exception of Option NLR3, for residential use.</li> <li>3. The relationship between Options NLR1 to NLR5 and the options for employment land to the west of Rayleigh (primarily to the south of London Road) would need to be taken into consideration, in particular the impact on the highway network, landscape, the Green Belt, and the provision of a green buffer to the west of the residential options.</li> <li>4. The impact of areas at risk of flooding on the siting of residential development would need to be carefully considered, but residential development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</li> <li>5. The existing playing field to the south of the site is an established community facility which should be retained.</li> <li>6. If the options may not be able to accommodate the number of dwellings at an appropriate density then a composite of the different options presented at the initial Discussion and Consultation Document stage may be required.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
<p><b>West Rochford</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 600 dwellings considered: Option WR1, Option WR2, Option WR3, Option WR4, Option ALT2 and Option ALT3.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option WR1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives, in particular through impact on the Green Belt, accessibility, landscape impact, and sustainable transport promotion.</li> <li>2. The impact of flood risk areas would need to be carefully considered, but development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</li> <li>3. There is potential for the provision of a bus service heading west from the options, towards the main routes into Southend and to proposed employment growth at Southend Airport.</li> <li>4. The design of any development coming forward would need to be carefully considered within the context of the Conservation Area.</li> <li>5. Option ALT2 performs well against the sustainability objectives, particularly in terms of promoting development in an accessible location and promoting sustainable methods of travel, but would not be able to accommodate the full housing requirements for the general location of 'West Rochford', which may lead to fragmented development.</li> <li>6. Option ALT3 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives as the areas at risk of flooding could significantly constrain the capacity of the site, and have negative implications for the delivery of housing and associated infrastructure in particular.</li> </ol>
<p><b>West Hockley</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 50 dwellings considered: Option WH1, Option WH2, Option WH3, Option WH4, Option WH5 and Option ALT4</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option WH2 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives. Although there may be a short term impact on local employment, this option would promote the development of previously developed land, and have a lesser impact on the Green Belt and areas of ecological importance than other options. Option WH5 performs well, with the exception of including some greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available.</li> <li>2. An area of public open space may be provided within Options WH1 and WH4 to provide a natural buffer between any development and the Local Wildlife Sites.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Sites/Ancient Woodland may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the sites in the medium to long term.</li> <li>4. Option ALT4 generally performs well against the sustainability objectives compared to other West Hockley alternatives, with the exception that it promotes the development of greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available in the general location of 'West Hockley'.</li> </ol>
<p><b>South Hawkwell</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 175 dwellings considered: Option SH1, Option SH2, Option SH3, Option SH4 and Option ALT7</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option SH2 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives, in terms of its relationship with the existing residential area, ability to promote cohesion and potential to retain parts of the wooded area within this location, when compared to the other options for 'South Hawkwell'.</li> <li>2. The impact of flood risk areas would need to be carefully considered, but development can be accommodated whilst avoiding such areas.</li> <li>3. Option ALT7 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives through the provision of housing and associated infrastructure and promoting balanced, healthy communities to a certain extent, although this is outweighed by the impact on the Green Belt and landscape character. However, it has the potential to lead to fragmented development, creating an island of residential development within the Green Belt. In addition, it is not well-related to existing designated residential development.</li> </ol>
<p><b>East Ashingdon</b></p> <p>Three options for the allocation of 100 dwellings considered: Option EA1, Option EA2 and Option EA3.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EA1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for this general location in terms of its location adjacent to King Edmund School, its potential to provide improved access to this facility, and its less significant impact on the Green Belt and landscape character when compared to the alternatives.</li> <li>2. Access to King Edmund School can be provided within Options EA1 and EA3.</li> <li>3. The provision of the list of requirements set out in the Core Strategy Submission Document could take the form of offsite financial contributions for new facilities within the vicinity.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
<p><b>South West Hullbridge</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 500 dwellings considered: Option SWH1, Option SWH2, Option SWH3, Option SWH4, and Option ALT1</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Both Option SWH1 and SWH2 have a similar arrangement in this general location and subsequently have comparable sustainability implications, however, whilst Option SWH2 performs well against the sustainability objectives, Option SWH1 performs even stronger due to its potential lesser impact on landscape character.</li> <li>2. Options SWH1 and SWH2 are well related to the existing residential area and the local services and facilities situated within the village centre along Ferry Road.</li> <li>3. Option SWH2 may have a greater impact on landscape character than Option SWH1 in terms its projection further to the west, which would potentially have a greater visual impact in the locality from the roads to the south.</li> <li>4. Pedestrian links to the east should be provided between the option taken forward and existing residential development rather than road connections to prevent an overburden on the village's existing highway network</li> <li>5. Although Option ALT1 is previously developed land, it does not perform well against the sustainability objectives in terms of the relationship with the existing residential area, accessibility, and the impact on the Green Belt in this location. This option would project into the Green Belt, create fragmented development and potentially undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this location.</li> </ol>
<p><b>South Canewdon</b></p> <p>Options for the allocation of 60 dwellings considered: Option SC1, Option SC2, Option SC3, Option SC4, Option ALT5 and Option ALT6</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Options SC1, SC2 and SC3 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives as opposed to Option SC4 due to their relatively less significant impact on landscape character and the Green Belt.</li> <li>2. Options SC1 and SC2 could accommodate the housing requirements for this general location but would extend the designated residential area further to the south and west respectively.</li> <li>3. Option SC3 is well related to the existing residential area and could accommodate the housing requirements for this general location, but proposes two segregated sites.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. If Option SC3 is taken forward it should be amended to exclude the small site to the west of the road leading to St Nicholas Church to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained, and if possible extended northwards towards St Nicholas Church.</li> <li>5. Careful consideration would need to be given to the design of any development if Option SC3 is taken forward given its proximity to the Canewdon Church Conservation Area which also encompasses a Grade II* Listed Building (particularly if the option is extended northwards).</li> <li>6. Option ALT5 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives in terms of impact on the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardeners Lane, and the Green Belt.</li> <li>7. Option ALT6 performs well against the sustainability objectives as it could provide housing and associated infrastructure and could provide a defensible Green Belt boundary. It is debatable as to whether this site could be considered commensurate within the general location of 'South Canewdon'. However, any development on this site would either have to be at a high density or additional land would be required to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy Submission Document. This has the potential to lead to fragmented development with limited opportunities for providing additional infrastructure.</li> </ol>
<p><b>South East Ashingdon</b></p> <p>Three options for the allocation of 500 dwellings considered: Option SEA1, Option SEA2 and Option SEA3.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option SEA1 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options for this general location of 'South East Ashingdon'.</li> <li>2. Option SEA1 has the potential to provide more equal and sustainable access to local services and facilities, and would be able to create a more defensible Green Belt boundary compared to the other options.</li> <li>3. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
<p><b>West Great Wakering</b></p> <p>Five options for the allocation of 250 dwellings considered: Option WGW1, Option WGW2, Option WGW3, Option WGW4 and Option WGW5.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Options WGW1 and WGW5 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared to the other options. These options promote development on one site which is well related to the existing residential settlement and have the potential to promote a defensible Green Belt boundary.</li> <li>2. Cohesive development in this general location of 'West Great Wakering' would depend upon the redevelopment of Star Lane Industrial Estate for residential use if Option WGW1 is taken forward.</li> <li>3. The relationship between Options WGW1 to WGW5 and the options for employment land to the south of Great Wakering would need to be taken into consideration, in particular the impact on the highway network, landscape and the Green Belt.</li> <li>4. All of the options would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt in the area than Option WGW1.</li> <li>5. The impact of different land levels in the locality on accessibility would also need to be considered.</li> <li>6. Option WGW1 would likely create a more defensible Green Belt boundary than Option WGW5.</li> <li>7. The site to the west of Alexandra Road (part of Option WGW3) could have ecological value, and plans / policies should account for this.</li> <li>8. The impact of any development on the Local Wildlife Site (with the exception of Option WGW5) would need to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this site.</li> <li>9. A green buffer between the Local Wildlife Site and the options (with the exception of Option WGW5) should be provided to help mitigate the impact of development on the site.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
	<p>10. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</p> <p>11. If an option may not be able to accommodate the number of dwellings at an appropriate density then an additional site may be required. In this case, ecological protection may need to be weighed against landscape protection.</p>
<b>Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</b>	
<p><b>Gypsy and Traveller Site Options</b></p> <p>Seven options for the allocation of Gypsy and Traveller pitches were considered: Option GT1, Option GT2, Option GT3, Option GT4, Option GT5, Option GT6 and Option GT7.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option GT1, GT2, GT3, GT6 and GT7 are situated within the western part of the District which accords with the Core Strategy Submission Document.</li> <li>2. Options GT1 and GT2 encompass an existing, if unauthorised, Gypsy and Traveller site, and perform strongly against the sustainability objectives.</li> <li>3. Option GT3 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives, however, high voltage power lines run through this option site and are unlikely to be viable to move given the scale of the potential development.</li> <li>4. Option GT6, if allocated in its entirety, would entail the allocation of more Green Belt land than required.</li> <li>5. Option GT3 would require the reallocation of undeveloped greenfield Green Belt land.</li> <li>6. Option GT2 would involve a greater loss of greenfield land and development projecting into the open countryside (and therefore the Green Belt) than Option GT1.</li> <li>7. Option GT1 would create a defensible Green Belt boundary, whereas Option GT2 may not.</li> <li>8. It is unlikely that additional sites would need to be allocated if Options GT1, GT2 or GT6 are taken forward.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
	<p>9. Highways access from Options GT1, GT2, GT3 and GT6 would need to be negotiated carefully if taken forward.</p> <p>10. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Sites/Ancient Woodland within Option GT4 and GT5 may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the site identified within Option GT1 (10/00582/COU), and permission was refused on 1 November 2010. An appeal was lodged and subsequently refused by notice of 6 December 2011. In balancing the range of considerations, Green Belt and highway issues were very much weighted against the site, and the Inspector’s Report concluded that “Although the overall implications of the proposal in terms of sustainability would be neutral the total level of harm that would arise would be considerable.” (paragraph 76).</p>
<b>Employment Allocations</b>	
<b>Option E1 Baltic Wharf</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option E1 is situated in a relatively inaccessible location and is located on the banks of the river Crouch. This option may continue to impact on this area of ecological importance around the river Crouch.</li> <li>2. However, it is an existing employment site which performs well against the balanced communities and economy &amp; employment sustainability objectives in particular.</li> <li>3. There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.</li> </ol>
<b>Option E2 Swaines Industrial Estate</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option E2 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives particularly in terms of the retention of local employment opportunities and its accessibility to local communities.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Option E3 Purdeys Industrial Estate</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option E3 is an existing employment site which performs well against some of the sustainability objectives particularly in terms of its impact on economy &amp; employment. However, it is acknowledged that the location of this site on the banks of the river Roach would continue to impact on this area of ecological importance.</li> <li>There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.</li> </ol>
<b>Option E4 Riverside Industrial Estate</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option E4 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the balanced communities, accessibility and economy &amp; employment sustainability objectives in particular.</li> <li>However, this option is located on the banks of the river Roach and may continue to impact on this area of ecological importance.</li> </ol>
<b>Option E5 Rochford Business Park</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option E5 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the economy &amp; employment sustainability objective in particular. However, there is potential in the longer term to improve sustainable access to this site.</li> <li>Policies should accompany the allocation of Rochford Business Park which seek to improve links with new employment development in proximity to London Southend Airport, and to take advantage of transportation improvements to which this area will be subject.</li> <li>There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.</li> </ol>
<b>Option E6 Imperial Park Industrial Estate</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option E6 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives, particularly economy &amp; employment and accessibility</li> </ol>
<b>Option E7 Brook Road Industrial Estate</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option E7 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the economy &amp; employment sustainability objective in particular.</li> <li>There is potential to improve public transport links to this site</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Option E8 Aviation Way Industrial Estate</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option E8 is an existing employment site which performs strongly against the economy &amp; employment sustainability objective in particular.</li> <li>2. There is potential to improve public transport links to this site, and for it to benefit from accessibility enhancements in the vicinity of London Southend Airport.</li> <li>3. Any development in this location should carefully consider the potential for surviving deposits beyond the boundary of the airport.</li> </ol>
<b>Option E9 Star Lane Industrial Estate (northern section)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option E9 (the northern section of the Industrial Estate) performs strongly against the sustainability objectives within the context of being reallocated from employment to residential use. It would positively impact on the balanced communities, housing and land &amp; soil objectives in particular.</li> <li>2. This option is currently in use for employment purposes. Any redevelopment of the site for residential development should be done in conjunction with the relocation of existing employment uses. Failure to provide alternative accommodation for existing employment uses will have a negative impact on sustainability objectives, particularly on terms of economy &amp; employment.</li> <li>3. Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'West Great Wakering' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further. Although the cumulative impact of development in the vicinity of the village would need to be carefully considered.</li> <li>4. There is potential to improve public transport links to this site.</li> <li>5. The impact of any redevelopment of this site on the Local Wildlife Site and historic environment would need to be carefully considered.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The proximity of this site to a Local Wildlife Site could impact on biodiversity, although this could be mitigated against. Public open space within any proposal for redevelopment of this site should be located to the eastern/south eastern section of the site to provide a buffer between residential development and the Local Wildlife Site.</li> <li>7. This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.</li> <li>8. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Option E9 Star Lane Brickworks (southern section of Industrial Estate)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option E9 (the southern section of the Industrial Estate) performs strongly against the sustainability objectives within the context of being reallocated from employment to residential use. It would positively impact on the balanced communities, housing and land &amp; soil objectives in particular.</li> <li>2. Although the identified area is allocated for employment purposes, this option encompasses land which is currently disused.</li> <li>3. Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'West Great Wakering' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further. Although the cumulative impact of development in the vicinity of the village would need to be carefully considered.</li> <li>4. The impact of any redevelopment of this site on the Local Wildlife Site and historic environment would need to be carefully considered.</li> <li>5. The proximity of this site to a Local Wildlife Site could impact on biodiversity, although this could be mitigated against. Public open space within any proposal for redevelopment of this site should be located to the eastern section of the site to provide a buffer between residential development and the Local Wildlife Site.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Enhanced accessibility to local services and facilities would depend upon the northern section of the Industrial Estate coming forward for development prior to the southern section and the spatial relationship between any land allocated for residential development to the west of Great Wakering (which may have the potential to provide pedestrian links to the High Street).</li> <li>7. This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.</li> <li>8. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</li> </ol>
<b>Option E10 Eldon Way Industrial Estate</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option E10 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives within the context of being reallocated from employment to mixed use. This option would redevelop previously developed land in an accessible location, promote access to services and facilities, and enhance local housing and employment opportunities.</li> <li>2. This is an existing employment site which is currently in use, although a number of the existing units are vacant. Redevelopment of the site should incorporate employment generating uses in order to perform well against sustainability objectives.</li> <li>3. It is noted that any redevelopment of the Industrial Estate will be determined through the Hockley Area Action Plan.</li> <li>4. This option is well related to the centre of Hockley and public transport links.</li> <li>5. This option would act as an interim designation prior to the finalisation of the Hockley Area Action Plan. It may enable a wider scope of reasonable/ appropriate options to be derived for the site.</li> <li>6. This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
<b>Option E11 Stambridge Mills</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerns with this option include flood risk, its detachment from the existing residential area, and the impact of vehicular traffic from the site on the air quality in Rochford centre.</li> <li>2. Notwithstanding the aforementioned concerns with this option, it also has significant sustainability benefits as it would entail redevelopment of derelict, previously developed land; redevelopment of a site which currently has a significant impact on the landscape; and would reduce the need to develop on greenfield and Green Belt land elsewhere in the District.</li> <li>3. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</li> </ol>
<b>Option E12 Rawreth Industrial Estate</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option E12 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives, in particular housing, balanced communities, land &amp; soil and air quality, within the context of being reallocated from employment to residential use.</li> <li>2. This option is currently in use for employment purposes. Any redevelopment of the site for residential development should be done in conjunction with the relocation of existing employment uses. Failure to provide alternative accommodation for existing employment uses will have a negative impact on sustainability objectives.</li> <li>3. Comprehensive development alongside any future development in the general location 'North of London Road, Rayleigh' would enhance the sustainability credentials of this option still further. The cumulative impact of development in this location would need to be carefully considered.</li> <li>4. Although public transport links are available, the accessibility of local services along London Road may depend on the potential to provide an additional link (potentially a circular public transport route) with any comprehensive redevelopment in the general location 'North of London Road'.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Public open space will be incorporated within any development coming forward on this site which may be provided to the south west of the site (where there is an area of flood zone 2).</li> <li>6. This option presents a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary.</li> <li>7. This site may require decontamination before any development takes place.</li> </ol>
<b>Additional Employment Land to be Allocated</b>	
<p><b>West of Rayleigh</b></p> <p>Six options for land to the west of Rayleigh were considered: Option E13, Option E14, Option E15, Option E16, Option E17 and Option E18.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option E13 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of utilising previously developed land, its proximity to the existing residential area and residential options to the north of London Road, its accessibility and impact on landscape character (given that it is already developed).</li> <li>2. Options E14, E15, E16 and E17 perform well against these objectives, with the notable exception that these options encompass varying degrees of greenfield land in addition to the brownfield site.</li> <li>3. Option E17 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives, with the notable exception of it being on greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available.</li> <li>4. Option E18 generally performs well against these objectives, although it is less accessible, in terms of sustainable access this option performs less well than the other options.</li> <li>5. Any impact on hedgerows to the north, east and west of Option E18 would need to be taken into consideration.</li> <li>6. The relationship between Options E13 to E17 and the options for use to the north of London Road would need to be taken into consideration, in particular the impact on the highway network, landscape, the Green Belt, and the provision of a green buffer to the west of the residential options.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
	<p>7. Two areas to the west of Rayleigh could be allocated for employment use as follows, and this would perform well in sustainability terms:</p> <p>Option E13 could be allocated for employment use, but this could be limited to light industry/office use due to the proximity of these sites to residential development to the east. The size of the site taken forward would therefore depend on the amount of such uses required for this general location.</p> <p>A proportion of Option E18 could be allocated for employment use (depending on the amount of heavier employment development required for this general location). Although this site is located further away from the existing residential area of Rayleigh than the other options, it is well located to the strategic highway network and has the potential to accommodate 'heavier' employment activities which are likely to become 'bad neighbours'. It has the potential accommodate a significant proportion of employment land without impacting on residential amenity or the local highway network (highways access from this site may need to be negotiated carefully).</p>
<b>North of London Southend Airport</b>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal of the area to the north of London Southend Airport for additional employment uses will be undertaken during the preparation of the London Southend Airport and Environs Joint Area Action Plan.</p>
<p><b>South of Great Wakering</b></p> <p>Six options for land to the south of Great Wakering were considered: Option E19, Option E20, Option E21, Option E22, Option E23 and Option E24.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options E19 and E22 perform strongly against the sustainability objectives when compared against the alternatives, in terms of the lesser impact on the landscape &amp; townscape and land &amp; soil in particular.</li> <li>The general location to the south of Great Wakering is not considered to be an appropriate location for a large employment site – a smaller employment site to accommodate businesses displaced from the redevelopment of Star Lane Brickworks would be a more sustainable approach.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The size of Option E19 is considered to be appropriate for this general location, but the arrangement of the site may not facilitate a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary. It is recommended that the eastern boundary of Option E19, if taken forward, is extended further to the east towards the defined field boundary and the southern boundary is moved northwards. This would create a similar site arrangement as per Option E22 but with a site area akin to Option E19.</li> <li>4. The options may have significant implications on the highway network at certain locations; therefore this impact would need to be considered. The cumulative impact of development in this location would need to be carefully considered.</li> <li>5. The relationship between Options E19 to E24 and the options for residential use to the west of Great Wakering would need to be taken into consideration, in particular the impact on the highway network, landscape, and the Green Belt.</li> <li>6. Any potential impact of development on the historic environment and the potential for surviving archaeological deposits would need to be carefully considered.</li> <li>7. The relationship between residential development (on the reallocated Industrial Estate and Brickworks) and employment land within the recommended employment allocation (particularly with Options E19, E20 and E22) would need to be carefully considered. The cumulative impact of development in this location would need to be carefully considered.</li> <li>8. Options E19 and E22 are in close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to this site. The proximity of this site to a Local Wildlife Site could impact on biodiversity, although this could be mitigated against.</li> <li>9. It is recommended that a green buffer is provided to the north and/or east of Options E19, E20, E21 and E22 if taken forward.</li> <li>10. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Environmental Allocations</b>	
<b>Local Wildlife Sites</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The option to allocate the 39 identified Local Wildlife Sites performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives through encouraging the retention of local biodiversity which could have wider positive, long term implications.</li> <li>2. New development which would impact on Local Wildlife Sites should prepare a management plan to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</li> </ol>
<b>Upper Roach Valley</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The option to allocate the Upper Roach Valley performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives through protecting and potentially enhancing the landscape character, soil quality and biodiversity of this area.</li> </ol>
<b>Coastal Protection Belt</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The option to allocate the Coastal Protection Belt performs very strongly against the sustainability objectives through seeking to protect the character of the undeveloped coastline and limit development in sensitive areas.</li> </ol>
<b>Education</b>	
<b>Site North of London Road Rayleigh</b>	The sustainability of allocating a single-form entry primary school to the north of London Road, Rayleigh depends on the specific site allocated for residential development. Please refer to the Sustainability Appraisals for residential development in this general location (Options NLR1 to NLR5).
<b>Site to the West of Rochford</b>	The sustainability of allocating a new primary school to the west of Rochford depends on the specific site allocated for residential development. Please refer to the Sustainability Appraisals for residential development in this general location (Options WR1 to WR4).

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<p><b>King Edmund School</b></p> <p>Three options for land to be set aside for the expansion of King Edmund School were considered: Option KES1, Option KES2 and Option KES3.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All of the options perform strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of providing for local education needs and enabling to school to expand as appropriate, although Option KES2 and KES3 may force potential residential development in the general location of East Ashingdon further to the north and may have an impact on the provision of improved access to the school from Brays Lane.</li> <li>2. A proportion of the existing playing fields which are not required for expansion would retain their Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment. In effect a proportion of the existing playing fields, in addition to new playing fields would have a dual designation of educational use and Green Belt.</li> <li>3. Option KES1 should not be accessed from Oxford Road as it would not relate well to existing or additional school buildings (if provided on the current site). It is also a narrow residential road and the provision of access along this road would have a negative impact on community cohesion in this locality.</li> <li>4. Improved access to the school should be provided from the north along Brays Lane.</li> <li>5. The impact on the historic environment would need to be considered with any development.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Option EDU1 – Great Wakering</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU1 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Option EDU2 – Barling</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU2 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU3 – Canewdon</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU3 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU4 – Rochford</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU4 encompasses four existing educational facilities which perform strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of these schools in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>2. The existing playing field for Waterman Primary should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU5 – King Edmund School (existing)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU5 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>2. The existing or new playing field would retain a Green Belt designation to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt. This would depend on the option taken forward for the expansion of King Edmund School (Options KES1, KES2 or KES3).</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Option EDU6 – Ashingdon</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU6 is an existing educational facility which performs well against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU7 – Greensward Academy, Hockley</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU7 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU8 – The Westerings Primary School, Hawkwell</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU8 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt and to protect the character of the Upper Roach Valley Special Landscape Area.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU9 – Hockley Primary School, Hockley</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option EDU9 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Option EDU10 – Riverside Junior and Infant School, Hullbridge</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option EDU10 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt and to protect the character of the Coastal Protection Belt.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU11 – St. Nicholas Church of England Primary School, Rayleigh</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option EDU11 is an existing educational facility which performs well against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU12 – Our Lady of Ransom Primary School, Rayleigh (A)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option EDU12 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> <li>The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU13 – Sweyne Park School, Glebe Junior School (B)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option EDU13 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU14 – Down Hall Primary School (C)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option EDU14 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> </ol>
<b>Option EDU15 – Edward Francis Junior and Infant School (A)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option EDU15 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Option EDU16 – Fitzwimarc Secondary School (B)</b>	1. Option EDU16 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.
<b>Option EDU17 – Wyburns Primary School</b>	1. Option EDU17 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.  2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.
<b>Option EDU18 – Grove Wood Primary School, Rayleigh</b>	1. Option EDU18 is an existing educational facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.  2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the Green Belt.
<b>Option EDU19 – Stambridge Primary School</b>	1. Option EDU19 is an existing educational facility which performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives in terms of enabling the expansion of this school in a location that is accessible to the local population.  2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and educational use to prevent unnecessary encroachment into the open countryside.

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Open Space</b>	
<p><b>Open Space</b></p> <p>Two options for the allocation of open space were considered: option OS1 and Option OS2.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option OS1 to allocate existing areas of public open space performs strongly against the sustainability objectives, in terms of promoting the protection of areas accessible to local communities, promoting healthy and safe communities, and safeguarding areas of ecological value.</li> <li>2. All areas of public open space as identified in the Open Space Study 2009 should be included within the open space designation.</li> </ol>
<b>Leisure Facilities</b>	
<p><b>Option LF1 – Rayleigh Leisure Centre</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option LF1 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives through safeguarding this existing facility which is accessible to the local population and promoting health communities.</li> </ol> <p>It is noted that the playing pitches to the rear of Rayleigh Leisure Centre have now been completed. Therefore it is recommended that these are included within the designated area of Rayleigh Leisure Centre to ensure that these are protected through the planning process.</p>
<p><b>Option LF2 – Clements Hall Leisure Centre</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option LF2 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives through safeguarding this existing facility which is accessible to the local population and promoting health communities.</li> <li>2. The existing playing field should retain a dual designation of Green Belt and leisure use to prevent unnecessary encroachment.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<p><b>Option LF3 – Great Wakering Leisure Centre</b></p>	<p>1. Option LF3 is an existing leisure facility which performs strongly against the sustainability objectives through safeguarding this existing facility which is accessible to the local population and promoting health communities.</p> <p>Great Wakering Leisure Centre became unviable to run and was closed in October 2011. It may therefore not be appropriate to allocate Option LF3 for leisure use. This site, which encompasses both the leisure centre and the playing field, may retain its existing public open space designation. However, the allocation of the existing developed part of the site may need to be reviewed in light of these recent changes.</p>
<p><b>Community Facilities</b></p>	
<p><b>Community Facilities</b></p> <p>Two options for the allocation of community facilities were considered: option CF1 and Option CF2.</p>	<p>1 Whilst there would be benefits to allocating community facilities for community use, it is not considered to be practical to identify and allocate all buildings/structures in community use, as there is potential that some facilities could be missed, or despite being of importance, are too small to warrant a land-use allocation.</p> <p>2 The approach of allocating existing community facilities for community use, as set out in Option CF1, performs well against sustainability objectives in terms of safeguarding facilities which are accessible to the local population.</p> <p>3 A general policy supporting the retention of all community facilities would also be a sustainable approach. It is noted that Policy CLT6 of the Core Strategy Submission Document would provide overarching protection for all community facilities in the District.</p>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
<b>Town Centres</b>	
<p><b>Rayleigh Town Centre</b> Two options for Rayleigh town centre boundary were considered: Option TC1 and Option TC2.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing town centre boundary in Option TC1 performs more strongly against the sustainability objectives than the smaller area identified in Option TC2. Option TC1 would positively contribute to ensure the appropriate mix of town centre uses, promote accessibility, facilitate residential development and support business development in particular.</li> <li>2. The Rayleigh town centre boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Rayleigh Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction will other proposals within the Area Action Plan.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Rochford Town Centre</b> Four options for Rochford town centre boundary were considered: Option TC3, Option TC4, Option TC5 and Option TC6.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whilst the options generally perform well against the sustainability objectives, Option TC5 performs more strongly in terms of the potential to promote mixed, high density residential development within Rochford and ensuring access to services without being too widely drawn (like Option TC3 and TC4) or not wide enough (Option TC6).</li> <li>2. Whilst Option TC5 encompasses much less residential development than the existing town centre boundary (Option TC3) and includes the new retail development to the north of the Market Square, it does not include some potentially key opportunity sites for redevelopment.</li> <li>3. The boundary defined in Option TC5 could be extended northwards along North Street towards Weir Pond Road to include potential redevelopment sites in this area.</li> <li>4. The boundary defined in Option TC5 could be extended westwards along West Street and southwards along South Street towards Bradley Way to include the area encompassing Locks Hill, the health centre facilities and Back Lane car park.</li> <li>5. The Rochford town centre boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Rochford Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction will other proposals within the Area Action Plan.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<p><b>Hockley Town Centre</b></p> <p>Three options for Hockley town centre boundary were considered: Option TC7, Option TC8 and Option TC9.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option TC8, which encompasses a slightly smaller area than existing, performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of focusing town centre and other appropriate uses around a core area, promoting accessibility and facilitating business development.</li> <li>This boundary may be reviewed through the development of the Hockley Area Action Plan. The sustainability of any revised town centre boundary would have to be considered in conjunction with other proposals within the Area Action Plan</li> </ol>
<p><b>Option TC10 – Reallocation of Hockley as a District Centre</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The option to reallocate Hockley as a District Centre does not perform well against the sustainability objectives, as retail and other business opportunities may be directed to Rayleigh and Rochford town centres which would have a significant negative impact against a range of sustainability objectives.</li> </ol>
<b>Primary Shopping Areas</b>	
<p><b>Rayleigh Primary Shopping Area</b></p> <p>Two options for the Rayleigh Primary Shopping Area were considered: Option TC11 and Option TC12.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC11 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of focusing primary retail uses within the town centre. This area is smaller than the town centre boundary for Rayleigh (Option TC1), which performed better against sustainability objectives than Option TC2.</li> <li>The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Rochford Primary Shopping Area</b></p> <p>Two options for the Rochford Primary Shopping Area were considered: Option TC13 and Option TC14.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC13 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of focusing primary retail uses within the town centre. This area is smaller than the town centre boundary for Rochford (Option TC5 with minor amendments) which performed better than Options TC3, TC4 and TC6.</li> <li>The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<p><b>Hockley Primary Shopping Area</b></p> <p>Two options for the Hockley Primary Shopping Area were considered: Option TC15 and Option TC16.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The Primary Shopping Area defined within Option TC15 performs strongly against the sustainability objectives in terms of focusing primary retail uses within the town centre. This area is smaller than the town centre boundary for Hockley (Option TC8) which performed better than Options TC7 and TC9.</li> <li>2 The area outside the defined Primary Shopping Area but within the defined town centre boundary should encompass a mix of appropriate town centre (retail and non-retail) uses to complement those within the Primary Shopping Area.</li> </ol>
<b>Alternative Options</b>	
<p><b>Option ALT1 – Nevendon Salvage, Lower Road, Hullbridge</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although Option ALT1 is previously developed land, it does not perform well against the sustainability objectives in terms of the relationship with the existing residential area, accessibility, and the impact on the Green Belt in this location.</li> <li>2. This option would project into the Green Belt, create fragmented development and potentially undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in this location.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Option ALT2 – South of Hall Road, Rochford</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option ALT2 performs well against the sustainability objectives, particularly in terms of promoting development in an accessible location and promoting sustainable methods of travel.</li> <li>2. This option would not be able to accommodate the full housing requirements for the general location of 'West Rochford' which may lead to fragmented development.</li> <li>3. Development of this option may impact on the deliverability and viability of wider infrastructure provision in this general location.</li> <li>4. This option has the potential to have a direct impact on the setting of two Listed Buildings.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Option ALT3 – North of Ironwell Lane, Rochford</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option ALT3 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives as the areas at risk of flooding could significantly constrain the capacity of the site, and have negative implications for the delivery of housing and associated infrastructure in particular.</li> <li>2. This site extends north away from Ironwell Lane which may impact on accessibility.</li> <li>3. This option would create fragmented development in the general location of 'West Rochford'.</li> <li>4. A significant proportion of the western and southern section of the site is situated within an area at risk of flooding (flood zone 2 and 3).</li> <li>5. Areas at risk of flooding could accommodate public open space, however, this would significantly reduce the capacity of the site to accommodate residential development.</li> </ol>
<b>Option ALT4 – East of Folly Chase, Hockley</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option ALT4 generally performs well against the sustainability objectives compared to other West Hockley alternatives, with the exception that it promotes the development of greenfield land when brownfield alternatives are available in the general location of 'West Hockley'.</li> <li>2. This site relates very well to existing residential development and a primary school.</li> <li>3. There is potential to provide access to the existing highway network.</li> <li>4. It would be challenging to create a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary with this option.</li> <li>5. Any development at this location would have to be carefully managed to avoid harm to the Local Wildlife Sites.</li> <li>6. An area of public open space may be provided within this option to provide a natural buffer between any development and the Local Wildlife Site (Folly Wood).</li> <li>7. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<p><b>Option ALT5 – South of the Anchor Lane/Gardeners Lane Junction, Canewdon</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option ALT5 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives in terms of impact on the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardeners Lane, and the Green Belt.</li> <li>2. Although the severance between this site and the existing residential development to the north of Anchor Lane could have an impact on community cohesion, this barrier is unlikely to be insurmountable.</li> <li>3. The impact of providing access near to the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardeners Lane would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward on this site.</li> <li>4. Although there is an existing dwelling to the west, the location of this site would extend the designated residential area of Canewdon further to the south.</li> <li>5. This site may not be able to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the locality.</li> <li>6. A management plan for one of the Local Wildlife Sites may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Option ALT6 – North of Gardeners Lane and South of Lambourne Hall Road, Canewdon</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option ALT6 performs well against the sustainability objectives as it could provide housing and associated infrastructure and could provide a defensible Green Belt boundary. However, it is debatable as to whether this site could be considered commensurate within the general location of 'South Canewdon'.</li> <li>2. Any development on this site would either have to be at a high density or additional land would be required to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy Submission Document. This has the potential to lead to fragmented development with limited opportunities for providing additional infrastructure.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The site is separated from the main residential area to the west by the primary school and the allotments, which could have an impact on community cohesion.</li> <li>4. The impact of providing access near to the junction of Anchor Lane and Gardeners Lane given this site's location would need to be carefully considered with any development coming forward on this site.</li> <li>5. There is limited potential to connect this site directly onto Lambourne Hall Road or Anchor Lane due to the enclosure of the site both to the north and west.</li> <li>6. A link may be provided outside of the site but this would require additional Green Belt land potentially to the east/north east.</li> <li>7. This site would be able to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained in the locality.</li> <li>8. A management plan for one of the Local Wildlife Sites may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</li> </ol>
<b>Option ALT7 – Potash Garden Centre, Main Road, Hawkwell</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option ALT7 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives through the provision of housing and associated infrastructure and promoting balanced, healthy communities to a certain extent, although this is outweighed by the impact on the Green Belt and landscape character.</li> <li>2. Although it has an existing use as a garden centre and adjoining dwelling, it is not previously developed land.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Additional land potentially in the Green Belt would be required to meet the shortfall in housing and infrastructure provision in the general location of 'South Hawkwell'. This has the potential to impact negatively on community cohesion through the creation of fragmented development.</li> <li>4. This option would extend the allocated residential area to the south of Main Road. It would potentially create an island of allocated residential development within the Green Belt.</li> <li>5. If this site is taken forward then surrounding dwellings should be allocated as residential development. However, the development of this site may subject adjacent areas to development pressure and thus undermine the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary in the locality.</li> <li>6. Although there are dwellings to the north and east of this site, it is not well related to existing residential development which is designated as such.</li> <li>7. This option would lead to the loss of employment in the locality through the displacement of an existing business, but it would not result in a loss of employment land, because it is not designated as such.</li> <li>8. The existing land use is considered to be an inappropriate use on the urban fringe, and so reallocating this site would contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe.</li> <li>9. This option has the potential to ensure that a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained in this locality. However, it could create an island of allocated residential development within the Green Belt which could undermine this.</li> <li>10. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Sites may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the sites in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the sites.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

<b>Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation</b>	<b>Recommendations/Key Observations</b>
<b>Option ALT8 – Land at Madrid Avenue, Rayleigh</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option ALT8 does not perform well against the sustainability objectives in terms of its impact on the Green Belt and landscape character, implications for accessibility and potential effect on health (primarily due to the presence of masts and powerlines).</li> <li>2. Due to the scale of the site, it may not be able to accommodate the full pitch requirement for the District.</li> <li>3. The lack of enclosure on three sides of this site and the creation of an isolated allocated area of land in the Green Belt raises concerns regarding the potential to ensure a robust and defensible Green Belt boundary in the locality if this site were allocated.</li> <li>4. The allocation of this option would have a significant impact on local landscape character.</li> <li>5. The extension of the site to the north away from Rawreth Lane may impact on accessibility for some, particularly for those without access to private transport.</li> <li>6. There are high voltage power lines running across the site with a mast in close proximity to the eastern boundary, and there are also high voltage power lines to the west of the site. As the lines run through the site, they would have the potential to have a negative impact on health. It is unlikely to be viable to move these obstructions given the proposed land use.</li> <li>7. There may be some impact on the A1245, and highways access from this site will need to be negotiated carefully.</li> </ol>
<b>Option ALT9 – West of Purdeys Industrial Estate, Sutton Road, Rochford</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option ALT9 performs reasonably well against the sustainability objectives in terms of enhancing local employment opportunities in proximity to Rochford town centre.</li> <li>2. It is well related to Rochford town centre.</li> <li>3. This option is not situated within a strategic location identified within the Core Strategy Submission Document for additional employment land.</li> </ol>

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical Summary)**

Options Considered and Appraised: Published Reports and Public Consultation	Recommendations/Key Observations
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. This option would secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District as any allocation to the west of Purdeys Industrial Estate would be designated in addition to the strategic locations identified in the Core Strategy Submission Document, and appraised through the Sustainability Appraisal process.</li> <li>5. Although it would ensure access to jobs in this area, it has the potential to detract from future employment opportunities to the west of Rayleigh, south of Great Wakering and to the north of London Southend Airport.</li> <li>6. Whilst this option would be able to create a defensible Green Belt boundary, it would result in the loss of Green Belt land in the District where no justification for such loss is evidenced and would impact on the local landscape and openness of the area.</li> <li>7. This site is situated to the north east of London Southend Airport, and is not as well related to this key economic driver unlike the general location 'North of London Southend Airport' which will be allocated independently through the London Southend Airport Joint Area Action Plan.</li> <li>8. There are physical barriers between the site and the airport.</li> <li>9. Existing employment land would be extended towards residential development if this option were taken forward.</li> <li>10. There is potential to create a public open space buffer between this option and existing communities.</li> <li>11. A management plan for the Local Wildlife Site may be required to ensure the appropriate management of the site in the medium to long term, although this may depend on the relationship between the option taken forward and the site.</li> </ol>

### **Consultation on the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document and the draft SA Report**

- 1.30 Given the delay between the publication of the Discussion and Consultation Document in March and April 2010 and the draft SA Report in early 2012 it is considered appropriate to provide stakeholders with an additional opportunity to comment on both documents together, and in particular the implications of the final Sustainability Appraisal for the initial stage of the Allocations DPD on the options within the Discussion and Consultation Document. Key stakeholders will be invited to comment again on these documents for a four week period.

### **Implementation and Monitoring**

- 1.31 Monitoring of the LDF will take place through the publication of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies potential indicators for monitoring which relate to the SA Framework objectives. The Allocations DPD is a key component to deliver the Core Strategy. The potential indicators for monitoring the Allocations DPD have been identified. Recommendations from this SA in relation to monitoring will be incorporated into the Council's monitoring strategy as appropriate.

### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

- 1.32 The Sustainability Appraisal has appraised the residential, employment, environment, community facilities and town centre options set out in the Allocations DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document, identifying potential cumulative, short, medium and long-term, temporary or permanent effects, where possible.
- 1.33 Each of the residential and employment options to deliver the requirements of the Rochford District Core Strategy have different implications for the sustainability objectives in terms of site level effects, however, in general the options would have a range of short term negative impacts on local communities through their construction, primarily due to the relationship between the options and existing residential areas, impacts on the local and wider highway network and air quality. Over the longer term, these options would in general have negative impacts on landscape whilst having positive effects on housing/employment objectives in terms of providing housing/employment and associated infrastructure on land currently designated Green Belt.
- 1.34 The retention of existing employment land (in accordance with the Core Strategy), in general would have long term positive effects on economy and employment. The environment options would have long term positive impacts on biodiversity and landscape. The options to retain existing schools, community facilities, open spaces and leisure centres would likely have a long term positive impact on balanced communities and accessibility, however, the deallocation of those options currently in the Green Belt would impact on landscape & townscape and land & soil in the longer term. The different options for town centre boundaries and primary shopping areas would likely have positive effects on housing, the local economy and employment, landscape and townscape, and balanced communities in the longer term. However, in the short term, redevelopment within the town centres would have an impact on communities, in terms of the proximity of construction to the existing residential area, highways, and air pollution.

**Rochford District Council – Allocations Development Plan Document:  
Discussion and Consultation Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical  
Summary)**

---

- 1.35 This Sustainability Appraisal contains a number of recommendations in relation to various allocation options. The Sustainability Appraisal, alongside consultation responses received, will be used to inform the preparation of the pre-submission Allocations DPD. The recommendations and key observations identified throughout the report have been made to assist in mitigating the potential impacts of the options and to enhance the sustainability of the plan. Any significant changes made to the document will be subject to further SA, and a Revised SA Report will be published alongside the Allocations Submission Document.